

LEGISLATIVE ASSEMBLY OF SASKATCHEWAN
March 2, 1972

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

WELCOME TO STUDENTS

Mr. E.C. Whelan (Regina North West): — Mr. Speaker, before the Orders of the Day, I would like to welcome to this Legislature 30 Grade Seven students in the East Gallery from the McNabb School, Regina North West. They are accompanied by their teach Mrs. Bev. Coulter. Members will join me I am sure in expressing the wish that their visit here with us will be pleasant, informative and educational.

Hon. Members: — Hear, hear!

Mr. A.W. Engel (Notukeu-Willow Bunch): — Mr. Speaker, it gives me great pleasure to welcome the Grade 12 class from Glentworth, Saskatchewan. Arrangements for this visit were made by one of the students, Miss Debbie Jalbiert. Their teacher accompanying them today is Mr. Wayne Wallace. All the Members of the House, I am sure, extend a warm welcome to these 26 students who ventured out on a cold day like this.

Hon. Members: — Hear, hear!

Mr. H. H. Rolfes (Saskatoon Nutana South): — Mr. Speaker, I am sure that Members of this House would like to join with me in welcoming 60 grade Seven students from Churchill School in Saskatoon. Again, venturing out in this inclement weather certainly must give an indication of the quality of the students in my constituency. They are accompanied by Mr. Gogal and Mrs. Hendrickson, their teachers. I hope that their trip here will be an educational one, and that on their way back they will feel this has been a worthwhile day.

Hon. Members: — Hear, hear!

Mr. R. Romanow (Attorney General): — Mr. Speaker, I, too, would like to welcome students from two schools, St. Goretti, teachers Mr. Schneider and Mr. Olauson and St. Dominic, teachers Mr. Regier and Mrs. Lee. I welcome them. I hope the visit here is informational and I wish them a safe journey back.

Hon. Members: — Hear, hear!

STATEMENT

MRS. ROMANOW

Hon. R. Romanow (Attorney General): — Thank you, Mr. Speaker. I'll be as brief as I can.

March 2, 1972

If I run into Leader of the Opposition's time, I am sure that some adjustment can be made.

Mr. Speaker, I rise on a point of personal privilege to speak to a matter raised in this House late yesterday afternoon. I refer to a Statement made by the Hon. Leader of the Opposition, Mr. Steuart, in reply to the Speech from the Throne concerning the present employment status of my wife Eleanor Romanow. Briefly, the facts are these, Mr. Speaker. My wife started employment in early December of 1971 as a teacher at the Vocational Centre in Regina for a period ending at the end of April, 1972, in the status of temporary teacher. The purpose of the program is to upgrade the educational qualifications made available by the Federal Government, Department of Manpower and Immigration. The Federal Department of Manpower and Immigration ultimately assumes, I am informed, 100 per cent of the costs of this program. Although, aware of some provincial Department of Education involvement, frankly, Mr. Speaker, I have always understood Eleanor to be engaged in a program of the Federal Government.

My wife's employment did not begin, Mr. Speaker, after my assuming office as a Cabinet Minister. The facts are that Eleanor first made an application entirely on her own initiative on January 28, 1971, when I was a Member of the Opposition and the Members opposite were the Government. At the time, Mr. McIsaac was the Minister of Education. She made application for identically the same job for the identically same purposes in Saskatoon. The next day on January 29 the Vice Principal appointed her a temporary instructor. On February 3, 1971 a Public Service Commission form was signed by the then Associate Deputy Minister, Mr. Lou Duddridge approving of the application and forwarding it to the Public Service Commission and her appointment was finalized in that manner. In fact, I am informed that at that time when I was a Member of the Opposition that the former Minister of Education, Mr. McIsaac, personally know of this application, raised it with the Deputy, and to his credit, approved it and took no objection, she having won on the applications in the contest.

After my election on June 23 and my move to Regina on June 30, my wife, upon the urgings of her supervisor in Saskatoon, and entirely on her own, I stress, Mr. Speaker, made another application for a second term having had what was considered to be a successful term in Saskatoon. This was to be an identical job here as she had in Saskatoon. She was again re-appointed in the usual and normal fashion on the recommendation of Mr. Glen Tippitt, at that time supervisor of the operation, beginning December 6 to be ended at the end of April. Mr. Ready, the Associate Deputy Minister forwarded the application to the Public service Commission through normal and usual channels and it was approved.

Mr. Speaker, the procedure is that the supervisor of the program makes the decision to hire.

Mr. wife holds a Bachelor of Arts degree and a Bachelor of Education degree obtained from the University of Saskatchewan, together with a number of years of experience in radio communication in the larger centres of Canada. We have no children.

In view of the fact that my wife was employed last year when I had no control or influence directly or indirectly on the

March 2, 1972

Minister of Education or on the Government opposite, and in view of the fact that she obtained the second term entirely on her experience and qualifications, and I might add, with little or no knowledge on my part that she got the job until it was done because I was away on a trip on behalf of the Government, I felt certain, I felt absolutely certain that no charge of undue influence or unfair advantage could or would be directly or indirectly levelled against Eleanor, my wife, or myself, particularly in this political arena in this House. Anyone who has had any dealings in this matter of employment, I am certain, will attest to the fact that both appointments were in strict conformity with procedures approved by the Department and the Public Service Commission with absolutely no interference in any of the cases by myself, not even mentioning it to my colleagues. Notwithstanding this being a program totally underwritten by Ottawa and the facts herein of hiring both before becoming a Minister and after, I wish to advise the House that my wife has of her own volition today decided to terminate her employment effective immediately the moment that a replacement can be found for her students.

I regret this decision, Mr. Speaker, very much. She feels she does not want her name bandied around by innuendo or otherwise nor does she want to embarrass our Premier or the other Members of the House on both sides. She loved her work and she was good at it, and although she is an individual in her own right, I regret that she may because of the circumstances be unable to pursue her own teaching career in her own province with the education and talents which she may have.

Thank you, Mr. Speaker, for affording me this privilege.

Some Hon. Members: — Hear, hear!

ADJOURNED DEBATES

ADDRESS-IN-REPLY

The Assembly assumed the adjourned debate on the proposed motion of Mr. A. Taylor (Kerrobot-Kindersley) for an Address-in-Reply.

Hon. D.G. Stuart (Leader of the Opposition): — Mr. Speaker, before I move into my remarks on the debate I should like first to deal with the Statement made by the Attorney General, Mr. Romanow. While the program that his wife, Mrs. Romanow is working under was a Federal-Provincial program whereby Manpower refers the students to the program under the Saskatchewan Department of Education, the teachers in this program receive their salary cheques from the Saskatchewan Department of Education in the same manner as a teacher employed at the applied Arts and Sciences located in Saskatoon and are, for all intents and purposes, employees of the Saskatchewan Department of Education. There is no question in my mind that Mrs. Romanow was working for the Government in the same manner that someone who works for the Medical Care Insurance and it's a partially funded program by the Federal Government, works for the Government of Saskatchewan. I want to make it very clear, Mr. Speaker, that I have never suggested and I didn't suggest yesterday when I brought this up that Mrs. Romanow whom I have met and have every respect for does not have the right to work for the Department of Education or

March 2, 1972

any other department of this Government. I don't question that. Nor did I suggest yesterday that the fact that Mrs. Romanow was working for the Department of Education in any manner reflected in any way on the Attorney General, Mr. Roy Romanow or that he has done anything improper or used any influence or that he has anything to apologize for, he has not. He has every right to be proud of this wife. What I was pointing out was this, that it was the Premier, Mr. Blakeney, who brought in the question of Mrs. Allan guy. The circumstances outlined by the Attorney General were very similar to the situation of Mrs. Guy. She received the job at the Saskatchewan Power Corporation from the then manager Mr. Dave Furlong. If you question Mr. Furlong or anyone at the Saskatchewan Power Corporation, they will inform you that Mrs. Guy was a most efficient employee. When the Government changed she resigned. She had every right to have that job and had every right to resign. It was the Premier who brought this up. All I said to him then and all I say to him now – it is this usual sanctimonious double standard, one standard applies for what the NDP do, another standard applies for what the Liberals do.

Some Hon. Members: — Hear, hear!

Mr. Steuart: — If Mr. Blakeney could bring up in his snide way and impugn some motives to Mr. Guy or Mrs. Guy then I say he should use the same yardstick with his own Ministers. I don't use the same yardstick. It was his yardstick, not mine. And I am sorry he brought it up, but in defence of our side of the House I felt it necessary to acquaint the public that Mr. Blakeney was allowing to go on in his own Government what he was condemning when we were the Government.

Some Hon. Members: — Hear, hear!

Mr. Steuart: — Mr. Speaker, on a more pleasant note, I am sure all Members will join with me welcoming to this Chamber, the Federal Minister of Justice, The Minister in charge of the Wheat Board, the Hon. Otto Lang.

Some Hon. Members: — Hear, hear!

Mr. Steuart: — Mr. Lang is to be honoured tonight by the Sales Marketing Executive Association of Regina being named Salesman of the Year for Saskatchewan and I think no finer choice could have been made.

Some Hon. Members: — Hear, hear!

