

LEGISLATIVE ASSEMBLY OF SASKATCHEWAN
Second Session — Eighteenth Legislature
4th Day

Wednesday, March 17, 1976

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

WELCOME TO STUDENTS

MR. B.M. DYCK (Saskatoon Mayfair): — Mr. Speaker, I am very delighted to introduce through you to this Legislature, 38 Grade Seven and Eight students from MacNab Park School in my constituency of Saskatoon Mayfair. I should like to welcome them to this Assembly and also their teachers, Mr. Froese and Mr. Reckert and hope that they have an enjoyable and informational afternoon. I look forward to meeting with them this afternoon in the rotunda.

HON. MEMBERS: Hear, hear!

MR. G.H. PENNER (Saskatoon Eastview): — Mr. Speaker, I wonder if I, through you, might join the Member for Saskatoon Mayfair in welcoming the students from MacNab Park School. They are not in my constituency but I notice that a couple of my former colleagues are sitting there, Mr. Reckert and Mr. Froese. I am delighted to see you here and I hope you have a safe journey home.

HON. MEMBERS: Hear, hear!

INTRODUCTION OF GUESTS

MR. G. McNEILL (Meadow Lake): — Mr. Speaker, it gives me great pleasure to introduce a group of gentlemen and I think they are the reeves and councillors who have the distinction of being the reeve and councillor of the newest municipality in Saskatchewan, the Rural Municipality of Meadow Lake, which was formed and came into existence on the 1st of March.

I should like to introduce the reeve, Mr. Roy Armstrong, who was born in Minnesota in 1910 and he has homesteaded . . .

SOME HON. MEMBERS: Hear, hear!

MR. McNEILL: — . . . in the Meadow Lake area in 1928 and has worked with the farm credit union and other community projects since.

The Deputy Reeve, Mr. Ray Wolfing, born in Meadow Lake. He has worked for the Department of Education for five years.

SOME HON. MEMBERS: Hear, hear!

MR. McNEILL: — One of the councillors, Walter Kovloski, born in Meadow Lake in 1933, farms in the area and also one of the members of the old LID councillors.

SOME HON. MEMBERS: Hear, hear!

March 17, 1976

MR. McNEILL: — Lee Clarke born in Meadow Lake in 1932 and farms in the area and he is also one of the members of the council.

SOME HON. MEMBERS: Hear, hear!

MR. McNEILL: — Glen Ronald born at Fiske in 1918 and moved to Meadow Lake in 1939 and farms and ranches in that area.

SOME HON. MEMBERS: Hear, hear!

MR. McNEILL: — Missing are two of the councillors who couldn't be here. Also with them is their acting secretary Mr. Harry Stobbs. I should like you gentlemen to stand up.

SOME HON. MEMBERS: Hear, hear!

MR. McNEILL: — Mr. Speaker, I wish and hope that their work in the town and in the convention much success. I wish them a safe journey home and I will be meeting with them later on.

MR. A. THIBAUT (Kinistino): — Mr. Speaker, I should like to introduce the council from the RM of Invergordon, of which I was reeve for seven years before I came to this House. I did such a bad job that they sent me down here and that is the only way in which they could get rid of me.

They are sitting in the galleries to your right, Mr. Speaker, led by their Deputy Reeve, Mr. Jackson and the councillors, Mr. Stelmaschuk and Mr. Borsa. Would you please stand up. What a fine looking bunch of boys we have up there in Invergordon. Mr. Zabolski, Mr. Chitrinia and Mr. Toner. They are the finest group of people you could have here in this House. I also want to say welcome to Mr. Stobbs from Meadow Lake. He used to come from my constituency. He was also a reeve. I certainly appreciate having them here this afternoon and the next 25 minutes should be very enlightening.

HON. MEMBERS: Hear, hear!

QUESTIONS

Harold Livergant

MR. D.G. STEUART (Leader of the Opposition): — Mr. Speaker, I should like to direct a question to the Premier.

Is the Premier aware, does he have any knowledge that one Harold Livergant was ever convicted of an offence under the Criminal Code of Canada, of theft, or fraud, or conversion of money or any similar such offence?

HON. A.E. BLAKENEY (Premier): — No.

MR. STEUART: — The Premier says that he has no knowledge of this and I must take him at his word. I would then ask the Premier

if this knowledge is brought to light, would he change his opinion about our contention that there is a conflict of interest in handling Mr. Livergant and his organization too great powers, to purchase, to buy and to control the nursing homes in the Province of Saskatchewan?

MR. BLAKENEY: — Mr. Speaker, I cannot see what relevance a conviction would have — what influence it would have on whether or not there is a conflict of interest. If there is a conflict of interest then presumably there is, whether or not the person involved has or has not a criminal record. However, if there are facts of which we are not aware of which should be brought to the attention of the Government we would be happy to consider them.

MR. STEUART: — A further supplementary. Would the Premier, since it is my information that this took place during his time in office or about that time in office, would the Premier undertake to look into it and report to this House?

MR. BLAKENEY: — No, I will not. If the Hon. Member has information he can lay it before the House or alternatively send it to me privately. I do not undertake to chase down every rumor that he may wish to raise in this House.

MR. STEUART: — Mr. Speaker, I certainly will lay it in front of the Premier. I am absolutely amazed that he claims that he has no knowledge of this at this time.

MR. BLAKENEY: — Mr. Speaker, I wonder whether that was a supplementary. The Hon. Member may be amazed. He is frequently amazed at the truth.

SOME HON. MEMBERS: Hear, hear!

Municipal Road Load Limits

MR. S.J. CAMERON (Regina South): — Mr. Speaker, I have a question of the Minister of Municipal Affairs, with respect to his comments yesterday to the Saskatchewan Association of Rural Municipalities and the load limits with respect to municipal roads that he indicated that he would be imposing.

May I ask the Minister if these load limits were imposed would it not in fact prohibit the winter movement of grain from grain elevators to the Government terminals on lines that are blown in with snow?

HON. G. MacMURCHY (Minister of Municipal Affairs): — No.

MR. CAMERON: — A supplementary then. May I ask the Minister by what process would that grain movement be exempt if you had limits of 32,000 or 50,000 pounds on municipal roads?

MR. MacMURCHY: — We would use the 50,000 pound road limit. I want

to make it clear to the Hon. Member that what I put forward to SARM Convention was the SARM policy, which they have requested us to implement over a fair period of time. We now see our way clear to implement their policy with respect to municipal roads. That being, 32,000 pounds for single axle, 50,000 pounds for double axle.

MR. CAMERON: — A supplementary. Was it SARM's request that all semi-trailer outfits that are used for hauling grain be taken off Saskatchewan roads?

MR. MacMURCHY: — It was SARM's request that the road limits on municipal roads be, as I indicated, Mr. Speaker, just a few minutes ago, 32,000 for single axle, 50,000 for double axle.

SOME HON. MEMBERS: Hear, hear!

MR. SPEAKER: — The Member for Souris-Cannington. Is it a supplementary?

MR. E.A. BERNTSON (Souris-Cannington): — A supplementary, yes, Mr. Speaker.

Will the Government act in light of the fact that this proposed change will eliminate larger trucks and semi-trailers from rural Saskatchewan, will he indicate whether or not he will allow F plates on tandem farm trucks?

MR. MacMURCHY: — We have no policy as yet to allow F plates on Tandem trucks. The matter is under consideration, but we have not announced any change in our present policy.

MR. BERNTSON: — A further supplementary, Mr. Speaker. Does this 50,000 load limit not conflict with the 500 pounds per square inch load limit on provincial highways?

MR. MacMURCHY: — I think that it will be relative to the size of tire, I think that is granted. What I announced yesterday, Mr. Speaker, for the information of the Member for Souris-Cannington, it was our intention to implement a policy in response to the requests of SARM. I indicated to them that we could see a good deal of problems particularly administrative problems, with implementation of this particular policy. That we want to sit down with them to discuss the possibility of providing permits under certain circumstances. We want to do that and we will do that before we make any formal announcement, or any specific announcement, with respect to time of implementation and other conditions that may be involved in implementation.

Scuttling of Hall Commission Report

MR. C.P. MacDONALD (Indian Head-Wolseley): — Mr. Speaker, I should like

to direct a question to the Minister of Transportation.

Is this not a direct attempt by the NDP to scuttle the Hall Commission before it even submits its report? Does the Minister not know that the Hall Commission now . . .

MR. MESSER: — That is not a question.

MR. MacDONALD: — Yes, it is a question. Is the Minister not aware that the Hall Commission is studying at this present time the entire problem of transportation in grain handling in the Province of Saskatchewan and western Canada? And how does that not presuppose a denial and a scuttling of that report before it has even come up and may in all honesty tamper with any efforts to upgrade and improve the grain-handling situation in the Province of Saskatchewan.

MR. MacMURCHY: — Mr. Speaker, I am fully aware of the efforts of Justice Emmett Hall in this commission. I think they are doing an excellent job. I think that the people of Saskatchewan are doing an excellent job in making their position clear to that commission.

It seemed to us that the people who build the municipal roads and maintain the municipal roads should know the kind of load limits they want on those municipal roads. They have indicated that by a Resolution of their contention . . .

MR. SPEAKER: — Order, order! I think we have had two short speeches on this matter now, one in the guise of a question and the other in the guise of an answer. I would suggest that we get back to the Question Period.

Does the Member for Nipawin have a supplementary?

MR. COLLVER: — I will concede to . . .

MR. SPEAKER: — Member for Thunder Creek.

Studies on Damage by Semi-Trailers to Road System

MR. W.C. THATCHER (Thunder Creek): — Mr. Speaker, I should like to ask a supplementary question of the Minister of Transport.

The Minister, in his speech to the SARM has referred to the damage done by semi-trailers to the road systems in Saskatchewan. I should like to ask the Minister if he has evidence of such, the studies that have taken place on it; have any taken place and if so are you prepared to table such studies in the Legislature?

MR. MacMURCHY: — Mr. Speaker, I am not sure that the Rural Municipalities Association have data which we can provide for all Members. If they have I will ask them if they are prepared to table such documentation. I think that there has been some evidence of damage done by semi-trailers, hauling the heavy loads of grain on our provincial highway system. I can get information from the Department of Highways and I will certainly provide that information to the Hon. Member.

MR. THATCHER: — Since the Minister is perpetuating his thesis with no documentation, does he realize that under what he is proposing that every hopper bottom grain trailer will be taken off the road? That every cattle liner to every rancher will be taken off?

MR. SPEAKER: — Order, order! The Member is expressing opinions and I don't think he is asking a question. If the Member wants to get to the substance of his question, would he proceed at once to it.

MR. THATCHER: — Would the Minister dispute what I just said? Would you agree with what I said? Would you accept the fact that every semi-trailer in the category that I just mentioned will be taken off the road under what you are proposing?

MR. MacMURCHY: — No, no, I think that many of the cattle trucks will come under the 50,000 pounds. I think that if there is need for providing permits for hauls on the municipal system we are prepared to look at that. We are not out to completely change the municipal systems so far as hauling heavy loads or heavier loads, but we are certainly out to change, or prevent, total damage of that municipal system by continuous heavy loads.

MR. SPEAKER: — Order, order! I must caution Members to refrain from this manner of questioning because I think what we are doing here is not pursuing the topic which was opened up in the original question about the discretion of, or the imposition of, bans or load limits on highways but instead we are getting into a discussion about the construction of highways and about modes of transportation. And that's not the question. The Member for Souris-Cannington.

MR. BERNTSON: — Would the Minister agree that if this proposal is adopted that a farmer could leave his farm under the 50,000 pound load limit, only to be ticketed on the provincial highway for being overweight?

MR. MacMURCHY: — One of the things we have to do is get into discussions about how this system as we are attempting to implement on behalf of the Rural Municipality Association can fit into the limits under the highway system and they will certainly be part of discussions as we develop and implement this policy.

Municipal Road Load Limits

MR. COLLVER: — Is the Minister aware of the implications of his suggestions this morning on the hauling of pulp wood to the Government owned and controlled Carrot River pulp mill and is this suggestion being made because the Government of Saskatchewan does not want to add municipal roadways to its highway grid system to save money?

MR. MacMURCHY: — I am sorry, Mr. Speaker, I lost the latter part of this

question. Could you repeat the question again for me, please.

MR. COLLVER: — Mr. Speaker, I am glad the Minister mentioned that. I wonder if it would be possible, just off the record, to get this particular microphone upgraded a little bit so that when I give my questions I do not have to shout. I am not very good at shouting.

Is the Minister aware of the implications of the policy which he announced today to the SARM, of the effect of that policy on the hauling of pulp wood over municipal roads to the Government owned Carrot River sawmill and is the Government of Saskatchewan attempting to introduce this now in order that it does not have to take into the provincial highway network the municipal roadways in order to alleviate some municipality problems in financing these badly beaten up municipal roads?

MR. MacMURCHY: — Mr. Speaker, I can't respond specifically to the question of the wood haul into the sawmill in Carrot River. I don't know whether they have to haul over the grid system or the municipal system in order to deliver loads to Carrot River. If they do then, as I have indicated earlier, this must be a matter for consideration. I want to point out to all Members what we have announced does not affect the provincial highway system which is 110,000 miles gross to the primary system and 74,000 miles gross on the secondary system. This only applies to municipal roads.

