

**LEGISLATIVE ASSEMBLY OF SASKATCHEWAN**  
**Third Session — Eighteenth Legislature**  
**46th Day**

**Tuesday, April 26, 1977**

The Assembly met at 2:00 o'clock p.m.

On the Orders of the Day.

**WELCOME TO STUDENTS**

**MR. G. H. PENNER (Saskatoon-Eastview):** — Mr. Speaker, I should like to introduce to you, and through you to Members of the House, a group of students who are sitting in the east gallery, from St. Mathew School from good old Saskatoon-Eastview, along with their teacher, Mr. Noonan. We welcome these Grade Eight students to the Assembly, and hope they have a good day in Regina and that they enjoy their stay in the House. I look forward to meeting with them afterwards and I ask all Members to join with me in welcoming them to the Legislature.

**HON. MEMBERS:** — Hear, hear;

**HON. W. E. SMISHEK (Regina North East):** — Mr. Speaker, I should like to introduce to you and to the Members of the Legislature, a group of 35 Grade Eight students from Dover School, located in the Regina North East constituency. They are accompanied by their teacher, Mr. Hubick. On behalf of Members of the Legislature, I extend to them a warm welcome. I do hope their visit to the Legislature will be a rewarding experience. Mr. Speaker, I would ask all Members to extend a welcome to them. It is my intention to meet with the students and Mr. Hubick around 3:30 in the Members' dining room later.

**HON. MEMBERS:** — Hear, hear:

**MR. H. H. P. BAKER (Regina Victoria):** — Mr. Speaker, I too should like to welcome a group of students from St. Augustine School - 51 Grade Eight students are here. They are seated in the west gallery, accompanied by Mrs. Vanderlinde and Mr. Frolick. I hope that their tour of this fine building today will be educational. It will be my pleasure to visit with them a little later on. Again, a warm welcome to you, to our Assembly.

**HON. MEMBERS:** — Hear, hear:

**MR. D. H. LANGE (Bengough-Milestone):** — Mr. Speaker, I should like to introduce a group of school students from Radville Public School. Seated in the west gallery are 31 Grade Seven and Eight students. They are accompanied by their teacher, Mr. Neil Buckler, and by the school superintendent, Mr. McIntosh. We should like to welcome them to the Chamber this afternoon, and inform them that we will be meeting them after they leave.

Also, with your permission, Mr. Speaker, I should like to introduce a special group of students situated in the Speaker's

Gallery. These are American students from Outlook, Montana. They number 20 - Grades Nine and Ten, and they are accompanied by their teacher, Miss Wither, and their bus driver, Mr. Donelle Wangerin. I should like to welcome these students to Canada and to Saskatchewan this afternoon, and hope that they enjoy their visit.

**HON. MEMBERS:** — Hear, hear;

**MR. PENNER:** — Mr. Speaker, I notice that there is another group of Grade Eight students in the gallery, not from the great old constituency of Saskatoon-Eastview, but from the great old city of Saskatoon. The group of students is from St. Anne's School in Saskatoon, accompanied by their teacher, Mr. Olauson. We hope that you will enjoy your stay in Regina and that you will find your stay here in the Legislature this afternoon to be particularly interesting.

**HON. MEMBERS:** — Hear, hear!

**MR. P. P. MOSTOWAY (Saskatoon Centre):** — Mr. Speaker, on behalf of Bev Dyck, MLA, who is unable to be present at this time, I should like to extend a welcome to the students from Saskatoon, St. Anne's, and wish them a pleasant stay in Regina and a safe and pleasant journey home.

**HON. MEMBERS:** — Hear, hear!

**MR. R A. LARTER (Estevan):** — Mr. Speaker, I should like to add my word of welcome to the students from Outlook, Montana. I spent many of my school years between Outlook and Plentywood, at the homes of Jim Larter and Bob West at Outlook and I, too, should like to welcome them here today.

**HON. MEMBERS:** — Hear, hear!

## QUESTIONS

### EMPLOYMENT FOR STUDENTS

**MR. A. N. McMILLAN (Kindersley):** — Mr. Speaker, I should like to direct a question to the Minister of Culture and Youth. In view of the fact that upon the completion of the secondary and post-secondary term this year, approximately 40,000 additional potential employees will be reaching the Saskatchewan labor market and the Government YES Program is only designed to create an additional 1,440 jobs, I wonder if this Government is planning to take any action in the field of job creation to try to alleviate the unquestionably serious employment problem that is going to face students in Saskatchewan this summer?

**HON. E. L. TCHORZEWSKI (Minister of Culture and Youth):** — Mr. Speaker, the Member quotes 40,000 students coming on the labor market as if all of them will need additional jobs created. I want to make it clear that I don't think that is necessarily the case. Certainly the opportunities available in Saskatchewan for jobs during the summer are better than they are in almost any other place in Canada, and so we don't foresee any great difficulty. But, nevertheless, because there will be some need

for additional jobs for students, we have continued with the Youth Employment Service Program. There has been recently introduced, for whatever it is worth, and I think it will have some benefit, the job creation program by the Federal Government, the Canada Works Program. We welcome that, and I think together with the public sector, these two components of special job-creating programs will go a long way towards providing job opportunities for our students who will be seeking them this summer.

**MR. McMILLAN:** — Well, a supplementary, Mr. Speaker. In view of the fact that there already seems to be some problem for university students, and that segment of the potential labor force hits the market early, who are finding difficulty in getting suitable jobs, the problem obviously could get much worse when the high school students are out. Is your Government prepared at this time to reconsider the thrust of the YES Program to include private businesses, to try to encourage significantly more opportunities on the labor market for our summer students?

**MR. TCHORZEWSKI:** — That is not the present policy of the Government under the Youth Employment Service Program. If there is a change in policy at some time, it will be announced in due course.

**MR. McMILLAN:** — A final supplementary, Mr. Speaker. In view of the fact that the Minister apparently isn't prepared to take additional steps to alleviate the problem, would he not agree that this Government's philosophical hatred of private enterprise is going to deny Saskatchewan young people jobs . . .

**MR. SPEAKER:** — The Member for Souris-Cannington.

#### **PEDIATRIC SECTION OF PASQUA HOSPITAL**

**MR. E. A. BERNTSON (Souris-Cannington):** — A question to the Minister of Health, Mr. Speaker. Certain doctors have expressed concern that the pediatric section of the Pasqua Hospital may be closed or moved. Are these concerns well-founded?

**HON. W. A. ROBBINS (Minister of Health):** — I'll take it as notice.

#### **WATER SUPPLY IN SASKATOON**

**MR. PENNER:** — A question, Mr. Speaker, to the Minister of the Environment. In light of the water shortage experience in the city of Calgary on a weekend, which created some difficulty for that city, and in light of the fact that the city of Saskatoon is basically on the same water supply system, what provisions has the Minister taken with the city of Saskatoon officials, if any, with regard to any potential problem there?

**HON. N. E. BYERS (Minister of the Environment):** — Mr. Speaker, the Minister personally has not taken any initiatives with the city of Saskatoon to ensure a water supply. We are confident the water supply in Lake Diefenbaker will be sufficient for most urban requirements in the province along the river.

**MR. PENNER:** — Supplementary, Mr. Speaker. Is the Minister really saying then that the water supply through the city of Saskatoon is not, expected this year, at least as far as it is forecast now, to be any lower than it has been in the last few years, for example?

**MR. BYERS:** — Mr. Speaker, I don't have at hand, the projected river flows for Saskatoon. At present we feel that the supply of water in Lake Diefenbaker will be sufficient.

**MR. PENNER:** — A supplementary, Mr. Speaker. Would the Minister not agree that the unexpected shortage in Calgary this weekend is sufficient reason for your department officials to re-examine the situation projecting a long dry summer?

**MR. BYERS:** — The reason for the water shortage in Calgary is that it didn't snow last winter in the Rocky Mountains. A second reason for the water shortage is that the weather experts tell me that the jet stream has been off track for a couple of years and it is the jet stream that influences climatic conditions all over the world. Neither the United Nations, nor any national state, nor any provincial government has been able to overcome that problem.

**MR. SPEAKER:** — I think the Minister is answering out of his jurisdiction. Next question.

### **RIVERHURST FERRY**

**MR. R. H. BAILEY (Rosetown-Elrose):** — Mr. Speaker, I should like to direct a question to the Minister of Highways.

I understand, from phone calls that I have had, that a number of people have been inquiring as to why the Riverhurst ferry has not been put into operation. They have not been satisfied with the answers as to the approximate date. I wonder if the Minister could inform this House why the ferry is late to operate. Perhaps it is because of low water.

**HON. E. KRAMER (Minister of Highways):** — Well, I don't know if this has anything to do with the water situation or not. I am sorry, but I am going to have to ask the Member for Rosetown to refer the question to the Captain of the fleet, the Minister of Municipal Affairs, as he is in charge of the ferry.

**HON. G. MacMURCHY (Minister of Municipal Affairs):** — Mr. Speaker, I am sorry I don't have my admiral hat on today. The issue of the Riverhurst ferry has not been brought to my attention. I did a check last week on whether the ferries were operating and the report back to me was that they were being set up, getting ready to go. I'll see if I can find out the information later this day, and inform the Member what's going on at Riverhurst.

**MR. BAILEY:** — Supplementary, Mr. Speaker. I wonder if the Minister in charge of ferries, in doing so, would also answer my question that

I asked about, last Friday.

**MR. MacMURCHY:** — I don't have that information as yet. I checked in my offices today at noon.

### **HIGH COST OF FOOD**

**MR. E F. A. MERCHANT (Regina Wascana):** — The Minister of Consumer Affairs, on Saturday, made a number of announcements, Mr. Speaker, which I think are different from past policy and I wonder if I might direct a couple of questions to him about the three areas that I think are different from previous Cabinet positions.

First, Mr. Speaker, the Minister said in Saskatoon to a consumer affairs organization, that part of their job would have to be to fight the high cost of food. I wonder if the Minister would not agree that it is in the better interests of the province of Saskatchewan, and probably the interests of his seatmate's department, that food prices be maintained and, indeed, that cattle and hog producers get better prices, more appropriate to the cost of their production.

**HON. E. WHELAN (Minister of Consumer Affairs):** — Well, first the Hon. Member doesn't have his facts straight. I thought he would have done a little bit more homework I wasn't in Saskatoon. I didn't address the consumer affairs group. It was the Consumers' Association of Canada meeting. I thought that surely, he could get a little more information; the question is about as inaccurate as the background. I said that I thought the consumers should organize to battle the cost of living. My complete remarks are available and will indicate clearly that I had no objection to other groups organizing in society, and I paid tribute to those that had I said that they were certainly exerting their influence and I said that very carefully. I don't think that's anything out of step with what the Government has said time and time again.

**MR. MERCHANT:** — Supplementary, Mr. Speaker. Did the Minister say to that group that a preference should be given by consumers to dealing with co-ops and to dealing with credit unions, rather than dealing with business and other banks? I don't believe that the Government, at any time, has shown a preference towards credit unions and co-ops as opposed to other businesses. I wonder also if the Minister would answer the question about encouraging a fight against food price increases.

**MR. WHELAN:** — There are so many ramblings in that question and it's really a speech rather than a question, that I don't know where to start to answer it. What I did say to these people was that there were consumer organizations that were available to them, that they should use as vehicles. This Government has wholeheartedly approved of credit unions and co-ops and many of the monuments in battle to fight the cost of living go to the consumer groups such as credit unions and co-ops. I reiterated that and reiterated it very strongly and I urged them to take an active part in credit unions and co-ops. I will do that over and over again and that is completely in step with the policy of this Government.

**MR. MERCHANT:** — Final supplementary, Mr. Speaker. Did you, in that speech, use the words, -outrageous profits' and refer to Saskatchewan businessmen as being guilty of the sale of shoddy goods? Do you think that Saskatchewan businesses are earning outrageous profits and selling shoddy goods? Is it for that reason that you have announced, on behalf of your department presumably, that a preference should be given in people's buying, to deal with co-ops and credit unions rather than dealing with private businesses throughout Saskatchewan?

**MR. WHELAN:** — Mr. Speaker, I think it is well known to everybody that there are cases of outrageous profits and that there are cases of shoddy goods, or there wouldn't be consumer affairs organizations across this country, at a federal and provincial level. If that wasn't the case, then your mother wouldn't be working for the federal organization, and you know it and I know it.

**SOME HON. MEMBERS:** — Hear, hear!

### **DOWNTOWN DEVELOPMENT**

**MR. J. G. LANE (Qu'Appelle):** — Mr. Speaker, I should like to direct a question, either to the Minister of Municipal Affairs or the Minister responsible for Sask Tel, with regard to the proposed Regina downtown redevelopment. A press article would indicate that three major components of the proposed downtown redevelopment are in need of more space. Now it seems from that statement, that final plans have not been developed, and that perhaps there will be more expropriation of property or more property needed. The Supreme Court of Canada has ruled that the project itself may be a factor in determining compensation for expropriation and if more property is to be taken over, it is going to give an unfair advantage to those new property owners, who are being considered for expropriation. Has the Minister considered the unfair advantage that is arising as a result of what seems to be poor planning as the project . . .

**MR. SPEAKER:** — The Member for Saskatoon Eastview.

### **BOARD OF WESTERN DEVELOPMENT MUSEUM**

**MR. PENNER:** — Mr. Speaker, a question to the Minister of Culture and Youth. In view of the fact that on Friday last, you admitted that the Board of the Western Development Museum was constituted outside the bounds of the Legislature, would the Minister not agree that the actions taken by the board during the period April 26, 1976 to April 7, 1977, are, therefore, null and void?

**MR. TCHORZEWSKI:** — No, I would not agree. I have asked for a legal opinion on the matter, and it is being prepared. I have also indicated to the Member that when it arrives I will be making a statement to clarify the issue in this House.

**MR. PENNER:** — A supplementary, Mr. Speaker. I am pleased to hear the Minister make that statement; I obviously didn't hear you correctly on Friday. Is the Minister prepared to suggest, should the statement prepared by the legal people indicate that our

contention is correct, that Mr. Wilson ought then to be reinstated?

**MR. SPEAKER:** — Order! The Member for Estevan.

### **OIL PRODUCERS SASKATCHEWAN – ALBERTA**

**MR. R. A. LARTER (Estevan):** — Mr. Speaker, I should like to ask the Minister in Charge of Saskoil a question. In an interview last week on CBC with the critic for the oil resources in Alberta, it came out that a good part of the \$16 million, or the part that is being put into Lloydminster for our heavy oil field at present, is going on the Alberta side of the border. The contractors say that there is not too much difference in money for a barrel of oil, but that their claim is better. Could you tell me is this true, and is your department doing anything about this?

**HON. E. L. COWLEY (Provincial Secretary):** — Well, Mr. Speaker, all I can respond is that Saskoil's activities in the heavy oil area around Lloydminster are all on the Saskatchewan side.

**MR. LARTER:** — Supplementary, Mr. Speaker. Can the Minister tell me if private companies, on the whole, are heading for the Alberta side, or are you getting good play from the private companies on the Saskatchewan side?

**MR. COWLEY:** — Well, I can inform the Member that we have certainly been talking with several companies in that area and some of the major producers with respect to activities on the Saskatchewan side. I believe we have two and perhaps three joint ventures, either entered into or in the discussion stages, with respect to private oil producers on the Saskatchewan side. Certainly that, to me, doesn't show any particular flight of oil producers one way or the other. There has historically been, I think in that area, a much stronger development on the Saskatchewan side. I wouldn't be surprised if there was some increase in activity on the Alberta side, in view of the fact that historically there hasn't been very much there at all.

**MR. LARTER:** — Mr. Speaker, could the Minister tell me if it is the intention of Saskoil to purchase any producing companies on the Saskatchewan side of the border?

**MR. COWLEY:** — Well, Mr. Speaker, certainly we look at all producing properties that are offered to us. In Saskatchewan, in particular, in the event that properties were offered to us that involved producing properties in the Lloydminster area, and we could obtain them at a price that we thought was fair, we would do so. We have acquired, over the past couple of years, some producing properties in that area, although the bulk of our holdings are in the southeast and southwest because that is where we happen to have had an opportunity to acquire properties. But we have acquired some properties in that area. We are now looking at some additional properties and if we can come to terms on those, we will be acquiring them.

## CONSUMER MARKETING PROGRAMS

**MR. MCMILLAN:** — Mr. Speaker, I should like to direct a question to the Minister of Agriculture. I should like to refer the Minister to an advertisement that his Department of Agriculture has placed in many of the weekly papers and I believe the Western Producer called: 'Filling a Grocery Cart.' It states briefly, and they list milk, eggs, bacon, and beef, that in order to find these products, that the programs are initiated by the Provincial Government, and it says here:

The programs are marketing ones that let him know that he will be able to sell his products, referring to the farmers. And I would like to ask the Minister, in view of the fact that this province doesn't yet have a beef marketing program, and at present it seems that there is no action being taken to implement one, does the Minister not feel it is misleading for his department to run an advertisement which infers that there is a beef marketing program which makes and allows beef to be available to the Saskatchewan consumer and which helps Saskatchewan farmers market their products?

**HON. E. KAEDING (Minister of Agriculture):** — I don't think that it is entirely wrong for us to have made that statement in the advertisement. I think, that although we are not in the marketing field, we are certainly in the field of developing diversified operations and we are working to help farmers in that direction. I think that that is a pretty effective way to get across to consumers that we are doing some work in that area and that if we don't have that kind of activity in the Department of Agriculture, that food won't be there for them to eat.

**MR. MCMILLAN:** — Supplementary, Mr. Speaker, the ad states, "The programs are marketing ones that let him," referring to the producer, "know that he will be able to sell his product." There is no marketing program in Saskatchewan for beef, nor is there apparently, according to the Minister of Agriculture, any stage of implementation. Will the Minister not agree to withdraw this ad from the weekly newspapers, as I am sure that he is aware that that statement is misleading, and it is more than an attempt to soften up the public and farmers to the acceptance of a marketing board?

**MR. KAEDING:** — Mr. Speaker, I am sure that the public reading that ad is not going to assume the kind of assumption that he puts on it. I would suggest that the ad is not misleading to the extent that we are doing a fair amount of work to provide meat products to consumers, and I think he is reading more into that than there is.

## DOWNTOWN REDEVELOPMENT

**MR. J. G. LANE:** — Mr. Speaker, a question to either the Minister of Municipal Affairs or the Minister responsible for Sask Tel.

Again, the recent events seem to indicate that on the downtown redevelopment, some of the Government projects were inaccurate in their space planning requirements, as there have been adjustments in the SGIO building. There now seems to be a



need for changes in the Sask Tel proposed structure, according to the recent press statements.

My first question is, why was the Government unable to be more accurate in its space planning requirements for the downtown redevelopment? Secondly, is the Government aware, or can the Government advise me, of the increase in costs of the project because of the changes in the space planning requirements of the Government itself?

**MR. BYERS:** — Mr. Speaker, with respect to the first question, why was the Government unable to be more accurate with regards to its space plan - there has been no change in Sask Tel's estimates for its space requirements for the proposed head office complex. Secondly, are there any changes in the cost with respect to the proposed head office of Sask Tel - the final plan for the building is not finalized and, therefore, there has really been no firm estimate of costs?

**MR. LANE:** — Supplementary, Mr. Speaker. Would the Minister be prepared to admit that, as the project is discussed or contemplated and changed; one, that increased costs automatically occur; secondly, increased valuations for expropriation purposes also occur because of changes? Can the Minister advise when the Government will be able to advise the people of Regina as to the final plans for the downtown redevelopment as set out, involving the SGIO and Sask Tel head offices?

**MR. BYERS:** — No at this time it is not possible to give a definite date as to when all the final plans will be completed.

### **IS HUGGETT STUDY TO BE TABLED**

**MR. S. CAMERON (Regina South):** — Mr. Speaker, I ask again a question of the Attorney General, which I have been asking now for weeks on end, without response. Is the Attorney General prepared to table, for Members of the Legislature to examine, the Huggett Study on the administration of the courts of appeal in the four western provinces?

**HON. R. ROMANOW (Attorney General):** — Mr. Speaker, the answer simply put is, no, I am not. The Huggett Study, so-called, was a request for information that I asked Mr. Huggett to prepare for me in the course of deliberating a request from some people on the court, for additional support staff. I view that to be an internal working document for my own purposes.

**MR. CAMERON:** — By way of supplementary, Mr. Speaker. I wonder if the Attorney General is prepared to indicate to the Members of the House, what the findings were that Mr. Huggett found in the course of examining the administration of the courts in the four provinces. I indicated to you earlier that it was my understanding that he had found Saskatchewan at least wanting, in respect of the administration of its court of appeal. Would you indicate whether that is the fact, would you be prepared to give us, generally, what his conclusions were?

**MR. ROMANOW:** — Mr. Speaker, I have indicated already that in a study of

this nature, a number of obvious conclusions can be made. There are different provinces with different populations, different courts, different duties. For example, in our court of appeal there is a higher percentage of criminal matters than in other courts of appeal. The general trend of the study was that there should be, I believe, two additional clerk stenos added to the support staff of the court of appeal, which we undertook to do. As far as I know, these people are now on stream or will be on stream.

