

LEGISLATIVE ASSEMBLY OF SASKATCHEWAN
Monday, February 28, 1972

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

QUESTIONS

INCREASE OF LICENCE INSURANCE

Mr. D. G. Stuart (Leader of the Opposition): — Before the Orders of the Day I should like to direct a question to the Attorney General (Mr. Romanow).

According to a Press report on February 10th, the Attorney General made a statement that there would be no increase in the amount of licence insurance for Saskatchewan drivers for private passenger cars and farm trucks. When asked on a television program the other night if in fact there would not be an increase for trucks carrying an R licence, Mr. Romanow said that he didn't know.

Now I have a pamphlet put out by the Treasury Department indicating the charges for the coming year and, it does in fact, indicate that there will be an increase for 1972 model passenger cars of \$10, an increase for class F trucks and class R trucks of \$5.

Now my question is. Did Mr. Romanow know what he was talking about on February 10th when he put out the statement? I believe he did know what he was talking about when he said that he didn't know on the television interview. Has he got the information now and can he inform the House and public at large, which is the truth?

Hon. R. Romanow (Attorney General): — Mr. Speaker, I should like to say first of all, there is a great deal of disappointment in our view in the way the Liberal Opposition has, in particular, by this question being asked, handled this matter.

I want to say to the Leader of the Opposition that there is no general rate increase for auto rates for the licence year 1972-73 except basically in the following categories: motorcycles, U Drives and dealer plates, all of which were set out in the statement that the Leader referred to under date of February 11, 1972 and in the Press conference.

I didn't see the television program, but it appears from the reports that I have received, the issue raised their concerns the rates for the 1972-73 model cars. Members will know that car rates are described by the year of the car. The 1972 and 1973 car is basically a new category, with no comparable category. A rate has to be set having considered all the factors, and as stated, the 1972 and 1973 car insurance rates are as follows: For those under 100 inch wheelbase - \$89, under 120 but over 100 - \$95, and over 120 inches in wheelbase \$104. Now the confusion by some is when they compare this new year category with an entirely different new year category, the top of the line, 1971-72. In my respectful view that comparison

February 28, 1972

cannot be made.

One more important point must be made. This method of striking insurance rates, to my information, Mr. Speaker, is absolutely identical in every respect to that used by the Liberals when they were in government and when the Leader of the Opposition (Mr. Steuart) was the Treasurer of the government. And depending on your point of view, one would quickly see that every year since 1967 – in fact, Mr. Speaker, in 1967 the Liberals generally increased car rates particularly on the older model cars, doing a hardship there – they added increases. I say to the Leader of the Opposition and to the public, exactly the same announcement was made by the Liberals opposite, that there were no increases for the year involved.

Now we adopted this procedure by the Saskatchewan Government Insurance the same way that my friend the Leader of the Opposition has done. We did not object because of the reason that I put to you, that you cannot compare the 1972 and 1973 figures with the top line in the other year figures.

We knew what was going on, the Press knew what was going on, the public knew what was going on. We didn't cry foul because we accepted the principle that you, the Liberal government set in setting the insurance rates. Now all of a sudden the Leader of the Opposition gets up and tries to cry foul on a policy which is basically fair and a policy which has been working since 1957. But I say that the Leader of the Opposition in my view, Saskatchewan Government Insurance and the public of Saskatchewan a great disservice.

Mr. Speaker: — I think the question was a little late and the answer a little late. I think for the Orders of the Day the questions must be just for asking information and the answers much just give information and must not involve debate. I hope that we can ask questions that won't precipitate debate so that we can have the answers and proceed in the proper manner, otherwise a question on the Order Paper, where it can be debated, is the proper method.

Mr. Steuart: — I just asked a very simple question. I am afraid that I didn't get the answer. I should just like to ask a supplementary question.

I have here a pamphlet put out 1971-72 and it says, 1972 cars \$94; for 1972-73 passenger cars 1972, \$104. My simple question is: if that, Mr. Attorney General, isn't a \$10 increase then what is?

Mr. C.P. MacDonald (Milestone): — Mr. Speaker, I would ask a supplementary question. I should like to ask the Attorney General what was the automobile accident insurance reserve as of June 23rd? I remember very clearly, Mr. speaker, that on June 23rd we left that fund in great shape.

Mr. Speaker: — Order, order! I think I have to insist that Members ask for information but don't try to give information. There will be a time later on to give information, I hope.

February 28, 1972

Mr. MacDonald: — Mr. Speaker, the question I have is: what was the amount in the automobile accident insurance fund as of June 23rd? What is the amount there required by law? What is the amount as of January 1st?

Mr. Romanow: — Mr. Speaker, I'll take notice of motion, I believe, as that is the procedure for that question. I don't have the figures with me right now. I will undertake to provide the answer to the Hon. Member if I am given some time.

INTRODUCTION OF VISITORS

Hon. E. Kramer (Minister of Natural Resources): — Mr. Speaker, before the Orders of the Day I should like to introduce some visitors from other parts of Canada, Mr. Speaker. They are seated behind the rail: The Hon. Wilfred Bishop, Minister of Natural Resources from New Brunswick; Mr. McTavish who is Chairman of the Co-ordinators for the Man and Resources (1973) Conference. He works with the Department of Environment under the Hon. Jack Davis; Mr. Christian De Laet Secretary General of the Canadian Council of Resource Ministers. And, of course, you know Mr. Laird, our Resource Chief of Resource Programs of our Department here.

These gentlemen are here today, Mr. Speaker, for an executive meeting of the Canadian Council of Resource Ministers of which I now have the privilege of being chairman. We shall be meeting today in order to plan the Man and Resources Conference which will be held in 1973.

Hon. Members: — Hear, hear!

QUESTIONS

SMALL HOSPITAL CLOSURES

Mr. G.B. Grant (Regina Whitmore Park): — Mr. Speaker, before the Orders of the Day I should like to direct a question to the Minister of Health (Mr. Smishek). In response to a question toward the middle of last year, I think it was, the Hon. Minister indicated that he would review small hospital closures in light of statements that some might be reopened.

Mr. Speaker, I should like him to advise this House if any of these hospitals have been reopened and, if so, which ones and whether any of the boards of the hospitals in question have been advised of the results of his review of the question.

Hon. W. E. Smishek (Minister of Health): — Mr. Speaker, for the information of the House, no hospitals have been closed since our Government took office. There were 11 hospitals that were closed by the former administration and up until now none of them has been opened. Our Department is studying alternative uses, as well as establishing new health services for those communities in which hospitals have been closed. We have met with several of the communities. The communities are being informed and we are trying to work out a program of alternative health services. I might inform the

February 28, 1972

Hon. Members that one of the difficulties that there is in opening some of the hospitals is getting physician services in some of the communities.

Mr. Grant: — Mr. speaker, I don't think the Hon. Member answered the last portion of the question. Have any of the hospital boards been advised of the results of this review and if so which ones?

Mr. Smishek: — Mr. Speaker, we have met with some of the hospital boards, and we have been discussing alternative services. I thought I answered the question.

STATEMENT

CONGRATULATIONS TO OTTO LANG AND WHEAT BOARD

Mr. Steuart: — Mr. Speaker, I am sure the House would like to join with me in congratulating the Hon. Otto Land and the Wheat Board on the tremendous sale of 185 million bushels of wheat worth \$330 million to Russia, which will ensure another record year as far as wheat sales are concerned in the coming crop year.

Some Hon. Members: — Hear, hear!

Hon. A.E. Blakeney (Premier): — Mr. Speaker, I should like to make a brief statement to say that we, indeed, congratulate the Canadian Wheat Board. They have done a splendid job over the last several years. This is yet another indication that the Canadian Wheat Board is doing a splendid job for Canadian farmers.

Hon. Members: — Hear, hear!

ADDRESS-IN-REPLY

Mr. A. Taylor: (Kerrobot-Kindersley) moved, seconded by Mr. E. L. Tchorzewski (Humboldt):

That a humble Address be presented to His Honour the Lieutenant Governor as follows:

To HIS HONOUR THE HONOURABLE STEPHEN WOROBEZ Lieutenant Governor of the
Province of Saskatchewan,

MAY IT PLEASE YOUR HONOUR:

We, Her Majesty's dutiful and loyal subjects, the Legislative Assembly, of the Province of Saskatchewan, in Session assembled, humbly thank Your Honour for the gracious Speech which Your Honour has been pleased to address to us at the opening of the present Session.

He said: Mr. Speaker, in rising to move the Address-in-Reply to His Honour's Speech from the Throne, I am extremely conscious of the great honour and privilege that has been given both to me and to the constituency I have the privilege of representing in this House, the Kerrobot-Kindersley constituency.

February 28, 1972

The people of our constituency are justifiably proud of their area, which contains some of the best farmland in Saskatchewan. We are fortunate in being able to grow a top grade of meat to meet world demand. We raise a good quality of beef cattle in steadily increasing numbers. We are also proud of the recreational facilities available throughout the constituency. We have many fine parks with camping facilities, as well as the usual arenas, curling rinks and swimming pools. We are finding an increasing number of tourists enjoying the facilities which we provide. We have some of the best hunting, particularly for goose and duck, in North America; and every year thousands of hunters from all across Canada and the United States come to our area during the hunting season.

At the same time, our people are very conscious of the need for conservation. They recognize the benefits of tourism, but they also recognize that we must protect our wildlife for future generations. Our people will not be satisfied to accept an easy and quick profit in the present, if it means destroying our wildlife for the future. We are conscious that with good management we can enjoy good hunting and tourism now, without denying future generations the same benefits. The concern of our people for the protection of wildlife was shown just some time ago when six whopping cranes were sighted in our area. We received a good number of phone calls concerning this, and also discovered later that a number of local residents went out to watch over them and make sure the hunters made no mistakes. There was reason for concern, for we have found that we have some hunters that can't tell the difference between a cow and a goose.

Our constituency is also fortunate to include many fine small towns and villages, from Eatonia in the south, known as the prairie oasis; to Kerrobert in the north on the fly-way of the Canada Goose. The town of Kindersley, the largest town in that part of the province, with a population of about 4,000 has become the service centre for a very wide region. They have an active and friendly business community, and a mayor and town council working to bring new industry into the region. We also have in the Kerrobert-Kindersley constituency a fairly substantial oil field which is centered mainly around the industrious town of Coleville and which provides employment and assists the economy of the region.

At this time, Mr. Speaker, I should like to take a moment to congratulate the Member from Prince Albert West (Mr. Steuart) on his election and confirmation as Leader of the Liberal Party.

Some Hon. Members: — Hear, hear!

Mr. Taylor: — I might say that we are happy to see him sitting in his rightful place, on the left of Mr. speaker. We are certain that the Member from Prince Albert West will throw himself into his official role as Leader of the Opposition with the same enthusiasm and vitality he has shown in the past.

I would also like to take this opportunity, Mr. speaker, of congratulating the two men who have recently been appointed Ministers of the Crown, the Member for Souris-Estevan, Kim Thorson, now Minister of the Department of Industry and Commerce; and the Member for Saskatoon-Mayfair, John Brockelbank, now Minister of Public works.

February 28, 1972

Some Hon. Members: — Hear, hear!

Mr. Taylor: — These two men have won the respect of all their colleagues for their ability, their experience and their integrity. I am certain that they will greatly assist the Government in their deliberations, as they seek solutions to the many complex problems affecting our society.

Mr. speaker, I should like to ask the Members now to think with me about the world in which we live. I think that we would all agree that the world is in turmoil. Disquieting conditions exist in literally every part of this globe. I am sure there is no one in this Assembly who is blind to this fact. There are times when we might like to ignore it because it creates a distressing influence in our own lives. There are occasions when it interferes with our pleasure and enjoyment of life itself, but we cannot escape the cold hard reality of the facts.