In response to the latter part of the question, I tried to make it clear to the convention yesterday that the days of transferring or wholesale transfer of municipal roads to the highway system in this Government is past, the municipal system is going to be the municipal system. It will be their responsibility and the highway system will maintain its present system as close to what it is as we can, with the exception of the expansion perhaps into the northern areas.

MR. SPEAKER: — The Member for Nipawin.

MR. COLLVER: — A supplementary, Mr. Speaker. Would the Minister, therefore, be interested in knowing that at the moment pulp trucks are using the municipal roadways because the load limits imposed on the provincial highways do not allow them to pass over the provincial highways and that these road limit restrictions will then limit the hauling of pulpwood totally.

MR. MacMURCHY: — Thank you for the information. I think it is time that we put road limits on the municipal system according to the kind of limits that that system can stand.

SOME HON. MEMBERS: Hear, hear!

MR. SPEAKER: — The Member for Elrose.

MR. R.H. BAILEY (Rosetown-Elrose): — Would the Minister in charge of Transportation before this House say that there were no other motives than those mentioned in the House today for bringing in the road restrictions? No other motives except those mentioned today?

MR. MacMURCHY: — Mr. Speaker, (1) I think we are responding to SARM, let's make that clear. As the Member for Kelvington (Mr. Byers) points out, one of the first proposals they put forward to us was with respect to attempting to deal on a province-wide basis was road limits for this system. It is true also, as I indicated, it has implications for the inland terminals. We have stated that we are not as a government in favour of inland terminals.

SOME HON. MEMBERS: Hear, hear!

MR. MacMURCHY: — We want to protect the community, we want to protect the country elevator system if we possibly can. We are not stopping the hauls to the inland terminals as some people accuse us of when we limit the . . .

MR. SPEAKER: — Order! I think the Minister's answer tends to be too lengthy. I think the question was simple enough. I think a yes or no could have answered it. Do you have a question? Proceed.

Registered Technologists — Union

MR. COLLVER: — Yes, may I address a question to the Premier in the absence of the Minister of Labour. Is the Premier aware that the registered technologists in our province are planning dramatic action to protest their inability to form a union of their choice?

MR. BLAKENEY: — No, I am not aware of any action which I would have called dramatic action. I am aware of them writing letters to the press and writing letters to the Minister, but I am not aware of any other action which is contemplated.

MR. COLLVER: — A supplementary, Mr. Speaker. Would the Premier agree with the decisions of the Labour Relations Board forcing these groups of Saskatchewan citizens against their will to join unions which have very little whatever to do with their chosen line of work?

MR. SPEAKER: — I question the urgency of that question and I will not allow it to proceed. Next question.

Municipal Road Load Limits

MR. PENNER: — Mr. Speaker, I wonder if could go back to the Hon. Mr. MacMurchy with a question. Is the Minister aware and I think if he isn't he should be, that what he announced yesterday will in effect wipe out a number of operators who have vehicles that are semi-trailers designed specifically for carrying grain?

MR. MacMURCHY: — Mr. Speaker, this has been brought to my attention. The numbers involved I am not sure of. The kind of hauls they

are involved in I am not sure of and that is why I indicated earlier that we are open to discussion with respect to the final implementation of the policy.

MR. PENNER: — Mr. Speaker, I must say I am pleased to hear what the Minister has just said.

MR. SPEAKER: — Are you asking a supplementary? Proceed.

MR. PENNER: — Would the Minister be prepared to indicate what format he envisages for those who are interested in this question to bring their views forward so that he and his colleagues are aware of them?

MR. MacMURCHY: — Mr. Speaker, I think the format is to get in touch with my office.

MR. PENNER: — Could I ask one supplementary on that?

MR. SPEAKER: — Yes. Supplementary.

MR. PENNER: — Will there be public hearings on this question of weight haulage?

MR. MacMURCHY: — We will take it under consideration. I had not thought of that, but certainly we will make ourselves available to any representation which we always do, Mr. Speaker.

SOME HON. MEMBERS: Hear, hear!

Registered Technologists — Union

MR. COLLVER: — I should like to direct a question to the Premier with regard to my question. In order to alleviate the problem of the registered technologists in the province, is the Government of Saskatchewan contemplating for that reason or for any other reason . . .

MR. SPEAKER: — Order! I have already expressed the opinion that I didn't believe the matter was urgent. I was not impressed with the urgency when the question was first placed. The Member for Regina South.

Municipal Road Load Limits

MR. S.J. CAMERON (Regina South): — Mr. Speaker, I wish to ask an additional question of the Minister of Municipal Affairs. Would he indicate to the House when the Saskatchewan Association of Rural Municipalities requested this particular policy and in what form did they request it?

MR. MacMURCHY: — They made the request to us in a brief and I can't

remember the actual date, I think it was in November and it was part of their brief.

MR. CAMERON: — Mr. Speaker, would the Minister be prepared to table correspondence or documents with respect to the request that he refers to from the SARM?

MR. MacMURCHY: — Mr. Speaker, I will be prepared to table the brief.

Beer Manufacturing Business

MR. D.M. HAM (Swift Current): — Mr. Speaker, a question directed to the Minister in charge of the Saskatchewan Liquor Board. Since the Provincial Government is a major Canadian shareholder in the Heninger Malting Company is it the Government's intention to get into the beer manufacturing business?

MR. N.E. BYERS (Minister in charge of Liquor Board): — Mr. Speaker, no.

Municipal Road Load Limits

MR. J.G. LANE (Qu'Appelle): — Mr. Speaker, I should like to direct a question to the Minister responsible for Transportation or the Minister of Municipal Affairs.

You indicated earlier that the load limit proposals you made yesterday were at the request of the SARM and to prevent them from municipal roads, and yet in your speech you gave the reason as being what the load limit will prevent is the use of larger trucks and semi-trailers hauling to inland terminals, and that is specifically what you said at the convention yesterday. Would the Minister not also agree, or would the Minister not agree, that such a policy will stop many grain trucks and many farmers from using the Saskatchewan Wheat Pool high through-put elevators?

MR. MacMURCHY: — Mr. Speaker, what I said yesterday was that one of the implications of such a policy will be to restrict the kind of hauling envisaged to the inland terminal. The average farm truck is a three ton truck, which weighs about 10,000 pounds empty and fully loaded would weigh anywhere between 28,000 to 30,000 pounds.

MR. LANE: — Mr. Speaker, by way of supplementary, would the Minister not agree first of all that that policy will effectively restrict grain load limits to 300 bushels in the Province of Saskatchewan and would the Minister be prepared to bring these proposals before this Assembly for approval prior to implementation?

MR. MacMURCHY: — Three hundred bushels weighs 18,000 pounds, another 10,000 pounds to the truck is 28,000 pounds. If it is a 350 bushel load, it comes within the 32,000 pound load limit.

MR. CAMERON: — Mr. Speaker, with respect to the same question. Is the Government not prepared to vest in the municipalities some discretion themselves on their own load limits in connection with this policy?

MR. MacMURCHY: — Mr. Speaker, I indicated that there is flexibility in terms of under the limits that they have asked. There are municipalities which presently now have a 28,000 pound load limit. I think we have to discuss that, as we have to discuss the problems of implementing spring load bans.

MR. CAMERON: — Supplementary, Mr. Speaker. Does the Minister rule out any discretion in the municipalities above the load limits you have indicated?

MR. MacMURCHY: — In our discussions with rural municipality associations, they have indicated that that is the limit, the maximum limit that they desire.

MR. SPEAKER: — Member for Nipawin.

MR. COLLVER: — Supplementary, Mr. Speaker. What allocations or allotments or whatever have been contemplated by the Government to the municipalities who have provincial problems similar to the Carrot River sawmill which is a province-wide sort of organization? What extra funds will be made available to the municipalities to upgrade their municipal roads to bring them up to standards so that this kind of load limit is not going to materially affect the industry, enclose the industry in their particular area and in the same way the municipalities in those areas of the inland terminals and so on?

MR. MacMURCHY: — We have not developed such a policy. If we develop such a policy, we will be pleased to announce it.

MR. SPEAKER: — Order! Are there any further introduction of guests?

INTRODUCTION OF GUESTS

MR. L.E. JOHNSON (Turtleford): — Mr. Speaker, at this time I would like to introduce to this Assembly some members from Spiritwood RM. I believe they are Mr. Boechler, the reeve of the RM and two councillors, Louis Schalm and Jim Walter, along with the secretary-treasurer of the Spiritwood municipality, Gordon Thompson.

HON. MEMBERS: Hear, hear!

MR. W.H. STODALKA (Maple Creek): — Mr. Speaker, I should like to introduce three members from the RM of Enterprise, Mr. George Mastel, Mr. Allen Woelfle and Mr. Cliff Dunwald. I hope you enjoy your stay in Regina and hope you don't get into any trouble.

HON. MEMBERS: Hear, hear!

MR. D.G. BANDA (Redberry): — Mr. Speaker, it is a great pleasure for me to introduce the reeve of the Mayfield RM, Mr. Victor Prescesky of Ruddell. I want to wish him an enjoyable and interesting afternoon and wish him and his fellow councillors a good meeting and a safe journey home.

HON. MEMBERS: Hear, hear!

STATEMENTS

Changes in Text of Public Accounts

HON. W.E. SMISHEK (Minister of Finance): — Mr. Speaker, last year the report of the Select Standing Committee on Public Accounts recommended certain changes in the text of the public accounts. Specifically the committee made this recommendation, let me quote:

Your committee considered the question of the amount of the details now appearing in the public accounts text. Your committee recommends that the levels for detail to be shown in the public accounts be as follows:

\$10,000 per employee for wages and salaries; \$5,000 for payment to supplementaries and; \$2,000 per person for travel and; that where the aggregate of any person exceeds the limits throughout all departments, this aggregate amount is to be also shown.

Mr. Speaker, the first recommendation was for a change, as you will notice in the level of detail to be shown. This recommendation was acted upon and the public accounts which were tabled at the last session reflect this change.

Mr. Speaker, the second recommendation was that where the aggregate of that person exceeds the limits throughout all departments, this aggregate is to also be shown.

Mr. Speaker, in compliance with the request of the Select Standing Committee on Public Accounts, this information has been assembled by the Department of Finance for the first time. It is my pleasure, Mr. Speaker, to now table the supplementary information which was requested for and which we were able to compile and I hereby table that supplementary report for the consideration of the public accounts committee.

QUESTIONS

Question Period

HON. E.L. TCHORZEWSKI (Minister of Education): — Mr. Speaker, there was a question asked in the oral question period yesterday by the Member for Regina Wascana (Mr. Merchant) and I was to bring an answer. I am trying to get a clarification of the rules. Do I provide the answer now or should I do it tomorrow in question period?

MR. SPEAKER: — I would suggest the Member

do it in the question period at the earliest opportunity.

MR. COLLVER: — Mr. Speaker, if I might just bring this to the attention of the House that I don't know whether this belongs in question period or not, but yesterday the Minister of Highways assured us that he would bring an answer to a question that I gave to him to this Assembly today. He has not yet done so. Does that belong in question period or does that belong now?

MR. SPEAKER: — If that was the issue that was raised by the Member for Estevan (Mr. Larter), the preamble of which was a Point of Privilege, then I suggested yesterday that the Minister would answer during the question period because it was a question.

MR. COLLVER: — Well this was a specific question of a separate nature, Mr. Speaker, that I posed to the Minister of Highways.

MR. SPEAKER: — I am sure the Minister of Highways will take the opportunity to refresh himself as to what the question was and when he intends to answer, I expect he would bring it forward in the question period in due course.

INTRODUCTION OF GUESTS

MR. M. KWASNICA (Cutknife-Lloydminster): — Mr. Speaker, by leave of the Assembly I should like to introduce to the Members of the Assembly, members of the RM of Manitou Lake.

I should like to introduce to you George Patterson who is the reeve, secretary-treasurer, Ron Doupe and Geoffrey Hall and Harry Graham. We bid them welcome here and we hope that they have a delightful afternoon and a good convention and a safe journey home.

HON. MEMBERS: Hear, hear!

STATEMENTS BY SPEAKER

Oral Question Period

MR. SPEAKER: — Before proceeding any further to Orders of the Day, I should like to give a couple of statements which have been requested. The first being this:

Before the Orders of the Day yesterday, the Hon. Member for Nipawin asked for the reasons as to why his Oral Question was out of order. I have checked the verbatim transcript with regard to his Oral Question which was as follows:

Is the Minister attempting to use the Department of Highways to punish areas in Saskatchewan that voted Progressive Conservative in the last provincial election?

I refer all Hon. Members to the Interim Report of the Special Committee on Rules and Procedures, p. 9 and Beauchesne's Parliamentary Rules and Forms, Fourth Edition, Chapter 5,

p. 147 which is an outline of some of the basic guidelines which are to be followed. I rule that the question was vague in the nature of debate, contained an expression of opinion, was not of sufficient urgency and therefore out of order. It is possible that if the question had been specific and in a different form, the urgency of the matter would have been more apparent.