**MR. J. G. LANE:** — Has that study considered the Justice Information System that was established in British Columbia? It is referred to as being a very sophisticated computer system which allows the government to determine the nature of crime, what crimes are being committed and what percentage, in the various communities. Was that part of the study? If not, why not, and if not, would the Government consider the implementation of a system similar to the Justice Information System established in British Columbia?

**MR. ROMANOW:** — Mr. Speaker, Members of the Opposition are either deliberately, or ignorantly, making out as if this is some kind of a big report. I think the whole thing amounted to one page. One page . . .

**MR. CAMERON:** — Table it:

**MR. ROMANOW:** — I will not table it. I will not table any report that I asked for myself, to assist me in determining whether or not we need more clerks. I won't table that. I simply say to Members of the House, Mr. Speaker, it was a one-page report. The court of appeal asked me to get one or two additional clerk stenos. I said to my officials, as is the case for me to do almost 99 per cent of the time in a whole number of other areas, tell me what the number is of clerks and clerk stenos in other provinces, which they did, in one page. That's all the information I had, and I am not going to table that.

Now in terms of the criminal justice system of British Columbia, that is almost similar to our provincial management improvement system, with respect to the criminal justice scheme that we are now implementing in Saskatchewan, which will be into effect in 1978.

## **MOTIONS FOR RETURN**

### **RETURN NO. 70**

**Mr. E. F. A. MERCHANT** (Regina Wascana), to move that an Order of the Assembly do issue for a Return No. 70 showing:

- (1) Whether any buildings have been closed in Uranium City because of the high pico-curi levels.
- (2) The highest pico-curi levels recorded in buildings in Uranium City during 1976.
- (3) (a) Whether the Provincial Government has been requested to contribute anything towards the \$346,000 Federal Government project planned for 1977 designed to clean up the dangerous radioactive materials in the Uranium City area (b) whether the Provincial Government has requested equipment from the Federal Government or planned the purchase of equipment to test the radon

levels in an ongoing way in Uranium City and Rabbit Lake as the Ontario Government checks the radon levels in Port Hope.

**HON. N. E. BYERS (Minister of the Environment):** — Mr. Speaker, I certainly want to provide the Hon. Member with sufficient and accurate information. I should, therefore, like to propose a minor amendment to the Motion proposed, seconded by Mr. Kramer (Minister of Highways), namely to amend subsection (1) by deleting the word 'pico-curi' and substituting therefore, the word 'radiation'. And in subsection (2) to amend subsection (2) by deleting the word 'pico-curi' and substituting therefore, the word 'radiation'. I should like to speak to that if the amendment is in order.

**MR. MERCHANT:** — Mr. Speaker, I am not sure that the difference will be significant. I, therefore, don't oppose the Motion. I wonder, however, since I am, through this amendment, given an opportunity perhaps to question the Minister, whether he would indicate in speaking to this amendment, what level of expenditure is being spent by the Canadian Government on the clean-up program that was announced a few days ago? As I understand it, Mr. Speaker, approximately \$25 million is being spent on clean-up, principally in northern Saskatchewan and in the Port Hope area. As I further understand it, approximately \$15 million of that \$25 million will be spent in Port Hope, but as Members may recall, our radiation levels were higher than the levels found in the Port Hope schools. I wonder, therefore, what kind of expenditure has been negotiated by this Government in order to clean up the schools in the Rabbit Lake and Uranium City areas?

**MR. SPEAKER:** — Order, I believe the Member will agree with me that he is now, in fact, talking about the Motion, rather than the amendment, and since he already has spoken on the Motion, he has to confine his remarks to the substitution of the word 'radiation' for 'pico-curi'.

**MR. MERCHANT:** — The Minister indicated, Mr. Speaker, that he would be prepared to speak to this amendment. I assume by that he means voluntarily that he will be speaking to the amendment and I wonder, Mr. Speaker, if in addressing himself to the amendment he will give me the answers to those questions which I think are urgent.

**MR. SPEAKER:** — I think to preclude the possibility of you operating under any false illusion, the Minister of Environment has already spoken to the amendment when he moved it, and therefore, he cannot speak again on the matter. And he cannot close debate on an amendment. Therefore, his opportunity to speak has been used.

**MR. BYERS:** — Mr. Speaker, on a Point of Order.

**MR. SPEAKER:** — What's the Point of Order?

**MR. BYERS:** — I rose to propose the amendment. I think the records will show that I indicated that if the amendment was in order, I wanted to speak to the amendment, and I wanted to get your

ruling on whether my amendment was in order before I undertook to speak to the amendment.

**MR. SPEAKER:** — Unfortunately, when the Member for Wascana rose, the Member should have interceded at that point. Unfortunately, he has lost his opportunity. I recall the Member saying that, but I think the Member has the responsibility to rise to speak to it, once I assume the Motion is in order, or the amendment is in order.

Amendment agreed to.

Motion as amended agreed to.

## **RESOLUTIONS**

### **RESOLUTION NO. 32 - EQUAL PAY FOR WORK OF EQUAL VALUE**

Mr. E. F. A. MERCHANT (Regina Wascana) moved, seconded by Mr. Stodalka (Maple Creek):

That this Assembly urges the Government to enact legislation giving teeth to the principle of equal pay for work of equal value and urges the Government to establish within the Women's Bureau a task force working specifically to bring this concept to fruition in Saskatchewan.

He said: Mr. Speaker, I will in a moment be moving a motion which urges the Government to take some steps to go beyond merely enunciating a principle in favor of equal pay for work of equal value. Part of the problem that appears to have developed over the years, Mr. Speaker, is that governments, rather than making this concept happen, have only discussed the concept and passed laws which unfortunately have not been nearly as effective as the laws should have been. We've had a tradition in this province, and I think in fairness, it's a tradition that was led by the old CCF of looking forward, it's a tradition that developed under the Liberal Government when the Liberal Government in the teens and twenties was progressive in its outlook. This province then moved into the 1930s and into the 1940s with the CCF Governments and maintained that progressive outlook. I think that this is an area where Saskatchewan could show some leadership to the rest of the country if it chooses to do so, and clearly it has not chosen to do so today.

It's interesting that the Department of Labour has established a women's division, but that women's division really has not been very effective over the years. Whether it will be effective now, under its new leadership is another question, but in the past it's operated in a very underfunded way, with very few people involved. Indeed, there was a time when the women's division officers were curiously paid less money than officers in the Department of Labour doing exactly the same job, almost seeming to indicate that because they were women, they would be paid a lesser amount of money than the men who were performing the same functions and doing other things.

Going back to the start of this concept, one finds, Mr. Speaker, that the League of Nations, as long ago as 60 years past, enunciated in principle that they favored the concept of equal pay for work of equal value. The problem, however, is that nothing really happened after that. The argument then becomes, in

large part, an argument about numbers. Unfortunately those numbers tell the story and tell us that society, over these past 60 years, has been lulled into thinking that progress has been made in that fight for equal pay for work of equal value, but that, in fact, there has been very little progress made. You could almost say that all the governments have been doing is waving a rhetorical flag at the problem.

In Canada and in the United States, while there is a history of legislation which prohibits the payment of different rates based on sex for the same work, that history of legislation has not resulted in the aim that it intended. The inequity of paying two workers engaged in the same job, in the same premises and employed by the same employer, producing the same quality and quantity of work, has been recognized, as I said, for almost 60 years. In 1919, the International Labour Organization included as its goal, recognition of the principle of equal remuneration for work of equal value.

In this country, the first equal pay legislation followed a long time ago, 25 years ago, 26 to be exact, yet nothing really has happened since. The first legislation came in Ontario in 1951. The CCF was a government that I think, unlike the NDP, tended to have that progressive flair that existed in the old Liberal Party, the Liberal Party of the teens and the twenties, unlike this Government which seems to have lost that progressive flair. The CCF, in 1952, introduced similar legislation in this province. British Columbia and Manitoba followed four years later and in 1956, the Federal Government under the Liberals, passed similar legislation, an Equal Pay Act. Alberta followed the following year, as did the rest of the country, more or less, between then and 1960.

The first really effective legislation, and even that wasn't effective enough, came in 1964, when this country ratified the equal pay convention of the International Labour Organization and Quebec passed the first law prohibiting discrimination on grounds of sex, in certain kinds of employment. Five years later, 1969, British Columbia followed the Quebec lead and Newfoundland followed that year, Alberta in 1971, and Ontario, Saskatchewan, Prince Edward Island, a number of provinces, followed in 1972. What we did was add provisions to our definition of discrimination to exclude discrimination in conditions of employment on grounds of sex. The Federal Government followed that year with the same kind of legislation.

Basically, the state of the law in Canada, as it's existed for about the past five years, with regard to equal pay and with regard to discrimination on grounds of sex, is that there are laws on the statute books of all jurisdictions, prohibiting that kind of discrimination, but that legislation is basically most ineffective. The results are almost meaningless.

In late 1975 and early 1976, I was pressing in this House and elsewhere, for a positive action program for employment within the Government. We now have that positive action program. I applaud the Government for bringing in that kind of legislation and I look forward in the coming years to some progress being made in that regard. I even, Mr. Speaker, hope that when the 13 or 14 NDPs get elected in the next election, that they may bring a positive action program to bear on their nominations and elect a female or two to this House, as the Liberal Party did in the last election.

In the United States, the positive action program has been quite effective. It's worked in the universities, it's worked in large businesses, and to some extent I'm proud to say, Canada has led the way in terms of bringing a positive action program to bear in government. The American States have not followed that lead.

Unfortunately, the results of the equal pay for work of equal value legislation has not been nearly as encouraging. There are three million workers in Canada, defined in terms of going out and holding employment in the usual sense and approximately one-third of them are female. Of that female working population, one-third are in clerical occupations, one-fifth are in service and one-sixth are in the sort of female professions of nursing and teaching. In short, women are getting closeted into the areas where they can earn little, and unfortunately, that pattern isn't changing. One-tenth of female workers are production workers, one-twelfth are in sales and only four per cent hold managerial positions.

The pattern unfortunately, is not improving. There has been no improvement in those percentages from over a decade ago. In clerical occupations, for example, there were fewer female workers working in clerical occupations 10 years ago by 3 per cent. Ten years ago, 29.9 per cent of female workers held clerical jobs and now 32.9 per cent of females working hold those kinds of go-nowhere clerical positions. We are, in fact, going backwards in getting women out of that no-end, short-term kind of job. Females make up 72 per cent of all workers in clerical occupations. Ten years ago, they made up 62 per cent of people working in those kinds of poor positions, in terms of payment, at least.

The problem, Mr. Speaker, seems to be that the equal pay laws only prohibit the payment of differential rates because of differences in the sex of workers engaged in the same work or similar work. Where all the workers are of the same sex, then the principle of equal pay law is irrelevant. It is this problem that the status of women organizations throughout Canada are now grappling with. We find that women, principally continue to hold the dead-end, poor-paying positions. They hold the poorer types of work and when doing the same work, even usually higher remunerative work, they earn less. In managerial positions where as I said only one-twenty-fifth of women are occupied, the average earnings of men exceed those of women by 107 per cent. In clerical occupations where, not only do women occupy almost three-quarters of the total, but the total is up from ten years ago, the annual earnings of men exceed those of women by 57 per cent in the service industries, into which the rapidly-increasing female labour force has been absorbed, women account for almost three-fifths of the total work force, yet the average earnings of men exceed those of women by 113 per cent. In sales occupations, in managerial occupations, women make up a relatively small percentage of all employees. They consist in sales, of almost 40 per cent, but once again the earnings of men exceed those of women in sales by a whopping 170 per cent. In the professional and technical occupations, women make up two-fifths of the total, and that includes the sort of closeted women's occupations of nursing and teaching. Yet, even there, the earnings of men exceed those of women, by 66 per cent.

In short, Mr. Speaker, not only do women go on earning dramatically less than men, notwithstanding our legislation, but the female labor force continues to be clustered in areas usually considered to be at a dead-end, temporary and less remunerative than other occupations.

As I said, 32.9 per cent of all working women are in clerical occupations. A decade ago, the percentage was lower at 29.9; 21.4 per cent of all working women are in service and recreational jobs which is almost the same number as the 22 per cent of a decade ago; 17.4 per cent of all working women are in the professional and technical occupations, which includes nurses and teachers and librarians. That is only modestly better than the 16 per cent of a decade ago.

Even in the trade union movement, where one would have expected trade unionists to try to help women, we find, if anything, the trade union movement is discouraging women from taking traditionally male jobs. We find that 10.9 per cent of all women workers are trapped in production work, which is down from 12.8 per cent of ten years ago.

Mr. Speaker, as I think we all know, union workers are usually, though not always, paid more than non-union workers. An insignificant 4.2 per cent of the female labor force is employed in managerial and executive positions and that is almost identical to the 3.7 per cent of ten years ago.

Ironically, the average employment of full-time male baby sitters was 127.5 per cent higher than that of full-time female baby sitters. The earnings of male librarians is 19 per cent higher than that of females. Male dieticians and nutritionists derived average employment earnings which were 23 per cent higher than those of their female counterparts. Male tellers and cashiers earned 51 per cent more than their female counterparts. Earnings of waiters exceed those of waitresses by 55 per cent. Male hair dressers earn 38 per cent more than female hairdressers. In our own Department of Social Services, males hold far more managerial positions than the very small percentage of overall employment would dictate and they earn substantially more than the average of their female counterparts. Ironically, even in the positions which have been female by habit, men are paid more and are promoted more easily than females.

Members of the House will recall the Yorkton dispute as an example of the inability of our current law to come to grips with the problem facing society if we are to have equal pay for work of equal value. That is the area towards which this Motion addresses itself.

Our law must be framed in language that is clear and unequivocally enforceable. It is not now. It must provide penalties of sufficient size to encourage full adherence on economic as well as humanitarian grounds. Secondly, the administrators charged with the administration of the law and the courts which enforce the law, must clearly understand the intent and work towards bringing that intent into effect. Thirdly, the law has to be promoted. The public has to be educated about it. If employers and workers are both unaware of the existence of the law, and if little or no efforts have been made to bring the legislation to the attention of those affected, then quite obviously the law will fall into disrepute. That problem is particularly difficult with women, because frequently women hold those dead-end, low-paying positions and they are the people, more than any who don't realize the resources that are available to them and their recourse to the law.

As a result, in part, of the federal status of women and the Royal Commission on the Status of Women in Canada, the national government is in the process of establishing a commission on

human rights and interests which includes provisions designated to eliminate discrimination and employment on the grounds of sex and marital status. The Royal Commission on the Status of Women in Canada also proposed the establishment of an independent body reporting directly to Parliament. I support that concept and think that concept would be an addition to the enforcement of equal rights and equal pay legislation.

I also support the Saskatchewan Status of Women, that advocates a codification of jobs in a manner similar to the way that the Public Service Commission sets out the job specifications for public servants and designates the level of that position. Certainly, within the public service, such a concept is practical and should be implemented, though admittedly, it will be difficult to implement in all but the larger industries operating in this province.

In 1975 and 1976, I encouraged the Government to move in certain areas. I moved amendments for human rights legislation which the Government, incidentally, refused to pass – legislation which was designed to protect women from discrimination on the grounds of marital status in obtaining credit and in other areas. I moved other amendments regarding discrimination on sex, which I thought should have been included in our human rights legislation and I now repeat, governments must lead in this area.

Our Government is not leading in this area. If our Government, a government that claims to be progressive, is not prepared to lead, then surely the governments like that of Alberta and Ontario are not going to pick up the task and show the leadership that this country needs. Certainly, paying more than lip service to the concept of equality is a responsibility of government and passing laws, in terms of the laws that we have now, is not doing the job.

Therefore, Mr. Speaker, I move, seconded by the Member for Maple Creek (Mr. Stodalka), this Resolution.

**HON. G. T. SNYDER (Minister of Labour):** — Mr. Speaker, I want to contribute a few remarks to Resolution 32 before you put it to a vote, or before the Motion is adjourned.

I must say that I was deeply moved by the remarks of the Hon. Member for Regina Wascana, because he shows a good deal more depth, sympathy and understanding than any of the Liberals who have preceded him. If his feelings are genuine and they are subscribed to by the Members who surround him, then I congratulate him on raising his sights somewhat from the sights that were previously in evidence when the previous Liberal administration had an opportunity to do something about promoting the rights of women in the public service and in the private sector.

Mr. Speaker, in March, during the debate on Estimates for the Department of Labour, I informed the House, I believe, in answer to questions and remarks by the Member for Regina Wascana, that the women's division had begun at that time, or previous to that time, studying equal pay for work of equal value. Some Members of the House may not be familiar with the concept of equal pay for work of equal value and I think, therefore, it might be worthwhile to provide some background information.

Simply put, Mr. Speaker, equal pay for work of equal value means that if two people are doing work that is of equal value



to their employer, then they should be paid equally. It means that the work of a secretary, for instance, can be compared with the work of a laborer. And if the work they produce is equally valuable to their employer, then their pay cheques should be the same. The value of the work would be assessed on the basis of a composite of skill, of effort, of responsibility and working conditions.

Equal pay for work of equal value is not legislated in any jurisdiction in Canada at present, although Canada did ratify the ILO (International Labour Organization) Convention No. 100 concerning equal remuneration for men and women workers for work of equal value as early as 1972.

The Government of Canada has included equal pay for work of equal value in Bill C-25, which is presently, I understand, before the House of Commons.

There are certain advantages, and I believe also, Mr. Speaker, some disadvantages to legislation regarding equal pay for work of equal value. The major advantage to legislation on equal pay for work of equal value is that it would allow us, as a government, to deal directly with problems of wage discrepancies between men and women. In Canada, as has been indicated earlier, the average wage of a man on the labor force is something like \$10,072, while the average wage of a woman is in the neighborhood of \$5,500.

The situation isn't markedly different in the Province of Saskatchewan. The wages of employed women in the province are considerably lower than the wages of men. I do want to emphasize that they are not lower because of violations of our present equal pay for similar work law. Wage discrepancies are frequently a result of women being 'ghettoized', if I can use that expression, into certain occupations, occupations such as clerical and service work where the rates of pay have been, and continue to be, traditionally low by comparison to other sectors of the economy.

About 39 per cent of all women working in the Saskatchewan labour force are in clerical positions; 15 per cent of all women working in the Saskatchewan labor force are in service positions. In other words then, some 56 per cent of Saskatchewan women in the Saskatchewan labor force are working in low-paying positions and a large number of them at minimum rates of pay. Approximately 67 per cent of these women are working out of financial necessity because they are single, widowed, divorced or married to men whose earnings are less than \$8,000 per year.

At present, we don't have the legislation which will allow us to assist these women. Our present equal pay law is based on equal pay for similar work and we can deal only with situations where there are employees of both sexes doing similar work in the same establishment. We are not able to assist these women because they are usually in situations where there are only female employees doing the same kind of work and, accordingly, there is no similar position being performed by a person of a different sex, in order that we may make an objective comparison.

I should point out that Saskatchewan has now some of the best equal pay for similar work legislation in the country and our enforcement procedures provide an example for other jurisdictions in Canada.

A national study just completed by the Women's Policy Committee of the Canadian Association of Administrators of Labour

Legislation shows Saskatchewan to be a leader in equal pay enforcement. The Government of Saskatchewan must not rest on its laurels, however, but must continue to be the leader in the field of equality for women. More importantly, I think, we must examine other means to grapple with the serious problems faced by women in the Saskatchewan labor force. We must examine the concept of equal pay for work of equal value, and I think, Mr. Speaker, as I indicated earlier, that this study is well on its way.

I want to say, also, Mr. Speaker, that as well as the advantages, we must explore the possibility of disadvantages of legislation on equal pay for work of equal value. I believe we must examine this concept to see if it will really eliminate wage discrimination between men and women. We should not hold it out, I believe, as a magic formula or as an answer to all of the problems of women, only to find out later that it does not effectively deal with the problems. We must also examine the implications of such legislation as it applies to the collective bargaining system. We must examine the implications for businessmen and I suppose, also, the supply and demand for workers in the labor market cannot be totally ignored at this time. We must examine how legislation on equal pay for work of equal value would be properly implemented.

From the research that we have done so far, it would appear that job evaluation studies will be necessary to implement that concept. What method of job evaluation should then be used? Should it be up to each employer to devise a system or should there be a standard system throughout the province? Another question is, can this evaluation allow for more effective and more efficient use of employee resources or will it be an additional burden upon employers? Additionally, the question has to be asked with respect to the actual enforcement of the law. I think all of these questions must be examined and the people of Saskatchewan must have an opportunity to address their views on equal pay for work of equal value. In order to examine these questions and involve the people of Saskatchewan in discussion on equal pay for work of equal value, the women's division of the Department of Labour will carry out a project over the next number of months.

During the summer months of 1977, the staff of the division will be preparing, or will have prepared, educational materials to provide information to the public on equal pay for work of equal value. In September, I will be announcing the membership of a committee on equal pay for equal work, which will consist of representatives of business, labor and of women. This committee will be chaired by the executive director of the women's division. The committee will identify areas to be studied, develop a process of public information and consultation, examine the results of studies and public input and make recommendations to me regarding whether or not a legislative change is required, and what those changes should be. Consultation with the people of Saskatchewan will include public meetings in the spring and fall of 1978 and requests for briefs. The committee will be reporting to me early in 1979.