We have heard much in recent years of the problems of starvation alone. Indeed, we have heard so much that there is a real danger of us becoming hardened to the needs of other people, and yet starvation is a frightening reality in this world of ours. As long ago as 1967, F. R. Strong, Director General of External Aid in Canada, at that time addressing the Empire club said this: "In the next 10 years starvation may claim as many lives as all the wars of history." In that same year, the International Development Services of the United States said, "We thought of the food crisis of the world as being in the future. We have to readjust our thinking – the crisis is here. Hunger is one of the most crucial problems of our time, and time is the crux of the problem of hunger."

This period of history in which we live has been given many names. It has been called the Age of Technology, the Age of Advance, the Age of Scientific Achievement, and the Age of Discovery, along with many more. But, I wonder if when history is written, it might also be called the Age of Starvation. For those of us who live in a comparatively affluent society, it is difficult to grasp that every 10 seconds, about four people on this planet die of hunger. On June 23rd the Montreal Star quoted Gerald Leach on the Second World Food Congress as saying:

It isn't easy to contemplate a picture of the human race plunging into an unprecedented dark age of massive famine, poverty, illiteracy, unemployment and violent social unrest. Yet, unless drastic measures are taken immediately to stem the population flood, increase food production and provide jobs for the swelling hordes of the world's poor, the plunge is bound to come and probably sooner than later.

Some of us have been living under the illusion that things are improving; that they are getting better; that the world is in better shape today than it was some years ago. In fact, I suppose it hurts our pride to think otherwise. And in a certain sense we are probably right. Yet, a United Nations study released in 1970 says this.

It is a tragic fact that at the end of the 1960s, there are more sick, undernourished, and more uneducated children in the world than there were 10 years ago.

February 28, 1972

Unless the international community is prepared to give vastly greater support, the next 10 years will find the number of neglected children increasing by millions, despite all the efforts of developing countries, including endeavours by some to curb population growth.

I mention starvation first, Mr. speaker, because I think we need to recognize the fact that this is one of the basic causes of the tension we now see throughout the world. We who are relatively well fed, find it difficult to understand the basis for much of the unrest around us. We need to realize that much of this unrest is caused by people fighting for their very survival, and for the survival of their children. If my children were hungry and I saw another man with two loaves of bread, I think I would likely try to obtain at least one of them, legally or illegally, by persuasion, or even by force. The people of the world will not for much longer accept the extremes of poverty and affluence, not only between individuals but also between nations.

Nor will short-term, undependable and emergency programs of handouts solve the problem. Somehow, we have to find a longer lasting solution. We much find a new way of distributing the wealth of this planet and that not just in terms of money but also in terms of resources that much be available to all. It is in fact the disparity that now exists and the ever-widening gap between the rich and the poor, whether they be nations of individuals, that leads to the tensions we all feel and we all much fact. There is not a part of this globe that in recent years has not felt the effects of such tension. We can think of the India-Pakistani conflict, Biafra-Nigeria, the race riots in the United States and what is close to civil war in Northern Ireland. Surely it is time we stopped fooling ourselves that if we ignored the problem, eventually it would disappear. I want to suggest, Mr. Speaker, that as long as we continue to emphasize the accumulation of wealth and the motivation of profit, we do little more than fertilize the ground for strife. Conflict and friction will take root and grow.

Cardinal Paul-Emile Leger has said that “the third world is a hungry world, but is perhaps still more a world that suffers.” I want to suggest that it is also increasingly, an angry world, a world which will soon take what some refuse to share. Threat of war itself is, of course, another of the disquieting conditions that we all must face in this world of our. I have mentioned these facts only to emphasize that we stand at a very important point in history. All mankind faces the same crisis and all will share either the fruits of co-operative efforts, or the catastrophe that will be brought about by the continual striving for private or national gain and profit at the expense of others. Nor can we in Canada any longer sit idly back and say, “It can’t happen here.” There was a day when we felt fairly smug and complacent about the security and stability of our society, but this is no longer the case. We have faced the FLQ crisis, riots in many of our cities, disruptions in the life of our universities, and we are experiencing a general discontent and dissatisfaction among the youth of our citizens. The spectre of inflation and the outdated and obsolete answers to this problem to which the present Federal Government seems tied, have been the cause of much of the social unrest and upheaval in our country. The deliberate creation of unemployment in order to protect the so-called economy, and, I would suggest also to protect vested interest, can be described as nothing short of vicious and barbaric. When

February 28, 1972

governments are unwilling or unable to consider new methods and alternatives, it is surely not surprising that there should be an increasing distrust and dissatisfaction among people in general with the actions of the government.

It is just as true that we in Saskatchewan have not been able to avoid many of the difficulties of our society. In recent years we too have had to face the problem of unemployment, and probably even more important to many of us as a province, the problem of low farm income. What we need today, and what people are looking for, is a government that will provide creative and positive leadership in providing programs and policies that will better the conditions of every member of society. Certainly In our country we have the resources, and we have the technical ability to provide adequately for the needs of every citizen. The question is not whether this nation has the wealth but only how that wealth is distributed. We must work to make each man free – not only in the political sense – which is really meaningless unless he is also free in the economic sense. We have frequently heard in recent years, the phrase ‘Just Society’, although not quite so much in the last year or so as we had previously. This is a wonder dream in which I am sure we all share. We all give at least lip service to justice and equality for all. It was a phrase that caught the imagination of the Canadian people, evoking in them a vision of a new kind of society. But we must admit we have seen little evidence of such a society being developed. Instead of building a new and just society, we seem to have been spending time patching up the old. There is a story told of putting a new patch on an old piece of cloth; and a warning that when you do so, it will shrink and tear the cloth. The unrest and upheaval we have already experienced, it seems to me, is evidence that the fabric of society is already being ripped apart. No doubt we can keep the economy rolling – but at what cost? At the cost of unemployment which takes from men their dignity and self-respect, and forces them under our system, to seek charity?

Even our patchwork has only caused the poverty gap to widen, as indeed the rich do get richer and the poor relatively poorer. The percentage of people living at or below the poverty line seems to be steadily increasing. In 1968 for example, the Economic Council of Canada discovered that 29 per cent of our population lived at or below the poverty line, and that line was set at \$4,000 for a family of five or more! We are also, I believe, facing a crisis in education, and that not in terms of costs, as in so often suggested, but in terms of direction and philosophy. We continue to train people for jobs, jobs that may not be there by the time they finish their schooling. What we out to be doing is training them for life and this must include leisure. It seems to me that the elected Members of this Legislature have a responsibility which ought to weigh heavily on their minds. This is not, I suggest, a day for partisan, political wrangling. Rather, it is a time for statesmen who can rise above bigotry and bias. We have a responsibility to work together for the benefit of all people in every part of our great province, and by example for our nation and the world.

We have in the past set just such an example. Certainly in days gone by we have done so by providing some of the most advanced social legislation in North America, legislation which was later adopted, though in some cases under duress, throughout the whole country, such as hospitalisation and medical care insurance. The policies and programs which we as legislators formulate, will have an effect far beyond the borders of our

February 28, 1972

province. This has always been the case, and it is even more so today.

The world in which we live has been described as a global village, and so it is. With modern means of travel and communication, we are all neighbours on this planet. Kenneth Boulding refers to this planet as 'space ship earth'. As he looks at conditions in the world, he claims we are either destroying or using up our life support system. He provides a frightening picture of the future, a picture not pretty to behold. He looks at our pollution and warns that we are so destroying our environment and polluting our atmosphere that within the next generation it will adversely affect our ability to grow and produce food products. Dr. Paul Ehrlich of Stanford University gives his support to this position. He looks at the question of hunger and points out that we cannot feed the people who are already living, yet our population is expected to double within 30 years. It really any wonder that many of our people, young and old alike, are afraid and uncertain of what the future may hold? I personally have been greatly disturbed, in recent years, at the increasing number of young people planning marriage who have said bluntly that they are afraid to bring children into this work, for fear of what they may have to face. This is a said commentary, not on man's ability to use his technology, but on his will and determination to use it intelligently for the benefit of all.

Now, of course, we cannot solve all the problems of the world. We are not magicians, nor gods, nor miracle workers. Nor can we overnight change all of society. What I would suggest, sir, is that it is our responsibility as legislators to lay the foundations for a better society than we have at present. I should like to suggest, Mr. Speaker, that this can only be done by putting aside political animosity. I was happy to read in a recent newspaper report that the Member from Prince Albert West (Mr. Steuart) has already indicated his willingness to do just this, and to support the Government, at least in its defence of the equalization plan. I fully realize that the putting aside of political animosity is a most difficult think for politicians to do. On the other hand, I have taken some time in describing the present conditions of this world, in order to emphasize the need for this kind of thinking. As many of the scientists now tell us, both social and physical scientists, there may not be much time left. I am not suggesting that the Members opposite should ignore principle. I believe that if people have principles, they must live and act by them. I am suggesting, however, that at this point in history, people will rightly hold to account any Member who wastes the time and energy of this House by engaging in debate and tactics which could only be described as efforts to obtain cheap political propaganda or publicity. Citizens of our province will no longer accept this. The time for such useless bickering is over, if it every really existed. There is, and there must continue to be, room for honest differences of opinion, and differing political philosophies. But there is no place, at this crisis point in history, for blind prejudice that has no foundation in fact. This can only take place in men who have stopped thinking and whose minds are closed to new ideas. I should like to call upon the Members of this House to reject intolerance and narrow-mindedness, and to be open to new ideas and suggestions. Let us put aside, once and for all, the petty political bickering which only serves to place this Legislature and the whole democratic system in disrepute; let us rather work together to find the

February 28, 1972

solutions to the many perplexing problems facing society in the last part of the twentieth century. The election is long past and we have a job to do. Now, Mr. Speaker, having pointed out some of the dangers and conditions that exist in society, I want to say that, in my opinion, this Government, under the very able leadership of Allan Blakeney, has worked diligently and with speed to discover solutions to the problems facing our people in this province and they have acted with dispatch to implement the solutions so found. And when problems have developed, as they always will, this Government has moved with proficient speed to solve them. One of the first problems that was faced by the Government when taking office was the immediate plight of many of our farmers. Because of the rising cost of production and lower income from sales many were facing financial difficulty. It was for this reason that The Family Farm Protection Act was presented and passed by the last session of the Legislature. The Government did not pretend that this was either a perfect or a permanent solution to the problems faced by farmers. It was a short-term emergency measure designed to provide immediate and very necessary relief. I suggest to you, sir, that it has provided just this kind of assistance. I could cite to you, sir, cases of farmers whose land and very livelihood was in jeopardy and who have found in this Act, at least a breathing space. The Government was also quick to remove medical deterrent fees which were little more than a tax on the sick and discrimination against the poor. At the same time we removed the medical care premiums for senior citizens, in this, providing them with some immediate financial relief. As a reason for fighting inflation, the Federal Government expressed concern for the plight of those on fixed incomes particularly our pensioners. Its answer was a 42 cent a month increase pension. By removing the medical care insurance premiums, the Government of Saskatchewan has made available to these same citizens, \$36 a year for individuals or \$72 a year for a couple – not 42 cents but \$3. We might also say that many of our senior citizens have both by letter and personal contact expressed their gratitude for this assistance.

We have also provided greater assistance for students attending university, technical schools, or business colleges. In addition to the existing loan plan, we have established a bursary scheme to assist university students who are facing rising costs.