The second statement is as follows:

Before the Orders of the Day yesterday, the Hon. Member for Souris-Cannington rose on a Point of Order to seek clarification of the order that Mr. Speaker would recognize Opposition Members during the Oral Question period. I want to emphasize the point that the new Oral Question period, as recommended by the Special Committee on Rules and Procedures, would be an experiment only. It will take a few days or weeks for myself and all Members to adjust to this new procedure and to have it operating smoothly.

I referred all Hon. Members to the Order of Reference of the Special Committee on Rules and Procedures which instructed the Committee to — "provide for an oral question period similar — to the oral question period in the House of Commons —." When this Committee visited the House of Commons, it was noted that the Speaker recognized Members from the Official Opposition before recognizing Members from the other opposition parties.

Because of the Order of Reference mentioned above, I propose to follow the House of Commons practice.

I would remind all Hon. Members that any Member may ask a supplementary to the question already asked.

The new Oral Question period is still in the experimental stage and I encourage all Hon. Members to give the proposed new system a good try.

MR. R.L. COLLVER (Leader of the Progressive Conservatives): — Mr. Speaker, before the Orders of the Day, I should like to rise, I am sorry, on another Point of Order. Today, you ruled me out of order on a question because it was not of an urgent nature. I wonder if there wasn't confusion between the question that I asked and the supplementary question that I asked. The question that I asked was: Is the Minister aware or the Premier aware the Registered Technologists in our province are planning dramatic action to protest their inability to form a union of their choice? That was the question, I wonder is Mr. Speaker ruling that question as not of an urgent nature in the province?

MR. SPEAKER: — The Member will have to — I can't offer him a specific answer at this time; however, I will examine the record and determine at what point I said the matter of urgency was not apparent to me. I will bring something to the Member privately if he wishes later, possibly tomorrow. If the Member wishes I could make a statement in the House. I would expect the Member might be satisfied with a private explanation.

MR. COLLVER: — I would appreciate a statement in the House on this one, Mr. Speaker.

MR. SPEAKER: — I will do that.

ST. PATRICK'S DAY

HON. E. WHELAN (Minister of Minister Resources): — Mr. Speaker, I am sure that you would want me to recognize this particular day because it pays tribute to a glorious group of people. I notice that there are some staunch admirers and some staunch representatives of the Irish in the House. The Member for Saskatoon-Sutherland (Mrs. Edwards), the Assistant Clerk, the Hon. Member for Moose Jaw North (Mr. Skoberg), the Hon. Member for Rosemont (Mr. Allen), you can tell by their apparel that they are here on behalf of the Irish. And that they are very proud of that particular group.

In our generosity, we Irish will admit that the Ukrainian is personable, emotional and adroit, and the Scot is thrifty and witty and industrious. The Scandinavian is hardy, patient and kind and the German is musical, hard-working, immaculate and business-like. Many other groups have fine qualities.

We readily admit that. But I am sure that every Hon. Member will agree without reservation that the Irish have all of these qualities, all of them, and exhibit them modestly and without reservation, particularly on March 17th.

So I say, Mr. Speaker, to all of the Irish, 'top o' the morning and best of luck.

HON. MEMBERS: Hear, hear!

ADJOURNED DEBATES

Address-In-Reply

The Assembly resumed the adjourned debate on the proposed motion of Mr. D.G. Banda (Redberry) for an Address-in-Reply.

MR. H. ROLFES (Minister of Social Services): — Mr. Speaker, yesterday before I adjourned debate on the Speech from the Throne, I made a few comments in regard to the Members opposite and I should like for their edification briefly to re-state those comments.

I said that if one looked at the public policy issued by the Members opposite and the stances that they have taken publicly on such issues as natural resources, services to people, such as medicare, one could really see no difference between the Members opposite. And, therefore, one would, in order to save time and to make sure that we are clear, simply refer to them as the Opposition.

Secondly, Mr. Speaker, I had also spent some time on describing this Government's policy in regard to natural resources and which is directly opposite to what the Members opposite would adhere to. We believe that most of the benefits should go to the owners of the natural resources, that is the people of Saskatchewan not to the big multinational corporations.

I also had indicated, Mr. Speaker, that this Government recognizes the seriousness of inflation and that in general principles we agree with the Federal program, but that we would urge the Federal Government to make absolutely certain that not only wages and salaries are controlled, but also profits and

prices. And up to this time I think some of us are having some doubt as to whether the Federal Government is really serious in making certain that profits and prices are also controlled.

Mr. Speaker, today I want to spend some time in speaking about the Department of Social Services because I know that the House would be very interested by some detail on the Federal-Provincial conference that took place on social services on February 3 and 4.

Mr. Speaker, it is a fact borne out by action taken by this Government that we do believe in fighting poverty and to support those people who are on fixed incomes and those who generally fall below the poverty line. In my Department, on January 1, we took issue with some of the hardships caused by inflation by increasing SAP rates. We increased the rates from \$65 per person to \$75 per person for food and clothing. We also increased household allowances from \$30 to \$50. And we said that we would pay \$50 for utilities and also pay the actual rent and/or taxes.

In terms of a family consisting of two parents and two children, this would mean an increase of about 20 per cent across the board. For a single person this would mean an increase of approximately 15 per cent.

The increases relate directly to the percentage increase in average wages and more particularly the increase in the consumer price index.

Mr. Speaker, as Minister of Social Services I am prepared to constantly review what the effects inflation is having on the poor, the working poor and those who are not able to work. I am prepared to constantly review this and if necessary recommend to the Government further increases.

I stated, Mr. Speaker, in my first speech in this House after being appointed Minister that I was not prepared to fight inflation on the backs of the poor. I reiterate that statement today.

It is also noteworthy that in this province we have the highest minimum wage anywhere in Canada. This Government since being elected has increased the minimum wage, I believe, over 100 per cent. We all recognize that even at \$2.80 no married person with a family is expected, at least not on this side of the House, expected to live on that type of an income. Therefore, a few years ago, we implemented the Family Income Plan and I will say a few words about that plan right now.

Mr. Speaker, Members opposite have been very, very critical of the Family Income Plan. They have said that it is nothing but another way of handing out money to those worthless bums who are not prepared to work.

SOME HON. MEMBERS: Hear, hear!

MR. ROLFES: — I could quote the Member for Qu'Appelle (Mr. Lane) who is well known for where he stands on this issue. The Member for Thunder Creek (Mr. Thatcher), who in the last session said that this Government makes nothing but leeches of people . . . oh, I know it hurts when you have to face the facts and the

truth. But, Mr. Speaker, we are committed to support those people who are not able to work. But we expect those who are able to work to go out and work. But it is the responsibility of government to make work available. And in this regard, Mr. Speaker, Saskatchewan doesn't have to take second place to any province except Alberta.

At the Federal-Provincial Conference, I was very pleased and proud to be the Minister of Social Services of Saskatchewan because other Ministers were not so well off as we are here.

SOME HON. MEMBERS: Hear, hear!

MR. ROLFES: — I know this hurts with the Members opposite because when they were in power, what they were saying to people was, look, if you don't like to live off crumbs go to another province, go to another province, but you are not going to get further assistance. That is their attitude to people who through no fault of their own are not capable of working, or through no fault of their own have a Federal Government who is more prepared to put restraints on the poor than provide employment.

Mr. Speaker, I say again, in Saskatchewan, the latest statistics and I will refer to these a little later, show that unemployment in Saskatchewan is well below most of the other provinces. Well below the other provinces. Mr. Speaker, it is not like it was in 1969 and 1970 when there was little unemployment in this province. There was no unemployment because most of the people were moving to other provinces to get away from that type of Government that the Member opposite is now advocating.

Mr. Speaker, the Family Income Plan, although opposed by most Members opposite, and here I will exclude the Conservatives because I don't think they have made any statement on the Family Income Plan. But I know where the Liberals stand on it. They are opposed to the plan. Let me say this, at the Federal-Provincial Conference at Ottawa most other Ministers and most other provinces are very supportive of our Family Income Plan.

MR. BIRKBECK: — On a Point of Order.

MR. SPEAKER: — What is your Point of Order?

MR. BIRKBECK: — It would seem, Mr. Speaker, that the Member for the Government is speaking. I would like to hear it regardless of what he has to say, I am going to hear it. I just wonder if we might just have a little more quiet on this side.

MR. SPEAKER: — I think the point is well taken. I was having a little trouble a couple of times hearing the Minister of Social Services (Mr. Rolfes) in his address. I would ask the Members to show the usual kind of respect when other Members are speaking.

SOME HON. MEMBERS: Hear, hear!

MR. ROLFES: — Mr. Speaker, I would just like to make a comment to

March 17, 1976

Member for Qu'Appelle (Mr. Lane), you don't hear with your mouth, you hear with your ears. It might help if you closed the one and opened the other two.

Mr. Speaker, as I was saying that most other Ministers were very supportive and very interested in our Family Income Plan. Now I will relate to that a little later in my talk because the new income support supplementation agreed in principle to by the other Ministers is basically following the principle of the Family Income Plan.

The Family Income Plan, Mr. Speaker, . . . I really thought that the Tories were interested in programs for the poor, but I guess that they don't to listen and also . . .

MR. PENNER: — I thought they wanted to hear you.

MR. ROLFES: — I did too.

MR. PENNER: — They just heard about the Family Income Plan and they are going out to caucus.

MR. ROLFES: — Mr. Speaker, the Family Income Plan has had some problems in the initial stages. We all will admit that. And there were some loopholes which we had not anticipated. But it is not entirely that, I am glad that the Member for Eastview said that that is right, because we took as the basis for the Family Income Plan the Federal Income Tax system. And we thought that that would be a workable system. The Family Income Plan did have its problems but I think we have rectified and closed most of the loopholes. On January 1st, 1976 we made some changes. Income exemption has been increased from \$4,500 plus Family Allowance to \$5,500 plus Family Allowance. This relates directly to the consumer price index, Mr. Speaker, we didn't change the benefits per child, they still remain at \$40 for the first three children and \$30 thereafter, because when we initiated the program we took this into consideration.

Although this benefit level was set in 1974 and 1975 it was designed so as to take into account subsequent cost price increases. It is your belief that the benefit level is adequate. But, Mr. Speaker, we have had some problems and therefore we have set a gross asset limit of \$100,000. Furthermore, the Federal Income Tax Act allows depreciation and this has caused some problems and I recommended to the government and they accepted that no depreciation allowance would be allowed.

Furthermore, we suggested and made it policy that grain cheques were to be counted for the year in which they are cashed.

MR. LANE: — Very substantive changes.

MR. ROLFES: — Yes, they were substantive changes.

Results of the recent changes, Mr. Speaker, indicate that there are some people today not receiving benefits that were receiving benefits previously. However, we cannot, in this short time assess the total effects of these changes and again I am prepared to constantly keep under surveillance the program

and if changes need to be made will certainly recommend these to the government.

But, Mr. Speaker, before January we had about 18,000 families on the Family Income Plan. In March of 1976 we had 16,500. Whether this is the number that will remain for the year or whether they will increase or decrease is very difficult to determine at this time.

Mr. Speaker, let me now turn to another topic and that is unemployment and job creation. Unemployment in Canada is a very serious problem. In some parts of Canada this past winter we have had unemployment rates up to 21 per cent. Here, in Saskatchewan, we are very fortunate that our unemployment rate is approximately four per cent. It is a little over four per cent. The latest statistics, and I will refer to these very shortly, are very encouraging.

Mr. Speaker, if we are prepared to fight inflation and put in restraints, governments must be prepared also to either create employment or make programs available so that those people who are unemployed do not necessarily suffer from those restraint programs.

The unemployment rate in Saskatchewan is one of the lowest in Canada and I think is a direct reflection of the vigorous state of our economy. It is also a confirmation of the sound planning and physical responsibility of this New Democratic Government, Mr. Speaker. Members opposite are saying that the unemployment rate is low because people are leaving this province. Again statistics don't bear this out. The population is increasing and we are very hopeful and again I must say that the future looks very encouraging.

Mr. Speaker, for those who are unemployed the province will continue its efforts to facilitate re-employment. By way of training programs, vocational counselling and follow-up and through job creation by way of the employment support program.

Unlike some jurisdictions in Canada where we see cutbacks in these areas, the Saskatchewan Government will be maintaining its commitment to help those who are unemployed to find meaningful jobs. Today we find that people are unemployed primarily because of the failure of the free market system. I think it is intolerable to compel these same people to depend wholly upon that same system.

Mr. Speaker, just in the very recent past the Federal Government issued the statistics of the seasonally unemployed people across Canada and it is certainly very encouraging here in Saskatchewan. We note that the national figure in January of 1976 was 6.6 per cent, Saskatchewan at the same time was 4.3 per cent. In February the federal went up to 7 per cent, but Saskatchewan went down to 4.2 per cent. Again, a very encouraging sign and we certainly expect that it will continue.

Mr. Speaker, as I said initially I wanted to spend some time on the Federal-Provincial Conference that was held on February 3rd and 4th. But before I get into that I want to make a few remarks about the Members opposite and some of the comments that they have made pertaining to my Department. Mr. Speaker, it is of considerable concern to me, the half-baked truths that

emanate from the self-appointed experts across the way. We have all heard their general slams against the Department of Social Services in Saskatchewan and those people that it serves, the poor. These criticisms just won't wash, Mr. Speaker, the number of people on public assistance is down. It is down substantially, the percentage of people on public assistance who are able to work is one of the lowest in the country. On January the 1st 1972 the last year you people were responsible for the Budget we had 59,000 people on assistance. On January 1st of 1976 we had 36,000 people on assistance.