Mr. Steuart: — No one has done a finer, a more outstanding job for the farmers of Western Canada and of Saskatchewan in selling their grains and moving their grains than the same Otto Lang. I congratulate the people who made this choice and I welcome on behalf of this Assembly Mr. Otto Lang to our midst.

Some Hon. Members: — Hear, hear!

Mr. Steuart: — Mr. Speaker, before I get into the main part of my remarks today I want to discuss the situation of air time, specifically a report. Yes, again you are going to hear lots about radio time and airtime. The Select Standing

March 2, 1972

Committee on Radio Broadcasting made a report to this House and it was passed. Our Members, some of them might have voted for it. I didn't vote for it. It was resolved that radio time be allocated as follows, 844 minutes to the government and 281 minutes to the Members of the official Opposition, and that the allocation of the time to the individual Members be arranged through the usual channels. Now, Mr. Speaker, I didn't then and I don't now think that the allocation of time was very fair. If it's to be the broadcasting of a debate, of this debate and the debate on the Budget, certainly 281 minutes to the Opposition and 844 minutes to the government will be more of a monologue on behalf of the Government. But since this has been the custom when we were the Government and before we were the Government, I couldn't complain too seriously, although I think it would be much better if the Government took the attitude that while we only have 15 Members and in that respect may be entitled to only 281 minutes, we do, at times, represent 43 per cent of the people and we do, in fact, represent all of the people when we are acting as the official Opposition. However, that was a Government decision and we bow to it.

The latter part of that statement says that the time shall be arranged through the usual channels. Did we agree that the first 75 minutes of radio time would go to the government? Of course, traditionally, to the Mover and the Seconder. It was agreed the second 75 minutes would go to the Opposition and the third 75 minutes would go to the Government. Now it has been the custom for the two Whips to get together and divide the balance of the time, give and take, and try to accommodate the Members on both sides whether they want to make a 15-minute speech or a 40-minute speech or a 30-minute speech or whatever. At the conclusion of the first three days we on this side had 60 minutes left and the Government had 240 minutes left. I don't think that there was any way no matter how we wanted our time divided that anyone could say in fairness we weren't accommodating the Government Members. So we asked that we have 30 minutes day, then we would skip one day and we would have 15 minutes on two other days and that would be the end of our radio time. The Government would have 60 minutes today, 60 minutes tomorrow, 60 minutes the next day and so on. We were shocked and amazed, Mr. Speaker, when although we got the impression that Mr. Pepper – and I don't want to put words in his mouth he's a very fine gentleman and a very honourable man we got the impression that he had agreed, although I recognize that the Whip on either side cannot agree until he goes back and checks with his caucus. He came back and informed our Whip that this was not the way it was going to be, that the Government, in fact, was saying that our Members would take 15 minutes today, 15 minutes last tomorrow, 15 minutes first the next day, and 15 minutes second the day after. They were, Mr. Speaker, telling us not only when we should speak but also for exactly how long we should speak.

An Hon. Member: — That's right.

Mr. Steuart: — Now, I understand, Mr. Speaker, this came from even as high as the Cabinet, that Mr. Romanow and I presume Mr. Blakeney (If he knows what's going on on that side of the House, and sometimes I wonder) were involved in this. We were presented with a fait accompli, take it or leave it. Mr. Speaker, I have never seen such arrogance at any time in this House, that the government would say, "We will set the rules in this House." Let me tell you, Mr. Speaker, and you know this, but let me tell the Members opposite, they may have

March 2, 1972

45 Members to our 15, they may feel they can steam roller us and maybe they can if they change the rules of this House, but they can't throttle us and they can't gag us and they can't interfere with free speech in this Legislative Assembly.

Some Hon. Members: — Hear, hear!

Mr. Steuart: — Why did they do this? Why? This is the first time that I have ever been aware of such actions and I have sat in Opposition when the CCF were the government and for seven years when we were the Government and I have never, never known the Government to say to the Opposition, "This will be the times you will take and you will take them or leave them." Why did they do this? I know why they did it. They got angry. I was supposed to speak on the second day. The Leader of the Opposition has always spoken on the second day. And I am not aware of any rule that says the Leader of the Opposition shall speak on such and such a day. I am not aware of any rule in this book or in May or Beauschesne. Then the Premier is allowed to come on the next day and have his fun, slice up whatever the Leader of the Opposition said. We decided to do it differently. We had Mr. Guy and our new Member from Morse (Mr. Wiebe) speak. So they were mad and the word is that they were not mad at the rest of our Members they were mad at Steuart. He broke the rules, so we're going to discipline him. Well, Mr. Speaker, as you know the rules of this House are not made for the privilege of the government, they are made for the privilege of the minority. They are made to guarantee the rights of the Opposition.

Some Hon. Members: — Hear, hear!

Mr. Steuart: — I have gone through this blue book, which are the Rules and Procedures of the Legislative Assembly of Saskatchewan. I find nothing about radio time in it. There is nothing about radio time in May or Beauschesne. If the Government decides, as they have, to broadcast the proceedings of this Assembly on debates in the morning or the afternoon or the evening, that's their business. The Government broke the agreement, the Government broke the standing tradition as to how this radio time would be allocated and I tell them right now that as far as we are concerned on this side of the House, that that deal is over and it's broken and there is no deal.

Some Hon. Members: — Hear, hear!

Mr. Steuart: — Mr. Speaker, we will speak in this House and we will take our chances. You said when you were made Speaker, and we believed you, and up to this point you have shown every indication that you intend to be a very fair speaker. You intend to protect the rights not just of that side of the House where they have 45 Members and the power of the Government, but of this side of the House where we only have 15 Members in our Opposition. As you know, the parliamentary tradition doesn't say when members shall speak, or how long they shall speak for, it says they shall speak on that side of the House and then on this side of the House and that you will look that way and then you will look this way. We are going to depend on you, Mr. Speaker, because we have every confidence in your fairness. I tell the Members opposite, the Government, that they may think because they have 45 Members they have all the power in their hand, and they may think they will limit me to 15 minutes airtime today but they won't. I'll speak in this House as long as I want whenever I get the opportunity and I will take my orders

March 2, 1972

from the Speaker of this Legislative Assembly, not from the Premier, not from Mr. Romanow, or not from that arrogant Cabinet that has taken unto themselves this much power in seven short months.

Some Hon. Members: — Hear, hear!

Mr. Steuart: — Mr. Speaker, the Premier challenged me yesterday to speak about the pulp mill on the radio and I intend to do that too.

I am going to start with the Prince Albert Pulp Mill because the Prince Albert Pulp Company is one of the greatest success stories of any industrial development ever brought to this province in the history of Saskatchewan. I ask Mr. Feschuk, the Member for Prince Albert East, that if anything in all his time, and I imagine he has spent as many years as I have in that area, if anything to his knowledge has ever changed for the better the face of the city of Prince Albert, the economy of the city of Prince Albert, or in fact the economy and the prosperity of north central Saskatchewan than the Prince Albert Pulp Mill. The Prince Albert Pulp Mill was and is a good deal. We on behalf of the people of Saskatchewan put in \$1.5 million. We guaranteed \$50 million worth of notes. We set up a Crown corporation and we cut and delivered the wood at an agreed price and we lost money as we know we would. In fact, we lost about \$3 million. We made an agreement that the \$3 million loss would be split between the Government and the Company on an agreed basis. So, so far then we have about \$3 million invested in this Company. We agreed to build 200 miles of roads, at about \$10,000 or \$15,000 a mile and that is now being done and I presume, if the Government keeps the bargain we made, it will go on for the next few years. So we have another few million, 5, 6 or 7 million dollars invested in that pulp mill. What have we had back in the province? Well, we have had back 800 jobs directly in the mill and in the bush. And as anyone knows a direct job in an industry produces 3 or 4 subsidiary jobs so there have been another 2,000 or 3,000 jobs produced as a result of the pulp mill. We received \$1 million in E & H tax when it was built. We've received probably close to \$2 million in gas tax and stumpage fees. That's \$3 million at least. The Government of Saskatchewan has received its hare of all the income tax from those very well paid 80 workers since they went to work in that mill.

I say to you, Mr. Speaker, that, speaking on the safe side, the Government of Saskatchewan directly has had back probably \$10 million from the Prince Albert Pulp Company at least. Besides that the Prince Albert Pulp Mill pumped better than \$22 million a year into the economy of this province. It has provided jobs for railway workers, it has provided jobs at the Sodium Sulphate plant, it has provided jobs in the Chemical Plant in Saskatoon, and it has provided a tremendous number of jobs in stores, garages, and retail outlets in Prince Albert and throughout the North.

If the Government thinks it's such a bad deal they now have it in their power to get out of that deal. They have had back at least \$10 million. Maybe with the roads they've got invested \$15 million, I suggest to the Premier that he offer to sell his 30 per cent shares to Parsons and Whittemore and I am sure he would get \$15 million for it. The \$1.5 million I am sure he would get \$15 million. I think if he sold them he would be a sucker to take only \$15 million. He would

March 2, 1972

not only get \$15 million plus from the Company because they offered this deal to us, they would take them off the notes. Then the Government would have all its money back, double its money back in fact and they would have no more commitment, no more guarantee. Then they would have an industry that was paying its own way. If it's such a bad deal, Mr. Blakeney, then show the people of this province what an astute operator you are and move out of that deal and get off that guarantee that you find so reprehensible.