The Leader of the Opposition (Mr. Steuart) has said that we can also take full credit for blocking the Stabilization Bill introduced in the Federal House. We can only, I suppose, be thankful that in some small way we were able to protect our farmers from an Act which failed to take into account one of the most important factors facing our farmers today, the rising costs of production. I am also convinced that it was the defeat of this Bill that finally won for us the two-price system for wheat. Now I notice from a report in one of the newspapers, the Member from Prince Albert West disagrees with this. He is quoted as saying, "The two-price system for wheat was a necessary, well thought out, Liberal program." Well we certainly agree that it was necessary. And its delivery may have been well thought out, for when we consider how long it has been asked for it must have undergone the longest gestation period in history.

Now as we listened to His Honour's Speech from the Throne, we were impressed by the fact that this government is not satisfied with old answers and old ideas. It is indeed placing before us a program which is both practical in its application

February 28, 1972

and creative in its substance, and a program which shows that this government is seriously grappling with the problems and issues facing our society. The Land Bank proposal has already caught the imagination of our people. They look to it both with expectancy and with a sense of urgency. There is a great need both for the protection of our rural communities and our small towns, for just such a program. We need something to help arrest the steady enlargement of farms and the continuous migration from rural to urban centres. The social upheaval experienced by the impact of this on our small towns has been devastation. In the Land Bank, this Government believes that it has found a way to make easier the transfer of farmlands from one generation to the next.

Too often fathers have had to sell their land outside the family to enable them to retire with dignity. At the same time we believe that this program will assist the entry of young men into farming. They will not be required to tie up all their available capital in land purchase. I think too in this regard the Minister of Agriculture (Mr. Messer) is to be commended for the way in which he took this proposal to the people concerned, the farmers of Saskatchewan.

Some Hon. Members: — Hear, hear!

Mr. Taylor: — He went to them not with a ready made plan in detail, but with a general proposal and outline and asked them to help develop a workable plan. Many of us following his example tried to do much the same thing.

In our constituency just a week or so ago we held four Land Bank workshops. The response there was nothing short of astounding. There is no question but what the farmers support the program and look forward to its implementation. They have been both pleased and impressed by the willingness of the Government to consult, them. We should note that this Government has done the same thing with other important questions, such as the kindergarten study, the agricultural committee and so on. There has been a serious attempt, I suggest, to consult the people concerned before decisions were taken.

Some Hon. Members: — Hear, hear!

Mr. Taylor: — This I believe is an important extension of the principle of democracy.

We are pleased to hear that it is the intention of the Government to establish a new Department of Consumer Affairs. It is the responsibility of government to protect the unwary from those who would live off them by unscrupulous means. As the barrage of advertising and gimmickry grows the need for such a Department becomes increasingly clear. It is one thing to get what you pay for but quite another to get less than you were promised. It might also be said that the businessman, salesman and manufacturer, who operates with honesty and integrity has nothing to fear from such a department. It is my hope that in the long run such a department may eventually also be capable of undertaking testing procedures in terms of such things of durability and safety.

February 28, 1972

We are happy to see that this Government intends to take action regarding credit-reporting agencies. In the past it can be said that these agencies literally had the ability and the freedom to ruin the reputation of the people on whom they were reporting, without the person knowing who made the report and in this way having recourse to legal action.

We are equally pleased that a Human Rights commission will be established along with the office of Ombudsman. The Human Rights commission will serve not only to protect the rights of the individual but also to publicize those same rights. There is no reason why we as a society need to accept discrimination in any form whether in employment, accommodation or in any other way on the basis of sex, colour or creed. We recognize that we cannot legislate love or outlaw hate, but it is our responsibility to do everything within our power to make sure that everyone has equal opportunity. It is becoming increasingly evident that there must be a commission to which every citizen has access when he feels that his basic human rights have been violated. I suggest that we in Saskatchewan stand in a unique position. We still have many of our original pioneers who come from many racial backgrounds, we have a good history in this regard and we must make sure it is not lost.

In an increasingly depersonalised society the office of the Ombudsman which has been suggested takes on additional importance. The experience of many countries and provinces has already demonstrated the worth of this position. Here is a man who can stand between the bureaucracy of the system and the people the system was designed to serve. The task of the Ombudsman is to hear grievances, bring them to the attention of the proper person and in every way he can, if the grievance is justifiable, make sure that remedial action is taken.

We are impressed by the timeliness of the legislation which will be presented to establish a Department of the Environment. Apart from the protection of individual freedom and liberty I doubt if there is any issue of greater importance facing civilization today. In my introduction I made reference to the serious dangers threatening humanity from environmental damage and misuse. James Savage put it this way.

During most of man's existence he has been powerless to inflict any serious or lasting damage on the Complex biosphere, the thin life-sustaining mantle for soil, water and air. But with the advent of Modern technology his age of innocence has come to an end.

When we speak of conservation there are many who think in terms only of wildlife or the prevention of soil erosion. Without question these things are important. We must recognize however, that conservation means much more than this, it means the conservation of life itself and our whole life system. While the repair of damage which has already taken place in our environment is of great importance, it must be recognized that remedial action alone is not enough. We must learn to anticipate and take into account the problems before any new technological enterprise is undertaken and not after it is too late. It must be recognized that such a battle – and it is nothing less than this a battle for survival – such a battle will cost us something. The alternatives, however, are vastly more unpleasant and costly in terms of the future. The alternatives are water so contaminated that it becomes a poison, air so polluted that it becomes a danger to health, the atmosphere so contaminated it will affect

February 28, 1972

weather patterns and in turn affect the ability to produce crops. Nor is this particularly far-fetched or even in the distant future. Already there is one city in the world where oxygen is available on some streets like parking meters for citizens overcome by carbon monoxide from cars of the smoke from chimneys. One city on this continent had radio stations issuing bulletins warning parents to allow their children out only every second day because of the dangers from smog. The same city has regular radio alerts which basically warn the people it is unsafe to breath the air.

Up until now we in Canada, and particularly in Saskatchewan, have boasted of our fresh air and clean pure water. We have even tried to say that we have no real pollution problem. It is time to recognize that this is a fallacy. The atmosphere above Los Angeles is our atmosphere, the relatively little pollution we do produce merely adds to what is already there. We may escape the immediate thickness of the smog but we cannot escape the effects of atmospheric pollution on plant and animal life. Before we can tell others to put their house in order, we must make sure that our own house can stand up to inspection. This type of conservation is not something which can be left to individuals or voluntary organizations or even to corporations with good intentions. Nor is it a problem which can be shelved in favour of more important matters. There really are no more important matters, for it is not the raw materials for the use of industry that are now in danger but the raw materials of like itself. Governments around the world have already started to act but the action is still too slow. We are proud that this Government intends to implement action at this time.

We have also been told that legislation will be introduced making great changes in the government's approach to the people of the North. It is our hope that this legislation will give the people of the North at least two things. First we hope that they can be given more responsibility for the development of their own area, the kind that meets their needs. Second, we would hope that it would provide them with a means of feeling that they were a part of, and in closer touch with, the Government of our Province.

In the field of health the Speech from the Throne indicates that the Government intends to introduce legislation which will make it possible for chiropractic care to be included as an insured service.

Some Hon. Members: — Hear, hear!

Mr. Taylor: — This is a step we have reason to believe will be welcomed both by the citizens of the province and by the chiropractors themselves.

We are also encouraged to hear that the Government is investigating methods of making available drugs and hearing aids at greatly reduced costs.

In the field of welfare it is reassuring to hear that the Government intends to increase the ratio of welfare staff to clients. There is great need for such action. In many cases the present staff is physically unable to provide the kind of counselling and assistance that is really needed. If the members of the staff had more time and could provide a greater

February 28, 1972

degree of personal attention, they would then be in a position to provide more assistance to their clients, not in terms of money alone, but also in terms of helping them to find other desirable alternatives.

We are happy to see reference to the small businessman, for he needs assistance to meet the competition of the large corporations. He is at an unfair disadvantage when you consider the research, legal, advertising and other facilities that are at the disposal of the giant chains. If our friends across the way are really as concerned about free enterprise as they claim to be, I feel certain that we can count on their support for this kind of legislation. The small independent businessman must be assisted if there is to be any real and free competition in the market place.

Some Hon. Members: — Hear, hear!

Mr. Taylor: — In the last few years the small businessman has found himself fighting for his continued existence, as farming income dropped and the local merchant found his sales slumping. At the same time the merchant found it much more difficult to collect outstanding accounts, even those accounts which had been fairly fluid in the past became static, since many farmers just couldn't meet all their commitments. Some assistance for the local merchant was provided in the Family Farm Protection Act. Some farmers took advantage of this act to meet their local commitments. If the small businessman is to survive however some way must be found of providing the kind of assistance he needs. This is of particular importance in our small towns where the loss of even one more business adversely affects the whole community.

It is evident in the Speech from the Throne that this Government will emphasize in its program human values and social responsibilities. It is obvious that the people and their needs will be the motivating factor behind all the legislation presented. Mr. speaker, in a day when so many complex problems and difficulties confront us, both perplexing and disturbing, it is encouraging to note that the Throne Speech expresses pride and confidence in our people.

Some Hon. Members: — Hear, hear!

Mr. Taylor: — It indicates the ability of this Government to provide the kind of leadership we need at this time. It provides a new sense of direction and purpose in our life. It shows confidence in the ability of our people to deal constructively with the challenges of our day. This government in the Throne Speech has clearly indicated its priorities. It has shown a recognition of the problems facing our society and people and is willing to meet the challenges of a new age. The Speech from the Throne charts a course which will set a new direction for our province, a direction towards new social justice, and which provides a new hope for the future. I am therefore very pleased, Mr. Speaker, to move, seconded by the Member from Humboldt that an Humble Address be presented to His Honour the Lieutenant Governor.

Some Hon. Members: — Hear, hear!

Mr. E.L. Tchorzewski (Humboldt): — Mr. Speaker, as I rise to

February 28, 1972

Speak in this debate I am deeply honoured and gratified to be given this opportunity to second the Address-in-Reply to the Speech from the Throne. It is an honour for the people of Humboldt constituency to have their Member given this opportunity. I want at this time to thank our Premier on behalf of my constituents.

Before proceeding to discuss matters regarding the speech from the Throne, Mr. Speaker, may I first congratulate the two newly elected Members to this Legislature, the Hon. Member from Souris-Estevan (Mr. Thorson) and the Hon. Member from Morse (Mr. Wiebe).

Some Hon. Members: — Hear, hear!

Mr. Tchorzewski: — I congratulate them for being chosen by the people of their constituencies to represent them in this House. They have been entrusted with great confidence and responsibility and I wish them well in carrying out their duties as MLAs and I know that they will find their work interesting and rewarding. Also at this time, Mr. Speaker, I should like to congratulate the Hon. John Brockelbank and the Hon. Kim Thorson on their appointments to the Cabinet.

Some Hon. Members: — Hear, hear!

Mr. Tchorzewski: — I am sure that their wisdom, their capabilities and energy will be a great asset to the government of Saskatchewan and that each will make a significant contribution.

Mr. Speaker, during the special Session of 1971 it was sometimes difficult to determine who the Leader of the Opposition was, but as all things sooner or later come to any end, the great race is now over and I sincerely congratulate the Hon. Member from Prince Albert West (Mr. Steuart) on being chosen by his Party to be their leader. My sincere hope is that his understanding of the purpose of an Opposition in our democratic parliamentary system will be of benefit to this Assembly.

In speaking in this debate, Mr. Speaker, I have a deep pride in doing so as a Member for Humboldt constituency. My wife and I came to my constituency in 1965 as teachers and it did not take us long to decide that this was the place where we wanted to make our home.

If I may, Mr. speaker, at this time draw the attention of the Members of this House to a group of 78 students from St. Augustine School in Humboldt, They are accompanied by their teachers, Mrs. Fenwick and Mrs. Hergott.

Hon. Members: — Hear, hear!