SOME HON. MEMBERS: Hear, hear!

MR. MacDONALD: — What about the Family Allowance, Family Income Plan?

MR. ROLFES: — What do you mean the Family Allowance? The Family Allowance was always there even when you were the Minister. The figures are a total and include northern Saskatchewan as it did when you were the Minister and it does now — 36,000 as compared to 59,000.

MR. MacDONALD: — What about the Family Income Plan?

MR. ROLFES: — The Member for Indian Head-Wolseley said, what about the Family Income Plan. I intend, in the Budget Debate, in very detailed figures to give you exactly how many are on the Family Income Plan. You will be surprised that the number is relatively small.

Mr. Speaker, as I said earlier the Family Income Plan continues to be one of the most progressive pieces of legislation on the North American Continent. I was very pleased, as I had said before, that the other Ministers of the other provinces and the Hon. Marc Lalonde seemed to give some support and some eager support to the Family Income Plan. Very little criticism, the only criticism I heard from one Member was that the Family Income Plan in Saskatchewan was too rich and they could not afford to implement it on that basis.

Mr. Speaker, to add to these accomplishments I should like to take a few moments to inform this House of the results of the recent Federal-Provincial meeting regarding Social Security Review. In February of this year the Federal and Provincial Ministers reached an agreement in principle on a number of critically important issues. Mr. Speaker, I want to say at this time that although the Ministers agreed in principle each Minister must go back to his respective Cabinet and seek their approval. What I am saying today is what I have given approval to and not the Government. One of these was an income security system which incorporated income support for those who cannot work and an income supplementation for those working at inadequate incomes. I am pleased to announce that the federal proposal is based essentially on the model of the Saskatchewan Family Income Plan. All of the Ministers at this conference, myself included, stressed the importance of an income provision for those who are living on inadequate incomes.

At the same time we agreed that it was necessary to bear in

mind the current economic circumstances of this country and to design a system which would not be too costly and one which would be in harmony with the efforts of governments to encourage increased productivity. In Saskatchewan we already have the Family Income Plan operating. Therefore the federal move should serve to ensure cost-sharing of this program and should in fact mean an substantial increase in cost-sharing dollars for this province.

Another area which received approval in principle was changes to the Federal Social Services Act. Agreement was reached for the Federal Government to provide greater cost-sharing support for provincial social services programs.

There will be in the new Social Services Act, Mr. Speaker, an expansion on the rehabilitation services for the handicapped. Removing the present concentration on employment preparation and broadening them into the fields of pre-vocational training in employment and social integration in community living support.

The clients for rehabilitation will thus cover all age groups. A disabled housewife will have as much of a chance as a disabled mechanic at receiving the full range of rehabilitation services. The goals of community living and full participation in society become as important as employment. Also, for the first time sharing of capital of expenditures for certain rehabilitation facilities will become possible through a special fund. There will be a broadening of the services available to or on behalf of children and also there will be a new stress on the expansion of community development and community oriented services. These will include social action advocacy and self-help activities through the creation of a special sharing category. This will help the people work out the solution to their own problems and hopefully do so before the problems become acute.

There will also be inclusion of a wider range of planning, research, evaluation, training and program information sharing activities to allow for a systematic development of future services in order to avoid the previous prevalent crisis reaction decision-making format.

The conference of federal and provincial Ministers of Welfare reached agreement on all the principal features of the proposed new social services legislation which provides for the financing and development of social services in Canada. The legislative proposals recognize that social services are essential to ensure the opportunity for personal development for all Canadians and to present and alleviate the social and economic problems of individuals and communities. The future federal legislation is intended to assist the provinces in responding to the changing social and personal needs of Canadians in order to ensure that adequate services are available to all. It will replace the current Canada Assistance Plan which shares in the cost of services to persons in need or likely to become so. It will also broaden and replace the provisions of the Vocational Rehabilitation of Disabled Persons Act. In extending the scope of cost-sharing, beyond the poor and disabled, Ministers recognize that it is reasonable to expect persons with financial resources to pay a user charge for certain services.

MR. LANE: — . . . charge.

MR. ROLFES: — Call it what you will, it is a user charge.

Provincial Ministers endorsed proposals of three main classification of services. 1. Services to individuals and families. 2. Preventative and development services for disadvantaged communities. 3. Residential service for adults.

Mr. Speaker, it is interesting to note at this time that the Conservatives are not in the House. I wish they were because I really think that it is important. It is important that all Members be well informed on the new Social Services Agreements, new Social Services Act, the pension changes and the new Income Support Program which probably will become law within a year or two.

Mr. Speaker, shareable services to individuals and families will include crisis intervention, information and referral and family planning services. Preventative and protective services for children including residential services and rehabilitation services for the disabled may be provided without charge to persons who need them. And in regard to the rehabilitation services, the Saskatchewan group was able to convince the Federal Government and the other provinces that the rehabilitation costs of individuals who are handicapped but are integrated in the school system that these services would also be cost-shared, rather than cost-sharing them only if they are isolated from the community and housed in an institution. This was accepted in principle and I hope that we shall see this in the final draft of the new Social Services Act.

Social integration services will also be provided to aid persons who are isolated from community life. To establish and maintain themselves and become involved in community life. Day care services for children and adults, homemakers and related services, meal services, a development service for children will be available but subject, again, to a user charge.

Transportation services for the handicapped, subject to a user charge equivalent to the charge for regular public transportation in the community will also now be cost-shared. Community Services include community development programs and community oriented preventative services if provided to disadvantaged communities. Residential services for adults which are not insured services under the Hospital Insurance and Diagnostic Services Act will be shareable when provided to persons who require such services and will, again, be subject to a user charge.

The major area in which the legislation is designed to provide improved federal financing are rehabilitation services for the handicapped and support services which will enable the aged and the handicapped to live in their homes and communities instead of being cared for in institutions.

Mr. Speaker, in the communique that was issued it is interesting to note that all Ministers agreed that there must not be any advantage for a person to move into an institution rather than staying in the community. In other words, community services must be available at least at the cost or less than it would cost to have someone stay in an institution. I think most Ministers were aware of the dangerous trend of almost total institutionalization of our senior citizens and the disabled.

The objectives of the proposed legislation are further expanded by providing for a rehabilitation fund, as I said earlier, for capital expenditures for rehabilitation facilities. This fund will operate for a five year period with specific amounts allocated to each province.

Mr. Speaker, one further area that the Ministers were concerned about and agreed to in principle were changes or amendments to the Canada and Quebec Pension Plan. We agreed to two specific amendments.

1. That pension credits earned by both spouses during marriage would be divided equally between spouses upon the dissolution of the marriage.

2. The contribution of male or female spouse who leave the labor force to raise children up to the age when they can begin to attend regular school could drop out those months or years of low or zero earnings from the calculation of their average lifetime earnings for benefit purposes. It is our belief that these amendments would result in making the Canada Pension Plan more equitable particularly for women in our society.

A final commitment on the proposals entertained by the federal-provincial Ministers is yet to be forthcoming from both the Federal and the Provincial Governments.

In Saskatchewan, as in other parts of Canada, we are facing a couple of major problems.

1. The increasing demand on correctional facilities and correctional programs.

2. The increasing cost of institutional living, in particular I am referring to the ever-increasing cost of special care facilities for the aged.

On the basis of our provincial studies we are anticipating that we can come up with some concrete solutions to some of these problems. However, I think that we too readily forget that many of the social issues, which confront us, are not just a provincial responsibility. Although the Opposition parties would have us believe otherwise, a fair degree of social policy is a federal responsibility.

Take the area of income security for the senior citizens. I think we have forgotten that this is and has been traditionally an area of federal responsibility. Since 1971 the New Democratic Government of Saskatchewan has fought for a higher basic benefit level and the lowering of the pension age to 60. Personally, I am pleased with the advent of the spouse's allowance program. However, I think the Federal Government could have and should have gone much further. With regard to basic benefit levels for senior citizens I believe that the Federal Government is negating its responsibility.

Once again, Mr. Speaker, we hear nothing from the Members across the floor. It seems that they have difficulty in coming up with concrete programs when it comes to ordinary citizens on fixed incomes.

Another example of federal irresponsibility is the restriction of family allowance. Poor families in Saskatchewan and across Canada will be losing about \$30 per child because

of the Federal Liberal refusal to increase the rate of the Family Allowance benefit in accordance with inflation.

In the area of unemployment insurance benefits the Federal Government had made some recent changes. Some of these, I believe, are necessary and good but I caution this House that inevitably if unemployment rates increase the provinces will be under increased financial pressure to support the unemployed. Fortunately, in Saskatchewan, we continue to have one of the lowest levels of unemployment in Canada. I am critical of the federal actions for two reasons.

1. First they are doing little or nothing to spur employment. 2. Ottawa is defaulting on its responsibility by curtailing or restricting programs and services, passing the buck to the provinces.

MR. MALONE: — Nonsense!

MR. ROLFES: — The Member says nonsense. What it really means is because the Federal Government has not allowed the increases in the Family Allowance this must be picked up by the provinces or else you simply say to the poor families, tough luck, you simply suffer and the heck with inflation. That is exactly what the Federal Government said. And when it comes to unemployment insurance, what has the Federal Government done to create employment? You tell me what they have done. Tell me what they have done. You can't give me one concrete suggestion, not one. Then you say, nonsense.

Mr. Speaker, obviously my criticisms must be tempered by reality. To be reasonable we must all reduce our expectations and I recognize that. There is no doubt that wasteful spending is bad, but I emphasize that any restraint in the areas of social and income security must be approached with some prudence and must be approached cautiously. We cannot consistently say, that we are going to restrain programs for those who are on fixed incomes and we are going to cut back or restrain the programs for the poor. Relate it, Mr. Speaker, to the area of price controls. I believe that it is high time that the Federal Liberal Government took some definite steps to control profits and prices. Our Government feels that something must be done to curb inflation. However, the control of prices and profits for those businesses operating interprovincially lies within the federal jurisdiction. In fact, constitutionally, there is little that the Province of Saskatchewan can do in terms of this area.

I, for one, would like to see the Federal Government make some hard-nosed decisions in this area. Recently we heard a report that the profits of the chartered banks in Canada were up by over 30 per cent over the profits in 1975. I think that we should remember that 1975 profits were for the chartered banks up over 60 per cent above the 1974 profits. This is horrendous, it is totally, in my opinion, unacceptable. I believe, as does this Government, that we should pursue policies which equalize the burden of inflation for all Canadians.

The Premier of this province had indicated another way to combat inflation. He has stated that one method to curb inflation would be to transfer the control of multinational corporations to Canadians. This is a concrete solution. It is

interesting to note that the people of Saskatchewan seldom, if ever, hear what the opposition parties have to say with regard to excess profits. Some definite inequities exist which demand Federal Government attention.

You know it is a rare occasion, but for once I agree with the Prime Minister. Recently he said that there is no rational way that the free market system can be made to work so as to really help common people. The Opposition Party should listen to what their leaders have to say. With a little thought I am confident that they would give up their barren arguments, begin to exercise some leadership and join with people of this province and with this Government in finding a new approach, one in which ordinary people have a greater voice in those decisions which affect the future of their resources and their lives.

Mr. Speaker, from what I have said you will certainly conclude that I will support the motion before us, the Speech from the Throne.

SOME HON. MEMBERS: Hear, hear!

MR. B. ALLEN (Regina Rosemont): — Mr. Speaker, first of all congratulations to the Member for Redberry (Mr. Banda) for moving the Address-in-Reply to the Speech from the Throne and to the Member for Athabasca (Mr. Thompson) for seconding the Address. I thought that both of them in both areas of agriculture in northern Saskatchewan did a very, very commendable job.

SOME HON. MEMBERS: Hear, hear!

MR. ALLEN: — Mr. Speaker, there are just a couple of things that I want to mention today.

First is what I consider to me a very, very serious state of affairs that is beginning to come about in Canada in regard to our medical care system. Members will recall in the June Budget of last year, the Turner Budget, an announcement that increases in costs for medicare would be limited by the Federal Government. They introduced a Bill, Bill C-68 in the House of Commons to bring that about. And originally they envisioned limiting increasing costs to 13 per cent in 1976-77, 10.5 in 1977-78; 8.5 in the following years. That since has been amended to 14.5 per cent for the next two years and the following year to be negotiated. Not only did they do this, Mr. Speaker, bring in these amendments to our medical care system, but they limited debate on those amendments.

On Wednesday, March 9th, they gave notice that the debate on the Bill would be limited. Mr. Speaker, this is a very, very serious situation for the Province of Saskatchewan, indeed, for all the provinces of Canada. Because when provinces entered into an agreement for medicare, with the Federal Government, they did so on the basis that 50 per cent of the costs of that system would be covered by the Federal Government.