Okay, the same pattern was to be continued and carried on in the Athabasca Pulp Mill. Let me say to the people of this province very briefly, as I have said before, we would have guaranteed the non-pollution or pollution control in the Beaver River and in the Northern waterways. We wouldn't have been allowed to produce a pound of pulp nor would we have wanted to it we hadn't been able to control that pollution. We had \$10 million plugged into that deal just for pollution control. Of course we knew the Beaver River had to be augmented, built up. We would have reforested that land and looked after that forest. In fact, it would have been in better condition 15 years from now than it is today. We had several experts check and double check the feasibility of that mill as did Parsons and Whittemore and we were told by people who know far more about it than we do, and it is on records, that it was, in fact, a feasible and a viable deal. Sure, the pulp market is in trouble but take a look at them. They are old pulp mills, they are outmoded pulp mills, they are small pulp mills, and to live up to the Federal Governments pollution standards they are worth. So they will go out of business but our Prince Albert Pulp Mill will continue and I predict it will flourish just as the one in Meadow Lake would have grown and flourished.

Some Hon. Members: — Hear, hear!

Mr. Steuart: — What would it have done? All Mr. Blakeney said yesterday was, "What a deal, spend all that money and build a town site and a railroad to supply 800 jobs." He'll get to be known as tricky little Allan if he doesn't look out because he knew that there would be far more than 800 jobs. There would be a town site, there would be trucking, and there would be railroad employees. In fact there would have been 2,000 or 3,000 jobs and the people who live in that area would have a chance for the first time and an opportunity to work at decent wages.

What is the alternative of the present Government, the NDP Government? Well, they cancelled the mill and they said in effect to the 8,000 people who live in north-western Saskatchewan, our answer to you because we have no faith in the northern part of this province, our answer to you because we have no confidence in the development of things like pulp mills and mines and resource developments, is in fact to continue to let you rot on social aid. That's the answer of Mfr. Blakeney, that's the answer of the NDP Government. And on top of that they paid out \$6 million hard earned dollars of the Saskatchewan taxpayers to cancel the deal. The biggest deal the biggest complex that would have brought new life and new hope and new industry into northern Saskatchewan. All Mr. Blakeney says is that, "Oh, we admit we had to pay out a million or so dollars on the difference on the interest on the money borrowed, but if that Dave Steuart hadn't signed that deal on the 14th when

March 2, 1972

he knew he was going to be defeated.”

In the month of June, 1971, just before the election we might have had to pay out very little more or any more. We could have gotten out of the deal. Mr. Blakeney knows, if he knows anything, and I think he knows what he is talking about, he knows that if he had wanted to get out of the deal as his Wafflers did, without giving Parsons and Whittemore a five per cent piece, all he had to do was get into this Legislature and pass a Bill. Now he didn't choose to do this. I see Mr. Richards nodding his head in the affirmative. That's what his Wafflers wanted him to do. Now I respect Mr. Blakeney because he didn't do that. I respect his right to get out of that deal. He said before the election that if they were elected they would take a hard look at the deal and if they weren't satisfied they would cancel it. I was aware of that and so were Parsons and Whittemore but I do not respect him when he did find that agreement signed by the Deputy Minister and okayed by me in June to a final deal that was agreed on in May. I do not respect him when he used that as a red herring and tries to put the bulk of the blame for paying our this \$6 million on the shoulders of the former Liberal Government, the Member for Prince Albert West, myself, Dave Steuart. I say to him again if he thinks I did anything wrong, and I know that he doesn't, he has said this to the public and he's a politician. I have answered and said I have done nothing wrong. I acted in good faith. We were building a mill. We were the government in May when I agreed to that final deal. We had every right and responsibility to enter into that agreement. Of course, it is easy for him to come along after and say, "Oh, if you look at the deal from the point of view of getting out of it, you shouldn't have signed it in the first place." That was signed away back in January or February. I do not respect him when he used that as a red herring to try to cover up his decision to move out of the complex and cancel the deal. I would respect him if had the intestinal fortitude to say, "Yes, we think it's a bad deal and we have cancelled it. We think it is better to spend \$6 million now than gamble on the many other millions that we might have lost if the deal hadn't succeeded." And again, Mr. Blakeney, if you feel that way then I say take this to a judicial inquiry. Let someone other than you and I tell the people of this Province. If I have done wrong then the people should know about it. If I have done nothing wrong, and I tell you I have done nothing wrong, nothing to be ashamed of, then also let the people of this Province know what is the truth.

Well now, Mr. Speaker, before examining the Throne Speech and the Government's record to date, I would like to establish the general attitude our party will adopt during the short time that we are in Opposition. Winston Churchill once stated that in our parliamentary system the only job of the Opposition was to oppose, oppose, oppose. Well I believe that today people expect more than this from a political party in opposition and we intend to do much more than merely oppose the Government. We will, of course, oppose this Government with all our resources and energy when we are convinced they are wrong. We will question both their moves and their motives. We will be the watchdogs of the public purse. There is a saying that good opposition makes for good government and I believe this is true. If an Opposition is weak or lax in their duties any government tends to take liberties with their powers and will often short circuit the democratic process in the name of efficiency or speed. I don't only mean the elected officials but the civil servants as well.

March 2, 1972

We in Saskatchewan have for the most part a good sound civil service. However, like bureaucrats the world over many senior Government employees develop a conviction that they know what is best for the community and they become impatient and even intolerant of the legislative process. Another dangerous tendency among Government bureaucrats is to obtain for themselves wide and sweeping powers under the law. They rationalize this demand for power by claiming it is in the best interests of the public, or that they cannot carry out the will of the elected representatives unless they are given greater flexibility though laws and the regulations they themselves promote. A favourite expression of civil servants when asking for increased legal power is that the act under which they must operate ties their hands or creates great problems for them in carrying out the wishes of this Legislature. Another favourite expression used by Government employees when asking for a new act or an amendment to the existing act is that what they are proposing are just a few housekeeping amendments or they are just tidying up the act. A persuasive civil servant can also convince his Minister to support harmless looking amendments. The Minister often gets them through the Cabinet and caucus without serious perusal by saying my Deputy Minister assures me that this Bill is just routine tidying up of the act and you don't need to waste too much time on it.

Mr. Speaker, I can recall on occasion when I was the Minister of Natural Resources the former Game Commissioner assured me that the act he wanted to put through the House was merely routine. I took his word for it but the Opposition and some of our own Members didn't and they tore the Act, the Game Commissioner and me to pieces. We all deserved what we got and I learned a couple of lessons the hard way. One was to read everything a civil servant said was routine with great care and attention. The other lesson was to respect the need for a good wide-awake Opposition. We'll do our job to the best of our ability but we are only 15 Members backed by limited resources.

I ask the Government to do two things which will enable us to be a more effective Opposition. First, space the introduction of your legislation as evenly as possible so that we shall have a reasonable opportunity to study each new act before we are called on to enter debate. Secondly, increase the allowance given to the Opposition to enable us to employ year-round personnel. If the Government does number one, we on our part will not hold up the business of the House unnecessarily. If you do number two and increase our grant we shall be a much more effective Opposition and we will repay you by putting you out to rest in the Opposition at the first opportunity.

Mr. Speaker, before I discuss the Throne Speech I should like to first review the promised program upon which the NDP were elected on June 23rd last. Now this is a little service that I promise to do for the Government every year just in case they overlook any of the goodies they offered to the people before the election in 1971, and I will as an added service, keep a running score because I realize that the Premier is so busy discussing with his imported planners that he can't be expected to remember everything that the NDP promised. I know Mr. Romanow is so active making speeches, giving interviews and generally talking all day, every day on every subject that he has no time to keep track of the NDP promises. Now, Mr. Blakeney, you promised if you were elected to reduce the property tax to 25 mills for school purposes on

March 2, 1972

homes, farms and small businesses. Mr. Speaker, we are now told by the Premier that he can't fulfil this promise this year because the Federal Government won't allow him to raise income and corporation taxes. This is a deliberate deception on the part of the Premier and he knows it. In the first place when the NDP promised to reduce taxes to 25 mills there were no qualifications, no ifs, ands, or buts, just a straightforward promise to cut property taxes. In the second place, if one can stop him. Certainly not the Federal Government. Obviously the Premier has second thoughts about this promise truth and quit whining about the Federal Government who are actually reducing income taxes this year.

The NDP promised to help the family farm. But their answer so far is to sabotage the first real effort by any Federal Government to stabilize farm income.

You promised, Mr. Premier, that you would reverse the downward trend of many of our smaller communities. In fact, the trend has accelerated since you became the Premier. Hospitals have been closed, classrooms discontinued, businesses closed up and possibly 200 elevator operators threatened with the loss of their jobs. You ask, you NDP Members, the people in Pangman, Delisle, in Sedley or in Francis how your Government has kept its promise to keep open their hospitals and their schools.

You said an NDP Government would take action to locate business and industry in our smaller centres. I'll make it easy for you. Mr. Premier, name me five small centres where you have kept his promise. In fact, name me four, or three or two or even one. You might name one, but I doubt it, because you have failed miserably to attract business or industry to any centre, large or small. The truth is you have, and you will continue, to drive out as long as you are the Government, business from this Province, with the power of your laws and the fear of your threats.