Mr. Tchorzewski: — It is a particular pleasure for me, Mr. Speaker, to introduce these students, for they are the group of students which I have had the privilege of working with prior to the opening of this Session. I am sure that all Members are going to join with me in saying how pleased we are to have them here today and we hope that their trip will be an exciting one, an enjoyable one and an informative one.

Hon. Members: — Hear, hear!

February 28, 1972

Mr. Tchorzewski: — Mr. Speaker, I found in the Humboldt area a fairly dense rural population. The farm family operations in my constituency for the most part have always remained diversified; with hard work, with determination and good management the farm people of Humboldt constituency have retained their family farms. They are determined to continue to maintain their family farms in this rural community. These rural people throughout Saskatchewan value their rural way of life and they are proud of their rural communities. I am very pleased that our Government is going to bring in legislation to help renew rural Saskatchewan and begin rural community renewal.

Some Hon. Members: — Hear, hear!

Mr. Tchorzewski: — Besides being a major agricultural region in Saskatchewan, Mr. Speaker, Humboldt constituency also has several important industries proving that it is not essential that all our industry be located in only our larger cities. We have small manufacturing industries but important manufacturing industries in places like Annaheim, Engelfeld, St. Gregor and Humboldt which contribute a great deal by providing employment for a good number of people.

My constituency can boast of excellent facilities for recreation for people of all ages. Waldsea Lake and Lucien Lake Regional Parks are great assets to this part of Saskatchewan, and in recent months Leroy Leisureland has been taken into the Regional Park system after the people of Leroy and district put considerable amount of time, effort and their own money into developing a park, a golf course, a ball park and swimming pool complex.

And while speaking on recreation, Mr. Speaker, I believe that credit and recognition should be given to the many young people who worked during this past summer, not only in Humboldt constituency, but all over Saskatchewan, on worthwhile projects that provided recreation facilities such as the park and swimming pool at Muenster.

This Government recognizes the importance of youth, the importance of culture and recreation and, therefore, will be establishing a new Department of Culture and Youth to co-ordinate and advance these aspects of our community life.

Recreation is of growing importance in today's society. More and more people are having increasing leisure time. The demand for recreational opportunities is growing and we must be prepared to help provide it. It is not enough only to say that attempts must be made to make it possible for young people to start farming. Rural communities will have to provide some of the opportunities which people expect in today's world.

In all the efforts to provide these opportunities it must be remembered that recreation needs to be provided for all people, not only young people. There is a need for recreation opportunities and facilities for young people and for older people as well.

In our towns, for the most part today, we have very good programming for boys, but there is often a lack of programs for girls. Culture and recreation programs and opportunities need to be provided for all citizens, Mr. Speaker, for all ages

February 28, 1972

for both sexes and for people in all walks of life.

These facilities and opportunities may be provided but the building must go deeper than that. Our educational system must change. It must not concentrate solely on content in subject areas but it must put more stress in the development of people with the ability to think. Education must prepare students to live as individuals in a society of many individuals. Students must be taught to be open minded, constructively and objectively critical, but yet understanding of others. And with these students, Mr. Speaker, schools must teach our young people to make good use of their increased leisure time.

Recreation is important and I am pleased that many communities are taking serious action in this field. Our Government recognizes the need in this aspect of today's society.

The town of Humboldt, which is the largest centre in my constituency, is a modern town with excellent services and conveniences. It is one of the rare towns of its size that can boast of a Junior "A" hockey team, which finished incidentally, in first place in the Saskatchewan Junior Hockey League this year. An energetic group of people representing many organizations in our community is presently working hard at raising funds for a closed-in swimming pool. May I say that action taken by this Government in matching in grants the amount of the money, the amount of the forgiven loan under the Federal Employments Loan Program is helping to make this kind of a program possible.

This kind of community spirit exists in all the communities. I believe that if the Homecoming celebrations of the past year proved anything, they proved that the people of Saskatchewan are proud of their rural communities and that they are determined to develop them. One only had to attend the celebrations at Pilger and St. Brieux and Lake Lenore and all the other communities which I have mentioned and many, many other communities in Saskatchewan to feel the enthusiasm and become caught up in it. This spirit and determination was especially exemplified in the village of St. Gregor, which was awarded third place this year in the Homecoming community-of-the-year.

On June 23rd last, the people of all such communities in Saskatchewan spoke up with a resounding voice when the present Government of this Province was elected with 45 seats. The people of Saskatchewan said that the Federal and Provincial Governments of that day had failed, that they had failed miserably in even attempting to stop rural depopulation and rural community destruction.

Mr. Speaker, of all economic activity in Canada 42.2 per cent is generated by farmers. In Saskatchewan about 80 per cent of economic activity is generated by farmers. Nearly one-half of Canada's business activity is still based on supplying goods and services to farmers. As farm income drops, so do farm purchases. Business in towns and villages falls off and many country businesses close.

Between 1969 and 1970 average farmer's take home pay dropped by \$611 and in those same years total farm income dropped in Canada \$165,000,000.

There was an immediate effect on small business in Saskatchewan. Retail sales dropped 8.31 per cent in 1969 and there

February 28, 1972

was a decrease in similar proportions in 1970. Many places of business closed their doors and boarded up their windows. Many rural communities were in danger of becoming empty places and in fact some did.

There was a need for real positive action by government working with people to bring about some adjustment. There was a desperate need for a shot in the arm of our farm economy, and yet nothing happened. At a time when there was a need for level-headed, rational thinking, Mr. speaker, all Saskatchewan people got was false optimism, which unfortunately at times has been useful to some politicians. In the mid-1960s the Federal Government was still telling farmers, "grow all the wheat you can, we are going to sell it for you", and in the last 1960s Prime Minister Trudeau was going across Saskatchewan, saying "sell your own wheat." And after farm people of Saskatchewan took the advice of some of the people they had elected they found that sales had dropped, found that surpluses had developed and they found that the bottom had fallen out of income. And all that government could provide for an answer was a LIFT Program in 1970, which did nothing more than lift more people off their farms and out of the rural communities. All they had to do, Mr. Speaker, was to go out to the people of Saskatchewan and ask them if a LIFT Program was the answer and they would have found out that the resounding answer would have been No. After they had obviously considered this, when it was too late, in 1971 they took up the Prairie Grain Stabilization concept, which was being suggested by farm groups.

This act, Mr. Speaker, was inadequate and in the long run would have caused irreparable harm to our agricultural community. The Government of Saskatchewan, farm organizations and individuals attempted to convince the Federal Government that many changes needed to be made to the Stabilization Bill in order to bring it in line with the objectives of the farmers.

The Stabilization Bill provided no minimum price guarantee. The fact that it was going to involve income calculations, calculated over a five year average with no minimum guarantee, could have led to a situation where several consecutive bad years would have resulted in the average income used to determine whether payment should be made, could be so low that even with payments, farm income would have been almost nothing.

This the present Members of the Opposition, Mr. Speaker, supported. In reality they were supporting the removal of thousands of farms in Western Canada. In reality, Mr. Speaker, they were supporting the Task Force Report which recommends the removal of two-thirds of our farms.

We could not accept this and so this Government suggested important changes to the Bill, along with the Pool, and the Farmers Union, National Farmers Union and others, but the Minister in Charge of the Canadian Wheat Board, and the Federal Government stubbornly refused to budge and it stood firm. It even tried to threaten the voters of Assiniboia into accepting that totally inadequate bill. But those voters, Mr. Speaker, speaking for Saskatchewan farmers said that they wanted something that was going to be of meaningful help.

Mr. speaker, governments of today must be flexible. They should not, and they cannot force legislation which is unacceptable upon people who will be affected by it.

February 28, 1972

The principle of stabilization of grains income is a good one. We do not disagree with the principle of the Stabilization Plan, it is a good concept. We only disagree with the plan presented by Mr. Lang, because it would not have solved the farmers' problem. It guaranteed no minimum price or income; it did not consider increasing costs due to inflation; it guaranteed nothing other than keeping family farms in a state of perpetual poverty, leading to a gradual, if not rapid, takeover by corporate land barons.

The Stabilization of Grains Income is necessary and the Federal Government is being encouraged to act on it. In that Stabilization Bill as suggested in the debate on Friday, there should be a total minimum grains income set at \$1.1 billion with some consideration given to the increasing costs. Payouts would be made when gross grain receipts fall below this guaranteed minimum.

Now I don't propose, Mr. Speaker, in the debates in this House, to be critical and only critical. The Hon. Member from Kerrobert-Kindersley (Mr. Taylor) has indicated, we have to work together on many items and agree when we feel on principle we must disagree and agree on things that are to the common good. So at this time I should like to go on record as saying that the announcement of the two-price system is very welcome. This is something that Western farmers have been urging for two decades. It is a move into one of the major problem areas in agriculture – that of insufficient income.

But I must hasten to say that in welcoming this two-price system, it would be folly to suggest by this that all farm problems will be solved. This action is merely a small part of what needs to be done.

Western Canadian agriculture needs more than band-aids at election time. There is a need for an overall program. The transportation system must be improved in ways that will prevent the kind of hopeless situation we have seen this winter. A good stabilization of farm income is needed. Improvement in storage cleaning and loading facilities is needed. Aggressive sales by the Canadian Wheat Board must be constantly carried out, and Canada must be prepared to trade more with those nations that buy our wheat.

Now this whole story of agriculture and its almost total neglect by the Federal government is a sad reflection on the way that governments have operated in the past and it shows the need for some change in the whole process of government.

Government must stop ignoring problems for three years and acting only in election years. The two-price system is a welcome move, but where was such action in 1969 and 1970 when farmers were in their greatest hour of need? Why did it have to wait until election year? Why must people be starved in off-election years and feasted in election years?

But as I ask these questions, Mr. Speaker, there is a glimmer of hope in all this. When one reflects on the fact that the voters of Assiniboia were able to force the Federal Government to re-examine the Stabilization Bill and to initiate a more realistic two-price system the fact does come out that the electorate does have the power that it must have. And hopefully politicians and political parties will more and more learn that this is so.

February 28, 1972

Mr. Speaker, farm income and rising costs are a major problem area in agriculture today, but there is another that needs attention and that is the one of land transfer.

I am pleased that this government will be proposing legislation to help transfer land from one generation to another.

We are confronted with two alternatives. One is that corporations will buy up our farm lands, or secondly, providing legislation such as the establishment of the Land Bank to ease the transfer of farm land from one generation to another and to the transfer of farm land from one generation to another and to facilitate the entry of young people into farming. Corporate farming is totally unacceptable. It is totally unacceptable because it would most certainly destroy Saskatchewan. Corporate farming would see large outfits moving in during spring seeding. They would bring their own equipment, they would bring their own fuel and they would even bring truckloads of the necessary parts for repair. They would buy very little in the community and contribute nothing. And all income that might accrue out of the farming operation would leave this province. This is unacceptable, Mr. Speaker, and unless it is stemmed it will be disastrous for Saskatchewan.

This Government is prepared to act and provide a meaningful alternative with the Land Bank. We believe in rural Saskatchewan, we are committed to rural renewal and we are acting on our commitment.

This Session will see many other moves in the field of agriculture. The constituency of Humboldt is an area where farmers have always diversified, as I have said previously. The extension of the Livestock Loans Guarantee Act and the program to assist in the construction of veterinary clinics will be very welcome.

Small businessmen are also faced with very serious problems. As I mentioned earlier when agriculture in Saskatchewan suffers setbacks the small businessmen in our small towns and villages is affected at the same time. It has been a frightening sight to me and I am sure to everyone in Saskatchewan and to any Member of this House who has travelled through Saskatchewan to see many of our implement dealers and other small businesses close their doors during the past several years.