The Government of Saskatchewan, I think, has shown its commitment to equality of women through progressive legislation and through the actual establishment of the women's division and the career development office also, Mr. Speaker. We are aware of the many areas of discrimination which women in the labor force face and we are committed to doing whatever we can to eliminate that discrimination.

I am pleased, once again, Mr. Speaker, that the Hon. Member for Wascana (Mr. Merchant) is apparently so supportive of the work which is being carried on by the women's division of the Department of Labour. I only hope that he can get some of that support from other Members of the political parties which surround him, in helping us fulfil our commitment to equality for women.

There is a great deal more that should be added, and accordingly Mr. Speaker, I beg leave to adjourn the debate.

Debate adjourned.

## **ADJOURNED DEBATES**

### **RESOLUTIONS**

#### **RESOLUTION NO. 18 - ESTABLISH A POLICY FOR HIGH SCHOOL MATRICULATION**

The Assembly resumed the adjourned debate on the proposed Resolution by Mr. R. H. Bailey (Rosetown-Elrose):

That this Assembly urges the Department of Education to establish a policy that would require a minimum of 24 credits for high school matriculation; seven of these credits must be at the 30 level, two of which must be English and one Canadian History at the 30 level.

**HON. E. TCHORZEWSKI (Minister of Education):** — Mr. Speaker, just a few comments I want to make further on this Resolution, to those which I made the other day. At that time, I made a few remarks on the Resolution. As I said then, I would have more to say on it at a later time.

As I said at that time, Mr. Speaker, this is not a matter that can, or should, be taken lightly. The issue is not whether 24 credits is good for students graduating from Grade XII, as it was made clear students can take 24 credits now. As a matter of fact, most students do now and many take more than 24 credits.

Of the students in Grade XII during the 1975-76 school year, only 11 per cent graduated with the 21-credit minimum and 89 per cent had more than the minimum required. Two-thirds of the students, or 66 per cent, graduated with 24 or more credits. Just over half of the students graduated with 25 or more credits. Thirty-eight per cent of the students graduated with 26 or more credits; 27 per cent of the students graduated with 27 or more credits. I mentioned these very revealing statistics when I spoke on this Resolution some time ago.

I think that they say a great deal about the high quality and the effectiveness of our educational system. They also point out the high quality of our teaching personnel, who obviously are doing a commendable job of counselling students and helping them to broaden their experience and knowledge beyond the minimum requirements for high school graduation, and in many cases, beyond the requirements for matriculation which are determined by the university.

It is worth noting that the facts, Mr. Speaker, did not support the request as outlined in this Resolution and when I listened to the mover of the Motion, I am afraid that his arguments were not very convincing either. His arguments were not

convincing because what he was asking for, is in fact happening in our schools now. It is happening, while leaving our schools some opportunity to be flexible in their programming so that they are able to meet individual needs of individual students.

Mr. Speaker, the notion that the Division IV program should be as flexible as possible within a certain framework at the provincial level, so that more decisions about programs for individual students can be made at the school level, is as sound today as it was in 1968. In some quarters, I realize that there is some nostalgia for the good old days, whatever that was, and that is obviously the stance of some Members of this House and seems to be the stance of the Conservative Party with regard to education. This theme runs through the remarks of the Member for Rosetown-Elrose (Mr. Bailey) very clearly.

Mr. Speaker, during those so-called good old days, only a minority of school children had a good educational experience. A small group completed high school, which was geared to a narrow university entrance track. It was an elitist education system and I, for one, do not want to see us return to that era.

The Resolution requests that seven of the credits must be at the 30 level, two of which must be English and one Canadian History. This may be based on some claim that many students in Grade XII are only taking the minimum requirement of five level 30 courses. This, in fact, is not the case. I would not want anyone to draw that conclusion from this Resolution as it is proposed here. The facts are, Mr. Speaker, that of the Grade XII students in the 1975-76 school year, less than 8 per cent took only the minimum required number of level 30 courses. Seventy-seven per cent of the students took seven or more level 30 courses; 63 per cent of these students took eight or more of level 30 courses.

Now these arguments, Mr. Speaker, clearly refute the suggestion by the Member that students are not acting responsibly; that they only take the minimum number of credits and thus have too much spare time which is wasted. Furthermore, it should be clearly understood that principals of schools, under the direction of a superintendent, have a great deal of autonomy with respect to the timetable and the manner of the supervision of free periods. In those schools in which students are encouraged to carry out independent study and research, and in which student assignments are challenging and interesting, there does not appear to be a problem of waste of time.

Let me repeat again what I said the other day so that there is no mistake about it - the 21-credit requirement is a minimum requirement and school boards, in keeping with the principle of local autonomy, may require students to take more than that minimum, and indeed, many have. Emphasis also must be made of the fact that there is a difference between the requirement for high school graduation, which is determined by the Department of Education, and the required for matriculation, which is determined by the university.

As I have already said, high schools are intended to serve all students, not just those who are university-bound and that to set the minimal requirement in terms of matriculation requirement would deny, it seems, this fundamental fact.

Saskatchewan standards are not low and in terms of requirements for high school graduation, our province is more demanding than any of the other western provinces. As I pointed out when

I spoke on this Resolution before adjourning debate, the minimal requirement for high school graduation in the other western provinces is 20; in Saskatchewan it is 21. The minimum number of level 30 courses for high school graduation in the other western provinces is four; in Saskatchewan, five. The minimum number of compulsory subjects for high school graduation is 11; in the other provinces, nine. As I have already pointed out, these minimums are exceeded by a vast majority of students in Saskatchewan.

Once again, Mr. Speaker, with respect to the proposal that seven credits must be at the 30 level, including a compulsory course in Canadian History, I would agree that this would not be an unreasonable requirement for those seeking a matriculation standing. I would remind the Members that under the existing Department of Education policy, there is nothing to prevent a school superintendent from implementing such a policy if approved by his board.

With respect to the concern about the lack of a compulsory Canadian studies course, I would also remind the mover of this Resolution and the Members of this House, of the memorandum dated October, 1976, sent to all school jurisdictions, in which it was announced that effective July 1, 1976, students desiring to complete their requirements for high school graduation must obtain credit for either the traditional social studies 30(h), Canadian History, or the new social studies 30 - Canadian Studies.

I agree with the Member that there are many opinions with respect to this Resolution. I can't agree that there is overwhelming support for the Resolution as it stands before us now. For example, a recent study conducted in Moose Jaw indicated, rather conclusively, that parents did not favor an increase in the minimum number of credits for high school graduation in the number of compulsory subjects nor in the minimum number of subjects required at the 30 level. The information that I have is that parents across the province have the same view. The views of parents must be of uppermost importance in considering the applications of this kind of a resolution.

Mr. Speaker, when the present policy was instituted it was done so only after many years of discussions among interested parties in this province. The discussions began in the early 1960s and implementation began in 1968. It was thought at that time, and I tend to agree, that our high school programs had been dictated by certain considerations relevant only to a proportion of our students. No one would suggest that university entrance requirements, the demands of employers and the availability of federal money were not some of the factors that had to be considered when restructuring Division IV, but it was rightly felt that they should not be allowed to be the only dominant and deciding factors in a system of education which purports to educate each student in the utmost of his capabilities.

Mr. Speaker, whatever structure we have, whatever programs are offered in Division IV, there must be room for flexibility at the provincial level and in our schools. We have to ask ourselves if it is a good educational system that only requires students to take a number of courses which are nothing but hurdles provided by post-secondary institutions. It seems to me that education implies the development of the individual along a path which has meaning for him or her and not a series of hoops which some institution imposes as screens to select candidates.

Mr. Speaker, I began by saying that we should not treat this matter lightly. From what the Member for Elrose had to say, or even more, what he failed to say even in his role as a district superintendent, it is obvious that the matter of minimum credit requirements is not well understood.

There is a very real danger in making changes as practical and administrative problems arise, without due regard to the underlying philosophy and objectives. And because of this\_ it is wiser to review the whole program carefully before making a change in the compulsory credit requirements. We have always involved a wide cross-section of the Saskatchewan public in charting developments in education policy in our province. We have always listened carefully and responded positively to the needs of Saskatchewan people and we will continue to do so in the future. It would be wrong, I think, for this Assembly to simply take the action recommended in the Resolution without first undertaking a careful review of this question. Therefore, in closing I want to move the following amendment to Resolution No. 18. I move, Mr. Speaker, seconded by the Member for Regina Centre (Mr. Shillington):

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

Commends the Government of Saskatchewan for maintaining a high standard of education in our province and requests the Department of Education to provide information to school boards, superintendents and principals with respect to the number of credits that students are now acquiring in Division IV and, furthermore, requests the Department of Education to review the whole question of minimum requirements for high school graduation with the Saskatchewan Teachers' Federation, the Saskatchewan School Trustees' Association, the Saskatchewan Association of Superintendents and Directors of Education, the Saskatchewan Federation of Home and School Associations, before implementing any changes in policy.

**MR. W. H. STODALKA (Maple Creek):** — Mr. Speaker, I should like to offer a few comments after listening to both the Minister of Education and the Member for Rosetown-Elrose, the other day. The Member for Rosetown-Elrose, I believe, in his initial remarks indicated that it had great support among a good many of the different branches or elements that are involved with education.

I happen to be one of those people who agree with the Member for Rosetown-Elrose, that there was a step, you might say a backward step, when there was a change made from the eight to the seven credits. But, I can't agree with him when he said that there is all this support out in the field for it. I know that I have argued strongly at superintendent meetings and many other superintendents have argued strongly too, but I don't think we were ever able to arrive at the situation in which a resolution came from the Saskatchewan Association of Superintendents and Directors of Education, in which we were anywhere near agreement on this particular change. I believe, also, the Saskatchewan Teachers' Federation was, I suppose you might say, initially responsible for initiating this discussion. I believe, also, that they do not support any change or movement for change. The Saskatchewan School Trustees' Association, to the best of my knowledge, has not made any strong statement for change. What I am saying, I suppose, to the Member for Rosetown-Elrose, is that

I know that there is the principals' group in the Province of Saskatchewan, the high school principals' group, who have at various times passed resolutions asking the Department of Education to make the changes. I know also, that there are a good many educators involved in education who felt when the previous government did make this change, that it was a change that time that the change was made, it was indicated that with the seven subjects - what was supposed to happen is the material content of the seven remaining subjects was supposed to increase to make up for the one that had been dropped. I am not convinced that this actually did happen over the years. I don't think there was any substantial change in the course content. Some courses, it's true; some of the new science programs were more elaborate and, of course, more involved - this may have happened.

Again, the Minister indicated that it is the option of a school board to set the number of courses that a student is required to take in any particular year of Division IV. The only thing that I would say about this, is that I don't know of anywhere in writing, Mr. Minister, where this particular statement has been made. I know it has come down the line, sort of hearsay, or you can go to some of the regional people who have told us that a board has, or can, set the eight subjects in Grade X and require the student to take eight in Grade XI and require the student to take eight in Grade XII. But to the best of my knowledge, I stand to be corrected on it, but to the best of my knowledge, I don't think you have got any statement - anywhere - where it states that a board has that option. When the Department says that 21 credits are sufficient to graduate out of Division IV and a board insists that it must be 24, then who is really the authority here, the Department of Education or the board? Personally, I know that boards have been involved, the one I am involved with says you must take eight in Grade X, we say you must take eight in Grade XI - that's 16. The first semester in Grade XII we say you take four - that's 20. We say in the second semester in Grade XII, you can take whatever subjects you need. If you want to find yourself a part-time job to complete out the year, that's fine. But, I would suggest then that the Minister would indicate, if it has not been done, that boards do have this option to set this policy and that they don't have to worry about any parental reaction to board policies that differ from the Department of Education policies. I do feel, possibly, two things were done when this educational change was made. One was to reduce the credits down to 21, and the second was to make some internal changes in the requirements that were required of Grades X, XI, and XII. And I think possibly that some of the changes that came about there, some of the criticisms are in the math courses and the science courses - there appeared to be a drop in the number of students who were taking mathematics and science Division IV. It is my opinion that this drop occurred because of the fact that we used to insist on a math in Grade X or a math in Grade XI, probably more so at the university level, just like we used to insist on a second language. I realize also, that it used to be literature, composition and social studies that were the compulsory subjects in Grade XI and Grade XII, but there was a strong direction towards the mathematics program. And, this changing of having just English compulsory in Grades XI and XII, plus the five subjects that are compulsory in Grade X, has some effect on what students take in schools. And, I know I have sympathy with the Member for Rosetown (Mr. R. H. Bailey) when he says that there is a problem within schools of students not taking subjects. The Minister gave us some excellent statistics here today, which show that lots of students

take more than 24. The thing is, who are the students that take these extra subjects? Usually they are the better students within the school. And, it's the group that you are having a little problem with, that you have the pressure to take the fewer subjects. And, as the Minister says, "Okay, you can take and make a board policy, setting and insisting that it is 24. But, I don't know whether this is a good pattern - when you have the department on the one hand saying 21 is sufficient and you have the board on the other hand saying to the department, "We don't like your rules, we don't like your regulations. We are saying that in the Maple Creek School Unit or the Rosetown School Unit or Saskatoon - you have got to take 24." I don't think that this is good policy, nor a good standard - it is a weakness.

**HON. H. H. ROLFES (Minister of Social Services):** — I think that it is an excellent one.

**MR. STODALKA:** — Pardon? What is the Minister saying?

**MR. ROLFES:** — I will get up.

**MR. STODALKA:** — Good. Fine to hear. So I accept what the Minister has said, that there are a good many students that take 24. His statistics, I am sure, are correct, but the weakness, I think possibly, is in the fact that the boards have to my knowledge not been advised that this information has been made available to them. In concluding, I suggest that while there are many of us I suppose, that support the movement back there are also a good many who support the Department of Education's position as well.

**SOME HON. MEMBERS:** — Hear, hear!

**MR. G. H. PENNER (Saskatoon Eastview):** — Just a couple of comments, Mr. Speaker, if I may be permitted. I think the point made by my colleague is a good one, with regard to the 24 versus 21 credits. I hope the Minister will check to see whether or not, in fact, there has been anything that has come out in writing that gives boards the right to say that the number of credits a student must have to graduate is 24, when the department says that the minimum is 21.

Clearly, the problem that the Member for Maple Creek (Mr. W. H. Stodalka) indicates, is a real one for school boards. They are conscious of the right of the Department of Education to make that kind of statement and to set that kind of standard, and I think that when the Minister says the boards may then set it at 24, vagues the issue.

The fact that so many students are taking 24 credits or more, may in fact, be sufficient reason to raise the minimum to 24. There is such a tremendous number of students already taking 24 or more credits, that if the minimum was 24, the effect would be reasonably minimal on students in Saskatchewan.

I notice that the Minister of Social Services is going to get on his feet in a minute and that should be enlightening. I think that there is some merit in the suggestion of increasing the number of compulsory subjects in Division IV, beyond what it is at the present time. I again want to say that from my own



point of view, as a school superintendent, that the remarks of the Member for Maple Creek I think are worth listening to. When the number of compulsory subjects in Grade XI and Grade XII are as they are now, I think we miss the opportunity to be certain that students have subjects at that level in the field of math and in other areas.

One other point that I should like the Minister to take a look at, has to do with the way in which curricula has been established at the Division IV level and the effects that the semester system has had on that. Courses that were designed for use and completion over a ten-month period are now having to be handled, having to be taught, having to be learned in a five-month period, without any real revision in the course of study to accommodate that change in time period. And with those comments, Mr. Speaker, I have nothing further to say.

**MR. ROLFES:** — Mr. Speaker, just a few comments on this Resolution and the amendment proposed by the Minister. I certainly will support the amendment, and I am somewhat surprised that the Members opposite don't support it, because what the Minister has indicated is this - let's set the minimum standards and let the school boards at the local level decide what minimum standards they want to set. To me, that makes a lot of sense. The Member for Saskatoon Eastview (Mr. G. H. Penner) has already indicated, and I think that the Member for Maple Creek (Mr. W. H. Stodalka) has indicated, that most of the students are already taking 24 credits. If you set compulsory subjects for Grades X, XI, and XII - let's say that you say everybody must take a science course in Grade X and everybody must take a mathematics course in Grades X, XI, and XII - if they must take a science course in each of those grades, and mathematics in each of those grades, and a student indicates that he has no intentions of going on to a Type C Arts course at the university or he has no intention of going on to Engineering or Commerce, and he would like to take a Social Science course, you are preventing him from taking the Social Sciences, unless that student takes more than 24 subjects. I had a student come to me the other day who is going to be in Grade X next year. She said that she wants to go into Law. She would like to take Law, I don't know why, but she wants to go into Law.

**MR. CAMERON:** — She must be one of your brighter students to be able to come to the . . .

**MR. ROLFES:** — Yes, she is one of the brighter students - she happens to be my daughter. She asked me how many science and math classes she should take. She indicated to me that she wasn't interested in those particular classes, but she was interested in economics, she was interested in psychology, she was interested in sociology classes. And I advised her that those would certainly be the subjects that she should take. It's about time that the legal profession had some concern for humanity . . .

**SOME HON. MEMBERS:** — Hear, hear!

**MR. ROLFES:** — . . . and interpersonal relationships. Therefore, Mr. Speaker, because she had a choice at Holy Cross High School of not having to take the compulsory subjects as advocated by some of the Members opposite, she will be able to minimize the

number of math classes, the number of science classes that she will take, and she will take the history classes, she will take the sociology classes and the psychology classes, and the economic classes, which will be beyond the 24 that you are advocating, but they will not be compulsory.

And, what I am suggesting, Mr. Speaker, is that we should permit the Department of Education to set the minimum, but allow the maximum choice at the local level. There are guidelines set out and they were set out three, four or five years ago in Division IV. We have always used those in the high schools and the school boards have always used those as a guide. It indicates what must be taken but the choice will be left at the local level, and that is the way it should be.

Let's not put them all into the same framework and say all of them must take this. If they want to only take vocational studies after high school where they don't need the sciences or the math, let's give them a choice. Let's put some faith in the locally elected people who, through the communication that they have with the parents, will know what is best for their children. Let's not decide that at the provincial level.

**SOME HON. MEMBERS:** — Hear, hear!

**MR. R. H. BAILEY (Rosetown-Elrose):** — Mr. Speaker, I suppose that I could have anticipated in putting in the Resolution, and now before us this amendment to the Resolution, that somehow we would get embroiled in comparative techniques between provinces, and so on. And, I make it abundantly clear, Mr. Speaker, that along with my colleagues who have already spoken on this particular amendment, that what we are seeking at this present time is to alleviate boards of a certain problem that they now have. And, I am going to make it abundantly clear to the Minister of Education, that in his amendment he has raised, he is stating that he is going to provide information to school boards, superintendents, principals, and so on, with respect to the number of credits students are now requiring in Division IV, but the Minister well knows that every superintendent and every principal and every school board now has that information. He knows that very well. But, he refuses to budge from a certain particular problem, and that problem is this, Mr. Speaker - most boards of the province have seen that 21 credits are too few. They want to have 24 credits. Now the Minister will say, and the Minister of Social Services will say, that they have the right to do so. But there is one fundamental issue - while a board may try to deny matriculation on the basis of credits less than 24, the department is prepared to undermine that board and issue matriculation at 21 credits. This is the dilemma, Mr. Speaker.

**MR. TCHORZEWSKI:** — Nonsense.

**MR. BAILEY:** — "Nonsense," he says. I challenge the Minister. You show me one piece of evidence that's sent out to your office that requires a board to hold matriculation at 24 credits. How can a board have matriculation at 24 credits, when the department only requires 21? You have the final decision, the Department of Education, not the Board of the Eston-Elrose School Unit or the Maple Creek School Unit or Saskatoon East. This is one of the problems that has never been rectified. When we brought it forth in the Resolution, then you started bragging about the quality of

education in the province. We have said nothing about the quality of education in the province; we are trying to solve a problem. The Minister refuses to even recognize that there is a problem.

Now, Mr. Speaker, in taking a look at the Resolution and the amendment to the Resolution, I am somewhat surprised that it commends the Government for maintaining a high standard of education in our province. If you go to the various educators around the province, you will get dozens of different views. Obviously, the Minister of Education, himself, got a view from the Dean of Education at the Easter Council. He told teachers and he told the Minister of Education of this province what he thought was wrong with education in the province. I didn't hear the Minister mention that today.

And, then it goes on to request the Department of Education to provide information. Mr. Speaker, that wording is an insult to boards across this province. The Minister of Education, in making this Resolution, slaps the face of every superintendent in Saskatchewan - it's a slap in the face to every superintendent. But he says - let me read it again:

commends the Government of Saskatchewan for maintaining a high standard of education and requests the Department of Education to provide information to school boards, superintendents, and principals.

And what you are saying, Mr. Minister, is that school boards, superintendents and principals are so dumb about the operation of the system, that they don't know this information at the present time. Shame on you, Mr. Minister! That is what you are saying in the Resolution.

And then we go on to say, with respect to the number of credits the students are requiring in Division IV:

and furthermore, requests the Department of Education to review the whole question of minimum credits for a high school graduation with the various bodies.

Now, what he is trying to do here in this particular part of the Resolution, is to give it the 'motherhood' touch. Give it the 'motherhood' touch. We go to the grass roots to get our information. We go to all these people to get our information. That wasn't in the original Motion, Mr. Minister.