Last year those costs amounted to above \$1.5 billion. Now any increases in the future, Mr. Speaker, over the allowed limit will have to be picked up by the province. Last year, alone, the increases were 16 per cent. This is above even next year's

proposed guidelines. What does this say for extension of medicare in Canada?

As Members are aware Pharmicare and Denticare are not now covered by the federal medicare scheme. The province has been trying to get the Federal Government to share in these programs. They will not share these programs. And that is serious for us, but it is even more serious for poorer provinces of Canada which cannot afford to bring in these programs on their own.

Since 1968 the Federal Government has not increased one single health program in Canada. Indeed, Mr. Speaker, when the Saskatchewan Government brought in the Hearing Aid Plan they took treaty Indians off their medicare program as far as hearing aids are concerned. The extra programs that are being brought out in the provinces, under medicare, now amount to about \$1.2 billion.

What is happening, Mr. Speaker, and I think that it is very serious and the unilateral action of the Federal Government is very serious. It means that in Canada as far as health services are concerned there will be health service for the rich and another health service for the poor. I don't believe that we should let this continue. I think that representations from all sides of the House should be made to the Federal Government to not do this despicable act on the medicare system in Canada.

Mr. Speaker, my speech this afternoon was and is a little bit disorganized, but I want to say a word or two about the events in the Legislature over the last number of days.

Mr. Speaker, you will recall on Friday we opened the Session and we witnessed, on Friday in my view, the total and complete humiliation by the Premier of the Member for Nipawin (Mr. Collver). We saw, on Monday, Mr. Speaker, the total collapse in this House of the Leader of the Conservative Party. Yesterday, we witnessed a change in the Conservative Party. We observed that the effective Leader in the House for the Conservative Party was no longer the Member for Nipawin, but was the Member for Rosetown-Elrose (Mr. Bailey).

SOME HON. MEMBERS: Hear, hear!

MR. ALLEN: — And we witnessed today the total collapse of the Conservative Party in its entirety. They have all left the House today.

Mr. Speaker, I think this action by the Conservatives is childish, but even more than that, where is the devotion to duty that they have lectured us on. Where is the devotion to duty to be sitting in here day after day, hour after hour, saying nothing, doing nothing, knowing nothing, now they are not even here. I suppose, Mr. Speaker, that we will read in the Leader-Post, Collver did such and such. We read in the Leader-Post, the Member for Swift Current (Mr. Ham) asks embarrassing questions of the Government. Nothing will be mentioned of the dereliction of duty in the Leader-Post; nothing will be said of the total collapse in the Leader-Post of the Leader of the Conservative Party. Nothing will be said in the Leader-Post about the fact that when the crunch was on, when all the Members in the Legislature, and the Members of the Conservative Party were expecting the Leader of the Conservative Party

to come out fighting, stand up for his side, that he totally collapsed. We won't find that in the Leader-Post.

Now it might sound, Mr. Speaker, that I am being a little harsh, a little bitter about the press. Not me! Because it doesn't make any difference to me. If I waited for the Leader-Post to have "Allen says such and such in the Legislature," I would wait a very long time.

SOME HON. MEMBERS: Hear, hear!

MR. ALLEN: — Now I can go to Saskatoon and see the Star-Phoenix and see, "Allen says such and such." It does me a lot of good in Saskatoon-Sutherland when I am visiting my cousin. Let the Leader-Post in Regina, you know it would do me no good if they said something nice about me anyway, so I am not going to worry about what the Leader-Post says.

But I should like to say something just on that subject, not in a personal way, because I am not particularly bitter about it. But I should like to say something about the impression that that gives the people of Saskatchewan, that kind of reporting.

We have in the Province of Saskatchewan today, in the minds of at least some people, the idea that the Conservative Party are an alternative to government in Saskatchewan. Now where that idea came from is beyond my imagination. Because, I can only judge from what I see in the Legislature. I can only judge from the performance and the record in the Legislature of the Conservative Party, and I can say of the Liberals, where their record has been, in my view, unfair at times, wild at times, they are at least putting forward an argument, an alternative to government. But the Conservative Party, when they are called upon to speak, they do not speak; when they called to have a Throne Speech Debate, three of them got up to say a few words, offer no alternative to government, then sit down. And then I read in the Leader-Post that this man, the Member for Nipawin (Mr. Collver) is an alternative to the Premier of the province, I read that this band of the Conservatives, an alternative to the government of the province, and golly, Mr. Speaker, I just can't see it.

SOME HON. MEMBERS: Hear, hear!

MR. ALLEN: — I want to say another thing. I want to say another thing about news reporting. I am not a reporter, but I should like to say this. If the press in this province and particularly the Leader-Post puts emphasis on things that are not there, interprets news coverage in its own way. I will give you an example.

This disturbed me a little bit, maybe it shouldn't have. But I have a Leader-Post here, third page, March 16, talking about the little kafuffle when the Leader of the Conservatives collapsed under pressure in the Legislature the other day. I couldn't find it in the article — "Collver explains delay to attest Legislature." If that was explanation, it is beyond me. Great headlines for Collver, "but Premier Blakeney and Attorney General Romanow appeared to laugh loudest." You will recall when he was saying why they needed written agreement.

Premier Blakeney and the Attorney General laughed loudest. I tell you something, they didn't laugh any louder than me. But it gives an emphasis that what was going on in the House on that particular day was that the Leader of the Conservative Party was being unmercifully bashed around by the Premier, by the Attorney General, when in fact he simply didn't have the capacity, the intellectual or moral capacity to explain to this House his actions, and he had to sit down because he didn't have the courage to continue. And I will never, ever, see that in the Leader-Post until the day I die, and I know I won't.

Now, Mr. Speaker, as I have said, it may sound like I am being a little bit hard on the press, particularly the Leader-Post, but I thought that I should make those points.

Getting back to the Throne Speech, I notice that the Members opposite said that they couldn't support the Throne Speech.

MR. PENNER: — Nothing in it, Bill!

MR. ALLEN: — Exactly, but I couldn't figure out what you couldn't support. I couldn't find anything that you couldn't support in the Throne Speech. Now that Throne Speech, I think, if the Liberal Members were serious about what is going on here, they could have brought in some kind of resolution on housing, on many of the other problems that we are having, that could be debated. And I think that they were a little derelict in their duty by not doing that. Be that as it may, I am not going to criticize them. As I said before, I didn't want to speak long and I am certainly not going to speak long, other than to say one more thing about the Conservative Party.

I remember sitting here and seeing the Premier and the Leader of the Opposition give it to the Member for Nipawin and I wasn't sorry for the Member for Nipawin. Maybe I should have been. Maybe I don't have enough compassion. But I was sorry for the Member for Estevan (Mr. Larter) and I was sorry for the Member for Rosetown-Elrose (Mr. Bailey) because I knew it was these people that had entered the agreement. And what I thought had happened was that the Member for Nipawin, in his usual fashion, usual arrogant fashion, had decided 'well these dummies,' and you know he refers to them in that way. On a number of occasions I have heard him do that. 'They have blown another one and I simply am not going along with it and that's that.' These guys are put into the position where they say, "Well either I get up and I am behind my Leader and cut my throat, or I sit quietly." And I thought, well they are sitting quietly, they are embarrassed, they feel terrible, they are honorable men and it is a very tough position for them. I find out when the Member for Estevan gets up to speak that this isn't what happened at all. That they got together and decided to break their word. The Member for Estevan said to the Member for Rosetown, 'well look, we are going to be the government next time and it doesn't make a heck of a lot of difference if we keep our word or if we don't keep our word, that's the important thing. Our word doesn't mean anything.' I wonder what the people of Saskatchewan would think if it were ever reported in the Leader-Post accurately, if they saw that these guys had sat down, wrote out a little slip of paper and after meeting together had given their word and then got up and said that we decided to break our word. Never saw it in the Leader-Post, but I am getting carried away again on the Leader-Post. Now I was

very, very shocked to hear that and I am sure that the Member for Estevan feels badly about it. The Member for Rosetown-Elrose skirted the issue, as well he might. He did a commendable job. In my view, he has taken over, in fact at least, in this House, the leadership of the Conservative Party.

Mr. Speaker, I would have had a number of other things to say that I am kind of saving up for the Budget Debate, that will come after the 24th of March, but I should like to say that I take a good deal, a great deal of pleasure, Mr. Speaker, in supporting the Address-in-Reply from the Speech from the Throne and I will do so.

SOME HON. MEMBERS: Hear, hear!

MR. W.C. THATCHER (Thunder Creek): — Mr. Speaker, I wish I could say it is a pleasure to stand and address this Assembly in this Throne Speech Debate. Unfortunately I can't and won't. I wish I could say that during the past few days that I am proud to be a Member of this Assembly. Again, I can't and I won't, because what has been going on here the last few days is an indictment of the democratic process. I should also like to say that I have no intention of voting against the Throne Speech which has been presented and I have no intention of voting for it because it isn't even worthy of a vote.

I think, Mr. Speaker, what we have seen here is probably about as low a level any Assembly can get to in the past few days. We have had the Conservative Party and the NDP hassling back and forth about — you made an agreement; no I didn't make one — back and forth like a couple of kindergarten children. We have had the spectacle of Government Members standing up trying to give the appearance something has been happening in this Legislature, as though we are actually doing something, as though we are actually accomplishing things.

Mr. Speaker, frankly I don't really care what the circumstances were of the agreement between the Conservative Party and the Government. I suppose I have my suspicions, and yet I really don't know. We have heard the Government has a document and it will tell all and it will be tabled. It hasn't been tabled and I really don't care whether they do table it because I don't think it is important. We have had the case where the Government has enjoyed taking their pound of flesh off the Member for Nipawin (Mr. Collver) and a Member of the Conservative Party. I think you have been successful. I think you have taken your pound of flesh and I don't for one moment suggest that he didn't have it coming. I think he laid himself wide open for this when he made his maiden speech in this Legislature.

SOME HON. MEMBERS: Hear, hear!

MR. THATCHER: — And I think the Premier laid it to him pretty well on Friday and I don't think the Premier was at all unjustified in what he said. I agree with the previous Member who spoke when he said we probably witnessed complete destruction when the member for Nipawin spoke on his own behalf on Monday. I don't think anything else need be said about that. But, nonetheless, this House is doing absolutely nothing. We are wasting taxpayers' money, we are accomplishing nothing and this Throne Speech is nothing more than a fraud being perpetrated on the

people of Saskatchewan.

SOME HON. MEMBERS: Hear, hear!

MR. THATCHER: — And I fully confess today as not being in a very particularly good humor because, frankly, I take exception to being down here, not only wasting taxpayers' money by being here, but wasting my own time.

Mr. Speaker, there is no reason why this Budget cannot be read tomorrow. This nonsense that we have to send out invitations, that we have to have people in the galleries, that we have to go through all the red tape and frills, etc., is nonsense. That Budget Speech is ready, stand up and read the damn thing and let's quit this fooling around.

SOME HON. MEMBERS: Hear, hear!

MR. THATCHER: — Those people who are interested can very simply read about it in the newspaper, or you can mail them a copy. I am quite sure they would be thrilled to find out exactly what the situation is, instead of dragging this thing out until Wednesday. The spectacle of going until 4:00 o'clock on Monday was a disgrace. The spectacle of going yesterday until about 5:20 is a disgrace. What have you got us down here for?

Mr. Speaker, I take exception because, in contrast to many of them across the way, I am an agricultural representative and I make my money out of agriculture. I make my living out of agriculture. And when somebody really wants to insult me they can term my occupation — a politician. Because frankly, the term politician as it is used in this Assembly right now, is degrading. When somebody wants to cut me to the bone marrow just call me a politician, because, frankly, I am not very proud to be one. I am not very proud about what is going on around here. It has simply been a farce this entire week.

MR. MOSTOWAY: — You are living proof!

MR. THATCHER: — Well now, Member for Saskatoon, if you weren't sitting on it you would trip over your IQ.

Now, Mr. Speaker, many of us are agricultural representatives and we make our living out of agriculture. There is Mr. Nelson, there is Mr. Wiebe, there is Mr. Anderson, here and I am sure that there must be one or two on that side of the House and there are also some in the Conservative Party. Agriculture sometimes does involve a little bit more than seeding. If you are in the cattle business you have cows calving at this time of the year.

Granted, every single one of us is in this Legislature because he wanted to be here. Many of us had to fight for our nomination, many of us had to fight very hard to get elected. So we are here and we are obligated to be here when this Legislature is called no matter what the problems may be. I think most people make every effort to be here. But I don't think we have to like it and I don't think we are being unjust in suggesting that when you have us here, at what is a busy season of the year for us, that you can at least have something for us to

do and something that is important and I certainly have seen no evidence of that to this point in time.

Now, Mr. Speaker, right now it is not all that difficult to be away from your agricultural operation. But the ten days that we wasted here, tack them on the end of April and the first part of May, then it does become serious. And I ask you on behalf of the taxpayers of Saskatchewan and for the MLAs that work in agriculture, that make their living out of agriculture, for goodness sakes you have got us down here this time of year, let's get to work and quit the fooling around. Now you can read that Budget tomorrow if you want to and any delay is nothing more than a farce.