It seems that over the years the small businessman has been somewhat ignored yet over the years he has been finding it difficult to exist. Just as the farmer and the worker and the professional people have carried the greatest burden of taxation so has the small businessman. The recent tax reform of the Federal government has not resolved this situation. In the taxation field serious inequities apply to different forms of business, and I am sure that Members on the opposite side of the House will even accept these figures as they come from an authority whom they should recognize, Mr. Eric Kierans, a former Cabinet Minister in the Federal government. He has stated that over the last ten years, Mr. speaker, the retail merchants have paid taxes on 90 per cent of their book profits. Wholesalers have paid on 87 per cent of their book profits. Construction firms on 67 per cent of their book profits. Manufacturers on 65 per cent of their book profits. Mining Companies, Mr. Speaker, on 13 per cent of their book profits and yet they are given more exemptions. Oil and gas companies have paid taxes on only 5.7 per cent of their book profits.

February 28, 1972

The problems created by this kind of inequity in taxation have been compounded by the recent depressed economic situation in rural Saskatchewan. Small businessmen of Saskatchewan are asking for a better deal and His Honour's Speech from the Throne has made mention of welcome legislation which will be introduced to provide new services and financial assistance to merchants and business concerns.

There are many problems of small business that need consideration and I am confident that small businessmen and this Government, working together, will be able to arrive at other solutions that will be worthwhile and lasting.

I am hopeful that the program of financial assistance will provide an opportunity for small businessmen to consolidate debts and to improve or expand their businesses.

Mr. Speaker, during the campaign of June 1971, one of the most important issues was the need for independent electoral boundaries. And I am very pleased to be able to make a comment on legislation which will be brought in to remove the fixing of constituency boundaries from the influence of partisan politics. The destiny of any nation will be determined by the political process. This process must be allowed to function freely with process. This process must be allowed to function freely without interference by unscrupulous politicians or political parties who may become more concerned about their power than their responsibilities to the people that they represent. History has proven time and time again that when changes are needed be those changes political, or be those changes economic, or be those changes social, they eventually came about in spite of restrictions that may be imposed by those who interfere with the democratic political process. We must guard jealously the rights of people to exercise their votes freely and without interference. If these rights are taken away then needed changes may take longer to come about, but usually they do come about. If they cannot come about by the democratic process, Mr. Speaker, then they do come about by force. And Northern Ireland and nations in Africa and south America are today's witness to this. We must never allow this country of ours to get mired in that kind of a situation. Changes brought by the gun, Mr. Speaker, lead to greater problems, but when people cannot have the power to govern themselves they will get that power even if they have to use the gun. This does not always bring desirable results because the final result usually is that power falls into the hands of those with the biggest guns.

For these reasons the right of the vote must be cherished by any democratic nation. Political parties must be honest, they must be sincere and sensitive to people. And a political party should go to the people during an election campaign with a philosophy, a program and a platform. Its candidates should be expected to go out and articulate that platform. And any political party that doesn't have the courage to do this in fair electoral boundaries doesn't deserve the consideration of the electorate. And any political party that doesn't have the courage to do this in fair electoral boundaries cannot be trusted with the responsibilities of government.

Experience has shown that there have been such governments, Mr. Speaker. There have been governments which took two, three or four polls from one constituency and added them to another in the hope that they could save one seat for themselves. There has been a government that was so barren of new ideas, that had failed so miserably in its years as a government that its

February 28, 1972

Members gerrymandered constituencies so drastically that some constituencies held by its members had as few as 4,500 voters while constituencies held by the Opposition Members of that time had as many as 15,000 voters. Yes, there was such a government even in Saskatchewan. Such a government that had no respect at all for the democratic rights of people. But the people of Saskatchewan were to have no part of it and now that government sits on the Opposition with only 15 Members.

Mr. Speaker, this Government has a great task ahead. We must bring back sensitivity and understanding to what many people consider has become a cold machine like institution. We must restore the faith of people in government and this is being done and will continue to be done. The government must go out to the people and consult them. It must move out of the offices of this Legislature from time to time and hear from people their views, their opinions and their wishes.

I congratulate the committees on Liquor Regulations and Agriculture for their work in meeting with people throughout Saskatchewan. The Hon. Minister of Agriculture (Mr. Messer) should be commended for his efforts in presenting a Land Bank proposal to the People of Saskatchewan and find out from farm people their views on this outstanding proposed legislation.

Every Member of this House, Mr. Speaker, is faced with a great responsibility. Because no longer can an MLA expect to be elected and rest on his laurels until the next election, His work must extend beyond this House. It must extend among the people of his constituency, he must work among his constituents all year, every year and not only every four years. He must understand and he must make himself understood. As the work of Members of this Legislature is becoming more and more demanding, and so it should, Members will have to consider becoming full time representatives of their constituents. If our parliamentary institutions are to work, we must, in fact, have a responsible government comprising the best possible people we can elect. People who will speak up and people who will back governments when they are right and oppose when they are wrong, keep in touch with their constituents, speak up for them and breathe humanism into the impersonal structures of government.

With Independent electoral boundaries people will be given the freedom to judge the government on its record.

Individual rights and civil liberties are very important fundamental rights of our democratic society. Unfortunately, Mr. Speaker, these rights have not always been respected or upheld. Mankind must become mature enough and all members of our society must learn to accept the fact that all men were created equal.

No man should be judged by his colour, religion or his ethnic origin and yet I cannot be convinced that this is the way it is. And too often only lip service is given to the individual rights and the equality of man, while in practice, job opportunities and other opportunities have not been equally available to all people.

This inequality has also applied to women who have too often been expected to work on jobs the same as men for less pay than men. This kind of discrimination must be done away with.

And legislation which will be introduced to establish a

February 28, 1972

Human Rights Commission, which will help protect and enhance individual rights and civil liberties will be welcomed.

And to further enhance the rights of people and provide them with easy access to information from Government agencies, the Lieutenant Governor indicated in his speech that an information and referral centre will be established, with toll-free telephone service from any point in Saskatchewan. Government is very complex today and will likely become even more so. It is often difficult for persons to know which agencies they must deal with when confronted with problems or needs.

The complexity of government today has created the need for somewhere for citizens to go when they feel that they have been unjustly dealt with by a government agency or department. The provision of an Ombudsman will provide this opportunity.

Education, too, Mr. speaker, needs major changes and the Throne Speech indicated that the Government is prepared to act in this regard.

The restrictive 25 to 1 pupil-teacher ratio has been eliminated and has helped to relieve some of the hardship that has been created. I must say that there is yet a great deal more to be done.

For a number of years the realization that each child is different has been recognized. But unfortunately not enough has been done to provide the kind of facilities and the equipment and staffing to effectively work with individual differences.

In recent years the imposition of the 25 to 1 ratio has seriously hindered individualized instruction. School boards were forced to cut back staff because the Department of Education refused to provide grants. The result was that many classrooms did not have 25 students, Mr. Speaker, they had 30 students, and 35 students and 40 students. And a teacher given 40 minutes in a classroom of 30 students has something in the area of 1.3 minutes per student. And individual differences could not help but be ignored in spite of the efforts of most dedicated teachers.

Under the threat of loss of grants, Mr. Speaker, school boards were forced to make cutbacks on the type of teachers and the other staff that are absolutely essential in today's schools. Librarians were let go or were not hired. Guidance counsellors were not hired. Teachers of physical education, music and art were in many cases not hired. Many Saskatchewan schools were rapidly going back to the teaching of subject content only and the development of the whole child was beginning to be neglected.

With the abolishing of the ration and with the new freedom given for local people to plan for themselves what is needed in their schools, Mr. Speaker, hopefully education will begin to do what it should – develop people who can make a contribution to society in ways other than only those measured by the gross national product and by economics. Education must do more than turn out little units on an assembly line, little boxes on an assembly line made to fit into slots in our corporate economic system.

Because education is a continuing process the creation of community colleges is a very important development. I have

February 28, 1972

always said to students that education does not stop when the door closes behind them after graduation. Every day is an education. People want more and more to have access to continuing education. The rapid changes in society which lead to the elimination of jobs have created the need for community colleges where people can have classes that are on demand by the people of a community. The creation of community colleges run by the people of the community will provide these opportunities.

Mr. Speaker, because the Speech from the Throne draws attention to legislation to be presented which covers many areas of needed programs and changes in Saskatchewan; because it recognizes the problems in rural Saskatchewan; because it stresses the basic elements of individual freedom and dignity, it is my particular pleasure to second the Address-in-Reply to the Speech from the Throne.

Some Hon. Members: — Hear, hear!

Mr. A.R. Guy (Athabasca): — Mr. Speaker, at the outset of my remarks, may I, since this being my first opportunity, congratulate you, sir, on your appointment to the high office of speaker. Your previous experience in that honoured position along with your many years in this Legislature will no doubt assist you in maintaining order in this House and making unbiased decisions when that is required. I should like also, to congratulate my colleague, the Leader of the Opposition (Mr. Steuart) for his election as Leader of the Party. Under his leadership I am sure that her Majesty's Loyal Opposition will make a major contribution to the affairs of this province. To all the MLAs on both sides of the House, may I extend congratulations on your election last June 23rd and also to the Members from Morse (Mr. Wiebe) and from Souris-Estevan (Mr. Thorson) for their by-election successes last November. I certainly speak for all Members on this side when I say we welcome the Member from Morse as our colleague. Our prior association with him leads us to believe that he will make a major contribution to his constituency and to his province in the years ahead. I hope I speak for all Members on the Government side of the House as well when I say that we were pleased to see the member for Souris-Estevan appointed to the Cabinet so soon after his election. To the mover and seconder of the motion, may I say that while I cannot agree with all your content, I certainly can commend you for your preparation and delivery. I think we all agree that we must be concerned with the events that are occurring in the world today, both internationally and nationally, but I am sure that your constituents who had the opportunity to listen to you on the radio would have been much more appreciative if you'd shown concern for what was going on in the province today instead of wandering far and wide.

However, when one reviews the Throne Speech, it is no wonder that you find very little on which to comment in a favourable manner in that particular document. Mr. Speaker, I would also say that I appreciate the opportunity to participate in the Throne Speech Debate, in spite of the concentrated attempts by the government and my defeated NDP candidate to prevent me. I appreciate the many letters of support which I have received since last June from supporters of all political parties in my constituency. They have no objection to action under the Controverted Elections Act, but they were concerned with the Government's decision to appeal the recount last fall, when the final

February 28, 1972

count made it only too obvious the only reason for the appeal was to prevent the Athabasca constituency from being represented in the Special Session.

My constituents are also deeply angered at some of the tactics of the NDP candidate that he used during and after the election campaign. My constituents do not support in principle any attempt by any political party, to disenfranchise any person because of racial origin, economic considerations, or other circumstances created by the unique situation that exists in such a widespread constituency, and they intend to ask, through their Member, that this Legislature review The election Act to see that any restriction of this kind is removed.

Mr. Blakeney: — Not again!

Mr. Guy: — It is all right for the Premier to sit there and make comments, after all he was one of the instigators of what has gone on. Besides my remarks are not directed to him but to the Attorney General (Mr. Romanow). And since the election result is still under consideration by the Courts, I hope that perhaps he will be gracious enough, even though he may not received any support from his Premier, to sit down some day and discuss some of these problems that not only affect my particular constituency but many of the other northern ones. And I am not saying this because it affects me particularly, but I am saying it because we believe on this side of the House, that there should be fair play in regard to the election of members. However, Mr. Speaker, there was one action that shocked and angered my constituents more than anything else, when it was uncovered during the recount, and that was the deliberate practice by the NDP of using ineligible voters for their scrutineers. No one could believe that the Premier would condone the sending of people into that constituency having the business manager and the NDP candidate sign documents that they were entitled to vote and to act as their scrutineers, and then, a few weeks later sign a similar document saying that they were not entitled to vote, and should be used to try and overthrow the election.