**MR. TCHORZEWSKI:** — . . . ?

**MR. BAILEY:** — Absolutely, that's what it was. Whoever criticized you on that? You are skirting the issue and you know you are skirting the issue. The issue is simply that there is a problem but you can't see the problem. And, Mr. Speaker, we have more than that. We have more problems than that. If you would listen to what other people are saying, if you would have listened to the Dean of Education during Easter Council, and if you would have listened carefully to what the new Dean was saying, probably the best thing you could have done was to say that you would take the Resolution, that you wouldn't put the amendment in at all, that you would take the Resolution and give it some serious consideration. Mr. Speaker, I did not intend, with any stretch of the imagination, for anyone on this side of the House or from that side of the House to make a political issue over a high school system. We have a problem in the high schools of Saskatchewan.

We have lots of criticism today. If the Government can improve it, or if I can improve it as a superintendent, or if the Minister of Social Services can improve it, well then let's improve it. But, let's not throw it into the political arena as has been done here with this particular amendment. Mr. Speaker, I cannot support this amendment under any circumstances.

Amendment agreed to.

Resolution as amended, agreed to on the following recorded division:

YEAS - 31

Blakeney	MacMurchy	Cowley
Pepper	Mostoway	Tchorzewski
Smishek	Banda	Shillington
Romanow	Whelan	Vickar
Messer	Kaeding	Skoberg
Snyder	Kwasnica	Nelson (Yorkton)
Byers	MacAuley	Allen
Kramer	Feschuk	Koskie
Baker	Faris	Johnson
Lange	Rolfes	Thompson
Robbins		

NAYS - 7

Larter	Birkbeck	Berntson
Bailey	Ham	Katzman
Lane (Qu'Appelle)	Banda	Shillington

**RESOLUTION NO. 20 - SPECIAL GRANT TO SPECIAL CARE HOMES**

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

That this Assembly recommends to the consideration of the Government that the Department of Social Services make a special grant available to special care homes, to be paid on behalf of private-paying residents, in the event that rents are increased as a result of the recent proposed wage settlements of unionized employees of these homes in the province.

**HON. H. H. ROLFES (Minister of Social Services):** — Just a few comments, Mr. Speaker, on this Resolution, at the end of which I should like to move an amendment. Mr. Speaker, it has been indicated many times in this House, that a considerable amount has been done by this Government for senior citizens since 1971. I will, however, for the edification of Members opposite and for Members here, briefly review what this Government has done for senior citizens, Mr. Speaker. The Member for Saskatoon Eastview (Mr. Penner) said it won't take very long. Well, I want to let the Member know that when we came to office in 1971, that the Government at that time was providing a net of about \$500,000 to senior citizens in its budget. They were charging senior citizens about \$4.5 million in deterrent fees and utilization fees which, Mr. Speaker, we took off. We recognized that for seven years the senior citizens were not well taken care of by the Members opposite, and this Government took action immediately and have continued in each succeeding budget,

Mr. Speaker, to provide for senior citizens.

Let me just enumerate, Mr. Speaker, a few of the things that we have done since 1971: (1) a drug plan for senior citizens, (2) the SAIL program which would have cost senior citizens about \$1.3 million, (3) a hearing aid program which would have cost senior citizens about \$1.2 million, (4) the SAP, which there was very little of at that time; today these senior citizens are paid about \$19 million in SAP expenditures.

Mr. Speaker, because the Federal Government refused to act on implementing a reasonable pension plan, we established one for senior citizens which is costing us about \$6.5 million this year. Mr. Speaker, we also have special care subsidies, special care subsidies for people in Levels II and III in nursing homes, which will cost this Government about \$11.1 million, compared to no subsidy at all in 1971. Had we only done that particular item, Mr. Speaker, in our term of office, we could have been proud of it but we continued to do more. Construction grants for special care homes - about \$1.9 million this year; Senior Citizens' Provincial Council, Mr. Speaker - \$170,000, a senior citizens' council that has representation from all over this province to listen to the needs and wants of our senior citizens and the Government then responds. The Home Care Program, Mr. Speaker, was announced in the budget for approximately \$6.3 million to assist senior citizens to remain in their own homes so that they do not have to be institutionalized. We also implemented, Mr. Speaker, a property improvement grant and the senior citizens benefit tremendously from this particular program. We implemented a Senior Citizens' Home Repair Program - almost \$1 million for senior citizens there alone; the low rental housing, Mr. Speaker, 90 per cent of which goes for senior citizens, a total of about \$9 million. You add them all together, Mr. Speaker, and you will find that this Government is spending about \$79 million for senior citizens in all. As I indicated in my budget speech, 27 per cent of the budget of Social Services goes for senior citizens; 27 per cent, or about \$49 million.

The Members opposite waive a brief that is presented. No one denies that more should be done for senior citizens; no one will deny that more should be done for handicapped individuals; no one denies that more should be done for the low income groups. But, Mr. Speaker, to say this Government has done very little, or to criticize this Government for the attempts it has made to assist senior citizens, simply cannot be accepted. When you compare the actions of this Government as compared to other provincial governments over the same period of time, I think that we stand number one in what we have done for senior citizens. But, Mr. Speaker, that doesn't mean that we shouldn't be doing more and we will continue to do more.

However, I simply cannot accept the Resolution made by Members opposite. When we look at increasing our subsidies for special care homes, we always take into consideration the increase in wages that may be negotiated. And this year and last year were no exception. Therefore, Mr. Speaker, with these few words, I think I have shown again that the Resolution should not be accepted and needs considerable amendment. I, therefore, move, seconded by the Member for Arm River (Mr. D. L. Faris) on the proposed Resolution moved by Miss Clifford (Wilkie) that all the words after the word 'Assembly' be deleted and the following substituted therefore:

It commends the Government of Saskatchewan for initiating grants to private paying residents of special care homes

for the purpose of offsetting the increasing costs of these individuals; secondly, for subsequently raising these grants every year since their inception and; thirdly, for developing, in accordance with the need and wishes of senior citizens a community based alternative to institutional care (Home Care).

**MR. A. N. McMILLAN (Kindersley):** — The Member for Wilkie who initially put the Motion to the floor of the Legislature is unable to be here and listen to the chest-beating Minister of Social Services (Mr. Rolfes). I'm sure it's probably a good thing that she isn't here because his remarks would have undoubtedly upset her so much that it would have created some problem.

I'd like to beg leave to adjourn debate so that she may have the opportunity to respond to the amendment that was put on the Order Paper.

Debate adjourned.

### **RESOLUTION NO. 12 - BRING FEED GRAINS MARKETING UNDER CONTROL OF CANADIAN WHEAT BOARD**

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

That this Assembly urges that the Minister in Charge of the Canadian Wheat Board move immediately to bring the marketing of feed grains entirely under the control of the Canadian Wheat Board.

and the amendment thereto by Mr. Birkbeck (Moosomin).

**MR. R. N. NELSON (Yorkton):** — Mr. Speaker, speaking before this Resolution, there are three points that I wish to discuss and enlarge on today. With regard to the free market system and the fluctuation in prices, I mentioned trust in government, and I mentioned the fact that farmers were so often required to support corporate efforts by the sweat of their brow by turning the produce that they had produced over to the free market system to manipulate and handle to its benefit.

I noticed too, Mr. Speaker, that several speakers on the other side tend to object to a school teacher speaking on farm Motions. They seem to feel that a person such as I, speaking on these Resolutions, is somehow or other out of order. Now, just because I'm not an active farmer anymore, does not mean that I should not be able to speak on these topics.

It's typically Liberal-Conservative efforts to try and muzzle opposition to their own ideas. They can't argue against the ideas presented for it, so they follow three typical routes; they call names, or they sneer, or they say that the opponent doesn't have the right to speak on it for some reason or other. Mr. Speaker, that shows the depth of Liberal-Conservative thinking, using such logic. Using such logic, Mr. Speaker, one would say that the only two Members in the whole House who should be allowed to speak on railways or railway transportation are the two Members for Moose Jaw (Mr. Snyder and Mr. Skoberg). To carry the inane Liberal-Conservative logic to its ultimate nonsense, only the two Members for Moose Jaw should be allowed to vote on dealings with the railroad. So before the Hon. Member for

Rosetown (Mr. Bailey) or the other Hon. Member for the Liberal side should want to wax eloquent on the nonsense about who can speak on what topic, I shall remind them that I do talk to the farm people who live in my constituency. And I shall express their concerns over the objections of Members opposite, because in no way shall the opinions of my constituents be muzzled by Members opposite.

And I am very concerned, Mr. Speaker, over the difficulties faced by the farmers in my constituency. Many farmers in the Yorkton area tend to be smaller farmers. In fact, the Yorkton area has the greatest population density in the whole province. Because I represent small farmers, large farmers, farmers with and without livestock, I am very concerned with the wild fluctuations that these farmers must face in the market place. In grain sales and in livestock sales, these market fluctuations have a very detrimental effect on the farmers in our part of the province and in any part of the province. About four years ago the cattle prices were at an all time high. Farmers paid \$400 to \$500 a bred cow, then within the year the prices tumbled and the farmer was in a position where he couldn't have paid half the money that he had borrowed to buy them.

Let's look again at what happens in grain sales. The price of feed grain had shot up markedly at the same time as the price for the cattle was down. What an inane situation for our primary food producers to be caught in. Then look at the fluctuations in the price of feed grain. As you probably know, Mr. Speaker, the price of feed grain is always compared to its equivalent value in corn. In mid-October 1974, the price for 3CW wheat in Montreal was 70 cents below its equivalent in American corn.

Our grain farmers were struggling to keep their operations viable. Many small farmers weren't able to keep their heads above water. They drifted away to live in the city, and lived in a style of life that was much less satisfactory than the one that they would have preferred to follow. How do I know? Because many of them have told me so.

At the beginning of 1976, the same wheat that had been selling at 70 cents below the corn value was at 90 cents above its corn equivalent. The same sort of performance is evident in barley and oats. Barley on July 31, 1975 was 30 cents below its corn equivalent. In December, 1975, it was nearly 50 cents above its corn equivalent. How can small farmers operate in the face of such violent fluctuations? How can the dairy, beef and hog producers operate? Feast and famine, Mr. Speaker. It's small wonder that so many young farmers are leaving the land. It's small wonder that the size of our farms is continually growing larger. The small farmer cannot operate under these circumstances. He hasn't the financial backing to hold his produce to choose the most favorable time to sell his produce.

But Conservatives and Liberals don't want a steady market price that the farmer can depend on. They will oppose this Resolution to have all grains bought and sold through the Wheat Board. They will cry that they are defending freedom of action. What bunk! Whose freedom are they defending, Mr. Speaker? They are defending the freedom of the Grain Exchange and their Cargill type friends who want to come in and make a profit at the expense of the farmer.

The Wheat Board would get the best possible price for their

farmer clients. The corporate sector, by their very nature, must make a profit. If they are to make a profit they must buy at the lowest possible price and sell at the greatest possible price. And they will even go to the extent of putting gravel into grain shipped to starving people in India, as Cargill did in its United States operations.

Thus, the Conservatives and Liberals support the profiteering of these large companies at the expense of the farmer, at the expense of the starving people in the Third World. They will oppose the sale of feed grains through the Wheat Board. They must favor the idea that profits that would go to the farmer through the Wheat Board, should now go to their corporate friends. I say the continued sale of grain through the open market helps to drive the small farmer from the land, and when the small farmer leaves the land that leaves Saskatchewan businesses, large and small, in jeopardy throughout this whole province. Should the average farm size increase to four sections in the northeast area of the province, then let cities like Yorkton beware, for more than half the potential customers for the Yorkton businesses would then be gone.

And, unless the open market system in grains and other produce is halted, the farmer who wishes to remain on the farm will have to increase his farm size to stay in business. Yet Conservatives and Liberals oppose marketing boards such as wheat boards. And, that opposition will be shown by the fact that they will oppose having grains, all grains, sold through the Wheat Board. And they oppose the wheat board concept because of their philosophy that holds to the opinion - if it's big, it's good. It doesn't matter if our whole way of life in Saskatchewan is upset. If it's big, it's good, Mr. Speaker. That is why the Members opposite will oppose this Motion.

Now, I know Members opposite will cry out their innocence of such motives. But the end result of the policy the Members opposite advocate, that is the free play of the market forces, will in the final analysis, destroy the small farmer. And unless everything possible is done to strengthen the hand of the Wheat Board, its ability to work for farmers will also be destroyed.

Now, surely, elected officials can be trusted to run a wheat board and sell all the grains for the benefit of the farmers. But if any political party finds that it has members or leaders whose integrity can be in question in any way, then it is up to that party to divest itself of members or leaders who lack integrity. If the elected officials cannot be trusted to handle the grain or the sales of grain on the Wheat Board, they cannot be trusted to run any other part of our government. If you cannot trust the Members from your caucus to sell that grain and if you keep those Members, then all Members of your caucus become tainted. And both those parties opposite, by their constant opposition to orderly marketing, it is obvious that those Members do not even trust themselves, literally, to do the business for their constituents in the nation and the province.

Let me return once more to another point that I raised last day, when I was speaking on this topic. I think it is plain that I support orderly marketing concepts as are typified by the Canadian Wheat Board. It seems strange to me when I compare the sales of grains with the operations of large corporations. In the world of big business we see all sorts of combinations and



integrations and what-have-you. And, what is the purpose of this? Mr. Speaker, the purpose is to gain as much control of the market place as it is possible to do, to maximize profits for that corporation. We see evidence of this, Mr. Speaker, through the occasional token prosecution under the Federal Combines Investigation Act when companies combine to fix prices. In other words, in the world of big business, the moguls in charge, control or attempt to control, the price of their product from the point at which they first touch the material to where it leaves their hands. In other words, Mr. Speaker, the corporations do not act on a free market basis at all. They control the market to the full extent that the law allows and even beyond if it is at all possible.

The farmer, on the other hand, is told to be a free enterpriser, to be a free entrepreneur. He is the only one that is told to be the free entrepreneur. Turn your farm products over to such organizations as the Grain Exchange or Cargill or someone else. Let speculators make millions in futures. Let the speculators make billions manipulating the prices on the products that you sweated to produce. Personally, Mr. Speaker, I want to see a government-run organization like the Canadian Wheat Board handle all farm grains and eliminate the speculator. I have been told by many a farmer in my constituency that they agree. Because the speculator, Mr. Speaker, is non-productive and he adds greatly to the inflationary spiral that is still threatening to cripple our society.

I want to see that wheat boards do everything in their power to get the best possible deal for the farmer who raises the grain. I want to see steady prices so that the stock grower and the grain grower can make a living, and so that prices for meats and other foods are steady and reasonable for city people as well. That, Mr. Speaker, is why we are urging the Federal Government to move immediately to bring the marketing of these grains entirely under the control of the Wheat Board. Mr. Speaker, I am most pleased to support the Motion that urges the Federal Government to sell all grains through the Wheat Board.

**SOME HON. MEMBERS:** — Hear, hear!

**MR. L. W. BIRKBECK (Moosomin):** — Mr. Speaker, we have a reasonably simple Resolution before us. It is simply requesting that the feed grains be brought under the control and jurisdiction of the Wheat Board. We did have a teacher speak on this before and I didn't really have any objections. But now I am having some second thoughts after the Member for Yorkton has made a lot of complications of what, I think, is a very simple Resolution.

Mr. Speaker, I want you to really hear what I have to say. I am sick and tired of the Hon. Member for Yorkton, in particular, from the Government opposite, and his ramblings about things which pertain not to the business of this Assembly but to some political debate which he is trying to get going. You check the record, Hon. Member for Yorkton. You check the record and you see where I have opposed orderly marketing. You check the record and you will find that a Conservative Government, if my memory serves me right, brought in the Canadian Wheat Board. Now you do that! And, Mr. Speaker, I can appreciate that the Hon. Member is going to have his say. I don't have any objections to that. But when we have to sit here in our places and listen

to him muttering under his breath when other Members of this Legislative Assembly are speaking and we are all trying to hear what they have to say, I can tell you, Mr. Speaker, that there isn't enough water to go around to cool me when that Member is up speaking.

Now then, Mr. Speaker, in regard to this Motion, again as I said, I appreciate that the Hon. Member for Turtleford (Mr. Johnson) has introduced a Motion which he feels is in the interests of the grain producers. He feels that grain should be under the jurisdiction of the Canadian Wheat Board. Mr. Speaker, in answer to the Member opposite again, what I believe is that surely people like the Member for Yorkton shouldn't be making this decision. The producers themselves can make that decision as the rapeseed growers did with their plebiscite. So, very simply, Mr. Speaker, I would just ask the Members of the Assembly to support an amendment to this Motion. I don't see how the Members opposite can really disagree. I would just move, Mr. Speaker, seconded by the Member for Estevan (Mr. Larter) that Resolution No. 12 be amended by inserting the following words after the word 'immediately' and before the word 'to' where they appear in the second line:

upon completion of a plebiscite of the producers of feed grains similar to the rapeseed plebiscite and if it is the wish of the majority of producers.

**MR. S. J. CAMERON (Regina South):** — Mr. Speaker, some of the comments offered by the Member for Yorkton in arguing in favor of the Resolution hardly merit reply, and I am not going to get into any of the detail of that. I simply say to him that he ought to examine what he has to say because very much of it, indeed, is nothing short of utter drivel. It really, genuinely is. It is devoid of any thought; it is devoid of any reality; it is nothing but a mixture of myth and misinformation and misunderstanding. That is what it consists of. If the Member knew anything about the background of the current feed grains policy, he would know that farm organizations across this country struggled for many years trying to come up with a comprehensive program to deal with some of the problems that exist. There is no question that there have been some problems in the past.

How have they been dealt with? The Saskatchewan Federation of Agriculture, the three Pool organizations, the National Farmers' Union, the Canadian Federation of Agriculture, all these organizations have spent, literally, years in trying to come to some common agreement with respect to the various aspects of feed grain marketing and consumption in the country. But, they were never able to do it. Never. The Western Agriculture Conference, the provincial conferences of these farmers' bodies in the provinces, the national body, never were able to agree among themselves on how to handle the problems with respect to the growing and consumption of feed grain. It was left, therefore, for the national government to make some decisions. I am not going to get into all the detail of the program but I am going to ask some reasonable Members opposite to consider one aspect, one problem, and its bearing upon the continued existence of the Canadian Wheat Board.

The current program, as reasonable Members know, offers to a grower of feed grain a choice as to how he is going to market it. He can deliver it to the Canadian Wheat Board, take his

initial guaranteed price plus whatever final payment he gets in respect of it. Or, he has the choice to deliver it and sell it on the open market, as he will. So that he has, every day that he is selling his feed grain, a choice. Either he can stay with the Canadian Wheat Board if that is his preference, or alternatively, he can sell it to his neighbor or to a feed lot or to a consumer elsewhere in the country. How anyone, rationally, can argue against giving a producer, a Saskatchewan producer of barley and oats and feed grain, that kind of option or choice to be exercised as he will according to his free choice, I fail to understand. How can you be opposed to that?

But, there is one aspect I want to ask, as I said, reasonable Members to consider in respect of this whole thing, about which I hear so little discussion. That is this: the Canadian Wheat Board, as Members know, is a prairie institution. It is not a national institution. Its jurisdiction is limited to the three Prairie Provinces. Under the old system, all feed grains were marketed through the Canadian Wheat Board; and here bear in mind that people who purchased feed grains had to purchase them from the Canadian Wheat Board. Users in the Province of Ontario and in the Province of Quebec use vast volumes of prairie barley and oats to feed animals in Ontario and Quebec. They had to make their purchases from the Canadian Wheat Board. Even though they were Canadians, they couldn't come to Saskatchewan and buy barley from a Saskatchewan farmer to feed their cattle. They had to buy from the Canadian Wheat Board. Now, a user of feed grains in the prairies had a choice of whether he bought from the Canadian Wheat Board or whether he bought from his equivalent in Ontario or in Quebec, or in the Maritimes. Now, what does that lead to? Members will remember that when barley was in over-supply on the prairies, we were able to buy feed grain on the prairies for 50 and 60 cents a bushel. At the same time, Ontario and Quebec and the Maritimes and British Columbia, users of our feed grain, were having to pay the Canadian Wheat Board price, which was the international price and which was about two and one-half to three times higher than the prairie price among farmers and between farmers and feed lots.

**MR. ALLEN:** — What's the matter with that?

**MR. CAMERON:** — Now, the Members says, "What's the matter with that?" Let me show you. Let me tell you what's wrong with that, in a very real way. Quite apart from the fact that you are denying the right of one Canadian to purchase a product from another Canadian, except in some artificial way through the Canadian Wheat Board, let me tell you what else it does. Every time a producer of cattle in Ontario looks to his Saskatchewan and prairie counterpart and finds him buying barley for one-third of what he has to pay for it, what does he do? He complains. To whom does he complain? He complains to his Member of Parliament; he complains to the Federal Government. About what? This is the key question - about the Canadian Wheat Board. Because, he says, why should the prairie consumer be able to buy his at 50 cents, and I have to go to the Canadian Wheat Board that is charging me \$1.25 or \$1.50? That was the case in those years. Every time they had a complaint about price or supply, it was a complaint they brought against the Canadian Wheat Board. What I ask Members is: how long, how long could the Canadian Wheat Board have survived in the face of those incessant complaints emanating from that part of the country? Now that was a concern of all farm organizations, including pools and everyone else.