Mr. Speaker, I should like to address a word or two to our learned gentlemen who sit above you in the press gallery. I don't make this to all of you, I just make it to those of you who have a media here in the Regina area, or one that I do get access to read. To read the reports of this Legislature for Monday and Tuesday, one would almost think that something happened here. One would almost think there was something important. You know I just wonder what the press gallery people in Ottawa would have to say if the Government in Ottawa attempted to carry on with a phony charade such as what we have here right now. They would chop them to pieces. Can you imagine what Tom Gould would do? Can you imagine what Mike Phillips would do? Can you imagine what (oh, I have forgotten his name from Southam News Service), they would chop that Government to pieces and rightly so. And what does this press gallery up there do, you report it as though something is going on, like we are accomplishing something. And I suggest that in your reporting you are the only means that the people have to find out what is going on here and I don't think you have been reporting it accurately at all. I think you have been helping the Government to perpetrate the fraud that has been going on here.

Now, once again before I sit down, I would ask the Government, stop this fooling around and bring down your Budget and let's get to work.

As I mentioned earlier I don't think your Throne Speech is even worthy of casting a vote on it and I shall not vote.

SOME HON. MEMBERS: Hear, hear!

MR. J.L. SKOBERG (Moose Jaw North): — Mr. Speaker, much probably to the dismay of the Hon. Member for Thunder Creek (Mr. Thatcher) it gives me a great deal of pleasure to take part in this Throne Speech. Fortunately I haven't had to get disgusted because I wasn't allowed to speak in the last session and run home and not appear again. I didn't cry in my beard or whatever it may be and say, well I won't come back again because I have other things to do. And also it utterly amazes me that an Hon. Member, of course, would suggest that there is nothing to do. I understand that he was taken off the Crown Corporation Committee this morning which is a perfectly legitimate reason if someone else wants to go on and he probably has a reason for being taken off, maybe to go home to help his cows calve. But I should like to suggest that there is business which can be done here, there is business to be done here in this Legislative Assembly. There are committees to attend, there are Crown Corporations, Public Account Committees to be structured, so that those things

that can be done will be done.

It not only amazes me, also, Mr. Speaker, that an Hon. Member would stand up and talk about being disgusted, the low level of the Assembly, don't care about any agreement and still, we, in this Assembly are supposed to be elected here for a purpose of representing the constituency from which we come.

SOME HON. MEMBERS: Hear, hear!

MR. SKOBERG: — Also it is more than amazing for someone to not be concerned about mutual agreements, that to say that he is not interested in the truth and is prepared then to say the Throne Speech meant nothing. I might also suggest that with the remarks that the Hon. Member made, he is then saying that because his Leader took part in the Address from the Throne that that doesn't mean anything whatsoever to the people of this province. I suggest that every Member has some obligation to contribute whatever it may be, regardless of how little, how large, to a Throne Speech Debate insofar as this province is concerned.

Mr. Speaker, really to be very fair, I think the Hon. Member probably was trying to cover up a little bit for lack of a participation in the Throne Speech. I think, really, we have to realize when we talk about being a farmer, a railroader or a rancher, we have to really see just how much activity is involved in those various enterprises. No doubt the individual himself will have to look to see whether or not his absence from that particular vocation of his at this time is that important in this time of the Legislative Assembly.

Mr. Speaker, in taking part in the Throne Speech today, I am pleased that my honorable colleague did pay recognition to the day of the month. I am suggesting that there are many 'skis' and 'os' and 'bergs' and everybody else who would possibly like to be Irish people on a day like this. At least we can pay honor to the people from that country for what they have contributed to this province and in this nation as a whole. I am also certain that our society today is in a real crisis situation and it doesn't help matters any when we badger each other across the way, but we do that, in the main, in a good natured sort of way. But it doesn't help anything when we forget what our obligation is all about and the responsibilities that we do have as Legislative Assembly representatives of our constituencies. But I do say and I believe that anyone here would agree, that our compassion does go out to the people of that country that is being honored today and our compassion goes out in such a way that we do hope that we will be able to resolve their differences in their way and that their differences will then mean peace and security for the people living in that country. I am sure that each and every one of us would agree on that particular point.

SOME HON. MEMBERS: Hear, hear!

MR. SKOBERG: — Mr. Speaker, the Throne Speech naturally was very, very short. But I think today, when we saw what was tabled in the House, there is a good indication of why the Throne Speech was comparatively short as compared to the past. There is much legislation to be done. In fact there was much legislation already done in this House and I can assure the Members opposite

and I can assure the people of this province that down the road in history this Legislative Assembly in this last session will be proven beyond a doubt as creative history in this province and this country that probably will never be done again.

SOME HON. MEMBERS: Hear, hear!

MR. SKOBERG: — There is no question in my mind in Saskatchewan we have led the way and I will not go through all the many, many things that have been accomplished in the past, but now in this last session we have led the way to bring about some ownership of the resources which those opposite are not really that interested about. They talk about, we'll let somebody else develop it. They talk about, well so what, who owns that resource it doesn't really matter very much. But I am suggesting that the people of the province and our children in this province will forever and again be pleased to find out that some people are interested more so than what those opposite have indicated.

SOME HON. MEMBERS: Hear, hear!

MR. SKOBERG: — Mr. Speaker, I am suggesting what is needed now is very cool and reasonable negotiation with those people we are talking to and about. I am suggesting that the Premier of this province and the Cabinet of this Government can bring about that coolness and that reasonableness to bring about the negotiating that will have to be now entered into. And I am suggesting that those opposite naturally are in a position to criticize and they should be criticizing, rightly so, in such a way to make sure that the best agreement possible is brought about insofar as that the people of the province receive the greatest benefit.

Mr. Speaker, just a short few months back, we did open another Speech from the Throne. At that time I mentioned about the growth in Moose Jaw. I can assure the Members in this House and also assure the Hon. Member for Thunder Creek who lives in Moose Jaw, that there is tremendous growth in Moose Jaw and much assistance from the Provincial Government has brought that growth about.

SOME HON. MEMBERS: Hear, hear!

MR. SKOBERG: — I can also suggest, Mr. Speaker, that there are many other things that we have to look at, regardless of the political affiliation of anybody in this House, any Members in this House, that we should work together to bring about these improvements that are needed in that particular area. I refer to the Qu'Appelle River Basin as a good example. We know that there are studies under way, we know there have been studies. We know that in every likelihood there could be a flood this year depending upon mother nature. We know that it needs long-time planning to bring about a control of the Moose Jaw River in order that those areas of Moose Jaw will not be flooded. We know that Spring Creek, we know that Thunder Creek have to be harnessed and used for the benefit of that particular area. I can assure the Members opposite and I can assure this House with the studies that are under way that type of consultation brought about by those studies will bring about a plan that will relieve the problems that Moose Jaw has been faced with.

Turning to another area that I am sure all of us are concerned about, Mr. Speaker, and that is the transportation situation in Saskatchewan and in Canada. It is very difficult to understand when we listen to and watch the Minister in charge of Transportation, the Federal Minister in charge of Transportation, talk about the user must pay. I am suggesting, Mr. Speaker, that is utter nonsense when you compare it to other areas of transportation in Saskatchewan and in Canada. I am suggesting that there are millions upon millions of dollars being used in the air, on the sea, on the road, in public financing of the transportation facilities and to say that only the rail transportation must pay is begging a point of what this whole transportation policy is about. I am suggesting that there does have to be and there will have to be more planning and a complete planning program brought about in order to co-ordinate all forms of transportation and that means the roads, the air, the seaway and the railroads. I am suggesting that it is high time that we looked at the electrification of our railway system and used the resources that we do have instead of using up this scarce resource of oil energy in the operation of the trains that is being used at this particular time. That can be done as proven in Europe and proven in other countries and all it takes now is some determination on the part of all governments and some united co-operation in such a way that that can be brought about and could benefit all concerned. There is no question about it, the resolutions that are on the Order Paper, a lot of this will be discussed and I will not go into that any further at this time.

We do know that the public hearings now for the Canadian National and Canadian Pacific transcontinental trains have been advertised. We do know that there will be hearings held across Canada. We do know that there is every indication prior to the announcement from the Hon. Minister in charge of Transport, the Hon. Minister Otto Lang, that the very ultimate desire that they have is to do away with rail transportation if they possibly can. We do know that one of the suggestions that was brought about which he did not go through with because of the ultimate elimination of that seat of his where he is now residing, had to do with the one train to Sudbury, no train then all the way from Sudbury to Vancouver on the Canadian National north line, but rather than that, there would be one train to Sudbury, Canadian Pacific via Calgary to Vancouver. Somehow the Hon. Minister didn't even realize that a suggestion had been made not many months back that there would be a transportation system which the railroad companies themselves suggested, Mr. Speaker, that there would be joint trackage used from Sudbury to Winnipeg, then break up in a north and south route, join again at Kamloops and into Vancouver. In my opinion that made sense, but under these circumstances when you eliminate part of our province, the north and the south route, then someone has to suffer and, of course, the user will suffer. For the Minister to say that the user must pay policy so far as rail transportation system is concerned is completely begging the point of what our transportation system is all about once again.

Mr. Speaker, speaking now and turning briefly to the Anti-inflation Board and the Saskatchewan Price and Compensation Board, I have made it abundantly clear that I am not in favour of that type of control which controls only wages and not prices, interest and other type of incomes. I have made it clear that it is strictly a camouflage on the part of the Federal Government, it is a counterfeit control which is only bent on

destroying the collective bargaining of the various unions throughout this country and those people that band together for effective collective bargaining in a democratic society. There is no question in my mind whatsoever that it does eliminate collective bargaining. There is no question in my mind whatsoever that if you come to an agreement with your employer and then have to refer it to another board to make a final decision then that in itself is the destruction of collective bargaining as history has known it and as a democratic society has known it no matter which country we live in. I am suggesting that the bargaining that we must look at at this time is some voluntary type of recognition of the problem that we may be in. I am saying that the Federal Government could have gone about a voluntary type of restraint or a price freeze on everything in order that the people then would have been treated fairly, but this is not what happened. In other words the labor movement today is being treated as second class citizens and that, in my opinion, is a far cry from being the proper way.

At the same time the wage controls under the terms of the federal Anti-inflation Board does nothing to recognize a fair share to all groups in our society. You can't tell me that anybody who had a three-year contract and rightfully so, many of them did have three-year contracts, the Canadian Airline Employees Association is a good example and other airline employees associations had that type of a contract and now they are subjected to the type of anti-inflation guidelines set down by the Federal Government. But I might also say as I look at the Saskatchewan guidelines and as I look at the news release, "Steuart says Government Offers Union Payoff." I see there where he is talking about how terrible the situation is. He is talking about how the Government gets blackmailed by labor it will face more grave consequences at the next election. He made some remarks about this and that and all the rest of it. But I should like to refer the Hon. Members opposite to what the federal and provincial guidelines are all about, refer them to the fact that the provincial guidelines allow the board to make historical comparisons on a very wide basis when the board deals with the most appropriate valid relationship that exists on the inter-provincial basis. There is no question in my mind, Mr. Speaker, that those opposite are bent upon a plot to try and devalue the work of the labor people in this province. I can read another article, another little deal here where an Hon. Member said, "The NDP Government anti-inflation program is weak, toothless and wishy-washy."

Mr. Speaker, we have seen in this House those opposite, particularly in the Liberal Party, we have seen these people trying to undermine the labor movement in this province. We have seen them use everything at their disposal to try and screw up that labor movement, to criticize what little there is to criticize and try then to come in here and say, even the provincial plan should be like the federal plan which is the most discriminatory plan you can possibly come out with. At least the provincial plan recognizes that there will be historical relationships and that I subscribe to. I say that the Saskatchewan guidelines realize some of the problems that are being faced in this province and I am sure that the Hon. Member for Regina Wascana (Mr. Merchant) realizes that too but as a labor spokesman he is going to play a little bit of a game trying to get everybody up in the air. The only purpose,

Mr. Speaker, is to activate dissension within the labor ranks and those opposite. The only purpose is to use the labor people in this province, the public servants and Crown corporation's employees, to use them to devalue the work of the Crown corporations. That has been very apparent when the House was not in session as we looked at the Members on the opposite side use one Crown corporation after another trying to tell the people of Saskatchewan how terrible Crown corporations are. It is very apparent when we look opposite and see those people attack Crown corporations and then question whether or not the employees working for those Crown corporations or the public or civil servants are doing a good job. We have heard that in Question Period over and over again. As far as I am concerned, Mr. Speaker, it is a straight sinister plot on their part to discredit the public and Crown corporation employees. There is no question about it, they have been doing it and continue to do it and then they'll try and convince the people of Saskatchewan that the Potash Corporation of Saskatchewan is not a good corporation to depend upon for the exploration of potash.

SOME HON. MEMBERS: Hear, hear!

MR. SKOBERG: — Mr. Speaker, surely in this Legislative Assembly we can recognize the worth of our fellow people in this province. Surely we do not need to make scapegoats out of our public servants or Crown employees working for the Crown corporations. And surely we do not want to drive our civil servants and Crown corporation employees out of the province in order to get better wages and that is exactly what the guidelines recognize. They recognize that there will be a relationship between the provinces, they recognize that the people here in this province are entitled to an equal return on their paycheques as those in other provinces and that will be recognized. I am pleased to say that I support that 100 per cent.