Mr. Speaker, let's just take a look for a moment at some of these threats.

Too bad the Attorney General (Mr. R. Romanow) isn't in his place.

An Hon. Member: — Never is.

Mr. Steuart: — But first we have the Attorney General, Mr. Romanow, telling over six hundred Saskatchewan insurance agents, "either accept our socialist philosophy or else we will take your agency away." In some cases this would have meant their livelihood.

Then, of course, fearless Roy turned on the auto body repairmen. They had the gall, they had the gall to ask for an increase in their rates after the government put up the minimum wage and reduced the workweek.

Now, Mr. Speaker, I don't believe they were entitled to the entire \$2 per hour increase they asked for, but it is a common negotiating manoeuvre, used by unions, teachers, businessmen and others to ask for more than you have actually hope to settle for. It is called the bargaining process and has not

March 2, 1972

only been defended by the Premier and his NDP followers, but it has been guaranteed to certain people in our Province.

Some Hon. Members: — Hear, hear!

Mr. Steuart: — But evidently, evidently, Mr. Speaker, the small businessman is not entitled to the right to bargain with this Government for his livelihood. Mr. Romanow, representing the NDP Government, told the auto body shops they could increase their rates, not by two dollars, but by twenty-five cents. Not even enough to cover their costs. No negotiations, just twenty-five cents, and he didn't say, take it or leave it, he actually threatened. Oh, that's the same fearless Roy, the defender of the public rights.

Some Hon. Members: — Hear, hear!

Mr. Steuart: — He told these small businessmen if they didn't take the twenty-five cents an hour and shut up about any further increases the Government would go into the auto body business and put them all out of business. He reminded the, in a public speech, that they get over 80 per cent of their business from the Government and told them either to knuckle under or the NDP would stamp them out.

Mr. Speaker, here we have the Attorney General, who loves to mouth statements about human rights and the protection of minority rights, publicly humiliating and threatening any small businessman who dares to oppose this Government.

Some Hon. Members: — Hear, hear!

Mr. Steuart: — Mr. Romanow, the self-proclaimed champion of the underdog, the great crusader who promises long and loud to guarantee justice for all in our Province has arrogantly threatened to smash anyone who dares to stand up to this NDP Government. What a cheap, shallow performance. He has, in seven short months, Mr. Speaker, misused the power of his position as no other Attorney General ever has in the history of this Province.

Some Hon. Members: — Hear, hear!

Mr. Steuart: — And since the Premier allows him to continue, unchecked, we must conclude he either supports his actions or he is afraid of him.

Well then, the Minister of Agriculture (Mr. Messer) got into the act, he threatened the implement dealers. Either carry what the Government considers to be an adequate stock of parts or else the NDP will move in on this group of local businessmen.

Mr. Bowerman: — Hear, hear!

Mr. Steuart: — Hear, hear, says the great success story from Shellbrook. The minister of Industry (Mr. Thorson) was not long in making his contribution to the new NDP policy of threatening and bullying the community, large and small.

An Hon. Member: — Art Thibault.

March 2, 1972

Mr. Steuart: — Was that Art Thibault? I'm sorry. You know, when you look at them in profile, it's hard to tell which is which. Well, some rather vague reprisals against Gulf and Imperial Oil, for moving their refineries out of Saskatchewan. Then he told the industries to do more exploration work or the Government would do it and charge back the costs. He next threatened to increase the royalties that they paid to local land and mineral rights owners. Mr. Thorson finally finished off by telling the oil industry that although they have no social conscience, they are not paying either the Government or the farmers a fair dividend and that they treat their service station operators shamefully, Mr. Thorson said, in spite of all these terrible things you're doing, the NDP Government still loves you and wants them to stay in Saskatchewan and hopes they grow larger and more powerful.

Mr. Speaker, I can tell you that the speech Mr. Thorson made to the oil industry has them in a state of confused shock, and should drive any self-respecting Waffler to a psychiatrist's couch.

Some Hon. Members: — Hear, hear!

Mr. Steuart: — I shall deal now with the balance of the Government's Industrial Development Policy. I shall deal with the balance of the Government's Industrial Policy later in this speech, but to this point in time it has been an abject failure.

Now, the promise to increase the minimum wage and reduce the hours of work has been kept. While there is no doubt these Acts helped some people, others lost their jobs and many small businessmen have been forced to reduce service and some may even be pushed into bankruptcy.

The problem was caused due to the fact that a very sharp increase in the minimum wage was coupled with a reduction in the workweek. This double burden placed on small marginal businesses by the Government, has worked a real hardship in many areas, especially in rural centres. The NDP Government has hurt small business, not helped them as they promised to do. The Government should have given some assistance to the smaller businesses to compensate for the extra burden of cost they placed on them. It is not too late to make up for this failure, and I urge the Government to meet with representatives of small business and develop a plan that will be of some practical help to them.

During the last session, Mr. Speaker, when we were the Government, and throughout the election campaign, the NDP, led by Mr. Blakeney, attacked and ridiculed the floor price and prorationing of potash put in by Ross Thatcher and Alex Cameron. They called it a sell-out to the Americans, a cartel that created unemployment in Saskatchewan and they promised to wipe out the plan, immediately they became the Government.

Mr. Speaker, here is a quotation from the NDP election booklet:

A New Democratic Government will end the present Government collaboration in a potash cartel that restricts Saskatchewan's output and jobs.

It goes on to say that because the present owners of

March 2, 1972

Saskatchewan's potash mines have shown unconcern for our miners and forced farmers to pay exorbitant prices for fertilizer, an NDP Government will consider bringing the potash industry under public ownership. So, Mr. Speaker, to save the miners' jobs and to reduce the price of fertilizer, the NDP were going to do away with the floor price, throw out pro-rationing and possibly take over the industry itself.

That was all before June 23rd, 1971. Now move to December 9th, 1971 and examine a press statement made by Mr. Bowerman, the new Minister of Mineral Resources. He stated that the floor price would be maintained by the NDP Government, pro-rationing would also be continued.

I should like to quote a few lines from Mr. Bowerman's statement. Mr. Bowerman said:

We believe, that because of our assistance through pro-rationing and price stabilization legislation, the Province is entitled to some increase in revenues.

He went on to say that the Government would maintain the floor price of \$33.75 a ton because, and again I quote Mr. Bowerman:

It is an integral part of stabilization.

Then, Mr. Speaker, he added this rather amazing statement and again I'm quoting the Honourable Mr. Bowerman:

If pro-rationing were dropped we might have a situation similar to the wheat situation on our hands.

So here we have Mr. Bowerman, Minister of Mineral Resources no, I think that they removed him, and I don't know if it was for that reason. Here we have Mr. Bowerman, five months after he was blasting the floor price and the pro-rationing of potash as a sell-out to the Yankees and a direct cause of unemployment in Saskatchewan, embracing the whole program and even boasting about it. He refers to it as "our assistance", he calls it an integral part of stabilizing the industry.

Some Hon. Members: — Hear, hear!

Mr. Steuart: — Mr. Bowerman, what happened to all the unemployed miners? What happened to the tremendous price of fertilizer? Or have you found out since you became the Government that the farmers of Saskatchewan don't use potash for fertilizer? I'm glad you found that out. Anybody with a drop of intelligence would have know it before the election but the NDP Government evidently turned its back on all those sacred principles in five short months, or have they sold out to the imperialistic capitalists from south of the border?

I'm afraid, the truth isn't quite so dramatic.

While the NDP image of a political party prepared to bring in Democratic Socialism (whatever that means), once they obtained power, has been badly tarnished the real reason they have embraced the Liberal potash policy is simply because they know now that it works.

Mr. Speaker, it would be refreshingly honest if the Premier, or any of his Ministers had the decency to admit they were

March 2, 1972

wrong and pay a tribute to Alex Cameron and the late Ross Thatcher for actually saving our potash industry by putting in a floor price and pro-rationing.

Some Hon. Members: — Hear, hear!

Mr. Steuart: — This, Mr. Speaker, ties in with another promise made by the NDP, before the election, but it's only mentioned now by the Wafflers and other unacceptably honest people in the NDP. I quote from page eight of the NDP election program booklet:

With respect to new development, the NDP will give first priority to public ownership through crown corporations, end of quotation.

Well, Mr. Speaker, we've had seven months of NDP Government, all kinds of high priced experts imported from all over Canada, and we are now into the second session of the Legislature, and so far not even the slightest hint of any new development by private corporations, Government corporations or Crown corporation. Now, surely, Mr. Speaker, Mr. Blakeney had some idea when he put that plank in his election platform. He must have been thinking of some new kind of industry he would start if he ever became Premier. But, we have yet to hear a hint of a new industry founded or started by this Government. Oh, we know of industries that have been cancelled and driven out of the Province, and we watch with interest the floating Romanian tractor factory, that was, in fact, looking at Saskatchewan before the NDP was elected, but nothing now, absolutely nothing now. And, Mr. Speaker, if there was an exodus of people out of Saskatchewan before June 23rd, 1971, it must have reached flood proportions by this time.