April 26, 1977

We are vitally concerned about these constant complaints going to Members of Parliament from British Columbia and other parts of the country about the hijacking, as they used to say, in the Canadian Wheat Board. I tell you that that was bringing immense pressure on the Canadian Wheat Board.

One of the other aspects of the program, apart from giving the producers their freedom of choice, was to relieve this kind of pressure which was growing on the Canadian Wheat Board. Members opposite, I know, are very sincere in wanting, in the future, to continue to preserve this Board and we are too. This Feed Grains Policy, believe me, is in no small part designed to relieve some of the pressure that was growing on the Canadian Wheat Board. And had it been permitted to grow, I tell you, it would have been very destructive to the Board.

It is often difficult for us to look beyond Saskatchewan's boundaries. We tend to become parochial in these respects. For every farmer you find in Saskatchewan who is feeding barley to animals, you will find his equivalent in Ontario and you will find his equivalent in Quebec and you will find his equivalent in British Columbia. They, in total you know, outnumber the users of feed on the prairies. If these people are constantly complaining day in and day out about a lack of delivery, a lack of supply and overpricing against the Canadian Wheat Board, what do you think is going to happen in due course to the Canadian Wheat Board?

One thing about this policy, for whatever weaknesses it may have and really the present policy has some weaknesses and no one will deny that, is that at least it is preserving in tact the Canadian Wheat Board which might not otherwise be the case. Believe me.

I know the Member for Kindersley, Mr. Speaker, wants to address some remarks to the Resolution and the amendment as well in respect to other details of the program so I, therefore, beg leave to adjourn the debate.

Debate adjourned.

### **RESOLUTION NO. 15 - CONDEMNATION OF OTTAWA'S CENTRALIST POLICIES**

The Assembly resumed the adjourned debate on the proposed Resolution by Mr. R. L. Collver (Leader of Progressive Conservatives):

That this Assembly condemns the Liberal Government in Ottawa for its centralist policies which are encroaching on provincial jurisdictions, against the spirit of Confederation; which fail to recognize in a meaningful way, the regional, cultural and economic differences in Canada and which have now placed the very essence of Canada in uncertainty.

**MR. MERCHANT:** — Mr. Speaker, I think it is unfortunate in many ways that the Hon. Member for Nipawin (Mr. Collver) would have decided for his political ends, to pick at the Canadian institution in the way he has done and then having done that, to leave the field and not even stay to defend the kind of motion that he has moved and presented to this House.

Mr. Speaker, Canada is a very fragile commodity in many ways. We have five regions and those regions are not interrelated, indeed, those five regions don't even fit well together. When Canada was made into a nation the Fathers of Confederation were quick to point out that it was a national experiment in many ways because we don't have in this country the ingredients that one ordinarily sees in nationhood. We don't have one language; we don't have a close community; we don't have a unification of culture; we don't have a unification of religion. We are not a country that one would necessarily see coming together naturally and easily. To some extent we were brought forth as a political experiment because the Fathers of Confederation, at that time, could see that it was very important that there be a different country here and an independent country here, or we were going to be swallowed by the Americans. I am very pleased they did that, Mr. Speaker, because I am proud and happy to be a North American and even more proud and more happy to be a Canadian North American and not to be a part of the United States with all of the problems that they have. I say that, Mr. Speaker, knowing full well that the United States is our greatest customer and our greatest supplier and I believe our greatest friend. I am one of those who does not like to see the Americans run down in any way. But I also say that because an understanding of our relationship with the United States, I think, is important towards an understanding of the way these five unrelated regions, which would ordinarily have been expected to trade in the north-south direction have now come to be a nation as we are today.

When the country was established, quite unlike the words of this Motion, the country was established in a strong centralist vein. It was established as a strong centralist government, in part, because they were following the pattern of Great Britain which is not a federated government at all and, in part, because the Fathers of Confederation could see that it was important for Canada that we have a strong national government. Indeed, the people of Saskatchewan and the governments of Saskatchewan, whether they were Liberal, CCF or NDP have always known that it was in our interest in the West, in this province, that we have a strong centralist government to keep Canada together. Part of the problem that we have always faced is that we have some 20 or 25 million people today, spread like a ribbon across the 49th parallel. Given all of the difficulties that we had as we established ourselves as a country, we also had the problem of not being united by any natural boundaries. We are spread over a very varied terrain and over a large number of miles throughout this country.

Given those problems, what have we seen recently that has brought the Hon. Member to present this Motion to the House. We have had in Canada, traditionally, almost every problem in keeping the country together that all of the other nations in the world have faced. We have faced almost every problem that any nation has faced. We have faced problems of language and we continue to face them; we have faced problems of space; we are a multicultural country and we have unfortunately faced, and continue to face, certain kinds of prejudice. We have faced, not just racial prejudice, prejudice against East Indians and Canadian Indians, but we have also faced prejudice between the groups who have come to this country. We have faced religious prejudices, a matter I would suspect that the party who moved this Motion knows well, having I suggest, Mr. Speaker, been a part of precipitating those religious prejudices at sometime in their provincial history. Indeed, the last time that they were

any factor in Canadian politics, they did all that they could to precipitate those religious prejudices in Saskatchewan. We have faced, in this country, great problems and I suspect we will continue to face great problems. Given all those facts, the Hon. Member for Nipawin would choose, for political purposes, to put this shallow and meaningless Motion before this House, trying, at a time of political problems, to pick petty disputes with the Government which does not happen to be a government that that Member would choose to support.

It is interesting that the Member for Nipawin would say that somehow the Government in Ottawa is precipitating the problems when every poll indicates that the people of this province and the people of this nation believe that it is that national Government, now elected, that has the best opportunity to deal with these matters and to keep the country together. Not particularly because they are more interested than some other Members of the House, but because they happen to be in power and I suppose, to some extent, because they are led by a French Canadian. I suspect, Mr. Speaker, that of the three national parties it is the Tories who would be least capable of grappling with the problems that face this nation. And, again, it would appear that the voters of this province and the voters of this nation agree with my suspicions. Of course, Mr. Speaker, that may, in part, be due to the fact that the Conservatives are led so capably, they would tell us, by their national leader, a national leader of whom they are so proud that they are constantly, both in private and in public, speculating about the continuation of that great national leadership.

Mr. Speaker, it is interesting, given those national problems that the Conservative Party faces in dealing with the national unity questions, that again the Member for Nipawin would try, for political aims, to manipulate that matter before this House.

You know, Mr. Speaker, the very essence of the Canadian unity has been an understanding of the problems between regions and an empathy and a sympathy for problems between regions. We have some difficulties but we have not done such a bad job over the years of understanding differences, of understanding different races and different problems that face different people in different ends of the country. When I think of the problems that the United States has faced, for instance, I think Canadians can be well proud of what they have done.

Mr. Speaker, for this Resolution to come, you have to look at them trying to make their sort of cheap politics and what they have really said. The Liberal Government in Ottawa has now placed the very essence of Canada in uncertainty. You have to examine that and ask whether that was moved because they wanted to contribute something to the national unity debate or whether they just hoped to score some cheap political points at a time, one might note, before the Hon. Member for Nipawin would have had reason to see that the polls would indicate that the people of this country are, if anything, rallying to some extent, not behind the Liberal Government, because they are not rallying behind them because they are Liberal or not, but rallying in a time of difficulty behind the government of the day, which is something that the Members to my left wouldn't be prepared or capable of doing, I am afraid, because they are not able, in times of emergency, as others do in times of war or whatever, to rally around that elected government and try to make that government see the country through its problems.

It is fortunate, I suppose, that most Canadians have chosen to ignore that national party, which the mover of this Motion leads in this House. Well, the Hon. Member says "dreamer", and I must say that I would be concerned if I were the Hon. Member for Qu'Appelle (Mr. Lane), having read the comments of my leader about what he thinks about turncoats and people who abandon their party and join another party. As I recall, there is something about cheap political aims, but I don't ever find myself able to use the kinds of words that the Hon. Member for Nipawin can use when he is ticked off with somebody. I would only say to the Hon. Member for Qu'Appelle, as he says "dreamer", that perhaps he should be thinking about who was dreaming about the trust that you can put into your leader, if that is really what he thinks of people who joined other parties.

Mr. Speaker, what kind of a person would move this cheap political Motion?

**MR. ALLEN:** — A paranoid schizophrenic.

**MR. MERCHANT:** — It may be close to that. But I had in mind the sort of vulture who would pick the bones of a fellow vulture, something along those lines. Mr. Speaker, those are some of my kinder remarks that I wanted to make about this Motion and its mover. I had some unkind thoughts and I should like to consider them in further detail because I wouldn't want to say anything unfair about the Member for Nipawin and so that I may have an opportunity to consider those other thoughts that I have had, I beg leave to adjourn debate.

Debate adjourned.

## ADJOURNED DEBATES

### RETURN NO. 41

The Assembly resumed the adjourned debate on the proposed Motion of Mr. Cameron (Regina South) that an Order of the Assembly do issue for Return No. 41 showing:

The number of persons charged with offences under the Criminal Code who pleaded not guilty in the first instance, opted for trial by Judge alone, had a preliminary inquiry, then pleaded guilty, in each of the years 1971 to 1976, both inclusive.

**HON. R. ROMANOW (Attorney Gen.):** — Last date I was asking the Members of the House to adopt the amended Motion for Return because of the inability of the department people to obtain, in the form asked, the Motions for Returns 41, 42, 43, 44, 46 and 47. There was one comprehensive amendment which I moved and I believe that it is on the Order Paper as Item 29, Motion for Return No. 40, on page 9 of today's Blues.

Mr. Speaker, I am, once again, asking the Members of the House to follow the recommendation that I made, namely to adopt Item 29, Order for Return No. 40, when we get to it and to defeat the one that we are presently debating. Item 11, Return No. 41 and all of the other ones to Item 16, Return No. 47 inclusive, because I have subsequently checked with the officials again, and I am satisfied that they are unable to provide the information. The report that I have from the Director of our

April 26, 1977

Administrative Services, this is subsequent to the request from the Member for Regina South (Mr. Cameron)), says in part as follows:

The central records are not kept showing number of persons charged to number of individual charges handled, or the dispositions on each charge, other than numbers of convictions, absolute discharges and unconditional discharges.

I think I explained that earlier.

In order to try to make a reasonable attempt to obtain the information requested, it would be necessary to search the files of each court office, reviewing each individual Information.

Since 1970, Members will appreciate that there have been hundreds of thousands of cases before the courts.

It would be necessary to individually examine approximately one-half million Informations to provide the information required on dispositions and number of charges. The number of persons would be impossible, since such a review would not distinguish whether John Doe, for example, charged on one Information, is the same John Doe charged on another Information. We also have a problem with respect to the number of counts within a charge. To complete such review within six months, would be nearly impossible, requiring a special team of probably 30 persons at least, at a total cost of salary, travel, sustenance and other expenses in excess of \$200,000. It is doubtful the information requested would be available on a province-wide basis, in any event, and it is doubtful that the information requested would be available on a province-wide basis for any other province in the country of Canada. A number of provinces are developing information systems, but they are still very highly regionalized and not universal, not allowing them to make it on a provincial basis. Saskatchewan is perhaps as far advanced in this field as any. The provincial court management information system will be able to provide most, if not all, of the information requested, at a relatively low cost, when fully operational. The system will make us one of the first provinces to have a universal information system in operation. Our present implementation schedule will allow us to begin collecting this information sometime in 1978.

And I think that at that stage of the game we will be able to provide some factual data, as suggested by the Hon. Member.

So, Mr. Speaker, on balance, looking at the expense and the time involved, also looking at the information which will be provided by Return No. 40, Item 29, while not identical, but certainly providing significant information to the Hon. Member, upon which he can make an argument or debate his point, I would ask the Members of the House to defeat this particular Motion for Return No. 41 and all of the other ones for the reasons that I have outlined, and when we get to Item 29, Return No. 40, to adopt the amendment which will be the best and, I think, fairly satisfactory information for the Member to debate his points.

**MR. SPEAKER:** — I must take this opportunity to inform the Members that



the Member who is about to exercise the right to close debate and afterwards, all Members, will be precluded from speaking to this question, therefore, if any Member wishes to speak let that Member do so now.

**MR. CAMERON:** — Mr. Speaker, you will recall last day that I indicated to the Attorney General that I thought the Return No. 40 met a number of the questions that I had asked, providing me not precisely with the information I wanted, but providing me generally with the kind of information I wanted. And, therefore, I felt that it had gone a long way. The remaining issue was whether or not the kind of information sought in Return No. 41 was a matter of impossibility of collection or merely inconvenience of collection. I think I am satisfied, at least with the Attorney General's comments and the directive he read from his director that, in fact, it amounts to a virtual impossibility to get it. My purpose, in asking these questions, is to principally develop the base of information for future use in assessing some of the programs that are currently in place. For example, I think question 41, as the Attorney General will recognize, was directed at a certain problem and that is people frequently using legal aid will appear and in the first instance plead 'not guilty' and elect a trial by judge and jury and go through a preliminary inquiry. Then when they appear before the judge and appear before the jury, which has been empanelled at great expense, they change their plea and go back to the District Court and plead 'guilty'. So that in the meantime, we have had all the expense of the preliminary inquiry, plus the empanelling of the jury, only to be met at the eleventh hour with a guilty plea sent back to another court. It is a practice which we have to have a look at, to see whether there is not some way in which we can remedy it because it is very wasteful. The question, that particular question No. 41, was intended to find out how frequently this has been happening in the last number of years and how serious the problem really is.

Now, I do appreciate the fact that the information is impossible to gather, practically impossible to gather, and I am quite prepared, as a matter of fact, to withdraw the Motion. I don't know whether, Mr. Speaker, I can do that at this stage, but if I can withdraw the Motion, I will withdraw it.

Withdrawal of Motion agreed to.  
Returns 42, 43, 44, 46 withdrawn.

## **ADJOURNED DEBATES**

### **RESOLUTIONS**

#### **RESOLUTION NO. 5 - NATIONAL COW-CALF STABILIZATION PROGRAM AND NATIONAL MARKETING AGENCY FOR RED MEATS**

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

That this Assembly requests (1) the Federal Government to immediately fulfill its obligation to provide a meaningful National Cow-Calf Stabilization Program in response to the prolonged depressed marketing conditions in the beef industry and the dangers these conditions present for an extreme depletion in our beef breeding herd and distortion of natural production advantages through stopgap provincial programs; and (2) that the Federal Government initiate discussion with the provinces at an early

date toward development of a National Marketing agency for red meats.

**HON. E. KAEDING (Minister of Agriculture):** — Mr. Speaker, I should like to make a few comments on this particular Resolution. I am not surprised, Mr. Speaker, at the very sharp attacks being made by the Members of the Opposition on any proposal which deals and talks about orderly marketing for beef or any other commodity. That is not new, Mr. Speaker. For many years we have seen these same people standing up in the House and supporting and promoting the so-called free market.

We have just been through about three years of disastrously low beef prices; three years in which many young farmers have seen their investment lost, and their dreams of diversified agricultural enterprise dashed because of the operation of the so-called free enterprise system. Mr. Speaker, I get a little bit tired of hearing these champions of the present marketing system, across the way, telling us that there is nothing wrong with our present system. I would invite them to climb down from their silver saddles and get out among the young farmers in their constituencies and see some of the hardships that are out there. I would ask them to judge whether some of these good young farmers are inefficient or lazy or misfits in agriculture. You will find as I have, that there are many hundreds of young, ambitious farmers who had confidence that the livestock industry would provide a good livelihood for them but because they did not have the financial reserves they needed to exist through the long depressed cycle, they are now faced with the loss of their total investment. Not all of them, Mr. Speaker, were as fortunate as the Member for Thunder Creek (Mr. Thatcher) who stepped into a well-stocked ranch. Many of them did not have a father with a well-established enterprise behind him. We keep hearing from the free enterprisers, Mr. Speaker, that all we have to do is reduce our livestock numbers and the law of supply and demand will take care of the rest. But, Mr. Speaker, Canada is already a net importer of beef. We are, even now, not producing enough for our own market. Every cow that is sold, and every calf that is not born, means that we will have to import that much more beef from off-shore to meet our domestic needs.

Mr. Speaker, I heard the Member for Rosetown-Elrose (Mr. Bailey), that rancher-teacher-expert, whose job and income is well-protected through the STF and through his own organization and who bargains for the salaries for himself and the rest of his teacher friends. I heard him say that the beef producers should be governed by supply and demand. Do you hear him suggest that there should be free enterprise in the teaching profession? Would he suggest, Mr. Speaker, that when there is an oversupply of teachers, they should get into a wage-cutting war with one teacher out-bidding the other in order to get the available jobs? No chance, Mr. Speaker, no free enterprise over there.

I would be amused, Mr. Speaker, if it was not so tragic, at the ridiculous position being taken by some of those great freedom fighters, symbolized by the Members for Thunder Creek and Kindersley. They rant and they rave about the off-shore imports of beef, which have been permitted to come into this country by their Liberal friends in Ottawa. Yet, they demand and expect to have free, unrestricted access to the American market. In fact, Mr. Speaker, they fail to recognize that we exported almost as much beef as we imported last year.

Now, I don't want them to think that I support unrestricted imports into Canada, because I do not. I simply wonder about the consistency of the free enterprise concepts of the Members opposite.

Under the existing system, Mr. Speaker, under the system so valued by the Members opposite, I see thousands of our feeder cattle moving to the American and eastern feed lots, instead of being fed and processed here in western Canada. I see a tremendous loss in production in our prairie areas. I see the majority of our feed cattle moving out of western Canada for slaughtering and processing.

The free market dictates where the packer wants to process them and unless the market can be better mobilized, that loss to our economy will continue and will escalate. I hear the irrational, emotional and divided criticisms being levelled against The National Products Marketing Act. This Act is there to provide a framework for producers to organize their market and provides a mechanism for producers to establish a marketing mechanism which can obtain some muscle in a market place for producers.

The Resolution under discussion here calls for the Federal Government to begin discussions with the province towards the implementation of a National Marketing Board. No one will quarrel with the argument, that to be fully effective, a marketing agency must be on a national basis, since only at that level can imports and exports be controlled.

The Assembly recessed from 5:00 o'clock to 7:00 o'clock p.m.

**MR. KAEDING:** — Mr. Speaker, I was so rudely interrupted by the clock when I was talking about the irrational and emotional criticism being levelled against The Natural Products Marketing Act by people across the way and many of their friends out in the country. I'd like to remind them that The Natural Products Marketing Act in Saskatchewan is almost, word for word, the same marketing act which is in Tory Alberta and Tory Ontario. In Ontario the Minister of Agriculture tells me that they've got about 40 marketing boards there and he certainly is in strong support of marketing boards. I think the Federal Minister of Agriculture will also indicate that he gives very strong support to marketing boards which are set up under The Natural Products Marketing Act. This Act provides a framework for producers to organize their market and provides a mechanism for producers to establish a market mechanism which can obtain for them some muscle in the market place.

The Resolution under discussion here, calls for the Federal Government to begin discussions with the provinces towards the implementation of a National Marketing Board. No one will quarrel with the argument that to be fully effective, a marketing agency must be on a national basis. Since only at that level can imports and exports be controlled. Only at the national level can there be rationalization of production and processing across Canada. By maintaining a strong control over the import and export function, there's no reason why producers in this country should not be able to demand full cost of production for their products.

The Members opposite constantly criticize the Canadian Dairy Commission, CEMA, chicken and turkey marketing boards,

April 26, 1977

saying they are in a mess, they have been mismanaged and they are ineffective. I ask you, Mr. Speaker, could they possibly be in a greater mess than the free enterprise beef industry we have today?

One thing I know, Mr. Speaker, is that I do not hear the dairy producers complaining about going broke. I do not . . . that's right. I do not hear the egg producers complaining that they cannot meet their costs. I would ask the Member for Regina if he has been to some of the dairy conventions and asked those producers whether they like the Dairy Commission or not. The turkey producers are doing fine. And if the broiler chicken industry can get a national agency in place, they will be in a position to reduce American competition and will be in a profit position.

All of these producers have decided to band together through marketing agencies to protect their investment and guarantee their full cost of production. There are those, Mr. Speaker, who feel that producers should not have a right to organize their production and demand a decent return for their labor investment. I suggest that those who challenge that right should look at the rest of society.

Would the labor movement, for instance, suggest that now in a time of high unemployment the law of supply and demand should work, and that workers should compete on the labor market for jobs at \$6, or \$5 or \$4 or even minimum wage? I see no such proposition being put forward by the Members opposite. As I said before, would the teachers agree that we should recruit sufficient teachers in Europe or elsewhere and they should compete for those jobs? Not very likely, Mr. Speaker.

Do you expect that, in this year when the implement dealers find their lots full of machinery, Massey Ferguson or John Deere will drop the price of their new \$40,000 combine and, the Member for Estevan (Mr. Larter) may be interested, will the companies drop that price from \$40,000 to \$30,000 or \$25,000 or \$20,000 in order to sell the machine? Boy, that would be a dream, Mr. Speaker.