This is an action, Mr. Premier, that will return to haunt you because they will condemn this as being dishonest, illegal and completely reprehensible, and I would suggest that in any future election, the people of Athabasca will make that clear in no uncertain terms.

Now, Mr. Speaker, the people of Saskatchewan have not forgotten, I am sure, that the theme of the election campaign by the NDP was a "New Deal for People". I should like this afternoon, to review briefly who have been the main recipients of this New Deal to date.

The first recipient of the New Deal was of course, Premier Blakeney and in view of the people's choice, I should indeed be ill mannered not to congratulate him on his overwhelming victory, which placed 45 extremely ambitious Members snapping at his ankles or higher as the case may be.

As an additional compensation, he received a long sleek black Chrysler as his personal automobile which was somewhat embarrassing for him since he had always spoken so disparagingly about the taxpayers of this province providing such a vehicle for anybody, including the Premier or anyone else. But our new

February 28, 1972

Premier didn't want to give up his Chrysler but he also didn't want the people to see that he was becoming addicted to the symbols of a capitalist way of life. However, he rose to the situation with his usual aplomb. First of all he removed number one and substituted a six number licence plate. And then for the first few months, where did he park it? He parked it out behind the building so his supporters and people of the province wouldn't see that he was driving a big sleek Chrysler. This was a New Deal for the Premier but he didn't think it would be such a New Deal for his supporters.

Some Hon. Members: — Hear, hear!

Mr. Guy: — Now, the next problem the Premier had to face was which of his 45 Members he was going to share the New Deal as Members of the Executive Council with. I think it must be generally conceded that his choice of Ministers was reasonable when one considers the number lined up for the appointment and the number who promised during the campaign that they would be a Cabinet Minister if Mr. Blakeney were to win. I think particularly of my Member, my MLA, the Member from Regina Wascana (Mr. Baker) and former Mayor, who confidentially told 10,000 people during the campaign that he would be the new Provincial Treasurer.

Some Hon. Members: — Hear, hear!

Mr. Guy: — Now, I must admit that I was disappointed as I am sure he was when he was overlooked not only for the Cabinet position but also for a Legislative Secretary position. And I have heard that since the election he calls the New Deal for People a bad deal for Baker.

Some Hon. Members: — Hear, hear!

Mr. Guy: — Now, the new Ministers, of course, must be considered recipients of the New Deal in view of the increase in living and travelling expenses which they approved for themselves immediately upon taking office.

For those Members of the former NDP Cabinet who were ignored, those with the seniority and those with Waffle tendencies, who were bypassed for younger and less experienced Members, this was not such a New Deal. But perhaps if you had had no pride and thrown a tantrum, threatened to quit, walked out of caucus like the Member from The Battlefords (Mr. Kramer), the Premier would have taken pity on you as he did on him. Not only is he in the Cabinet, but he is also driving again as I understand.

An Hon. Member: — Flying too!

Mr. Guy: — Flying too, is he? I heard that he did quite a bit of flying even before.

One group that must be considered as recipients of the New Deal for People are the Legislative Secretaries whom the Premier appointed. This is particularly true when one considers how opposed the Premier and other Members of the Opposition were in 1965 when the Act to appoint them was first passed by the Liberal Government. Unfortunately, for the Liberal Government, all the

February 28, 1972

dire prognostications made by the NDP Opposition at that time came true and it was not a successful experiment. This was borne out by the fact that the former Government did not appoint any more Legislative Secretaries after 1967. After a trial period it became only too obvious that the criticism of the then Leader of the Opposition and his MLAs was valid and that there was no need, no value to the Province in having Legislative Secretaries appointed.

Perhaps we should review for the new Members and even for the old Member from Redberry (Mr. Michayluk) what was said on that occasion. Mr. Blakeney said, "My submission is that they have no useful role in this Chamber."

Some Hon. Members: — Hear, hear!

Mr. Guy: — Then, with unbelievable insight, Mr. Blakeney said:

It appears obvious that their function will be to carry out political duties of their Ministers, and the people of Saskatchewan should not be called upon to pay the salary modest and expenses not so modest. I believe sincerely that there is no justification for having Secretaries.

Now, it is hard to believe, Mr. Speaker, that a man with such strong views just a few short years ago should appoint Legislative Secretaries today and subsequently raise their expense allowance when he complained earlier that their expenses were not so modest and on a retroactive basis as well. But what was even worse was that he would take one of these political hacks for himself.

Now, Walter Smishek, the Minister of Health, has Mr. Richards as his Secretary and he said in 1965, "The government should not bring in Legislative Assistants to be nothing but ribbon cutters and political organizers."

Some Hon. Members: — Hear, hear!

Mr. Guy: — I wonder if the Member for Canora (Mr. Matsalla) is here this afternoon. There are so many back there I can't keep them sorted out. Anyway, if he is here, I wonder if he agrees with his Minister, the Hon. Minister of Municipal Affairs (Mr. Wood) who in 1965 said:

Legislative Secretaries are square pegs in round holes. They have no value unless it is as ribbon cutters and doing political chores for the Minister.

Now, These comments are strange from a man who was to have not one but two Legislative Secretaries for several months last fall. The Minister of Municipal Affairs had a secretary for Municipal affairs and he had another one for Public Works. Even that didn't keep them out of the mess that they are in, in both of those Departments.

Now, the Minister of Welfare and Labour (Mr. Snyder) — I am sorry that he is not in his seat, because he deserves to be commended for refusing to have a Legislative Secretary, because he said in 1965:

February 28, 1972

A minister should have only one portfolio, two is too many.

We'll agree with that.

Then we won't need to appoint political hacks doing political work.

The same Minister said:

Pay your organizers and stand up and be counted. Let us not have back door methods. Appoint Cabinet Ministers for Cabinet Minister's jobs and political organizers for political organizer jobs.

Mr. Speaker, we in the Opposition could not agree more with those sentiments and we hope that he will give his Premier and colleagues the same advice.

Now, we also agree with the comments of Mr. Whelan – and it is surprising that suddenly all of the Legislative Secretaries have abandoned this Chamber.

Some Hon. Members: — Hear, hear!

Mr. Guy: — Oh, there is Mr. Whelan back there, that's good. But today he is one of the fortunate few to be a Legislative Secretary. Because, Mr. speaker, if he was speaking today as he was in 1965 he would be saying:

Mr. Speaker, let us not kid one another in this House. The main duties I have will be that of a paid organizer to sell memberships, organize meetings and meet people in hotel rooms to pick up bail. The Opposition is obligated to object to this brazen, political activity. I suggest that not only the Members of the Opposition but those in the Government that are not going to be appointed, let your conscience be your guide and vote against this Bill.

Mr. Speaker, I am pleased that you also took exception to the intention to the appointment of Legislative Secretaries. Perhaps, more than any Member, you came closer to the truth when you said, "The Premier is trying to free-load six of his backbenchers." And you asked if this was a form of blackmail to keep the backbenchers in order. I can further assure you, Mr. Speaker, that the majority of the people in Saskatchewan today agreed with your final comment, that it is vicious and it is wrong in principle and it makes provision for free loaders and it should be stopped.

Mr. Premier, in view of these comments by yourself and your own Members, your credibility and integrity would be greatly enhanced if you would bring in legislation at this Session to repeal The Legislative Secretary Act of 1965 because in view of the comments that government Members on an earlier occasion have expressed, it must be acknowledge that except for the five or six MLAs appointed to the position, Legislative Secretaries are not a anew deal nor are they a good deal for the people of Saskatchewan.

Some Hon. Members: — Hear, hear!

February 28, 1972

Mr. Guy: — Mr. Speaker, another group that have become closely involved with the New Deal for People are the civil servants of our province and unfortunately there are not many of them who consider the New Deal as such. I am sure that Members on both sides of the House will agree that the Civil Service in Canada for their responsibility, their untiring efforts, their devotion to duty and their political neutrality. For that reason, Mr. Speaker, they are deserving of a better deal than they are receiving at this time.

In the past, whenever governments have changed, not only in Saskatchewan but everywhere, there have always been some dismissals in Minister's offices and other sensitive areas. Therefore, it was like a breath of fresh air when Mr. Blakeney, then Leader of the Opposition, stated categorically during the election campaign that should he become Premier no one in the Civil Service need fear for his job because of political belief and there would be no purge of the Provincial Civil Service. You know, Mr. Speaker, for a moment it appeared that a new day had dawned in the game of political patronage. Oh yes, it's true that when he was questioned at a meeting he did say that there might be transfers to less sensitive positions in a few cases, but again he reiterated with a halo shining around his head that there would be absolutely no dismissals or loss of jobs. Mr. Speaker, never before in the history of any province has any promise, any commitment to a Civil Service and the people of this province less than ten days before the election. Today, there is fear running rampant throughout the Civil Service, Crown corporations, as almost daily, civil servants see their colleagues fired at an hour's notice, without warning, without the benefit of having their Minister talk to them, without cause and without remuneration. Their places are filled within days by NDP candidates, party hacks, members of the party elite, and long time supporters appointed at unbelievable salaries, no consideration for experience, training and ability, no exams are required, the Public Service commission is usually not consulted and the only passport that is required is a current NDP membership card.

Some Hon. Members: — Hear, hear!

Mr. Guy: — I am not going to go into the details as to who was fired, when and from where, as I should need several hours to do so. However, I am sure my colleagues will place this shameful action of the Premier and his executioners on the record of this House before the Session is through. It is enough to say that it is not only executive assistants and Ministers' secretaries that have been fired as members opposite are trying to have the public believe. But it ranges from deputy ministers, directors and supervisors down to clerks, janitors, ferry attendants, farm labourers, with no regard as to whether they are appointed by Orders-in-council or members of the classified or unclassified service or were permanent, temporary or casual. All have felt the cold hand of the NDP Government relegating them to the ranks of the unemployed. In spite of promises and reassurances, the Premier finally expressed the true attitude of this Government when on October 27th he told a press conference, "Changes in the Civil Service will continue as long as the NDP Government

February 28, 1972

is in office, “ Premier Blakeney said Wednesday. If that statement along with the firings already carried out weren’t sufficient to demoralize the civil Service, the statement on November 8th by natural Resources Minister Kramer created a new wave of fear. Speaking on behalf of the Government, the Minister bluntly stated in North Battleford, “We have not fired nearly enough.” They never give up. Once they begin to intimidate a group of people, they continue as long as they remain in those benches. Then the Minister went on to cast a reflection on every civil servant in Saskatchewan when he said, “There is no way we can put up with the incompetence we find in some departments. Some departments are loaded with people who are grossly incompetent.” Mr. speaker, until the Minister has the courage to name the departments and the people involved he has cast an aspersion on every civil servant in this province.

The final blow to the Civil Service came in December when the NDP Convention backed up their leader by passing a resolution which called for more firings and, in effect, placed every position in the Civil Service on the firing line.

Mr. Speaker, surely this New Deal for the Civil Service cannot be condoned but must surely be condemned by every fair-minded citizen of this province who wish to see the civil rights and freedoms of our Civil Service maintained. What is even more surprising than the purge itself is the complete lack of response from the Civil Service Union who are supposed to protect their members. When we were the Government we couldn’t even reprimand an employee without bringing down the wrath of the whole SGEA Executive, but today they remain strangely quiet and unconcerned as one member after another is removed without cause, positions are filled without advertising, promotions are made indiscriminately, and salaries are adjusted by the whim of the Minister without regard to classification or range. Mr. Leonard, Executive Secretary of the union who was most vocal when we were the Government when asked what his position was in regard to the firings said he had no comment. One cannot help but wonder whose interest he has at heart. His members who represent all political parties or only those who can show their NDP membership card?