Lack of industrial and business development was the greatest weakness and caused the eventual downfall of the old CCF Government during the 1950s and early sixties.

Well, Mr. Speaker, we have come full circle and Saskatchewan has a new version, not much different, but a new version of the old CCF Government. The problem of stagnation appears to be with us again.

Before you can create a job, before you can produce a penny of revenue for schools or hospitals, someone must invest a dollar, and there are only three kinds of investment; from private sources, Government sources, or from a combination of the two. So far this Government has given the private sector of the economy very, very rough treatment.

One promise that the NDP have kept with a vengeance is that if they were elected they would limit foreign investment in Saskatchewan resource development. They have, in fact, limited any kind of investment, in our resources in this Province to zero.

Some Hon. Members: — Hear, hear!

Mr. Steuart: — Now, Mr. Speaker, a few other promises made by our friends opposite are worth looking at and will be dealt with in more detail by others in this debate, I'm sure.

They said an NDP Government would put an end to the teacher-pupil ratio. This is an example of outright hypocrisy by the

March 2, 1972

Premier and his Minister of Education (Mr. MacMurchy). Now let's explain it. Where our Government would say as a result of the teacher-pupil ration, a school could have, say, 50 teachers and a grant of say \$400 thousand for teachers' salaries, what do the NDP and Mr. MacMurchy say? They say, here is \$380 thousand for teachers' salaries and you can hire as many teachers as you want; you can stick the local taxpayers with the extra money. This is what the NDP call local autonomy and freedom. Again, the school board can hire as many teachers as they want as long as the extra wage bill is paid by the local taxpayers.

The NDP promised to prohibit discrimination because of political beliefs, and I can give you a list as long as your arm, Mr. Speaker, of people fired by the NDP, pushed out by the NDP, elbowed out by the NDP, simple because they were hired by a Liberal Government, who will bear witness to the cynical way that this promise has been broken.

You know, it's amazing how quickly and how righteously the attorney General or the Minister of Education (Mr. MacMurchy) spring to the defence of certain people who have lost their jobs in this Province.

A nurse is fired and we immediately have a board of enquiry by our fearless Attorney General (Mr. Romanow). Two weeks later he fires a war veteran, with no board of enquiry, in fact, even without the courage of a personal interview.

Some Hon. Members: — Hear, hear!

Mr. Steuart: — A school teacher is dismissed for spreading filthy smut to the Grade eight classroom and our Minister of Education rushes to her defence, yet the same man stands silently by while men with families to support are fired for no reason from his own Department.

There is no question the "New Deal for People" is only for some people; those who support the NDP.

Some Hon. Members: — Hear, hear!

Mr. Steuart: — Mr. Speaker, I have dealt with some of the Government's broken promises and I'd like to turn for a moment to some that they have kept or that they say they will fulfil.

Granted, Mr. Speaker, the Government is only seven months old and no fair-minded person would expect them to have fulfilled many of their promises, let alone all of them. They did promise to abolish utilization fees and they have done so. I must say I found the Minister of Public Health, Mr. Smishek's outburst about rising health costs rather interesting. The Leader-Post editorial welcomed him as the first Minister in the new Government to come down off cloud nine, and we were very pleased to see your responsible attitude to what you found in the Department of Health, Walter. When you get tired over there we'll make room for you over here.

The Government raised the minimum wage and lowered the hours of work, but as we've seen, this was a mixed blessing.

Now let's look at some of the promises they are about to fulfil, according to the Throne Speech.

March 2, 1972

I refer to the Land Bank and the imposition of an estates tax by Saskatchewan, and I link them together because they tell us a great deal about the fuzzy thinking of our friends in the NDP.

Some Hon. Members: — Hear, hear!

Mr. Steuart: — One of the basic principles of the Land Bank, according to the NDP, is to make the transition of farmland from father to son as easy as possible. One of the principal results of the estates tax will be to force many sons to sell the farm they just inherited from their father to pay Saskatchewan's death duties or estate taxes.

Some Hon. Members: — Hear, hear!

Mr. Steuart: — At first this seems to be an unbelievable contradiction, but close scrutiny of the Land Bank, as proposed, proves that the NDP really don't want the son to inherit the father's farm, they want the Government to own it and if he is a good docile follower and keeps in well with the local advisory committee he may, he just may get to be a tenant on his own family's land. Mr. Speaker, the Land Bank as proposed by the NDP its present form is a hoax and a fraud.

Some Hon. Members: — Hear, hear!

Mr. Steuart: — It stands condemned by the booklet entitled, "The Saskatchewan Land Bank" put out by the Hon. John R. Messer, (Minister of Agriculture), and by the very words uttered by the same man on this subject. Read the booklet, listen to Mr. Messer. Three facts stand out like a sore thumb. NDP do not intend to sell the land they will buy and buy and so within twenty or thirty years the Government could well own a quarter or a third of all the farmland in Saskatchewan. Now, Mr. Speaker, every year at least a million acres of farmland comes up for sale. This figure should go up with the Government purchasing land. The Government, if it is serious about buying land, will probably purchase at least about 500,000 acres a year. In twenty years this could give them over 10 million acres of farm land out of a total of about 48 million or more than 20 per cent of all the farm land in the province at a cost of \$60 million or \$700 million.

Mr. Speaker, look at page seven and eight of the booklet put out by the Government on the Land Bank and this will prove to any thinking person the difficulty an individual will have buying land under this plan. And when you get up, Mr. Messer (Minister of Agriculture), to speak on this Land Bank you tell us how those farmers are going to buy that land under your scheme. On page seven under the heading of who will be eligible to receive land we have the following paragraph:

Some farmers will be ineligible to receive land because their operations are already adequate. It is proposed that this be determined on the basis of a maximum net worth of \$60 thousand a maximum net family income of \$10 thousand per year, each averaged over a three-year period.

This means they don't intend to lease land to anyone

March 2, 1972

with much money. I'm not objecting to this fact but I will argue with the figures, I believe the principle of making land available to farmers in modest circumstances is good. However, it is a fact that the farmers allowed to lease this land will have little or no spare cash.

Now let's see how they go about buying the land under the present NDP scheme. On page eight of the same booklet under the heading "What type of Leases Will Be Used", we find this paragraph:

Under certain conditions, (says Mr. Messer, Minister of Agriculture) tenants will have the opportunity to eventually purchase the land. Sales will be on a cash basis, with the sale price being the market value at the time of sale, as determined by the Land Bank Commission.

End of quotation. The key words in this paragraph are, "Sales will be on a cash basis", and this tells the whole story. Where? Mr. Messer (Minister of Agriculture), where in the name of God, after a few years of leasing this land and paying the rent in cash will any farmer acquire enough money to pay cash for the land, and remember he has to pay this cash for the rental every year, good year, good crop, bad crop, large quote or small quota? Oh, he has to pay cash rent that may go up or down but he still has to pay. He has to pay his taxes, he has to pay his crop insurance. This becomes even more apparent when we consider the rent they are talking about charging.

Now, you stated Mr. Minister of Agriculture (Mr. Messer), publicly that the rents would be from \$2.50 to \$10 an acre. You have also said that the Government wants a return on its money. Today they are going to pay 7 per cent on the money at least, more maybe in the future. The booklet says the rent will be determined by the cost of the money to the Government, cost of land and on crop returns. On top of the rent, the farmers will be required to pay the taxes and carry crop insurance. Take the average rental, average taxes plus crop insurance and you have a farmer with ordinary land in this province paying out something between \$8 and \$10 per acre cash on every acre. If he puts only one-third and most of them put a half, but if he puts only one-third into summer fallow each year, the farmer would need about an eight-bushel quota just to pay the Government, the municipality and the crop insurance. Nothing left over to pay all his other costs plus his living. Eight bushel quota! How many times in the last 20 years have we exceeded an eight-bushel quota? This is the same farmer who will have to pay cash on the barrelhead if he wants to buy his land from this NDP Government. That's why I say, Mr. Speaker, it's a hoax and a fraud, the Government has no intention of selling the land.

Some Hon. Members: — Hear, hear!

Mr. Steuart: — I wonder why this should surprise anybody. I wonder why anybody should be surprised that this NDP Government wants to acquire the land and really doesn't want to sell it. Look at their record. When we became the Government we found that the CCF Government had acquired tremendous amounts of lease land and it was almost impossible for any farmer to buy it back. Well, we put that land up for sale. Since the NDP have come back into office they have literally, virtually stopped that program and the land is not for sale any more. The NDP are socialists, they are proud of this fact, at least some of them

March 2, 1972

are proud of the fact, and some of them try to hide it. But their aim is to have the Government own and control the means of production and distribution. This Land bank scheme is a giant step in that direction and the farmers of Saskatchewan will not be fooled by a high flying fast talking Minister of Agriculture (Mr. Messer), they will look at the facts and unless you change them, I predict they will reject the plan.

Some Hon. Members: — Hear, hear!

Mr. Steuart: — See, Mr. Speaker, Mr. Messer, (Minister of Agriculture) is shaking his head, I am not sure whether he is trying to clear it or whether he is indicating to me or the people of this Province that he has no intention of changing the Act, and I suggest that the latter is the truth. This is not a Land Bank, it is a Government land acquisition scheme and we will oppose it in its present form with all our resources.