It is very apparent in my mind that the Liberals opposite also try and say what a terrible department the Department of Northern Saskatchewan is, they also attack those people in the North in order to try and do disservice to those people who are dedicated to that type of a visionary outlook in the northern part of our province.

I am suggesting it is high time that those opposite in our Question Period, and I am glad to say that I believe it has livened up, I am completely in favor of an active Question Period, but I would like those people opposite to ask the Government whether or not in fact, either the federal anti-inflation board or the provincial one has looked into the increased prices of the cost of lawyers as an example? What about accountants? Not one decision has been brought down federally in rolling back the cost of services to the people of this country. Why wouldn't the labor people want an increase in order to try and keep up with the increased cost of lawyers that they have got to go to now to fill in their tax forms, or the accountants and all the rest of it? I am suggesting that their accountability opposite insofar as in questioning those other than labor people, is really brought to life in this particular Legislative Assembly.

I would like to refer also, Mr. Speaker, to the fact when we look at interest rates we see what the Bank of Canada did here most recently and we notice what happened immediately

afterwards, that the banks then raised their interest rates. It is rather remarkable that nobody opposite even suggests that there is any responsibility on the part of the banks to make sure that there are funds for housing in this province and other provinces that is consistent with the return to the labor person. It is rather remarkable that you can go across the line right now and for 2,000 square feet of housing, a bungalow, you can buy that house for \$29,000. Anybody here tells me what you buy a 2,000 square foot bungalow for is from \$50,000 to \$75,000. I am wondering if anybody opposite . . .

AN HON. MEMBER: — How many people have a 2,000 square foot bungalow?

MR. SKOBERG: — Have you not seen a 2,000 square foot bungalow? I thought maybe out at Lumsden you had one there. But I am asking you opposite, are the carpenters in the United States getting less money that they are in Canada? Are the electrical workers getting less money than in Canada? Are the plumbers getting less money than in Canada? So really then, if you wanted to zero in on something why then not call for a commission to find out why this vast spread exists even in the cost of housing between the United States and Canada? Why not call for an investigation into the vast spread of the oil prices as it may be?

Mr. Speaker, I should like to refer also, when we looked at the federal anti-inflation board which the Hon. Member for Regina Wascana (Mr. Merchant) really supports, it is a wonderful board down there you know. John Luc Pepin must be a special friend because John Luc Pepin got on television here about a week ago and said, 'expect price increases.' He didn't say they would investigate the price increases. I haven't heard anybody mention in the Question Period today about increased prices of coffee and whether or not we on this side are going to investigate them or have John Luc try and investigate them, but the fact remains that John Luc Pepin is not interested in prices or interest or dividends or the cost of lawyers and accountants to the people of Canada, they are only interested in making sure that labor is kept in their place and making sure that their wages are kept exactly where he wanted them.

I might also then mention as I move along into the agricultural economy — I wish the farmer from Thunder Creek was still here. It is rather remarkable that only a short while ago, that we had a Minister talk about the LIFT Program, the Lower Inventory for Tomorrow Program, and now we see once again where we are now not going to make any more sales, we have to wait and see what the market will do. We will now ask and try and find out whether or not there is going to be any foresight or insight into the future grains sales of this country. I am wondering whether or not those opposite are proud of their people at the federal level when they deliberately and methodically brought about a system of lower inventory and now we are in a position of not having the supplies that we should have. It makes me wonder when I see the Hon. Members opposite criticize the various areas and still not make anything concrete insofar as suggestions are concerned.

Another point that I will refer to, Mr. Speaker, is the most recent criticism and I'll spend a little bit of time on this. The most recent criticism that was brought about in the

Question Period yesterday, by the liquor board which dropped South African products. It said here and I am quite ready to admit that those opposite, some of those opposite, will take this in a very light vein, very few will because it is a very serious situation. But it says:

Dick Collver, Leader of the Saskatchewan Progressive Conservative Party said that the Government decision is political. I would hope they would comment on the racism in Russia against Jewish people and Chinese people.

Saskatchewan Liberal Party Leader, David Steuart, said I think the decision is rather silly. If the Saskatchewan Government decides to stop stocking products of everybody they don't like, they could get into a lot of difficulty.

I imagine I will hear, "hear, hear" from the opposite side.

SOME HON. MEMBERS: Hear, hear!

MR. SKOBERG: — Good, I am glad we heard that one.

Mr. Speaker, it is quite apparent that we are in a very small area of our society when we look at our provincial legislatures across the country. It is quite apparent that many of us think that only things such as this should be the concern of the Federal Government. But I would like to suggest that it is much deeper and much more serious than that. Actually in Africa today, the struggle for freedom and fundamental human rights is one of the world's most crucial problems and I am suggesting in this House today, that we could do something about that, even though how small it may be, to bring to the attention of this country, the people of this province and the people of this world that we are prepared to move.

SOME HON. MEMBERS: Hear, hear!

MR. SKOBERG: — I should like to refer to a report called 'Challenge in the Seventies.' Some of you may know this lady who was over in Zambia, an area that I visited in 1971, Central East Africa, a Mrs. Essie Johnson. She is well known throughout the United Church with a warmth and enthusiasm with which she approaches life. A native of Yorkton, Saskatchewan, she was appointed to work in Zambia in 1954 and again back in 1970 and I am given to understand by my hon. colleague from Yorkton, that she is home at the present time on leave from Zambia.

But some of these various areas were dealt with by the United Church and the World Council of Churches. When I hear criticism opposite and hear the hilarious comments made on this particular point, then I wonder what type of a society we are really living in. These are her words:

The people of the West who work in newly independent countries are impressed by the tremendous self-competence and exhilarating enthusiasm of the people. There is a will to surmount any and every difficulty that gives no quarter to despair, but this is not easy optimism. Freedom has been won and the same determination that prevailed in the freedom struggle will maintain national security, overcome the enemies of ignorance, disease and

poverty and will find a solution to tribal jealousies.

Mr. Speaker, I am suggesting those words should be taken to heart by all Members in this House. The Y, the international Y, put out what they call the black paper in response to the federal white paper that they put out on foreign affairs, 'The Government Speaks.' It is a publication of the Canadian Institute of International Affairs and the authors are Doctor Garth Legge, Associate Secretary, Board of World Missions, United Church of Canada, Professor Cranford Pratt of the University of Toronto, Mr. Richard Williams, a returned CUSO volunteer and active member of the International Education Project.

But some of the questions that were asked and as I read those news items, when I look at this, it is better that I read this than to try and explain it because, of course, it wouldn't be accepted from an Opposition Member. But it says:

Let us look at these points more closely.

And they are talking about trading with these countries that have racism and apartheid.

The question. Should political or moral judgments influence Canada's economic relationships with any other countries? If not in Cuba or the Soviet Union, why in Southern Africa?

The answer that they gave:

First of all South Africa is unique. Repression is based totally on differences of race, a situation found in no other cases of political repression.

Secondly, Canada is already politically and morally involved. Canada has censored the Southern African regimes at the United Nations and in the Commonwealth, concurred with the 1963 Security Council resolution forbidding arms sales to South Africa, supported sanctions in Rhodesia, ceased supplying military goods and voted against apartheid.

Finally, it is foolish to suggest that Canadian policy towards oppressive regimes must be the same in every case. Each situation must be judged separately. An assessment of Canada's position leads to the conclusion that Canada should be following much stronger policies.

The last question:

Economic and political sanctions are useless if they merely make Canadians feel good while other western countries move in to fill the gap.

Of course, because Manitoba and British Columbia have likewise banned the importation of South African liquors that should have some bearing on some of the thinking of those opposite.

But the economic and political sanctions are useless if they merely make Canadians feel good.

If they would please listen to the answer, and this is not my

answer, this is somebody who has done the study and I am not sure how many opposite are interested.

It is true that Canada is not very important economically in Southern Africa and that it cannot do anything that will significantly upset the governments of that area. But this is not an argument for doing nothing. It is important that at least some of the western nations publicly demonstrate that they are concerned with the denial of basic human rights. The Southern African issue is causing serious disagreements at the United Nations and within the Commonwealth. It is important that these organizations operate successfully and continue as international forums.

Mr. Speaker, in my opinion that is a clear indication of the position of those world churches, those Canadian Ys, the international Ys and the Ys across this world, of the concern about racism apartheid which some people should be concerned about.

I might also say in order that no one thinks that I am taking the side or that I completely condemn corporations that may be selling goods to refurbish the planes that we sold South Africa many years ago, but the same thing applies to the unions in South Africa.

This is a letter that came from the leader of the South African labor movement. His criticism of what went on in South Africa.

AN HON. MEMBER: — Take it as read.

MR. SKOBERG: — I'd love to put it on the record.

As at the end of April, 1968 (and this is an updated after this) the South African steel and engineering industry had under its employees the following figures: 177,522 Africans, 76,352 whites, 15,746 coloreds, people of mixed blood, 3,385 Indians. All other workers from other race groups are recognized by law and have the right to bargain with their employers. But Africans who comprise the greatest majority have no rights whatsoever.

The final paragraph that they refer to here, that I will refer to, it is not the final paragraph of the letter, he refers to the fact that the white trade union movement in Africa put out a letter in their journal stating:

We are up against employers who are turning the many industries which are concerned into black industries to the detriment of the white workers. This will require all our strength as well as a full support of our membership to oppose improvement of African workers' conditions.

Mr. Speaker, all I am saying is that no one person is right. But what has been done at least here, on a provincial basis on barring and banning the importation of South African liquor is at least one step that we can point to that something is being done.

I might also, when I listen to some Members opposite and I

notice as yet there is not one Conservative Member opposite and it is unfortunate. Of course, the Liberals will come to the defence of the Conservatives, I am certain of that. Then you asked the question, what other groups have really supported the position of banning the South African liquor?

Church body gives \$200,000 to anti-racists insofar as South Africa is concerned.

That's the church bodies themselves and that's all inclusive.

The YWCA of Canada in their publication said it's a matter of conscience regarding Southern Africa.

In that they refer to the fact that there should not be any exportation or importation of goods from South Africa. And just in case those people opposite believe that things aren't all that bad in South Africa and many of you have been over there on holidays, I understand it is a pretty good place, but the Commonwealth Medical Association has expelled South Africa and Rhodesia for practising apartheid in medicine. A statement on the expulsion, the president said:

The medical associations of the two countries refused to mix bloods from blacks and white.

And in that regard they expelled those medical groups from the Commonwealth Medical Association.

We now know what is going on in South Africa. These people who do the investigations, these people who are concerned will tell you exactly what goes on there in Rhodesia and surely somewhere along the line those opposite in the House and we on this side can work together for a principle of doing what we can insofar as apartheid and racism is concerned.

SOME HON. MEMBERS: Hear, hear!

MR. SKOBERG: — Mr. Speaker, a challenge was thrown out yesterday and I'll just say that I am only too pleased to take it up, by the Hon. Member for Rosetown-Elrose (Mr. Bailey) to debate on human rights, apartheid and racism, and I can assure the Member who is not here and no one from his caucus to pass on the message, I would be only too pleased to debate with him or with any Member opposite, the position of apartheid racism and discriminatory action insofar as I am concerned and insofar as this Party is concerned.

I should also like to suggest that it is quite positive that if anybody wants to know where the particular papers came out that he was referring to yesterday, they were published in the Rosetown Eagle and the Star-Phoenix. Many opposite did see those papers. As far as I am concerned I have nothing to take back insofar as my statement was concerned other than what I have said some months back, that maybe I should have given an opportunity to ask their question.

Mr. Speaker, in closing my remarks, I should like to say that I support the Throne Speech that has been given. I support the position of democratic government as we know it, even though it may be small at this time. I support the position that there is work to do, a lot of work to do in the Crown

corporation, the Public Accounts Committee, when the chairman convenes that committee. There is a lot of work to do in many of the committees that we have before us, no doubt, and also there is a lot of participation going to be put in and could be put into this Legislative Assembly for the benefit of the people of this province. I know that we may get under each other's hides once in a while, but I am suggesting that there is a purpose, a purpose of this Legislative Assembly to question those areas in legislation that should be changed. That is the purpose of the Question Period and that is why I believe that the Question Period will be much better than it has been in the past, because it will be better organized.

Mr. Speaker, I support the Speech from the Throne wholeheartedly.

SOME HON. MEMBERS: Hear, hear!

MR. S.J. CAMERON (Regina South): — Mr. Speaker, I intend to be very brief, indeed. That is my intention at least. I share the frustration of the Member for Thunder Creek (Mr. Thatcher) in this particular debate. The one question that has come before us and I think deserves some attention and indeed the only one in connection with the whole of the debate, is as to the agreement or lack of agreement between the Government and the two Opposition parties with respect to facilitating the bringing down of the Budget and the waiving of the Throne Speech.

It is my understanding when we prorogued on January 28, that as a result of a meeting that morning in the Attorney General's office, at which meeting there were present the Government, our Whip and House Leader, the Member for Regina Lakeview (Mr. Malone), the Leader of the Opposition (Mr. Steuart), together with the member for Rosetown-Elrose (Mr. Bailey) and the Member for Estevan (Mr. Larter). We had understood as a result of that meeting that there was agreement on two fronts. One is that we would waive debate on the Throne Speech when we came back in March. The second is that we agreed generally to facilitate the bringing down of the Budget on March 12th. That was our understanding clearly of the arrangements that had been made.