But somehow these freedom fighters over yonder think that farmers should do just exactly that. Every time some packer or processor or retailer can run in some product at less than the Canadian cost, or anytime there's a small amount of excess production, only farmers would allow their prices and investments to be destroyed rather than accept some control over imports or production. The Members opposite become almost paranoiac when any proposal for supply management is put forward. Yet, Mr. Speaker, almost every other segment of society has built into its system some mechanism to manage supplies, set prices or wages and has been prepared to give up a little of that so-called freedom to gain this security.

Many farmers through their marketing board are doing the same thing. And I ask you, Mr. Speaker, which makes more sense - to produce 75 steers at a profit, or to produce 100 at a loss?

I believe, Mr. Speaker, that we already have a supply management system working in the beef industry in this country. It's a very cruel and a very harsh supply management system, and many young farmers, who have not been able to become fully established, fear that if you can't meet your bank loan or your operating line of credit, you'd better be out of business. No

questions are asked, Mr. Speaker, whether he is a good producer or a good manager. No questions are asked as to whether he's an efficient operator. This supply management system simply says, "If you can't hack it, you'd better get out". Members opposite and many of their friends applaud this system; they say that's the way it should be. They say an efficient producer doesn't need any help. In fact, now that many of them have received their beef industry assistance grant or loan, they don't really want any help at all, after they've taken it.

It's interesting to note, Mr. Speaker, that probably more money went out under this program to the constituencies represented by the Members opposite than went out to any of the rest of the province. Would they want to say, Mr. Speaker, that the 26,000 farmers, who were recipients under the beef industry assistance program and whose taxable income, on average, was only about \$1,800, were poor operators, or they were inefficient, or they should quit if they can't survive? If that's what they are saying, Mr. Speaker, then they are saying that we should remove approximately half of all the producers in the Province of Saskatchewan.

Now, Mr. Speaker, this Resolution calls on the Federal Government to immediately fulfil its obligations to provide a meaningful national cow-calf stabilization program in response to prolonged depressed marketing conditions in the beef industry. And I think, Mr. Speaker, that they should say that the present beef marketing program, which the Federal Government has brought down, has come some way to providing some stability in the industry. Now when it has been announced that there will be a cow-calf program, I think that we should give full marks to Mr. Whelan, the Minister of Agriculture, for having done at least that much. Our only regret is that it took him so long to get there. I must say also that, although we agree that the program has some merit, we think there are a fair number of changes which need to be made in the program. And I think the Member for Cutknife-Lloydminster (Mr. Kwasnica) outlined some of those for you, and I won't go into them again.

We also think that the Federal Government should initiate discussions at an early stage with the provinces with regard to a national meat-marketing agency. We think that to meddle with income stabilization is simply a band-aid approach and that sooner or later we are going to have to get a national marketing agency if we are going to have a proper industry for our beef producers in this country. I'm not going to go any deeper into that, Mr. Speaker, because I know the Member for Cutknife outlined our position fairly well. I simply want to say, Mr. Speaker, that I hope that all Members of this Assembly will support this Resolution.

**SOME HON. MEMBERS:** — Hear, hear!

**MR. McMILLAN:** — Mr. Speaker, the Member opposite is looking at one person who won't be supporting the Resolution. And not because, as he suggests, that we don't have any . . .

**MR. SPEAKER:** — Order! I suppose I shouldn't have recognized the Member since he's already spoken on this Resolution. I don't want to give him two opportunities.

**MR. M. KWASNICA (Cutknife-Lloydminster):** — Mr. Speaker, I just have a few very brief comments to make, in wrapping up this very important debate. And, Mr. Speaker, before I proceed any further I just want to say that I chose for this debate a serious topic. I used a very serious approach, I pointed out the weaknesses of the present beef marketing system and the plight of our farmers in Saskatchewan. I offered solutions and as the Resolution states, simply asked the Federal Government to begin discussing with the Provincial Government the possibility of instituting a federal red meat marketing agency. Now, Mr. Speaker, what do we get from the other side? Well, let me just start briefly with the Member for Thunder Creek (Mr. Thatcher). I see he's not in his seat as usual but instead of dealing with the matter seriously, immediately he got up and asked who is that Member for Cutknife who is a school teacher; what's he doing talking about farm problems? As a matter of fact he went on, you know personal abuse, and he said he wouldn't know a cow, or a blackboard from a cow. After I used a learned approach, that's the kind of debate we get from Members opposite.

Mr. Speaker, I don't want to get involved in that kind of a low level debate, to heap abuse on a Member so that he won't speak again or something. But I could say, for example, that the Member for Thunder Creek probably has never read a book or any article of any consequence in the last ten years . . . I could say that, but I wouldn't. That would be personal attack and I wouldn't want to do that. But what I really want to say, Mr. Speaker, is that we try in this House to keep the level of debate high. I did in that presentation.

Then we have the press, and did they quote any important matters in the report that I saw in the Leader-Post that day or the next day? No, the comment that we got was the fact that the Member for Thunder Creek got up and accused the Member, or said that the Member for Cutknife doesn't know a cow from a blackboard. At least I thought the press would have a little more honesty or sincerity and would have said that's the kind of garbage that goes on in the House, but at least we don't have to report it. That's the kind of thing that does go on and I regret that the press doesn't realize that the more they publicize that kind of thing, the more they're going to get it.

It reminds me of the time when, in the election of 1971, a certain Liberal came into my riding and went on television during the campaign. He had not been on TV for one minute before he was heaping abuse on me as the Member for Cutknife and saying what a terrible fellow I was and nobody should vote for me. And every time he opened his mouth, heaping abuse on me, he gained about 200 votes for me because we managed to win that seat by about 1,200 votes. And I wish that the Member for Thunder Creek would enter my riding, at any time, and proceed to talk to the people who have elected me consistently for three times running. I wonder how long the Member for Thunder Creek has been elected, if he has that kind of record, and if he feels that he has that kind of prerogative because he has wealth or whatever. This House has really come to a fairly low level of debate.

I notice that I had two parts to my Resolution. I was asking for something meaningful in a federal cow-calf stabilization program. As far as I recall, not one Member touched that part of the debate, never even mentioned it. However, when

it came to the part about the marketing agency, wow, everyone was in there. The Member for Kindersley was up there screaming that the free enterprise system was doing its best. But the Member for Thunder Creek took the cake. He said that the reason Saskatchewan cow-calf producers are in a bind is because the open market system works terribly well, it has worked the way it is supposed to work. They have had three years of suffering in a row now and he said that it is a matter of supply and demand. That's the way the open market system works and if you want supply and demand working that way that's the way things should operate; he said, "I am a free enterpriser". And then he says, but we imported 190 million pounds of beef last year. Well if there was a shortage in Canada, why aren't the prices up like they are supposed to be when there is a shortage? That's some kind of a weird supply and demand in the Member's mind and that's the kind of debate we have had on this issue. It's amazing.

Then we get the Member for Rosetown-Elrose (Mr. Bailey) getting up and making the same kind of statements, saying, let those who raise cattle, or let somebody make some decisions about things. Well, of course, but a farmer is a farmer. He can be a mixed farmer. He doesn't have to be only a big cattle producer and that's whom the Member for Rosetown was talking about, the big cattlemen. Let them decide how to run this province, the big operators.

**AN HON. MEMBER:** — The land barons.

**MR. KWASNICA:** — Well, the land barons. Mr. Speaker, I posed some serious questions about the present marketing system. I said that the farmers are not getting what they should for the price of beef. They are losing \$100 to \$300 on an animal, depending on size and age. But there were no answers from Members opposite, not one suggestion except to leave it alone, leave it be, it's working beautifully. I mentioned also other problems of rail grading, which is not done, or the auction marts and the high commissions paid to buyers who buy from farmers. No answers, nothing serious at all, just hammer away, leave it alone, let it go and let's see more farmers go down the wayside.

I don't have to apologize to my constituents for bringing this up because we have, in my area, some of the best breeding stock raised in the province and many of you know that. And I am quite interested when some of the Maine-Anjou or Charolais cattle breeders come up to me and say that they think there may be something wrong with our system, that it certainly needs an overhaul. I don't apologize for that at all.

Therefore, Mr. Speaker, I urge all Members in this House to support this Resolution. It is not saying that we must do this or we must do that. Let's look at some alternatives, let's look at the chaotic beef marketing system in this province, let's get on with the job as serious Members in this House. I ask everybody to support this Resolution.

**SOME HON. MEMBERS:** — Hear, hear!

Resolution agreed to.

## **RESOLUTION NO. 28 - IMPOSITION OF THE METRIC SYSTEM IN CANADA**

The Assembly resumed the adjourned debate on the proposed Resolution by Mr. Birkbeck (Moosomin):

That this Assembly condemns the Government of Canada and the Government of Saskatchewan for its imposition of the metric system in Canada and Saskatchewan without the consultation of people affected.

**MR. S. J. CAMERON (Regina South):** — Mr. Speaker, I indicated to the Member last day that I was going to indicate to him how inconsistent this Resolution was with what his party was doing in other areas of the country. Our sister Province of Alberta is going along progressively and advancing quickly in converting to the metric. How very different is the position of the Conservative Party of Saskatchewan, apparently, from that of Alberta which is far more realistic.

I want to give to the Member some figures and some statistics which I gathered from the Province of Alberta to demonstrate to him how foolish his Resolution is. Now let me read to that Member some of the things that are happening in Alberta. Here is its schedule which they set up. In January, 1977, they indicate that Air Canada and the CPR will publish their carrying rates in metric units as of that date. Again in January, 1977 are the following things: publication of first priority metric standards for construction in the Province of Alberta; speedometers to read kilometers per hour, although the dual system is permitted; a conversion of ice cream packages to the metric system. Bulk grain sales in Alberta as of February, 1977, are to be converted to the metric system; February, 1977, most manufactured livestock feed to be sold in the Province of Alberta will be in metric units; February, 1977, milk companies in Alberta will commence metric packaging for retail trade. In July, 1977, conversion in the retail milk packages are to be completed in the Province of Alberta; July 1, an 18-month period will be used to phase in the new metric packs of tobacco sold in the Province of Alberta. In September, 1977, the shoe industry in the Province of Alberta will convert to metric. In September of this year road signs in the Province of Alberta will go to kilometers, speed limits will be expressed in kilometers per hour. In October, 1977, the Province of Alberta will start the metric highway design system. In April, 1978, a year down the road, the Province of Alberta will have regulations governing the registration of commercial vehicles in Alberta in the metric system.

Then, moving on, there is a whole series of other conversions that are planned by the Alberta Government in 1978. Then moving on to January of 1979, we have Peter Loughheed proposing to commence selling gasoline products in the Province of Alberta in metric units. In January of 1979, Mr. Loughheed also proposes that the whole of the petroleum industry and service sector in the Province of Alberta will begin to convert to metric. As a matter of fact, in January of the same year all wine sales in the Province of Alberta will be in metric.

**SOME HON. MEMBERS:** — Hear, hear!

**MR. CAMERON:** — Then we go to April, 1979, and this is the schedule of the Province of Alberta under Conservatives. In April, 1979, all the chemical and chemical products sector and all the products



sold will be sold in metric. There will be a completion of design conversion to permit construction of roads in Alberta, again on the metric system. In July, 1979, the entire forest industry in the Province of Alberta will convert to the metric system.

Then we move on to some incidentals in 1980. The biscuit packaging industry in Alberta in January, 1980, will convert to metric. Electrical utilities, February, 1980, in the Province of Alberta will be converted in complete to the metric system. In July, 1980, cookware and houseware manufactured goods in the Province of Alberta will be converted to metric. December, 1980, in the heart of Conservative western Canada, the electronics industry in Alberta will convert to the metric system.

On and on we go - the rubber industry, the plastic industry. Every industry in Alberta by September, 1983, will be effectively converted to the metric system. I found it strange to find this Member, a Conservative, indicating in his Resolution that somehow we ought to condemn both the Governments of Saskatchewan and of Canada for hastening the conversion to the metric system and as he put it, we ought to slow down and indeed we ought not to have it.

I have a publication, again from the Province of Alberta, called the Municipal Counsellor. Members to my left will know that the Minister of Municipal Affairs is one Dick Johnson, a Conservative in Alberta. He said:

The conversion in Canada to the metric system is steadily progressing toward the goal of predominant conversion by 1980. Alberta supports the national program as evidenced in the passing of The Metric Conversion Statutes Amendment Act, 1976, on November 4, in Alberta.

As of April 1, 1975 in Alberta, they converted from the Fahrenheit system to the Celsius system. As of September 1, 1977 we will begin to convert to the metric system in terms of the speed limits on our highways . . .

and so on. Then he says:

Adoption of the metric system of measurement for land related documentation is scheduled for the coming year, 1977.

Indeed in advance, I think, of the Province of Saskatchewan. He goes on to say and I think, again, this is a proposal in the Province of Saskatchewan that:

The section will remain the basic unit of land measurement in the rural setting. A township will continue to contain 36 sections, but measurements of these units of land will be expressed in metric units.

As of July 1, 1977, our proposal is that plans of subdivisions will be prepared completely in metric units as of July 1, 1977, in Alberta. Titles issued by land titles offices, as a result of registration of these plans, will express areas in hectares.

Those are the sort of comprehensive plans by the Conservative Government in the Province of Alberta for conversion to the metric system. There is clear indication by Mr. Lougheed and

April 26, 1977

and his Minister, Dick Johnson, that they are in fact moving forward at a very progressive, rapid rate in converting to the metric system which they say has been around since 1970 in terms of its proposal.

I want to quote to the Member a letter from the Saskatchewan Wheat Pool, dated February 25, 1977, to the Hon. Mr. Marchand who is the Minister in charge, clearly indicating that the Saskatchewan Wheat Pool is also in support of conversion to the metric system in respect of the grain trade. He says:

It is the policy of the Saskatchewan Wheat Pool to actively participate in the process of conversion internally and with industry associations in order to assure the conversion to the metric system takes place with the least possible cost and with the maximum benefits to the organization and to its owner patrons. The membership of the Saskatchewan Wheat Pool includes over 70,000 active members in the Province of Saskatchewan, all of whom, as farmers, have received information about the proposed plan to convert to metric from the Canadian Wheat Board, from Agriculture Canada, in bulletins from the Farm Press and through the regular news media. During all this period no resolutions were received from the 800 active Wheat Pool local committees or from annual meetings held or from other membership meetings held throughout the province to discuss issues dealing with the operations of farm policies of this organization that were adverse to the adoption of the metric system.

Without belaboring the point at great length, what we are telling the Member who moved this Resolution is that one wonders about it, in view of his compatriots in the Province of Alberta having adopted the extensive scheme of conversion that I have outlined. Let us turn to organizations and this isn't the only one but it happens to be the largest among the more responsible ones and that is the Saskatchewan Wheat Pool, which indicates it hasn't had a single resolution or a single indication from a local organization against conversion, over time, to the metric system in the grain industry.

I reminded the Member the last day in speaking about the Resolution that in respect of handling grain in this province and the three prairie provinces, we look at some 16 different conversions between metric and the old system costing producers, as a matter of fact, something in excess of \$1 million per year, which the metric system will save them. The Saskatchewan Wheat Pool freely recognizes the benefit of that. As I indicated to the Member the last day, the Canadian Wheat Board has indicated that it will continue to make its publications in the metric system on the one hand and secondly, in the traditional system on the other, until producers get a chance to adjust to it. What more can one ask in terms of being reasonable and being sensitive to some of the difficult requirements in adjusting?

First of all the thing has been around since 1970. There are a whole variety of publications. There has been work done by the Metric Conversion Commission. The governments across the country are adopting it. We are clearly out of step and we have been out of step for a number of years with other nations. We don't live on an island in this country. We have to convert. We have had six years in the process already. In the grain industry, we will continue to use the dual system until producers become used to it.

After all that, the question is: is that a reasonable proposal? I think that any reasonable man or woman would have to say that, the way in which it has been approached, is reasonable indeed. The conclusion that one has to come to is that the Resolution is an effort, again, by a Conservative to take advantage of some of the little difficulties that always set in when one is going from an accustomed system to a new system. In other words, it is an effort to take advantage of those few people who will find themselves opposed to the conversion and an effort by them politically to take advantage of it. Therefore, Mr. Speaker, certainly we will not support the Resolution.

**SOME HON. MEMBERS:** — Hear, hear!

**MR. R. A. LARTER (Estevan):** — Mr. Speaker, I wasn't going to say any thing, but that Alberta file which we had hidden away, we had it marked to be brought out in 1980.

I think the point that this Resolution brings out is what all farmers in Saskatchewan feel at the present time. The Minister of Agriculture has assured us, that in introducing the metric system into agriculture through the Ag. Reps., through different supplies the farmers buy, through markings on farm machinery, drills, etc., that it would be done in a dual fashion the first few years.

What the farmers are objecting to is things that you don't export, such as markings on the road, land that is there forever. We have sold wheat for years and we haven't lost the sale of one bushel of wheat through the bushel system. The letter that the Member for Regina South quoted was from the Wheat Pool, if you remember, and it was refuted later on that this was from one member of the Wheat Pool of the advisory board and it was brought out loud and clear that there indeed were many members of the Pool and the boards who objected to this quick conversion.

What the Member for Regina South didn't tell you was that when the Federal Government introduces the metric system, it is coming out in metric only and not in other measurement. It is only coming out in one measurement.

**AN HON. MEMBER:** — How about the Wheat Board?

**MR. LARTER:** — And the Wheat Board. Oh, the Wheat Board is dual, yes, but everything else that the Federal Government introduces is coming out in only one measurement and that is in the metric system. I think this is a very fair Resolution the Member for Moosomin proposes. I believe it is on the minds of every farmer in Saskatchewan and I believe it is exactly what they want. You can talk against it as much as you want but I wish the Member for Regina South was in a rural area. I think that he would find that his members would object strenuously to his stand on the metric introduction. I believe it has to come some day but certainly on certain portions of it, I don't think it has to come in quite as fast. I think you will see the Americans are backing off a little on it and we are an island unto ourselves - that is right. You said we weren't, but we are. In the computer age I don't think we shall have any trouble dealing with the rest of the world outside of metric.

Mr. Speaker, I will be supporting the Motion.

Resolution negatived.

## **RESOLUTION NO. 30 - PENSION PROVISIONS FOR SASKATCHEWAN GOVERNMENT SUPERANNUATES**

The Assembly resumed the adjourned debate on the proposed Resolution by Mr. Anderson (Shaunavon):

That this Assembly urges that a full examination be made of the pension provisions currently in force for Saskatchewan Government superannuates with a view to determining:

- (a) whether Saskatchewan Government superannuates are receiving fair pension benefits relative to other groups;
- (b) whether such pension benefits should be indexed as are Federal Government superannuates' pensions; and
- (c) generally whether fair and equitable pension provisions exist for the former public servants of Saskatchewan.

**HON. W. A. ROBBINS (Minister of Health):** — Mr. Speaker, I propose to say very little about this Resolution and I shall simply address myself to the three particular points raised in the Resolution.

It starts out saying:

That this Assembly urges that a full examination be made of the pension provisions currently in force for Saskatchewan Government superannuates with a view to determining: (a), (b) and (c) items.

I must inform the Assembly that over the last five years, I have addressed 61 meetings of employees in this province with respect to pension problems related to the fact that we were looking at the whole pension situation. In addition, a number of officials from the Public Service Superannuation Board and other officials of Government have attended those meetings and we had very, very extensive discussions, not only with union groups in organizations like Sask Power, Sask Tel, SGIO, Sask Minerals, Saskatchewan Transportation, the Public Service, etc., but also with representatives of out of scope employees in those particular organizations with respect to the pension situation.

Looking at the (a) section of the Resolution it says:

- (a) whether Saskatchewan Government superannuates are receiving fair pension benefits relative to other groups.

Anyone who looks at the 'allowance' system would have to admit that it is generous. They would also have to admit that, if they really studied it carefully, it is unrealistic. It doesn't get results for the vast majority of the people in those pension plans. In actual fact, actuaries generally look at pension plans on the basic assumption that approximately 80 per cent of the people who are participants in the pension plan at any given time, will never be pensioned by that pension plan. So I can say without hesitation that the pension allowance system, although it is generous, doesn't do the job because the vast majority of people who participate in pension plans generally do not get reasonable results. They either get very nominal pensions or none at all. This is basically because of the termination factor.

(b) whether such pension benefits should be indexed as are Federal Government superannuates' pensions;

My brief comment would be that an indexation system based on actual inflation factors of double digit proportions in the economy is a recipe for disaster in pensions. That is what it is. And the basic reason for that is that if you look at the statistical facts, we have currently about six persons in the work force for each pensioned person. Within 25 years we will have roughly three people in the work force for every pensioned person. With an aging population and a falling birth rate, we have real basic fundamental problems related to any indexation program in pensions.

(c) whether fair and equitable pension provisions exist for the former public servants of Saskatchewan.

That is a fair question. Obviously when people are pensioned on fixed pensions, they get hurt badly in inflationary periods, particularly if they live for a long period of time.

I checked on a former civil servant of the Government of Saskatchewan not too long ago and found out that he had been pensioned for 30 years. I need not tell you that he is a rather elderly person. The point I want to make here is that not only our administration but the previous administration attempted to do something about this particular problem and the administration headed by the late Premier Thatcher did make some adjustments in former public servants' pensions under provisions of the Act.