Mr. Romanow: — Good, Good.

Mr. Steuart: — Good, you say, you bet its good. Let the Government withdraw this plan and submit one which lets the farmer buy his land and sets the annual payment at a reasonable level, then and only then will be give it support. The last paragraph of this Government booklet has an ominous ring for Saskatchewan farmers. I quote: “The first group of tenants will take up the land allocated to them early in 1973”. Mr. Messer, (Minister of Agriculture), Mr. Premier, Mr. Attorney General (Mr. Romanow), you would make sharecroppers of our farmers in one or two generations. This, Mr. Speaker, will be the beginning of tenant farming in Saskatchewan. We reject this principle and so I predict will most farmers.

Some Hon. Members: — Hear, hear!

Mr. Steuart: — A strong and a free country must have as a base a strong agriculture industry made up of free farmers who own and work their own land. We will never give up fighting for this principle.

Some Hon. Members: — Hear, hear!

Mr. Steuart: — You should be sympathetic to this Mr. Romanow (Attorney General).

Mr. Romanow: — Tucker or tyranny.

Mr. Steuart: — Let me tell you this. Many, many of the people that came to this Province from other lands came here because they couldn't own land where they came from. They came here to own land. They will not stand idly by and see the land move into government control even by your Government, cloaked in sanctimonious sayings. I predict you will withdraw this plan, and if you don't withdraw it, you will rue the day. This is a bad plan in its present form.

Some Hon. Members: — Hear, hear!

March 2, 1972

Mr. Steuart: — Now let's take a look at the companion piece to the Land Bank. And I call it the companion piece, the new Saskatchewan Estates Tax or Succession Duty. It's a companion piece because I'm convinced that these two acts of the Legislature will remove more farms and businesses from the ownership of Saskatchewan people than anything that has yet happened in our Province's history. Mr. Speaker, I shall go into more detail in opposing the Succession Duty Act when the Government introduces it into the House. Today I shall point out some basic facts about the proposed new tax which should concern all of the people of this Province. Make no mistake, it's a new tax.

The Province of Saskatchewan under our Liberal Government gave back 75 per cent of the Estates Tax collected by the Federal Government to the people of Saskatchewan. We did it to enable one generation to pass on their hard-earned farm or business to their sons and daughters. We did it as well to encourage people with money to stay in Saskatchewan, to invest their wealth and contribute to our economy. We rebated this tax because Alberta had done so a year or two earlier and were in a position to attract people with estates away from our Province to theirs. All these reasons are still valid and one more factor has now been added that makes the imposition of Death Duties by the NDP in Saskatchewan even more unfair and short sighted and that is the elimination of this tax by the Federal Government. The Federal Government has quit charging an Estate Tax as part of the whole package of tax reform. This reform will see a reduction in Federal Income Tax for about one million Canadian, many of them will no tax to pay at all. It will see a new Capital Gains Tax levied which will bring in a great deal of new money to governments. As part of the package the Federal Government said in effect since we are not taxing almost every form of income, it would be unfair and it would be double taxation to continue collecting Estate Taxes or Death Duties. But the NDP saw what they thought was a chance to soak the rich, to soak the fat cats, and so they rushed in are slapping the people of Saskatchewan with this new tax. Oh, they say we will exempt the first \$150 thousand so all the ordinary people will not be caught by this tax. In fact, in the Commonwealth, they said Saskatchewan's new Succession Duties have been formulated in such a way that small family farms and family business will benefit most. Now can anybody benefit from a new tax? Only an NDP and only in the Commonwealth could they make such a ridiculous statement.

An Hon. Member: — Something wrong with the editor.

Mr. Steuart: — Never mind, I'll pass it over and you should read it and maybe you will see the light, I doubt it, but you might.

Mr. Messer: — Read John Mills.

Mr. Steuart: — It's patently false, the statement you made, as the people will find out when they see all the details of this tough new tax. Oh, he said read John Mills, yes, I've read John Mills. You had better read him again. You had better also take a look at some of the people that you mix with, you had better go and ask some of the people who came from lands like your ancestors did, to come here and own their own land, what they think of this new move to socialize land, take a hard look at it, Roy. I think you will back away from it.

March 2, 1972

Some Hon. Members: — Hear, hear!

Mr. Steuart: — I hope you've got the common sense and the decency to back away from it. Let me just tell the House some of the assets that will be added into everyone's estate and at today's prices let no one think that the average farm, small business or even the estates of a married couple earning reasonable salaries will escape. Our people acquire estates through many endeavours, all of which involve saving and investing. Many save through pension plans, including the Canada Pension Plan, company plans and private plans. These plans will be valued for estate tax purpose in Saskatchewan at from \$10,000 to \$15,000 for every \$1,000 of pension payable. Additionally the payment on a house mortgage is an investment providing an estate. Others use life insurance, and that will be taxable. Others take on debt and add to farmlands and machinery to improve the economics of their farm and livestock operation. Some people operate small businesses, make them larger based on Saskatchewan rather than outside ownership, and surely we know the benefits of having Saskatchewan ownership rather than control being lodged elsewhere – Toronto or the USA or anywhere else. We all know what inflation has done to values – dollars are worth less, so, for example, houses are worth more of the cheaper dollars. Over many years this has happened to farms and machinery, it has happened to houses and buildings and to most values, so that all of a sudden on death, the deceased's family finds that assets, which only produced a modest income, are now in the taxable bracket. A farm, for example which has been slowly expanded to stay economically viable now has to be reduced or sold outright to produce succession tax money, and can be either gone or no longer economic. A manufacturing plant or a business has been expanded to keep up with costs, and on death, the owner requires a partial or total sale to pay Saskatchewan's Death Duties. The result, often the whole farm or the business has to be sold and to the highest bidder no matter where the capital comes from and a great deal of it may be from outside this Province or even outside this country.

Mr. MacDonald: — Tell this to the Americans.

Mr. Steuart: — Any sensible person faced with the prospect of the break-up of his assets on death surely will dispose of them during his lifetime. Now, who can guess when the final time will come – so most will sell early and if their estate is taxable in Saskatchewan, they will move and this Province will lose productive citizens – will collect no tax, and face a loss of productive investment as well. I ask the government seriously to consider it carefully whether a tax, which most people will attempt to avoid, is worth the losses we shall face on account of this tax. Not only is it a disincentive to save, you will offer them a bonus to leave, in the form of lower taxes elsewhere. What young person would not accept a big bonus to take a job in Alberta or BC. Indeed what older person with a taxable estate would not do the same thing.

Mr. Speaker, who can't escape? Who has to stay here? Well the farmer, he is tied to Saskatchewan whether he likes it or not – he'll end up paying the tax or his people that inherit his farm will. And what hypocrisy to add yet another cost to agricultural production in Saskatchewan while at the same time mouthing slogans that the NDP are the farmer's friends.

Some Hon. Members: — Hear, hear!

March 2, 1972

Mr. Steuart: — Well, Mr. Speaker, we will not place our people in this position. A Liberal Government three and one-half years from now will repeal this tax. If this legislation passes, I'm afraid we can't do anything for the people of Saskatchewan until a change of government and I can only advise them to stay alive long enough to vote against the NDP in the next election.

Some Hon. Members: — Hear, hear!

Mr. Steuart: — Mr. Speaker, the Throne Speech is a mish-mash of pious hopes, a few goodies, a promise to extend many Liberal programs and at least two very bad acts, the Land Bank and the Succession Duties, that will hurt the people of Saskatchewan. On the first page it touches on the need for economic development to help produce jobs for our unemployed, especially the young people in Saskatchewan. It fails however, to spell out any plans for bringing about this necessary economic development. Under Premier Blakeney we are getting the worst of both worlds. He won't encourage private investment and he doesn't appear to be ready to go to the Government or Socialist route. To put it nicely the Premier doesn't have the intestinal fortitude to be a Waffler or the common sense to be a free or private enterpriser. In the meantime, Saskatchewan's economy lies in the doldrums. Mr. Premier, you have only been Premier for seven months, you've kept what I believe is called a very low profile. He has in effect stayed in the background letting his Ministers shoot the bullets, he's playing it real cool. But I warn him that the people are becoming concerned, not just the Wafflers who will soon be demanding his head if he doesn't show some action, but other more stable people as well.

Speaking of the Wafflers, I thought it very interesting, and I quote John W. Warnock, a Waffle spokesman writing in a magazine called Canadian Dimension, January 1972 issue. Mr. Warnock had this to say:

The polarization is growing within the Provincial NDP. The performance of the Cabinet, the MLAs and the right wing is forcing the people in the centre of the Party to the left. It will be difficult for the Waffle Movement to hold down those elements (Mainly the older CCFers and the youth) who want to split and form a Socialist Party.

I go on to quote Mr. Warnock:

Over the next two years if the Blakeney Government continues to be a caretaker, civil servant government, fiddling while Rome burns, then we can expect either a wholesale assault on the Party leadership by the growing left or a complete break with the Party.

In the same article he asks if it is worth the effort to nationalize or have the government take over all industry, and I quote:

Is it worth the effort. Of course it is. That is why the American corporations and their Canadian flunkies will fight so hard to keep things the way they are. That's why to make it happen will require a strong Socialist movement that has the brains, the tenacity

March 2, 1972

and the guts to take on the corporate giants and their Liberal friends and see the struggle through.