Then we began to read in late February or early March about those agreements apparently having come apart, when the Leader of the Conservative Party indicated that as far as he was concerned there was no such agreement. Then he indicated not only was there no such agreement, he was going to insist on a Throne Speech and insist on a debate of the Throne Speech.

I must say, just to pause and digress for a moment, that was a bit interesting to some of us because earlier when we were debating, at length, the potash takeover legislation, the Conservative Leader wouldn't participate, calling it a debate that wasn't worthwhile to be in. Then when there is an opportunity to debate he wouldn't avail himself of the opportunity; when there was arrangement to waive a debate then he wanted one. Then when we are in the course of the debate they stomp out as they did this afternoon in a fit of something or other, I am not sure what it is, not understanding apparently that the Speaker has the power to preserve order in the House and at their request the Speaker will preserve order if he thinks

we are getting out of hand.

But what was raised as a result of the Leader of the Conservative Party having said what he did in late February and early March, led to the Premier, on Friday — to a display which most of us I must say were privately shocked at — indicating that the Leader of the Conservative Party had not been entirely candid with respect to the arrangements that were made or were not made. Indeed, it is putting it pretty kindly to say that the Premier said he wasn't candid in that respect.

Then we saw earlier in the week, the Leader of the Conservative Party attempting to explain his position to the House during the course of which, incidentally, there were documents referred to. Mr. Speaker will remember that when the Premier spoke to the amendment moved by the Leader of the Conservative Party, he referred to some documents that were available which he said he would table if he was requested to. I think having spoken to that amendment and that amendment having fallen and not having mentioned the documents in the course of any debate, I can't call for their production. But if I had the opportunity to do so, I certainly would. I should like to see what kind of documents we are talking about. Which leads me to wonder why particularly in view of the comments of the Conservative House Leader, when he rose after his Leader and used phrases of the most base kind in connection with his charges, he said that they were being euchred by the House Leader for the Government; he said they were being told half-truths outside the Assembly and presumably behind the bars in connection with the arrangements. I can't think of more devastating words if you want to attack the honor of someone than to accuse him of telling you half-truths, euchring you and misleading you. That is what those two gentlemen were saying about the Leader of the House of the Government side, the Attorney General.

It is a serious question. We thought we had an understanding here. We are not privy to the conversations held between the Leader on the Government side and the Leader of the Conservative Party or their House Leader and, indeed, any of the conversations that go among them. We find it particularly astounding that that kind of personal charges were made about the personal honor of the Attorney General in the way in which he is conducting his duties as Leader of the House on behalf of the Government. Yet he has sat mute in connection with that debate. We still don't know where the documents are or what kind of documents there are. We don't know his version of the discussions that were held in which the Conservatives say there were half-truths spoken and in respect of which they say they were euchred and misled.

I think the Attorney General as the Leader of the House on the Government side has a responsibility to all Members of the Assembly to lay before us the facts as he understood them. If he has documents in connection with the facts, to lay them before the House so we can have a look at them. As I say among all the nonsense that we have heard back and forth, including as I say the two devastating speeches from the Conservative benches, the Attorney General who was most directly implicated has said nothing in connection with it. That is why I said at the outset that I share the frustration of the Member for Thunder Creek since that is really in essence the sole substantive question before us and yet we are getting nothing from Members opposite in connection with it. As for the rest of it,

I agree with him that what we have been doing by and large, with the exception, may I say, of the meeting this morning in Crown Corporations which was a good one and with the exception of the Question Period, is that by and large our time is not being spent very profitably and has not been. I hope as we go along in these next few days that that will not continue to be the case.

As I say, I am in no position to request that the documents be tabled. If I were the Attorney General, I would want very much to table those documents in view of his own personal reputation having been called into question in the House.

Mr. Speaker, for the reasons indicated I do not intend to support the Speech from the Throne.

SOME HON. MEMBERS: Hear, hear!

MR. E.B. SHILLINGTON (Minister of Consumer Affairs): — Mr. Speaker, I just want to say a few words, offer a few general comments. I thought I might report to the Members of the House how I see the rent control program operating. I thought this might be as good an opportunity to do it.

The Hon. Member for Regina Rosemont (Mr. Allen) mentioned the coverage that the press has given to the sittings in this House. I can sympathize with the members of the press. They would encounter no criticism if they would just allow everybody to write their own news story. It is certainly difficult to write news that satisfies everyone because you are going to offend some people. I have subscribed to the Leader-Post now for about 10 years, since I graduated from law school, (nine years I guess). I have read it in its ups and downs and I think it has been better, a whole lot better, than it is right now. I comment on what other newspapers in the province might be doing, but I think the newspaper of the capital has a special responsibility, because they are closest to the seat of government. I think they have a special responsibility to provide fair and accurate coverage of what goes on in the Legislature and in government.

As I say I think the coverage has been better, it has been a whole lot better than it was the other day in the coverage that was given the incident on Monday. It has probably reached some sort of a new low.

Mention was also made of the Wage and Price Controls. I want to say that I think the Federal Government is not making the job of those who support the program, or those who are trying to make it work any easier. My own personal position has been that inflation is a problem which is not only causing us economic problems, it is causing inequities. Canada is basically a trading nation. Because we are fairly good at it we enjoy a good standard of living, but if we don't keep our scales sharp we are not going to survive long in the economic tussle. Inflation is something that is eating away at our ability to trade competitively. If we don't deal with it, we are going to almost certainly suffer dire economic consequences. Indeed, the rest of Canada is already going through this process and

perhaps that is why the objections to the wage and price controls in Saskatchewan have been more vehement than they have elsewhere. I think the rest of Canada may be somewhat more aware of the consequences that inflation is going to cause.

In this province we have been lucky enough and I suppose skilled enough and good enough managers to avoid the worst consequences of the recession, in fact we have avoided them, I think, almost entirely. That doesn't mean that inflation is allowed to go unchecked, it won't affect us as well.

I think there is a more important reason why we have to deal with it. As the Prime Minister said, inflation causes injustices. What you get out of the marketplace, your wages and your profits, aren't in any sense determined by what you need or what you deserve or what you have earned. What you get now depends on how effectively you can bargain. I personally feel a form of inflation controls is necessary. I think there are probably only two ways of doing that, one is to induce a recession and stem the demand. That is unjust and unfair. The other is a form of wage and price controls. I think that the Provincial Government has to try and make the program work, that is what we are doing. I started out by saying that I don't think the Federal Government is making our job of trying to make this program any easier. The increase in the bank interest rates was unnecessary. It added to the appearance of inequity, because we are controlling wages. The Saskatchewan program I may say is in its infancy. We are not at this point in time in a position to judge it. I am not aware of any wage settlements which have been referred to the Provincial Anti-inflation Board which have been determined. I think to suggest that at this point in time that it is operating in a way that is biased toward the labor and we are trying to appease our friends, is just absolute nonsense. I think if we had wanted to do that, what I think we would have done was stay out of the program altogether and gone the route that the trade unionists asked to.

I think the Federal Government could do better in making the program appear fairer. I mentioned interest rates as one. Another thing I think the Federal Government ought to do is to publish the actions they took with regard to price controls. Where they say that a price is too high, that ought to be published. If you can publish wage rollbacks, why can't you publish price rollbacks. It just adds to the appearance of an unfair program. If the program is going to work, it not only has to be fair, but it has to appear to be fair. That is one of the things that is wrong with the federal program, they make no particular appearance to be fair.

Indeed, they got off on the wrong footing when they appointed John Luc Pepin as chairman of the board. I am not saying the man is not competent or not fair, but he has a long association with big business. What they should have done is do what the Provincial Government did, that is, appoint as a chairman, someone who is clearly impartial and has no association with either labor or business. They got the program off on the wrong footing and I think it has contributed to a lot of the mistrust and the criticism that has been levied on it since.

The only other comment I want to make is about the Member for Thunder Creek. He says he is ashamed to be called a politician. I just want to say that I am proud of being a politician.

SOME HON. MEMBERS: Hear, hear!

MR. SHILLINGTON: — I may not be a very good one, I am certainly not very experienced one. But I am proud to be a politician. I am not ashamed to experience frustration in politics, which you do, that is what the Hon. Member is experiencing. I am not ashamed to have people criticize me, publicly or privately. I am not afraid to make enemies, because I have done all of those things even in the time I have been a politician. The average public don't appreciate what a very difficult role politicians have in giving leadership to meet the inarticulate, conflicting and confusing demands that are made.

I can appreciate that one might be frustrated at the course this House has taken. All of us thought by the 1st of March we would have a Budget Speech on March 12, but we didn't. That is no reason for saying that one is ashamed of being a politician.

With respect to the rent control program, I am sorry the Hon. Members on my right are not in the House. I think part of what I have to say might be of interest to them, since it was some of their criticisms in a sense I am going to respond to.

I may say that by and large I am pleased with the way the program is going. I anticipate that that might produce some cynical comments from abroad, I mean across the House. By and large I am pleased at the way the program is going. I think I anticipate as clearly as anyone that there are going to be some transitional problems and there have been some transitional problems. In part we have been successful in dealing with them, sometimes perhaps we have been less successful. But considering the problems that the program started out under, I think the staff who are there have done a very good job of making it work.

There were four official openings in the province, I attended them all, not because I expected to speak to a great crowd, because as those opposite who have been members of government will know, at official openings you manage to cajole all the staff to show up, a couple of reporters, the mayor will be there, that's usually it for an official opening. The exception to that was Yorkton, there was a crowd at Yorkton. By and large when you have an official opening . . .

MR. STEUART: — Close them, you get a crowd!

MR. SHILLINGTON: — That's right, in closing them you can depend on a good crowd. But for official openings it is a lot tougher. By and large I was speaking to the staff. What I said to the staff was that what we had done in the Legislature was get at the framework and that they would flesh it out. How competently and how fairly they dealt with the people who came before them would go a long way to determining whether the program was successful or not.

MISS CLIFFORD: — That was a good line!

MR. SHILLINGTON: — Yes, it was a good line. I think the staff listened to it and I think they are going to try to be fair. Mr. Speaker, I think the staff I talked to were not quite as cynical as some Members opposite. I think they felt that it might be the truth

and I think they have tried to live by that. I think the staff have done their utmost to try and be fair to the people who come before them. I think they have done a reasonably good job of it, although they have not made many decisions yet, which have been subject to appeal or attack.

The workload is extremely heavy. The Regina office, in the third week in February was getting 600 telephone calls a week. Now with the staff we have in Regina, that is, I suggest more telephone calls than you can really deal with in a fair and thorough manner. That is not including the applications you have to deal with, the letters, all the people who come in through the door, there is just a steady stream in and out the door. There is a very heavy workload.

The telephone calls were recorded by the receptionist, I understand it would take no more time than is done in other areas, lots of departments record telephone calls. That is a reasonably common sort of practice. At least the numbers. One of the problems we anticipated which arose — it was temporary, but it was severe — was a lot of confusion around January 29th, as to exactly what the Act said. It was a problem for the landlords and tenants, because we passed the Act on January 29. On February 1st tenants had to know what to pay their landlords, the landlords had to know what to charge. I guess I got some of my just desserts because many people didn't know where to find the office of the Rentalsman, you couldn't contact it after hours. But it seemed that every landlord in Regina and every tenant knew how to find me. My telephone just rang off the wall for a couple of days. Fortunately or unfortunately I had already made previous commitments to be out of the city over the weekend. I stuck with the telephone calls as long as I was here and wished the telephone a fond farewell when I left.

In order to cope with that problem we set up a public information program, there are television ads, there were ads in the newspapers, there are pamphlets . . .

MR. LANE: — Who placed those ads?

MR. SHILLINGTON: — I think it was J.C. Struthers and Associates. We also sent out a pamphlet to every tenant that we could identify in the province. I think by and large the information program which we had was reasonably successful, at least my telephone quit ringing after awhile and that is sort of how I judged it. I received, from tenants and from landlords too, although to a lesser extent, compliments about the program. What we tried to do was to provide information and not tell them why the program was needed, what we tried to do was provide solid information of what the program did. As I say I think we were reasonably successful. I instructed my staff to send out a copy of the pamphlet to all Members of the House, I think you probably got it. If you need more, if you have inquiries on it, please feel free to contact me.

The workload is heavy, we are going to have difficulty in dealing with all the applications that come. Suffice it to say we are going to do our best to deal with them as best we can in the time limit that is given.

The political problem will be much harder to solve than the administrative problems. It is the administrative problems you

March 17, 1976

spend all your time with, but it is the political problems that are really much more difficult to deal with. A good portion of Canadians share the same view about the anti-inflation program. "It is a good program as long as it doesn't apply to me." That's what I hear the trade unionists saying, although as I said earlier I think their argument is much more complex than that. That seems to me what some of them are saying, that's what some businesses are saying, that is what landlords are saying. It is a good program, but I am an exception, here are all the reasons why I am an exception.

Mr. Speaker interrupted proceedings and the Assembly adjourned at 5:30 o'clock p.m.