Mr. Romanow: — Whatever, you do, don’t attack the Civil Service, Al.

Mr. Guy: — In the Civil Service the New Deal for people seems to be reserved only for NDP people. Nowhere is that fact more apparent than in the hiring of executive and special assistants. Mr. Speaker, it is hard to believe how any government could gather in such a short period of time such a conglomeration of people from all across Canada, all paid according to a different wage schedule, all carrying out different duties, with the only common denominator being the high salaries and the NDP membership.

During the last seven years, the Premier’s office has never had more than three assistants associated with it, and for most of the time only two. But at the end of December, according to the Leader-Post when another special assistant to the Premier was named, it was stated that Premier Blakeney had seven. Let us look at who they are and what the New Deal is doing for them. Number one is Gerry Wilson, former devil’s advocate, an ex-United Church minister, who is toiling for a meagre \$14,500 per year. He is the head of the Gestapo, the general chore boy for the

February 28, 1972

Premier, and I might say, also the most hated among the Civil Service for his intolerance, arrogance and his bad manners. Number two is Murray Koskie, Special Assistant and Caucus liaison officer, number two in the pecking order but number one in the salary received. He started in August at \$17,472, but on October 1, just two months later, he received a raise of \$1,400 to \$18,888 per year.

Mr. C.P. MacDonald: — Where did he work?

Mr. Guy: — One can only conclude that this special treatment was awarded him because he was a defeated NDP candidate in 1967.

Mr. MacDonald: — Where did he work?

Mr. Guy: — Oh, he worked in the back rooms of the NDP and I think he was a partner of the Premier's at one time.

Some Hon. Members: —Hear, hear!

Mr. Guy: — Well I was so shocked to see the salary that he was drawing down when the ranks of the unemployed are so full in this province, that it never entered my mind that the Premier would be helping one of his former partners. I felt that the Premier had far more principles than that and I am very disappointed that one of my colleagues had to inform me of that terrible situation.

An Hon. Member: — What about Roy?

Mr. Guy: — Oh, we will come to Roy in a minute.

Mr. Jack Kinzel is number three, Clerk of the Executive Council, the American citizen who has found his home with the most anti-American government in Canada, at \$17,00 per year. He is second in wealth, but third in prestige. Number four is Clare Powell a native of Manitoba, Cabinet Press Secretary. He is only getting \$10,812. Number five is Don McMillan Special Assistant, hired September 13 at \$7,872 a year. I feel sorry for Don because he is the lowest paid and yet he is the hardest worker, because he fills in as the Chief electoral Officer. Number six is Brian Coulter, another Special Assistant but a little more special because he is being paid \$9,600, \$1,700 more than Mr. McMillan who is doing all the work. Number seven, last but not least is Mr. Ian Phillips, a special Assistant who is in charge of protocol for visiting dignitaries. His last position was as a researcher with the poverty committee of the Saskatchewan Co-op Credit Society, being paid at the rate of \$7,872 a year, no doubt he will enquire into the poverty prevalent in the office of the Premier.

So, Mr. speaker, to assist the Premier of this province we find seven assistants plus one Legislative Secretary, being paid a total of \$88,544 per year of the taxpayers' money. This is certainly a New Deal for the Premier and his assistants but it is not a New Deal for the taxpayers of this province.

The Ministers of the Crown have also shared in this wonderful New Deal for the NDP. Now it must be admitted that they

February 28, 1972

have not been able to compete with the Premier in quantity, but they have made a valiant effort to compete in quality. The Deputy Premier, the hard-worked Attorney General (Mr. Romanow), he has only two that we know of although maybe more are hidden throughout the Department, but what he lacks in number he made up for in quality. Number one according to price is Mr. Jerome Bogdasavich a close personal friend of the Attorney General who was hired in September at \$17,472, but on October 1st he received a raise of \$1,400 to \$18,888, which is considerably more than the Attorney General receives but probably far more than the Attorney General is worth. However, Mr. speaker, the one who we should feel sorry for is his second assistant, poor Mr. Ed Shillington. Poor Mr. Shillington was defeated last June in Moosomin by my colleague Mr. John Gardner. Had he been unfortunate enough to win he would have received his \$9,000 indemnity like Mr. Gardner, but he lost and as a result the Attorney general felt sorry for him, hired him as an assistant at \$18,000 a year as of October 1st. You know one has to ask, who won that election? So the Attorney General with a close personal friend by one hand, a defeated NDP candidate by the other, walks merrily down the corridors of this building to the tune of \$36,360 worth of assistance at his command.

The Minister of Agriculture (Mr. Messer) also has two assistants, a Mr. Rogoza was hired July 3rd at \$9,240 per annum; but when the minister of Agriculture returned from Europe and saw what his pal in the attorney General's Department was doing, he headed for Alberta, he headed for the province west of here and came back with a real prize, a man worth \$16,236 at the going rate. One can't help wondering when he is not a defeated NDP candidate how does the Minister justify paying him \$7,000 more than his other assistant for doing the same job. Obviously, the New Deal is not an equal deal for people. This inequality appears quite regularly among the other executive assistants as we shall see.

The Minister of Labour (Mr. Snyder) who has two portfolios only has one Executive Assistant, Mr. Gedy receiving the lowest salary of any of the executives at \$525 lousy dollars a month. But the Minister of Public Health (Mr. Smishek) he has only one portfolio but he has two Executive Assistants, Mr. Cather started at \$755 on June 25th....

Mr. Steuart: — A month or a year?

Mr. Guy: — A month. Then he was given a 20 per cent raise two months later to \$901 per month. But I'll say this for the Minister of Health, he is the only Minister who saw fit to hire a lady Executive Assistant, he has Miss Judy Coburn, the only woman Executive Assistant started September 1st at \$531 a month. The women members of the NDP must be pleased to see that a man can earn \$370 more per month doing the same job. This may be a good deal for Mr. Cather but it is a darn poor deal for Miss Coburn. The Women's' Lib should have presented their petition a week ago to the Minister of Health, rather than the Minister of Labour. The Minister of Health is the one who refuses equal status to his women employees. The Member from Humboldt (Mr. Tchorzewski) had better direct some of the comments he made in the debate today to his friend who sits down in front.

The Minister of Indian and Metis Department (Mr. Bowerman) has the highest priced Executive Assistant of all, Mr. J. Allen

February 28, 1972

at \$875 a month. Now the question we have to ask ourselves is, why an Executive Assistant to a Minister who has lost one department because he couldn't handle it, who has another department that hasn't even been established yet, why should he have an Executive Assistant earning \$350 a month more than the assistants to the Minister of Labour and Welfare who has two of the heaviest departments in government. Another one of these New Deals for people.

Now it appears that the Executive Assistant to the minister of natural Resources is trying hard to catch up with some of his friends. He was hired on August 24th at \$654 a month, then on November 26th on instructions from the minister he was raised to \$686 and then a few weeks ago he was raised to \$779, retroactive to October 1st, which amounts to two increases totalling 19.1 per cent in 37 days. Not a bad deal for Mr. Wallace!

An Hon. Member: — ...Len ...

Mr. Guy: — No, not Len. Len is doing better than that as the political arm of the NDP.

The Executive Assistants for the Minister of Highways, at \$725 a month, and the Minister of Education at \$840 per month – I don't think he ever paid his farm hands any more than that so this seems to be in the same category. They are doing all right, but not as well as some of their colleagues. The Executive Assistant to the Minister of Municipal Affairs Mr. Archer who was born in Winnipeg, has the distinction of being the only Executive Assistant with his own secretary. Both are doing extremely well! Mr. Archer started out at \$755 per month but jumped to \$901 as of the 1st of October, a gain of 19 per cent. Miss Janice Olsen, his secretary, is receiving \$421, at the Minister's request which caused the Public Service Commission to note on the Order-in-council: "This salary is equated to a Clerk Steno III, although this young lady has never written a PSC test and is not now in the Public Service."

Mr. Steuart: — If she could only type she could get \$500 a month!

Mr. Guy: — Certainly a new and a good deal for this young lady but not such a good deal for the hundreds of other clerk stenos in the civil Service who never had the opportunity to apply for this plum.

When all these salaries for Executive Assistants are added up, do you know what the total is? The total is \$134,978 for Executive Assistants to the Ministers.

Mr. Speaker, there is one other area of the Public Service that is unbelievable to behold. That is a Special Committee of Research and Planning which has been established in the Executive. The secretary of this Committee is Mr. Keith Saddlemyer, who was appointed October 18th at \$17,000 per year. Within three months it was raised to \$18,420. A good deal for Mr. Saddlemyer. Another member of this Committee is Mr. Svetkov from Edmonton, who has been designated provincial co-ordinator of special areas program in Meadow Lake at \$16,000 per year. What is interesting about this position is that when the NDP

February 28, 1972

took office there was a provincial co-ordinator of special areas program for Meadow Lake, receiving \$12,000 per year and working hard planning the developments required for a pulp mill in the area. But this was fired, the pulp mill was cancelled and yet Mr. Svetkov was hired at \$4,000 more to a position that had become obsolete.

The best deal in this Committee has been reserved for Mr. Gardner a research officer who is being paid a mere \$21,336 per year. The other members of this Committee are Greg Darychuk at \$15,000, Brian Hill from Ottawa at \$13,764 and Malcolm McNeil at \$9,120. I wonder what he didn't do that he didn't get on the gravy train. When these six top positions are added together we have \$93,630 and when this is combined with the salaries of Grant Mitchell, Chairman of the committee, Wes Bolstand and Roy Lloyd, the other members of this Committee, and the technical and clerical support staff, many of whom are Clerk Steno IIs being paid at Clerk Steno IV levels, you have a grand total of closed to \$180,000 of the taxpayers' money for a Committee which, in the Mr. Blakeney's own words has no authority but they must plan and think.

Surely, Mr. speaker, this is extravagance and waste that this Province can ill afford at this time. No one will deny that the Premier and his Ministers need adequate help to carry out their responsibilities, but surely, in a province of 900,000 people we cannot afford \$86,000 for the Premier's staff, \$184,000 for the Ministers' Assistants and \$180,000 for the Premier's dream team. This total of close to \$400,000 for defeated candidates, party hacks, imported Socialists and friends of the Ministers should not be paid by the people of Saskatchewan.

Some Hon. Members: — Hear, hear!

Mr. Guy: — It may be a New Deal for the people who get these high paying jobs, but it is not a New Deal for the people who have to pay them. It is unbelievable when unemployment is so high in this province and university students are having difficulty finding jobs that the Government is importing people from outside the province. Why can't Saskatchewan graduates fill these positions? Why should the Premier say to these graduates, "You cannot have these positions," when he told them in June he would find jobs for them. There are plenty of them. They come from Ottawa, they come from Edmonton, they come from all over the country. There have been very few graduates from Saskatchewan being paid at the \$17,000 limit that has been established for some of your party hacks and your own Committee, Mr. Premier.

Mr. Speaker, it is obvious by my remarks so far, that the New Deal for people promised by the NDP last June has had a very limited application. The only ones to feel this fresh wind of change are those that least need it. It is reserved for defeated NDP candidates, imported thinkers and friends of the Government, while our university graduates, civil servants and Saskatchewan people are excluded.

Mr. Speaker, before adjourning the debate, I wish to bring to the attention of Members of the House, a situation which I view to have deep and significant overtones for the civil rights and freedoms of every individual in Saskatchewan. I sincerely hope that the Premier and the Attorney General will be able to advise us that our fears are unjustified.