Well, Mr. Speaker, I don't agree that it would take much tenacity or brains for a government to seize and control our total economy, but I do agree it would take political guts to try it. I believe, the members on this side of the House believe, that if we in this Province use our brains and our common sense we will take the best instrument at hand to develop our resources for the benefit of Saskatchewan people.

If private investment can do a certain job then by all means encourage them, if the next project would be better developed by the Government then we say use that avenue and when a combination of the two is called for then we say, that's the route we should go. But in a capital starved, underdeveloped province like Saskatchewan surely you don't threaten, intimidate, discourage or rule out any form of honest investment.

In short, Mr. Speaker, you don't act like the present NDP Government is doing. I challenge the Premier to come out of his shell, take a stand and get on with the job he was elected to do – develop Saskatchewan in the best interests of the people. People of this Province were disappointed in the Throne Speech. They expected more. You people went to the people in this Province and said that if you were elected it will be a different kind of government. You said, when we bring in our first Throne Speech it would be a different kind of Throne Speech. You promised literally that a new day would dawn for the common people of this Province. Where is that great promise? When is the new day dawning? Look at your own Throne speech. What is in it? Where is the development? Where are the jobs? Where is the hope for your young people to stay in this Province, to build their lives here and to help us build this Province of Saskatchewan? Where is your confidence in the people of Saskatchewan and in the resources of Saskatchewan?

To this point, and it has only been seven months, I admit, you haven't shown any daring, you haven't shown any intestinal fortitude to depart from old ways, you have just carried on and, in fact, all you have done so far is to ruin and discourage and sabotage what we had built up without building anything new of your own.

I tell you today although it has only been seven months the people of this Province don't think it is good enough and we don't think it is good enough. And as a result I intend to move a motion of non-confidence if I can fit it – and I have found it. I am sure that you would have been very disappointed if I hadn't.

So, Mr. Speaker, I move, seconded by Mr. Grant that the following words be added to the Address:

But this Assembly, acutely aware of the serious unemployment and underemployment that exists in the Province of Saskatchewan, denounces the government for its failure to pursue any resource and Industrial development program that would both diversity our economy and provide much needed employment for our citizens.

Some Hon. Members: — Hear, hear!

March 2, 1972

The debate continued on the motion and amendment.

Mr. E.C. Whelan (Regina North West): — Mr. Speaker, I should like to congratulate the mover of the motion, the Hon. Member for Kerrobert-Kindersley (Mr. Taylor) and the seconder of the motion, the Hon. Member for Humboldt (Mr. Tchorzewski) on the convincing manner in which they presented their material. Both Members are able, competent representatives and in my estimation they will be in politics for a long, long time.

Some Hon. Members: — Hear, hear!

Mr. Whelan: — Mr. Speaker, I should like to congratulate the Hon. Member for Souris-Estevan (Mr. Thorson) on his election and on his appointment to the Executive Council. His contribution will be valuable to this Province for years to come. I should like to congratulate the Hon. Member for Morse (Mr. Wiebe) on his election.

Election to this House carries with it prestige and honour but also a great deal of responsibility. I am sure the newly elected Members will carry that responsibility with dignity and with ability. I should like also to congratulate the Hon. Member for Saskatoon City Park (Mr. Dyck) on his election as Member for Prince Albert West (Mr. Steuart) on his election as Leader of the Liberal Party.

Mr. Speaker, I think that he faces a very difficult task and at the same time he has undertaken a very important task. You know there was a distinct rumour around, according to posters that appeared in many hotel lobbies, that we were backing the Hon. Member in his leadership race. Mr. Speaker, on behalf of Members on this side of the House, I want to assure him that this was not so.

I want to congratulate my long-time associate, the Hon. Member for Saskatoon-Mayfair on his appointment to the Cabinet. We worked together on many projects, whether it was a Crown corporation committee, a resolution on electoral boundaries, or any assigned task, the Hon. Member proved himself competent, hardworking, personable and pretty cool. There is a rumour around that he takes after another member of his family. Mr. Speaker, I suggest that is not so. He made it on his own and he has made it with flying colours and is qualified in every respect.

Some Hon. Members: — Hear, hear!

Mr. Whelan: — Mr. Speaker, without divulging any secrets, I want to say that there is no truth in allegations that it was to outmanoeuvre a revolt on this side of the House, or an attempt to settle the Irish question. It is my understanding that the choice to send me as a representative to the Commonwealth Parliamentary Association meeting came about on a seniority basis. Mr. Speaker, in my capacity as a representative of this Legislature, I want to assure every Member here that I shall try to uphold the proud reputation Saskatchewan holds among the parliamentary groups of the Commonwealth, established by those Members of the Saskatchewan Association

March 2, 1972

who have attended conferences on our behalf from both sides of this House. It is with humility and pride, Mr. Speaker, that I undertake to represent a legislative body which I have learned to respect, appreciate and admire.

Mr. Speaker, I wonder if I might turn for a moment to the controversy over radio time. You know it is a new experience to me to find the Leader of the Opposition, without any reference to the Government, fixing his own radio time. It has been my privilege to sit in this House since 1960 and at no time have I seen such an example of unco-operative arrogance by a Party leader regardless of where he was sitting in this House.

Some Hon. Members: — Hear, hear!

Mr. Whelan: —Mr. Speaker, during my term as Party Whip I had the questionable pleasure of accepting his edicts for radio time when he was the House leader. He knows that then and before it was based on the number of Members elected. The people of Saskatchewan set the allocation for radio time on June 23rd.

Some Hon. Members: — Hear, hear!

Mr. Whelan: — The Hon. Member for Prince Albert West (Mr. Steuart) cannot fix radio time like he fixed his riding boundaries.

Some Hon. Members: — Hear, hear!

Mr. Whelan: — Mr. Speaker, sooner or later as this Session grinds on, he might find out that his Party lost the election – 45 seats to 15. The radio committee knows it, the people know it and I wonder when he will get the message.

When we argued voters' percentages in 1965 – and I was on the radio committee – he rejected it out of hand. I recall very vividly – and it is strange how he changed his position when he moved to that side of the House. But, of course, Mr. Speaker, consistency is not a plank in the platform of his Party.

Mr. Speaker, before I turn to the Throne Speech itself I wonder if I might indulge in a few obvious replies to those who have preceded me in the debate. Mr. Speaker, the Hon. Member – and I am not sure what riding he represents – I don't think that it has been decided. It may be Athabasca or it may be the Court of Appeal – but in any case the Hon. Member Opposite (Mr. Guy) spoke at great length. I want to tell the Hon. Member what a very wise and experienced Member of this House once said when a new backbencher who had just arrived in the House asked him how to make a speech. He gave him this advice. He said to him, "Listen to the Hon. Member for Athabasca. Don't do anything or say anything he does. You will get your Party in trouble, reduce the decorum of the House and eliminate your credibility."

Mr. Speaker, prior to the last election when I was referring to seats that would be won after the 1971 election was called, I reviewed those who wouldn't hold their seats, who wouldn't be back. The Hon. Member who led off for the Opposition in this debate rose in his place and said, "Would you like to predict the outcome of Athabasca?" Mr. Speaker, looking at

March 2, 1972

him now in the circumstances he finds himself, listening to his speech, adding up its net worth, if he will get on his feet and ask me how I think the next election in the constituency will turn out, I am prepared to answer him. My answer, Mr. Speaker, is that he will get every vote that he deserves.

Some Hon. Members: — Hear, hear!

Mr. Whelan: — It won't be enough to elect him. Mr. Speaker, why did the Liberals suffer such a humiliating defeat in the election? Why were they so soundly and completely and thoroughly thrashed in riding after riding? Why would they have been beaten in 10 more ridings if the average vote in Estevan and Morse had been applied, after we had been in office only six months. Many people have asked that question and I think it is about time those in the Liberal Party, not only the Members of the 171 Club, whom I am told are led by the former Member for Elrose, but all Liberals, not just those who are looking for answers and feel stifled and the need of a program, but all Liberals, should seek the answer. All of them should seek the answer as to why they suffered such a complete and devastating defeat.

I suggest, Mr. Speaker, that one of the reasons was that, in spite of the most energetic efforts of McLaren Agencies, in spite of the many and constant appearances of Cabinet Ministers on television, the public had ceased to believe them. And why did they quit believing them? They had claimed in the 1967 campaign that they would wipe us out. The public noted carefully that we came within an eyelash of defeating them. They weren't exactly accurate then. And the same claim was made with verbosity and enthusiasm prior to the 1971 campaign.

Those who sat on the Treasury benches then bragged persistently of their business ability. They carted out Crown corporations, honest efforts were made to develop secondary industry, but lost a few thousand dollars. Let's take two of the babies they raised in the Crown corporation field, just two of their pet projects; the Water Supply Board and Saskatchewan Pulpwood Limited.