We have done the same, in fact, we have done it five times in the last six years and I just want to give two examples to illustrate why we used the approach we did. My contention is that it is a fair, reasonable and equitable way of doing it. Just take two examples. Take Mr. A who was pensioned on a pension of \$4,200 per annum or \$350 per month. Last year in the provisions of the Bill, that individual got an increase of \$12, or \$1 per month, times his years of service. If he had the full 35 years of contributions, he got a \$420 increase in his pension or a 10 per cent increase. That 10 per cent at least met the cost of inflation in that particular year. However, if that person had a pension of \$8,400, double the first example, he also got \$420 based on \$12 or \$1 per month times his 35 years of service. This meant again a \$420 increase in pension, but in this instance, a five per cent increase. I think it is perfectly logical and reasonable to argue that the second individual was getting some help against the inflationary trend but did not need as much help as the first individual based on the actual facts of their situations and, therefore, I would contend that a fair and equitable pension provision has been made in the most equitable manner that we could make it in relation to those people. I don't want to say any more on this particular Resolution tonight because we have a pretty major Bill coming before the House in which we will have lots of discussion on pensions, but I just thought I should make those few remarks, Mr. Speaker, at this time.

**MR. W. H. STODALKA (Maple Creek):** — Mr. Speaker, just to resume the debate, I noticed with interest today, after I read the Bill when I came back into the Legislature this afternoon, how with one Bill you can modify and adjust the pensions of a good many people who are employees, indirectly or directly of the Government of Saskatchewan. A number

of years ago there was a pension plan, a plan to which I happened to belong. Probably because of an election promise, the teachers of Saskatchewan were given a superannuation plan that was a negotiable item. Because it's a negotiable item, you are going to have a much more difficult time with this particular pension plan. You won't be able to introduce a piece of legislation into this Assembly that tells the teachers of Saskatchewan they will be bound by a plan similar to the one that you have introduced here into the Legislature. The fact that it's negotiable, of course, means that you'll have to get both parties to agree. The fact that this was made a negotiable item is going to cause a good deal of embarrassment to this Government before they are ever able to settle this pension plan with teachers.

We saw in the Estimates how the cost of living index, that's built into the teachers' pension plan, has forced the Government of Saskatchewan over five years to contribute from a figure five years ago of \$1.3 million to this year's Estimates where it took \$20 million to take care of the pension plans of the teachers of the Province of Saskatchewan. It's a pension plan, I notice, which takes a contribution right now, I think, of about 6.3 per cent on the part of the people who belong to that particular plan.

I was very interested when I heard the Minister remark that this concession was a recipe for disaster. This is a recipe for disaster in 1977. The initial concession was given for .3 per cent because the contribution before was 6 per cent. This concession was bought by the teachers of Saskatchewan for .3 per cent. Certainly then this disaster was created by whoever was responsible at that time for negotiating those pension plans. You are in a bind and you are going to have to negotiate your way out of this particular bind. It's not, as I said earlier, going to be one big swoop, where you bring in a bill and take care of these things. As I said, it's really interesting to note on behalf of the Opposition Members here, this particular negotiable item which was brought about by great fanfare. The cost of living index brought in for the teachers is now called by the Members opposite, a program that is a recipe for disaster.

**MR. MERCHANT:** — Mr. Speaker, I was only going to say that I probably agree with the Minister about point (b) of the Resolution. It's interesting to note in dealing with the question of whether our former public servants are receiving fair pensions, and I believe the number is around \$42 million that the Government has profited from pension deductions over the years, that if you deducted and computed that money in the same way that somebody in the private sector would have had money deducted, and would have then had to duplicate that money, those funds would have been fully funded.

All that this Resolution asks is that some review be made of the way the Government deals with the public servants who have worked so long and capably for the Province of Saskatchewan. It impliedly says do a better job in the future. I happen to believe that the Government should have to run a fully funded program for public servants of the Province of Saskatchewan. Indeed, I am somewhat distressed to see the national Government giving what I consider to be poor leadership, in terms of not running a funded program and in terms of having an indexed pension plan. I think that to some extent the Minister is right when he says that that's a dangerous direction in which to move. Although I say that current public servants should be

treated in a fair way and treated in a way that demands a fully funded plan, I don't understand why the Government, if it's fair in dealing with former public servants, doesn't go back and rework the numbers and ask where they really stand with those people who were with them in the 30s and 40s and early 50s. What kind of money would they have, what kind of pension would they have coming to them now, if the Government had run a fully funded program then? I think the Minister knows that the Province of Saskatchewan has been far better off as a result of taking the money of public servants, not contributing money in an equal way, using that money in general revenue, holding that money not separate, but saying that the province would be responsible in the final analysis. The public servants have to a large extent been badly used by the province, not so much by this Government, I'm not suggesting that there was anything so inappropriate about what this Government has done. This Government again has an opportunity to right a wrong that has developed over the last forty years. From what the Minister says, the Government doesn't intend to right that wrong in terms of dealing fairly with the public servants.

I thought the Government acted with some compassion, for instance, when they said that they would review the circumstances for retired teachers, the teachers who had worked many years ago. I commend them for doing that. The same kind of thing should be done for the public servants. The public servants should get back the money that they would have had, had that money been invested in a fully funded program for them.

I think particularly, Mr. Speaker, one should remember that public servants, in the past, tended to be forced to be, perhaps, more dedicated than public servants today, only in that they were badly paid and that they weren't paid the kind of going rate that a public servant receives now. I suggest to the House that certainly as far as items (a) and (c) are concerned, that a review along the lines that the Motion asks for, would be a very appropriate matter and indeed that a review of (b) would be appropriate as well. If there is any implication that a fully indexed program would be advisable, I agree with the Minister that that would be a mistake.

Motion negatived.

## **MOTIONS FOR RETURN**

### **RETURN NO. 58**

**MR. S. J. CAMERON** (Regina South) moved that an Order of the Assembly do issue for Return No. 58 showing:

Whether the former Minister responsible for Transportation, the Hon. Attorney General, or the present Minister of the Saskatchewan Transportation Agency, or any other Minister or official or agency or department of Government at any time between January 1, 1973 and March, 1977: (a) gave to the Government of Canada or the Minister of Transport for Canada or Transport Canada, a written brief, memorandum, letter or other writing respecting national freight rate policies, including, but not restricted to concerns about: (i) long-haul, short-haul anomalies; or (ii) the CTC appeal provisions of the National Transportation Act of 1967; or (iii) minimum-maximum freight rates; or (iv) the reliance on competition in the National Transportation Act, 1967, to govern

freight rates; (b) if so, the dates and the names of the persons who gave such brief, memorandum, letter or other writing; and (c) a copy of such material.

**HON. G. MacMURCHY (Minister of Municipal Affairs):** — Mr. Speaker, I'm going to make an amendment to the Motion proposed by the Hon. Member for Regina South (Mr. Cameron). It first of all deletes any other Minister or official or agency or department of a government. On the examination of this particular Motion it was found that this would be a fairly horrendous task to provide this answer. So I'm deleting that in the amendment. I'm also adding more information on behalf of the Transportation Ministers or the agency or the officials. I am, therefore, moving that the word 'agency' in the third line be deleted and the following substituted therefore:

or any official responsible to either of them, at any time between January 1, 1973 and March, 1977: (a) communicated to or received communication from the Government of Canada or the Minister of Transport for Canada or Transport Canada, by means of a written brief, memorandum, letter, other writing, or by means of discussion at a pre-arranged meeting, concerns related to national freight rate policies, including, but not restricted to concerns about: (i) long-haul, short-haul anomalies; or (ii) the CTC appeal provisions of the National Transportation Act of 1967; or (iii) minimum-maximum freight rates; or (iv) the reliance on competition in the National Transportation Act, 1967, to govern freight rates; (b) if so, the dates and names of the persons who so communicated, and (c) a copy of any such written communication.

I so move, seconded by the Minister of Labour, Mr. Snyder.

**MR. CAMERON:** — I think, Mr. Speaker, it is a fair amendment and we'll support it.

Amendment agreed to.  
Motion as amended agreed to.

## **ADJOURNED DEBATES**

### **RESOLUTION NO. 8 - DISPUTE OVER CABLE TELEVISION POLICIES**

The Assembly resumed the adjourned debate on the proposed Resolution by Mr. Stodalka (Maple Creek):

That this Assembly urges the Government of Saskatchewan to provide a quick settlement to the dispute with Ottawa over cable television policies.

and the proposed amendment thereto moved by Mr. Skoberg:

That the following words be added after the word 'policies' in the last line:

and that this Assembly condemns the Federal Government for its stand on the ownership of cable television hardware in this and other provinces which will inhibit the introduction of cable television to smaller centres and will give the Federal Government and private



operators control over Saskatchewan's communication network; and further, this Assembly commends the Provincial Government for its stand on cable and closed circuit television being delivered by non-profit community co-operatives.

**MR. MERCHANT:** — Mr. Speaker, let me say a few words about the amendment because this is, in fact, the nub of the red herring that the Government always uses as a justification for their delay of the advent of cable television into this province. The Government well knows that they can easily use their ability to control the costs of carriers of cable to make it possible for the various locations throughout the province to have cable television without having absolute control as they seek to have it.

The thing that I find distressing, of late, is the continued and more obvious attempts by the Minister and others, I believe, to misrepresent the true situation to Saskatchewan voters. I can't help, Mr. Speaker, but think that when the Government apparently misrepresents the cost of the facilities that have been built by Sask Tel, and I can't characterize it any other way, that what they are trying to do in that regard is misrepresent this situation. It's all part of a piece in terms of drawing, as I say, a red herring before the people of this province, about why their policy exists and whether their policy is necessary in order to ensure that cable television will be provided for rural Saskatchewan. Recently in this continuing debate we've had the question of the headend facilities at Outram or Tolstoi. The matter of interest there and the matter that is of interest in relating it to this amendment, is that as Members now know, the cost of the facilities at Outram has been \$35,000. The loss as a result of constructing those facilities at Outram will be about \$17,000. Yet . . .

**MR. BYERS:** — We haven't lost a dollar.

**MR. MERCHANT:** — Well that's very interesting. The Minister now says that we haven't lost a dollar, and that is the same Minister who, I suspect, was misrepresenting things to this House and to the press, saying that the losses looked like they were going to be about \$2 million. Now, the Minister in charge of Sask Telecommunications, I believe, was being taken in by the Minister in charge of Cable Telecommunications, in that that Minister, in talking about cable television, was trying to convince the people of this province there was some heinous crime going on, there was some misrepresentation by the cable operators and that a \$2 million loss was in jeopardy.

Now, Mr. Speaker, about the question of Tolstoi or Outram, it is interesting that the Minister in charge of Sask Telecommunications is not in a position to say to this House that they even consulted with the cable operators. They didn't even tell the cable operators that they were building a headend there. We've got a situation that they were to be the customers; they didn't even tell those cable operators that the headend was going in though the Minister would say, and this amendment would say, the whole purpose of dealing in that way was to get enough money out of these larger cable operators, so that we could then facilitate the provision of cable to the more rural areas where one would hope to have cable in due course.

The other great misrepresentation that this House has seen and to which the press has been subjected, is the misrepresentation that we can expect to have cable in about six months. We can't have cable until about six months after some negotiations go on between the Government and the cable operators. And, really what the Minister in charge of cable is saying, is that it will be six months before we are even prepared to talk with the cable operators. Mr. Speaker, you would have a special interest, having been in charge at one time of this area; do you know that the Minister who has taken over from you has never even initiated a meeting with any of the four cable operators? Never mind the cable operators that he doesn't like, the private enterprise cable operators, he has never even invited the two co-op cable operators and, of his initiative, said, "Would you come in and we'll discuss this matter? Would you come in and we'll discuss how, given that we lost before the CRTC, we can see to it that cable facilities will be provided to the rural areas that are not as affluent as the larger areas? Would you come in and we'll discuss the fact that Sask Tel, acting on my direction, (as the Minister no doubt would affirm), is now going to build the facility at Outram?" The facility which the Minister then apparently misrepresented as having cost \$2 million.

Now, Mr. Speaker, as I said, it is all a part of this amendment, and all of the things that we have heard about cable that are all a part of the red herring that says that the people in Kindersley or the people in Maple Creek or the people in Lloydminster can't get cable unless this Government has absolute control of cable. That's hogwash. The Government is in a position, through the control of the hardware now, to pass the benefits and savings on to the smaller operators. I think the Minister well knows that. I believe that is the reason that you see this amendment, the reason you have seen what I consider to be misrepresentation about the cost of the Outram facility, the reason that you have heard in this House what I suspect to be misrepresentation/ which implies that we will have cable in six months. The Minister should well know that until some negotiations are carried on with the four cable operators, that six-month flow won't begin to run. I think that the whole thing comes back to this Government's determination that somehow the co-ops are going to have control, that the co-op in Saskatoon and the co-op in Moose Jaw are going to have control. I am driven to that conclusion. I am driven to that conclusion when the Minister says in the House that a converter will cost about \$15, when the converters cost \$100. I'm driven to that conclusion when the Minister says in the House that what they hope to do with pay TV is occupy the four channels under the VHP spectrum and the Minister then knows that that will drive the cable operators into having to have a converter that will cost about \$100, and that would give to the people in charge of pay (whom the Minister hopes will be cable operators) that advantage.

I ask the Minister, and it is very germane to this kind of amendment, whether the Government now has switched its thinking to the belief that rural Saskatchewan will only be able to have pay television and not cable television? The Minister says that we haven't really switched our thinking to that, but you have to examine that a little more closely. If the Government is saying that, the rural areas will have pay first and then cable would have to follow. The cable would have to move in and buy those converters and do what they have done in eastern Canada where some sets have converters, but very few do.

Cable, Mr. Speaker, competing against pay, would be delighted to do that, provided the dice aren't weighted against them and they have to have the converter in order to get into the VHF spectrum. We can have cable in rural areas without the Government having absolute control. We can have cable in rural areas without the Government's enunciated policy of absolute control in this area, but we can't have it if the Government goes on with their stick-in-the-mud attitude which results in no negotiating with the four cable operators.

Mr. Speaker, I do not believe, and I think that any fair-thinking person would agree, that it is not necessary for the Government to have the kind of control that this amendment enunciates. This amendment is a part of a process of misrepresenting the true situation regarding cable, to the people of this province. And until the people of Saskatchewan realize that at every stage, going back to 1971, the NDP, for whatever reason, has been dragging its feet over bringing cable into this province. I frankly, Mr. Speaker, didn't have, a year and a half ago, that kind of suspicion. There were Members of our caucus who had that kind of suspicion from the very beginning.

**MR. CAMERON:** — I certainly did.

**MR. MERCHANT:** — Well I know, many Members of our caucus started with that suspicion. I guess that I was prepared to give to the NDP the benefit of the doubt. Unfortunately, I have been disappointed and voters of Saskatchewan have been again disappointed although they gave the benefit of the doubt to the people who are running their Government in this province.

**SOME HON. MEMBERS:** — Hear, hear!

**HON. N. E. BYERS (Minister in charge of Sask Tel):** — Mr. Speaker, I hadn't intended to participate in this debate. But in view of the extent of the misunderstanding of this issue by the Liberal Opposition Party in this House and in this province, as exemplified tonight by their main spokesman and proposed authority on this subject, I cannot refrain from at least trying to deconfuse some of the confusion that has been not only heard in this House but spread throughout the province by the Hon. Member.

First of all, Mr. Speaker, I should like to isolate only a few of the issues which the Liberal Party is misrepresenting in this province. In the first instance the Member said the New Democratic Party is somehow dragging its feet with respect to the delivery of cable television and closed circuit television. I want to say to him that our Government started negotiations with the Federal Government in 1972, a few short months after we assumed office, to persuade the CRTC and the Federal Government to hold hearings and to receive applications from interested applicants. We were successful in having those hearings held here in early 1976, which was the decision of the CRTC, and which comes within their domain and not our domain.

There is a second issue, I think, that the Liberals are trying to misrepresent. It seems no matter how many times you try to set the record straight for them, they continue to exhibit their slow learning abilities, of which they are well-endowed. They continue to parrot around this province the belief that Sask Tel has constructed a tower at Outram,

April 26, 1977

Saskatchewan that cost some \$2 million. That is entirely false. The information has been given to this House on more than one occasion and yet Liberals in this House and out of this House, go around and misrepresent to the people of Saskatchewan that Sask Tel has invested \$2 million in a headend and a tower at Outram, Saskatchewan. The tower has been at Outram for 20 years, as part of the National Defence System. Now Sask Tel has constructed an antenna and a receiver on that tower that has cost in the order of \$34,000, not \$2 million, not \$1 million, not \$500,000, not \$100,000, but \$34,000.

The third matter which is badly misrepresented is that Sask Tel didn't tell the cable operators that the proposed location for the headend would be Outram, Saskatchewan. It is my understanding that all of the applicants to the CRTC for their cable television licences fully understood when they made their application to the CRTC, that the headend would be constructed at Outram, Saskatchewan and it would be constructed by Sask Tel and there was never any misunderstanding . . .

**SOME HON. MEMBERS:** — Hear, hear!

**MR. BYERS:** — . . . as to where the hardware would start and end, with respect to that system. And yet, Mr. Speaker, day after day and long into the night in this House and I suspect beyond the walls of this Chamber, the Liberals go around in defence of the cable applicants, saying that somehow they got snowed or conned by this Government through Sask Tel. That is absolutely incorrect and absolutely false.

The fourth issue that they continue to misrepresent is that somehow this whole system of hardware may have to be abandoned and that the taxpayers of Saskatchewan will be stuck with a white elephant, or \$2 million worth of redundant hardware. That is entirely false. It is only in the last three or four months (I first read of this last fall, and there were some articles in the newspaper during the Sutherland and the Prince Albert by-elections) that some of the successful licensees, since they've received their licences, have considered approaching the CRTC to relocate the headend at another location, namely Tolstoi, Manitoba. If there is a decision to relocate the headend, that decision will not be made by Sask Tel. It will not be made by this Government. That decision will be made by the CRTC and by the CRTC alone. If that decision is made, it is a simple process to send a building crew or a moving crew to move some hardware a few miles from Outram, which the Hon. Member for Estevan (Mr. Larter) and the Hon. Member for Souris-Cannington (Mr. Berntson) can tell you is in the order of 80 or 90 miles east to the Manitoba border at Gainsborough, where Sask Tel could simply relocate the headend.

Now in this province we can move grain elevators. The only thing you can't move is the Liberals from a stubborn position that they have dug themselves into . . .

**SOME HON. MEMBERS:** — Hear, hear!

**MR. BYERS:** — . . . and will not retrench from the grave that they continue to dig for themselves and they don't even know what they are doing.

**SOME HON. MEMBERS:** — Hear, hear!

**MR. BYERS:** — Now with respect to the \$2 million that has been put into cable hardware in the inter-city microwave system, that is \$2 million invested in hardware from Blewett, Saskatchewan, which Hon. Members will know is around Heward in the Weyburn district, to Regina, to Moose Jaw, to Saskatoon and on to North Battleford. And I want to say to Hon. Members that most of that \$2 million investment in the inter-city microwave system is invested in the inter-city microwave system between Regina and Moose Jaw, and between Regina and Saskatoon, and on to North Battleford. A very small portion of that investment is in the inter-city microwave system between here and Blewett. Even if the location for the headend is moved to Manitoba, then the existing hardware will be used, all of it will be used and the Saskatchewan people, through Sask Tel, will not have lost one dollar in the investment that is in place.

The Hon. Member says that Sask Tel is dragging its feet. I say to him that in the present calendar year, 1977, Sask Tel's capital budget for cable television facilities for the laying of coaxial cable and other related facilities is in the order of \$5 to \$6 million. I want to tell him that today, as I said in the Crown Corporations Committee, in Sask Tel there are approximately 90 people who are working full time on the cable television system in the designing and the supervising of construction and in the various roles, so that we in this Government need to apologize to no one for our initiatives to ensure that the hardware is in place, and has been put in place in a reasonable period of time to carry the cable television facilities. I have given this House the construction schedule for laying the coaxial cable on previous occasions; Moose Jaw is scheduled for 1977, North Battleford is almost finished now. Saskatoon and Regina will be completed early in 1978. I would like to comment further on this with respect to the prospects of extending this service to rural Saskatchewan. I would like more time to examine some of the other misunderstandings that have been advanced in this debate, and therefore, I would beg leave to adjourn the debate.

Debate adjourned.

## **RESOLUTION NO. 24 - VIOLENCE ON TELEVISION**

The Assembly resumed the adjourned debate on the proposed Resolution by Mr. Thibault (Kinistino):

That this Assembly deplores the increasing violence in television programming and the consequent desensitizing effect on viewers and urges the Canadian Radio Television and Communications Commission to take steps to: (1) study the effects of constant exposure to violence, particularly among young viewers; and, (2) set standards for programming which prevent excessive amounts of violence.

**MR. BAILEY:** — I have a few words that I, should like to say on this Resolution No. 24. You know when the Member, Mr. Thibault, moved the Motion there was no question in my mind that he did so with all the sincerity with which any Member could move a particular resolution. Some Members who speak on resolutions or propose resolutions, do so with a great deal of sincerity, and certainly the Member did that in proposing the Resolution.