February 28, 1972

It has come to our attention that on November 4, 1971, just four months after the NDP Government was elected, an organization known as the Saskatoon Aid Centre Society was incorporated in this province. The objectives as listed at the time of incorporation were as follows: 1. To accumulate and maintain comprehensive and accurate resource information on local health welfare and recreation services. 2. to maintain detailed information on civil, fraternal, labour, professional and service organizations. 3. To provide information regarding the above through telephone, interview, correspondence, consultations, audio and visual tape, and mass media.

Mr. Speaker, to us those objectives show the intent of this organization to keep a dossier on every individual and every public and private organization in this province. Mr. Speaker, I don't believe that in a democracy this type of activity is necessary or desirable, and above all, regardless of whether we are interpreting these objectives or not correctly, I don't believe that the taxpayers of Saskatchewan should be called upon to finance it. I am not surprised that the Premier is sitting there with a look of amazement because the Order-in-Council that provided the money for this was signed by the Attorney General (Mr. Romanow). Because to our mind, in all sincerity, Mr. Speaker, it is morally and perhaps even legally wrong to use organizations such as this to line the pockets of party supporters and MLAs.

I am sure that the Members of this House will be dismayed to know that although this Saskatoon Aid Centre Society was not incorporated until November 4, it received a grant of \$5,365 12 days later from the Government by way of an Order-in-council signed by Attorney General Romanow. This must surely be the fastest processing of a grant request in the history of the province and I hope that some of the other agencies that come to the Government requesting grants will be able to get the same consideration in the same short period of time.

It was interesting to note who the Directors of the Society are and it did explain why the grant was processed so rapidly, within 12 days of incorporation. There are only five directors so it works out that if the Society were disbanded tomorrow, which it could well do, each member could pocket \$1,072 of the taxpayers' money.

The officers of this Society are none other than Mr. Gordon Hjertaas, son of the NDP candidate in Prince Albert West and Mr. Bev Dyck, MLA for Saskatoon City Park and Deputy Speaker of this Legislature.

Mr. B.M. Dyck (Saskatoon City Park): — On a point of order, Mr. Speaker. I am no longer Director of that association.

Mr. Guy: — That is not a point of order, sir. I have the Order-in-council right here because I thought there might be somebody who would deny it in this Legislature. We have the full name of the applicant, Mr. Bev Dyck, MLA Saskatoon City Park.

Mr. Blakeney: — Mr. Speaker, on a point of privilege.

Mr. Guy: — You will have your

February 28, 1972

opportunity tomorrow.

Mr. Blakeney: — I am sorry, but I am rising on a point of privilege if you don't mind. Do I have the floor, Mr. Speaker? I just want to be perfectly clear: Is the Member asserting that the Member for City Park is a director of this association?

Mr. Steuart: — Mr. Speaker, that is not a point of privilege.

Mr. Speaker: — The speaker rose on a point of privilege. I will judge when I have heard the point of privilege. I cannot judge it until I have heard it.

Mr. Steuart: — The point of privilege must be connected with Mr. Dyck not with the Premier.

Mr. Speaker: — The Premier has arisen as the Provincial Treasurer and Premier to rise on the point of privilege the same as you will have on behalf of your group as Leader of the Opposition.

Mr. Blakeney: — I simply want to ask him what he is asserting. Is he asserting that this is, as he says, an organization which if disbanded the directors could get money. Because after all you are making a very serious charge against a Member of this Legislature if you were asserting that.

Mr. Guy: — What I am asserting, Mr. Speaker, is that there was a society that was formed in the city of Saskatoon, that had Mr. Dyck as one of its founding members, one of the men who was responsible for the objectives and the idea of the society, who because a member of this society and then who came to the Government of Saskatchewan and received a grant of \$5,365. If on the same day that the grant was received and he was still the member of that organization, it could have been disbanded and he could have taken his share out. That is what I am asserting in this Legislature.

Mr. Blakeney: — We are happy to know it.

Mr. Guy: — You are happy to know it. I am glad that at least some of the facts have come to your attention because it is obvious that they were brought to the Cabinet when you were not there.

All I am saying, Mr. Speaker, is that the Opposition sincerely believe that it reflects badly on this whole Assembly to have MLAs, regardless of what side of the House they might sit on, to be actively involved in the organization of societies and then requesting and receiving government grants as their sole source of revenue. It leaves it open to abuse and the suggestion that Members are using their authority for private rather than for public interest. We should hope that the Premier and the Attorney General will give us assurances that this organization will do two things; first of all that it will not infringe on the right of any individual or organization in this province and, secondly, that the MLA involved will not have access to the

February 28, 1972

government grants for his own personal use.

Mr. Speaker, since there still is considerably more that has to be said regarding this so-called New Deal for people I beg leave to adjourn debate.

Debate adjourned.

CONDOLENCES

Hon. A.E. Blakeney (Premier): — Mr. Speaker, I know that the House will be grieved to learn of the death last Friday of the former Member of this House from the Constituency of Saltcoats, Mr. Asmundur Loptson, better known as Minty Loptson. He died last Friday, in the evening, after we had completed our condolence procedures.

I should like to move the formal motion of condolence and add a few words of my own and to give opportunities to other Members who will undoubtedly wish to add a work. Accordingly:

I move, seconded by the Leader of the Opposition (Mr. Stuart):

That this Assembly records with sorrow and regret the passing of a former Member of this Assembly, and expresses its grateful appreciation of the contributions he made to his community, his Constituency, and to this Province:

ASMUNDUR LOPTSON, who died on February 25, 1972, was a Member of this Legislature for Saltcoats from 1929 to 1934; for Pheasant Hills from 1934 to 1938; and for Saltcoats from 1948 to 1960. He was born in Iceland in 1885 and came to Canada in 1887. He received his education from the Logberg Public School and Success Business College. He served on the Council of the Rural Municipality for four years. He was Secretary Treasurer of the Bredenbury Town Council, Councillor and Mayor of Bredenbury at different times, and he also sat on the local school board. He was a highway contractor and farmer. He was a member of the Masonic and Odd Fellows Order.

Mr. Speaker, there will be some Members in this House who served with Minty Loptson in the House up until 1960. I did not have the pleasure to serve in the House with Minty Loptson, but as many of you may know I was active as a public servant in the early 1950s acting as Secretary of Crown Corporations. I attended many Crown Corporation meetings where Minty Loptson appeared. He was an altogether lovable person in the Legislature. I think no one had a greater capacity, in my experience in public life, to ask the loaded question. He was able to impart into the words of a question, all manner of overtones without any particular use of words which conveyed them. It was a gift which I thought stood him in exceptionally good stead. He was a person who greatly enjoyed the House, greatly enjoyed the interchange of politics. I did not know his work in his constituency. But judging by the affection in which he was held by a good number of people of all political persuasions, as we were constantly advised when we asked of our prospects in the Saltcoats constituency, it is clear that he was a favourite with many people in that constituency.

In recording its own deep sense of loss and bereavement,

February 28, 1972

this Assembly expresses its most sincere sympathies with members of the bereaved family.

Mr. D.G. Stuart (Leader of the Opposition): — Mr. Speaker, I just learned today of the passing of Minty Loptson and it is my privilege to join with the Premier, and I am sure all Members of this House, to pay a tribute to his memory.

While I didn't sit in the Legislature with Minty I was very active in our Party when he was a Member of this House and I sat in the gallery many times and watched him in action. He and his desk mate, Herman Danielson, were sometimes affectionately and sometimes not so affectionately dubbed by the Government of the day as "The Gold Dust Twins." They sat at that end of the front bench on the Opposition side for many years. They were two very close men but they were two very opposite men. Herman would come in to make a speech, as you remember him, Mr. Speaker, he would pile up his notes and clippings and if Herman made a statement he would prove it sideways, backwards and frontward and quote from several publications. And about the time you figured he was all finished with the pile of notes and his speech was over, he would reach under desk and get another armload of files.

So he never said anything that he couldn't prove and I sometimes wondered if Minty ever said anything that he could prove. Minty once told me when I first got into politics, never worry about the facts. Just accuse them of spending \$10 million and you will get them so mad the scoundrels will tell the truth and it will hang them every time. I can remember another occasion Minty came up to my constituency and he came up to the house and showed me his speech. It was a pretty rough speech and he said, "What do you think of that?" He said something about radio and I looked at it and said, "Well that is great Minty but don't give it in this area." "Well," he said, "it is too late, I have already given it." I said, "Well what did you show it to me for?" And he said, "Well I thought you would like to be informed about what is going on in your own constituency."

Minty was a great public servant. He really believed in the democratic process. He was a great supporter of our Party, a great worker for our Party. He felt the affection of not only the people of his own constituency of Saltcoats but through the radio he had the affection and the respect of thousands of people throughout Saskatchewan.

He stayed interested in the procedures in this Legislature and in Ottawa right to the end. I wish to join with the Premier in paying a tribute to his memory and sending my condolences to those of his family.

Mr. E. Kaeding (Saltcoats): — Mr. Speaker, I should like to say a few words with regard to the passing of Mr. Loptson, who was Member of my constituency for approximately 20 years.

Mr. Loptson was a very active man in his community having been involved in a number of businesses and as road contractor and owned a large farm in the Bredenbury area.

Before entering politics he was involved in local municipal work and served as councillor reeve of the R.M. of Saltcoats for quote a number of years. He served as Mayor of the town of

February 28, 1972

Bredenburg for some time. He was a respected citizen in his community and he was a leader in the Icelandic community in the Concordia district.

During his term in the Legislature he was never known to sit idly by if his words were challenged. Both as a Government Member and while in Opposition his opponents frequently felt the lash of his quick quip.

Mr. Loptson sat as Member for Saltcoats from 1929 until 1934. In 1934 the name of the constituency was changed to Pheasant Hills and he represented that constituency from 1934 to 1938. In 1939 he was defeated by Mr. J. L. Phelps, later the Minister of Natural Resources, but he regained his seat again in 1948 and sat then as Member for Saltcoats until 1960. In 1953 he was appointed as temporary House Leader until the election of a new leader in 1954.

On his retirement, Mr. & Mrs. Loptson moved to Yorkton where they resided until Mrs. Loptson passed away just over a year ago. Later Mr. Loptson moved to Winnipeg where he passed away on February 25th, last. He is survived by one son and two daughters. Although Mr. Loptson was always a controversial figure, his opinions were always respected by both his opponents and his friends and his days in the Legislature will be well remembered by those who knew him.

On behalf of the Members of the Legislature I should like to extend our deepest sympathy to this family and to his friends on their bereavement.

Mr. F. Meakes (Touchwood): — Mr. Speaker, I remember I sat with Mr. Loptson for four years in this House. I think he was the most colourful person with whom I have ever sat in this Legislature. I'll never forget him sitting over where the Hon. Member from Wilkie is sitting. Surely you remember him, too, Mr. Speaker, how he would sit there and lean back in his chair with his feet out. You would swear he was asleep because most of the time he would have his glasses back up on his forehead. But Mr. Minty Loptson never slept. When you were really sure he was asleep suddenly without opening his eyes would come that sharp, quick, witty retort. I know, having sat with him for four years, that we all liked him, that he was a fighter and gave no quarter but behind it all there was always a sense of humour in his remarks that, in a sense, relieved some of the sharp touch that he would give to it.

I just want to add an expression of regret to the family and I agree he will be a man that will go down in the history of this province. He was a pioneer both as a farmer and as a legislator.

Mr. Blakeney: — Mr. Speaker, I move, seconded by the Hon. Leader of the Opposition (Mr. Steuart):

That the resolution just passed together with the transcripts of oral tributes to the memory of Mr. Loptson, be communicated to the bereaved family on behalf of this Assembly by Mr. Speaker.

Motion agreed to.

The Assembly adjourned at 5:03 o'clock p.m.