What disturbed me was the seconder of this particular Resolution, and I just want to make a comment or two. The Member who seconded the Resolution stood before this House and tried to intimate to the Members of this House, that the crime and the violence that you see was a by-product of the corporate society. In other words, what he tried to present was that some of these corporations, like Eatons or Simpsons or Imperial Oil, are producing the violence; they are the ones that are the cause of all of this. Now, Mr. Speaker, the seconder of the Motion completely destroyed the intent and the sincerity of the man who moved this Resolution. The Resolution, Mr. Speaker, is a good one, and I certainly intend to support it.

Motion agreed to.

### **RESOLUTION NO. 31 - SUFFICIENT FUNDS FOR PROBATION SERVICES FOR JUVENILES AND ADULTS**

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

That this Assembly urges the Government of Saskatchewan to provide sufficient funds to permit a renewed emphasis on probation services for juveniles and adults.

**MR. ROMANOW:** — Mr. Speaker, just a few words on this. I am going to be moving an amendment at the conclusion of my remarks which I believe more accurately reflects the true state of affairs in this particular matter.

The complaint, basically, is that there are insufficient funds available for adequate probation services for youth and adult offenders. Mr. Speaker, I believe that the facts do not support this Motion. I would point out to the House that in probation officer numbers, the figures supplied to me by the Department of Social Services show that in the year 1970-71 we had 17 probation officers; in the year 1976-77, just completed, we had 41 probation officers. Furthermore, there is a substantial Indian probation program; 12 officers supervise 256 clients. Thirdly, a departmental study reviewing services to juvenile offenders is in effect now with respect to Health, Education, the Attorney General, Culture and Youth, and the Social Services Departments, which may produce some additional action if the study so points. Fourthly, there is an on-going consultation with the Federal Government for a new youth offender legislation. As you know, we have some quarrels with the youth offender legislation as proposed by the Federal Government, but we are working with them in attempts to develop the probation services program for youth and young offenders in conflict with the law. While we don't agree with all points, some very substantial progress is being made there.

During the life of this Government, the Community Training Residences Program has been introduced which is a new and innovative matter. Presently there are five centres which have been operational. As far as the Fine Option Program is concerned, Mr. Speaker, I believe all Members will agree that this is indeed a new development. It is estimated by the Department of Social Services that somewhere in the neighborhood of 5,000 people have been kept out of jail because of the inability to pay fines but who have worked off the fines by some way of community work, some other type of similar activity which is both beneficial to the community and to themselves, and shows

an innovative probation service or alternative sentencing program.

Mr. Speaker, one could make a lengthy speech on this matter but I don't think it is appropriate. I think those few remarks of mine will indicate that a substantial amount has already been done by the Government. I acknowledge the Member's plea that more should be done. We are conscious of that and want to do more but because the Resolution doesn't adequately reflect what the true state of affairs really is and what has been accomplished, I would like to move, seconded by my colleague Mr. Whelan, the Minister of Consumer Affairs, that on the proposed Resolution No. 31, moved by Mr. Merchant, that it be amended as follows: that all the words after the word 'Assembly' be deleted, and the following substituted therefore:

commends the Government of Saskatchewan for increasing the number of probation officers, establishing community training residences and establishing the Fine Option Program all in an effort to provide a better alternative to incarceration.

**MR. MERCHANT:** — Mr. Speaker, some of the things that the Member refers to in the amendment are valuable things. It would be like discussing a Rolls Royce and having an amendment that says Chevrolets make nice cars and Chevrolets make better cars if they have green upholstery in them. That's really, what the Hon. Attorney General does with this Motion.

I made some very specific charges and some very specific suggestions. Not only does the Government choose not to deal with those charges and suggestions but they, in the rather boring mundane manner that this Government deals with matters that come before them on the Motion Paper, say that since we've got to discuss something, why don't we pat ourselves on the back for something that we've done that's sort of similar or something that is at least in the ball park. If they don't like our cashews, let's talk about our nuts. And that's really what this amendment does.

The Minister hopes to soften my reaction to it and the reaction of the Liberals and probably the Conservatives by saying that you know I appreciate what the Member has said, I know that the Member has probably good intentions when he talks about the problems that are faced by juvenile delinquents and young offenders. I know the Member is well intentioned when he said that these people are over-worked and that nothing seems to be done. But by moving that kind of an amendment, the Minister doesn't address himself one iota to the problems I raised in this House. He doesn't even choose to respond to the problems that probation officers face.

I, for instance, Mr. Speaker, said the other day that a parole officer can breach someone by his own signature and by our legislation you have to take them back before a court and that doesn't happen. I talked about the fact that there is a con here, the appearance of security when there is no security. The Minister, with that amendment and with his failure to even respond to those charges, is saying that we don't really care, I suppose. We know there are some problems, we know that probation workers are over-worked. You know, Mr. Speaker, I was fairly specific. They talked about numbers and caseloads, and the Minister doesn't even deny those numbers, doesn't even deny those charges.

Now, I agree with parts of the amendment but I would recommend to Members of the House that they vote against the amendment, not because the things mentioned so much are wrong, but because of its transparent political manoeuvring. Doesn't the Government want to deal with the questions raised in the Motion? I gather not. Why don't they get up and say we want to deal with the problems raised in the Motion. We don't think that those things are relevant. We're not prepared, if that's what the Minister wants to say. We're not prepared to put money into that area. We think there are other priorities that are more important. Maybe they would be right to say that. I don't think they would. I think that Liberals, and that's a part of what liberalism is all about, would say that if you have a criminal problem let's deal with the rehabilitation of those criminals. The Tories, I am sure, would say that if they have a criminal problem, let's throw them in jail for awhile or whip them.

Now, Mr. Speaker, my question is why wouldn't the Government address themselves to that question instead of moving this kind of amendment? That's right, that's right. You can either say it's cheap politics or a lack of courage in dealing with the issue. I don't know, I leave it to Members opposite to decide whether they are guilty of cheap politics or lack courage in dealing with the issue. I wouldn't want to put words in their mouths and I'm not able to decide why they opt for one or the other. But I do say, Mr. Speaker, that it is unfortunate when there is a mounting crime problem in Saskatchewan, that the Government wouldn't want to deal with one of the areas of rehabilitation and reformation, something that we believe is very, very important. I'm disappointed that the Government won't even debate that question, won't even allow a vote of the Assembly on that question.

Amendment agreed to.

Motion as amended agreed to.

## ADJOURNED DEBATES

### SECOND READINGS

The Assembly resumed the adjourned debate on the proposed Motion by Mr. S. J. Cameron (Regina South) that Bill No. 87 - **An Act to provide for an Economic Impact Statement to accompany Government Bills when introduced in the Legislature and to accompany Statutory Instruments and Regulations when issued, made or established**, be now read a second time.

He said: Mr. Speaker, I rise again as I have now done several times to move second reading . . .

**MR. ROMANOW:** — On a Point of Order. I am not trying to be obstructive but unless my memory has played tricks with me, I thought that Mr. Speaker made a ruling saying that this Bill was in order. At the time of making the ruling, I got up on a Point of Order and I made an argument about the economic charge on the province. As I understood it, Mr. Speaker, you were going to make a ruling today, when this matter came up again. Am I in error there?

**MR. SPEAKER:** — I think the Attorney General is in error because I had made my ruling that the Bill was in order and that the Member



could speak on the Bill.

**MR. CAMERON:** — Thank you very much, Mr. Speaker. I commend Mr. Speaker for the ruling which I think is a very good one. I had indicated, as a matter of fact, that had the Chair come to a different conclusion it would, in effect, have made eunuchs out of private Members. None of us would like to see that, I am sure.

This Bill, Mr. Speaker, entitled The True Cost of Government Programs Act, is intended, as I indicated earlier, to find some means to bring some greater measure of discipline into government spending in respect of government programs. It would have, in my opinion, and I submit this to Members, a three-fold effect if Members would take it under consideration seriously and pass it. In the first instance it would make all of us more conscious of the price tag that is attached to government programs and that would be nothing but good in my opinion. Secondly, it would serve as an additional break in the internal workings of government to new programs that place additional new burdens upon the backs of taxpayers. Thirdly, by requiring the filing of a statement listing the start-up costs as well as the projected future costs of programs, it would give to each Member a standard or guidepost by which to measure, in the future, the benefit of the program as opposed to the cost of it. I will come back to these in a few minutes, Mr. Speaker, and I intend to keep my remarks relatively short.

Let me turn, if I may, to describe the details of the Bill in the first place, and then secondly, the sort of broad background of government spending and the declining role of Members in respect of government spending, that prompts the introduction of this Bill.

Mechanically what the Bill would do is require the Government, each time it brought legislation before the House, or each time it passed a regulation calling for spending, to file a detailed statement of the various aspects of the cost of a program. The statement which I refer to is an economic impact statement. That economic impact statement would require the Government to lay five things before us:

1. It would require the government to lay before us a statement, in detail, of the original or start-up costs of every program;
2. It would require a statement of the economic benefits of the proposals;
3. The statement would include the alternative by which one might accomplish the same objective and the costs of those alternatives;
4. It would require, as well, a projection of the future costs of a program that is laid before the House.

In my view, ideally, what that item would do is express in annual, terms, in five-year periods at least, the projected cost in the future of the program.

5. It would require an analysis of the economic impact of the measure on those whom it is intended to benefit and those

expected to pay for the program.

So those are the five things that the economic impact statement, in respect of any program or Order in Council, would have to include if my Bill should pass. Members would then debate the program itself and the merits or demerits of it, and would also have a separate and second debate on the whole question of cost, the benefits to be derived, the various alternatives, and future projections of cost, so that one could determine, not only what the merit of the particular program was, but the benefit measured against the cost, today and tomorrow, of the program.

Among other things that it would accomplish in this way, it seems to me, is to break this notion, which so many politicians for so long have perpetuated, and that is the notion that somehow you can have a government program for free. All of us know that that is not the fact, you cannot have government programs, whether it be a dental program, a drug program, medical care, hospitalization or whatever, for free. And if each time we had one of these programs introduced, it was accompanied by the kind of cost statement that I suggest, we would, in my view, fairly quickly break that notion that you can, in fact, have something for nothing.

Now the general background, in my view, in respect to which the Bill is introduced is this: that as the tax burden on our people grows relentlessly and unceasingly, more and more people are seeking a basic answer as to why it seems so difficult to get ahead. You get a raise one year and it doesn't take eight or nine months and the raise is eroded by a variety of things, including increased government spending. So in no small measure, people are on a financial treadmill, finding it very difficult to get ahead in a financial way. That tends to sap people's energy and erode their will to work.

I was reading the other day that about 20 or 25 per cent of the incomes now earned by Canadians is eaten up in the way of personal income tax. I was reading that in the United States it is 14 per cent. What is happening is that governments are taking somewhere now between 45 or 50 per cent of the value of all goods and services produced in the country unto themselves. In other words, almost half the gross national product currently today is being consumed by government. I think that what it says to us as legislators is that there is a challenge here for us, a challenge at least to play a more active role in respect of the cost side of government programs.

I have often wondered, Mr. Speaker, why for some strange reason we, as a people, accept a much more modest standard of life for ourselves than what we see our governments assume for themselves. I wonder why that is? For example, we will shop for groceries - and we see this every week, in every home, I am sure, in the homes of your people opposite, in the same way as in the homes of the people here - and if we can save a few cents here or a few dollars there on an item, we do it. That is the standard we accept for ourselves.

Yet, on the other hand, the Government can somehow throw \$100,000 down the drain and it hardly draws a shrug. It happens again and again. In fact, we saw an example of that the other day. The Department of Co-operatives, in conjunction apparently with the Department of Agriculture, spent \$50,000 on a land processing plant in Alberta. The plant went bankrupt. Our \$50,000 went down the tube. That drew hardly a response from the

Minister of Co-operatives. In fact, I recall no response from him. It drew a kind of a nonchalant indifferent response from the Minister of Agriculture.

I doubt whether the Premier, as a matter of fact, is even aware of it and if he were I don't think he would care much more than the two Members I have mentioned. It is no criticism of them, personally. What I criticize is this: how have we come to the point in time that we accept, with such complete indifference and apathy, \$50,000 down the drain with hardly a shrug? That is how indifferent we have become to the cost side of government programs.

I want to give a second illustration about the different standard that we accept for ourselves as opposed to what we find our Government doing. Most of us, and this includes most of the population of the province, live in small homes, and make mortgage payments for 25 to 30 years. It is a struggle for most people to get by, in terms of good housing. Yet we see in governments a very different notion about how they house themselves. We see in Wascana Centre a new government building going up, the most palatial and sumptuous quarters that one can imagine. Government buildings are surrounded by expensive works of art; waterfalls in the interior of buildings, central air conditioning, and all manners of luxury. Now why? That is a good question. Why do we accept such a modest standard for ourselves and, at that same time, are prepared to put up with a much richer standard that government assumes unto itself? Why, I ask anyone of you in respect of your homes or your business, do you take a modest careful approach in attitude about what you do, yet somehow when you get into government, you are prepared to accept a building that is maybe costing \$100 per square foot, with central air conditioning, wall to wall carpet, carpet up the walls, waterfalls, expensive works of art and so on.

Again, it is not an attitude that is unique to you people, it is an attitude that all of us have come to somehow accept. That is to say, that the standard for ourselves is a much different standard than we set for our governments. I don't think that is a very good idea.

The reason for that lies in part in a neglect, a very real neglect, by people in government, people in elected positions to the cost side of government programs. I think that we are, in a very real sense, slothful in this respect, always looking to the program itself because I suppose, in part, that is the attractive side, that is the appearance side. Too often politicians are more apt to be drawn to the appearance of things rather than to their substance. That, I think is wrong, too. The substantive side lies on the cost side very often - that is not universally true - and the appearance side tends to be the program side. Therefore, more attention is paid to the appearance than paid to the substantive cost side. It is always so easy for governments to have money because somehow for governments it is such a painless exercise. That is an attitude which I think that all of us, over the course of time, have to challenge in government.

This Bill I introduce is designed in its purpose to come to grips with that very thing. Mr. Speaker, the chief merit, if there is one in an underling sense in this Bill, is that it would force Members of the Legislature and Members of the Government to pay a good deal more attention to the financial aspects

April 26, 1977

of government programming and, in that way, bring more discipline into government spending. Goodness knows we have got to the point in time when we have to be far more disciplined in respect to spending than we have been in the past.

I hope that Members on all sides of the House will see some merit in this proposal. I am a realist and I know that since it is a Private Member's Bill and it originates on this side of the House, I don't suppose it is realistic to suppose that it will pass. But I hope, at least in putting it forward and drawing some attention to it, that we will begin if even in a small way to change some attitudes about the free way in which people spend government funds.

I am, therefore, pleased, Mr. Speaker, to urge Members to support this Bill and I move second reading of the Bill.

**SOME HON. MEMBERS:** — Hear, hear!

**HON. G. MacMURCHY (Minister of Municipal Affairs):** — Mr. Speaker, I want to consider in particular the remarks of the Hon. Member in moving second reading of the Bill and in order to do that I need a bit of time and I, therefore, beg leave to adjourn the debate.

Debate adjourned.

The Assembly resumed the adjourned debate on the proposed Motion of the Hon. Mr. Robbins that Bill No. 51 - **An Act to amend The Medical Profession Act** be now read a second time.

**MR. M. KWASNICA (Cutknife-Lloydminster):** — Mr. Speaker, I should like to take a few minutes to comment on this Bill, Bill No. 51.

I feel that this Bill is not without its problems and I want to place on the record some of the dangers that I feel are implicit in this Bill and that, I doubt, anyone else in this Assembly would be voicing.

There are only two major principles in the Bill that I can see of any importance. One is that three lay people will be appointed to the 16 member council of the college of Physicians and Surgeons. The second principle is that this Bill literally gives the College of Physicians and Surgeons sweeping powers of total control over every single doctor in this province after this Bill is proclaimed.

Although the first principle may have some merit, I suggest that it will be really totally ineffective in bringing any pressure on the college to improve services to the people of this province.

The three lay people on the College Council, who are not doctors, will no doubt have difficulty keeping informed about the implications of many decisions that the college would be making. It would have been far better, I suggest, Mr. Speaker, to have several doctors representing another philosophy and approach to practising medicine in this province, that is doctors from community clinics in the province. This, I feel, would be much more effective than three lay people. It would be much more beneficial in bringing meaningful changes in health services

to the people of this province.

Be that as it may, Mr. Speaker, it is the second principle of the Bill that will have the most serious repercussions, as I see it, for health care in Saskatchewan. This Bill gives virtually total and complete control to the council of the College of Physicians and Surgeons to such an extent that no non-Canadian doctor will come to Saskatchewan after this Bill is proclaimed.

I would like to ask Members of this House what doctor would care to come to Saskatchewan from Great Britain or the United States, for example, knowing that he would have only two years in which to write the LMCC and pass it, or else he would be disallowed to continue practice in Saskatchewan? I am told that the LMCC is equivalent to something of a general final university examination. I ask the professions in this Assembly, the lawyers, the teachers, whoever they may be, what hope they would have of passing a final university examination some five or even ten or twenty years after they had graduated from university? It was easy to pass that exam then, but virtually impossible to pass some five or ten years later. The LMCC must be written in Canada as well and is offered only once a year, in the month of May, I believe. Knowing the busy schedule of practising doctors this situation makes it extremely difficult for them. I maintain that the LMCC should be made available at medical schools throughout the world, perhaps at London, Edinburgh, and American medical colleges as well, so that the graduating doctors would be able to write the LMCC for Canada, if they wish, upon graduation in their own particular college, in their own particular country.

But I have two other very serious concerns. One is that this Bill will cause some rather difficult times ahead for our community clinics which have been the backbone of innovative change and have helped Saskatchewan residents through difficult times in the past. I am concerned that this Bill will cause real problems in rural Saskatchewan as well. I feel, Mr. Speaker, that this legislation discriminates against some 62 per cent of the doctors in rural Saskatchewan today. These dedicated people came to rural Saskatchewan when Canadian and Saskatchewan doctors had shown very little interest. This, I feel, is not fair, and the record speaks for itself. Canadian and Saskatchewan doctors have consistently moved to larger centres, abandoning rural Saskatchewan, because they expect a high standard of living for their wives and children. They want the cultural benefits, the sports benefits, the educational facilities and so on, that the larger centres have to offer.

Given the powers of this Bill and the continued pattern of movement to larger centres, it is very possible that several small hospitals may have to close because our own doctors are not showing an interest in rural Saskatchewan. And this is the fear that I have, Mr. Speaker. This is a fear that I don't hear anyone else voicing in this particular debate.

This Bill gives the College the power to impose limitations and restrictions and conditions with respect to any other doctor and these restrictions can be imposed retroactively. This is a sweeping power, if given to the college, as is proposed in this Bill. This could open the door to unfair practices and tactics that could be aimed at the 62 per cent of our rural doctors. I don't feel that we, in this Assembly, should open the door to that kind of possibility. Such practices, as disallowing a

physician who has been practising in the field for years to continue practising after this Bill is proclaimed, could be dangerous.

Mr. Speaker, I don't accept the statement made by some that standards are in jeopardy at this time. I would like to know how anyone can claim that a doctor graduating from say London or New Delhi, or Edinburgh, or Boston, for that matter, is not as qualified as Canadian or Saskatchewan graduates. I just can't believe that. Doctors are all human; all can and do make mistakes, regardless from where they graduate.

I repeat, Mr. Speaker, this Bill is not without its difficulties. If even one small hospital should have to close in a small town in Saskatchewan in the years ahead because no Saskatchewan or Canadian doctor is interested, each and every one who supports this Bill will have to share the blame. That includes Members on this side of the House as well as Members in the Opposition parties as well. I feel this Bill will not help to curb health costs as suggested by some. It will simply increase the salaries of our city doctors already based in larger centres. The college, by keeping its numbers low, will guarantee larger salaries for its numbers, much to the detriment of health care in rural Saskatchewan. There are not enough doctors in rural Saskatchewan now. And this Bill will do nothing, Mr. Speaker, will do nothing to distribute doctors more equally across the province. Let no one think that this Bill will help that situation one iota.

Mr. Speaker, I would like to inform Members of this House, in case they have some questions about what I am trying to do or what is happening here, that I have received strong endorsement for my stand on this Bill from a very representative group of my constituents. A meeting of approximately 80 people was held in Paynton just last Saturday, which included all members of my executive and other people from other parties as well. A motion was passed at that meeting supporting my opposition to this Bill. There were only three who opposed my particular stand. And so, Mr. Speaker, I have no particular axe to grind with anybody in the Government, but in my honest opinion the Bill is bad for rural Saskatchewan. The Bill gives the College of Physicians and Surgeons total control henceforth and for evermore. And I feel that this Bill presents a real problem for health care in Saskatchewan. My constituency is a rural riding. I have three small hospitals, one larger hospital and a community clinic. I have no option, no alternative but to weigh in my mind seriously what this could do to my constituency. If I expand the same principles to other rural parts in Saskatchewan, I feel that I am right in my assessment of what this Bill may do. And, therefore, Mr. Speaker, I will be voting against Bill 51.

Motion agreed to and Bill read a second time.

The Assembly adjourned at 9:03 o'clock p.m.