In the Water Supply Board, the accounts receivable were questionable, according to the auditor. Even then the accumulated net losses for the water Supply Board, at the end of 1970, amounted to \$898,000. It wasn't a small operation like the box factory that their great business genius raised from a baby. Saskatchewan Pulpwood Limited, a Crown corporation organized to haul wood to the Prince Albert mill, heaven only knows what equipment was transferred to whom and when, but even without getting all the deals, this pet that was nurtured and hatched and developed by our efficient, business friends, lost \$846,000 in accumulated losses to the end of 1970, according to the statement.

Mr. Speaker, I won't go into other Crown corporations which had been operating and which lost money as a result of their business genius, but these two, and they were all their own, these were their pets and these two lost a cool sum of \$1,744,000 in accumulated net losses at the end of 1970. And they said to the people of Saskatchewan, "elect us because we are the smart businessmen".

March 2, 1972

Mr. Speaker, let me give you another example. Time after time with the men of the Press waiting verbose and loud speeches were made when we were the Government because we hadn't called for tenders on typewriters or office equipment. Then they became the Government, one request after another indicated that if tenders were called they declined to give us the information. They declined to give us a list of the tenders submitted. Meanwhile when we asked for the prices and serial numbers of cars and trucks and construction equipment sold by Crown corporations we discovered that it was sold without tenders, at give-away prices by these same people who criticized us for the way we bought and sold public property.

Now they come into the House with another new angle in the last three or four days. They know that although the population dropped they know that the value of a car has not doubled, they know too that the cost of compulsory automobile insurance that we purchase with the automobile plate has increased from \$12 million in 1964 to \$24 million in 1971, over a period of seven years. A 100 per cent increase, Mr. Speaker. Now these virtuous straightforward people come into the House and object to a \$10 increase on a brand new automobile. Well, they have denied with a straight face year after year that there was an increase, the cost of insurance jumped from \$12 million to \$24 million. Mr. Speaker, they stood in their places in the House and denied that there had been an increase in rates. Do you think the public should believe this?

When the sale of grain dropped off and the farmers were without income as a result of their policies, their Minister of Agriculture said 'diversify'. Speech after speech in their most persuasive manner was made by Cabinet Ministers of the day. Hogs and sheep – they were the answer. Hog barns were built and loans were made, barns were insured. Without a marketing board the price of hogs collapsed and left many of the farmers so deeply in debt that they prayed that their barns would be destroyed by wind or lightning. Were they telling the farmers the truth and did they know when they said 'diversify whether it would save the farmers?

And then there was the statement that was mailed with the Homeowner Grant and it said, "This is your dividend from Saskatchewan's economic development." Mr. Speaker, after the fellow took his Homeowner cheque in his hand went down the main streets of Regina, businesses to the right of him, businesses to the left of him, businesses in front of him, businesses behind him were bankrupt, their doors closed. Mr. Speaker, 135 businesses in Regina closed their doors in one year. Could we believe them. Could we believe the little note with the Homeowner Grant?

The people asked for jobs. They said, "We have no unemployment. Look at the statistics published by our friends from Ottawa. We have fewer unemployed than any other province in Canada." They were right! But the people who were left remembered that those who went away were out of work and had gone to Manitoba, Alberta or British Columbia looking for a job. Would they believe them when they said there was no unemployment in Saskatchewan?

Even now, Mr. Speaker, they don't like the Land Bank idea because the farmer can't buy the land. What did they do, Mr. Speaker? They allowed one company to make \$7 million in loans at outrageous interest rates, the length and breadth of

March 2, 1972

the Province and removed the protection the farmer had on the home quarter because the mortgage company asked them to, the protection the farmer had fought for and won over a period of decades. Now one Hon. Member opposite who either knows no history or doesn't care says that the farmer if he leases the land pays for the land many times over. Mr. Speaker, I want to ask the Hon. Member how many times he thinks the farmer is going to pay the \$7 million at an interest rate of 8, 9 or 10 per cent. Yes, can you believe them when they say they worry about the farmer being able to purchase the land. Do they mean purchasing it Liberal style at 10 per cent interest?

Then there were the long tirades about the Power building, how we couldn't afford it, how it was too expensive, how no utility company on the North American continent had built such an expensive head office. Yet, Mr. Speaker, in every brochure, on every calendar, on every piece of publicity they put out, on many television programs when the Leader of the Opposition appeared on the television set, what was the background? You guessed it, the SPC building. They had taken it to their heart as if it was their idea. Can you believe in the sincerity of such critics. Time after time the Hon. Members opposite have risen in their places and worried about the Waffle movement in our organization. Now they have in their organization a huge rump active group trying to develop constructive and progressive ideas. After listening to the speeches in this House, Mr. Speaker, it is obvious that the sections of their party are not communicating. It is also obvious that you can hardly validate their criticism of our party, in light of the situation that has developed, the unbelievable situation the untenable situation that has developed behind the Leader of the Opposition.

In their most vocal fashion they rose in their places in this House and criticized The Family Farm Protection Act, but what they fail to say, Mr. Speaker, is that if there was a need for the legislation – and there was a need – that need was brought about first because of their economic policies; and second by the fact that they had completely stripped the Provincial Mediation board of its staff; and third they placed an interpretation on certain legislation that was anaemic and ineffective.

Finally, Mr. Speaker, this makes their criticism of The Family Farm Protection Act silly when one considers the part they played in the need for its development. It makes their criticism innocuous, ineffective and unexplainable.

Mr. Speaker, we have been told by the Press and by the Leader of the Opposition that following the Speech from the Throne they would consult their constituencies for new ideas, for new approaches, for new points to make in the House. Well, we welcomed this. We thought this might be an improvement. We thought they needed new ideas. The contradiction and their failure to do so must be evident to all of those constituencies as it is evident to every member of the house. It is evident by the speakers who have taken part in this debate from that side of the House, because they are making the same old worn out ridiculous, garbage can speeches they made prior to the election on June 23. It must be obvious to the constituencies that they will have to change the speakers or they will have to rewrite their script if they want a new and different approach and perhaps they should get some scripts from the 171ers.

The people of the province quite believing them a long time

March 2, 1972

ago. After listening to the speeches they have enunciated in this debate and examining the record, I say seriously, can you blame them!

Mr. Speaker, the Speech from the Throne has within its paragraphs a promise to do something about housing. In one province after another in this country housing corporations have been set up. Alberta to the west of us, Manitoba to the east, with a climate similar to ours have gone to work on the housing problem. As unemployment increased as the need to provide jobs for tradesmen became obvious other provinces undertook programs but we sat idly by without a housing corporation. Mr. Speaker, the former Minister of Municipal affairs time after time was voted millions of dollars for housing. We voted \$5 million for capital expenditures, they spent a little over \$2 million of it. Even the homeowner incentive plan never really got off the ground until this government got elected, Mr. Speaker, and there was an expenditure made commensurate with the need. The net result has been a fantastic increase in units completed in the Province of Saskatchewan. Mr. Speaker, as far as housing was concerned, the economic paralysis that swept over the activity to provide jobs was typical of their whole attitude. Why was there no planning? First, because the people opposite are opposed to spending money on planning, secondly, the result was that money voted was never spent and thirdly, there was no employment and eventually as a result, no housing. Mr. Speaker, in the neighbouring province, during the year 1971 approximately 4,00 units were built.

A housing corporation holds prospect for developing:

1. A housing program.
2. Planning housing construction for rural and urban people in the Province.
3. Developing industries that will produce the component parts for a housing program.
4. Developing construction methods that will be economical and practical for our climate.
5. Planning housing construction year after year, not only to build new homes but also to rebuild older homes in the cities, towns, villages and on the farms of Saskatchewan.

The people of this Province have said loud and clear that there must be planning by a reasonably adequate staff of knowledgeable people to provide housing for senior citizens, for young people, in short for the people of Saskatchewan.

Because the Speech from the Throne holds out the prospect for developing a housing program, is one of the reasons, Mr. Speaker, why I wholeheartedly endorse the Speech from the Throne.

Mr. Speaker, Co-operatives and Credit Unions have played an important role in this Province for many years. Not only have they established a yardstick for business practices, not only have they pumped economic life into many economic activities but they have developed leadership and taught people to work together. The Speech from the Throne holds forth the prospect for a strengthening the Department of Co-operatives and Co-operative Development. Many facets, many new fields for co-operative development challenge the imagination of those who believe in this method of economic organization. To name a few, housing,

March 2, 1972

day care centres, recreational activity, ownership of farm machinery. The operation of secondary industry and examination of consumer standards above all present a challenge to make co-operatives serve those who need service at cost because they are faced with economic hardship.

Mr. Speaker, the challenge of Co-operatives and Credit Unions is to serve those in economic distress while at the same time expanding the control of co-operative organization so that it reaches out in a meaningful way and becomes a part of the very day-to-day existence of housewives, students, welfare recipients, farmers, working people and retired citizens. Mr. Speaker, extension and expansion of the Department of Co-operatives is necessary as a vehicle to aid and assist people in previous Government did and allow the Co-operative Department to dry up is a crime against the pioneers who worked tirelessly to develop the biggest and best co-operative movement in this country. The action by the Government to set up a committee to examine the function of the Department of Co-operation is commendable, necessary, practical, worthwhile and, I predict in the long run, Mr. Speaker, a good sound investment in humanity.

Some Hon. Members: — Hear, hear!

Mr. Whelan: — Mr. Speaker, activity in the area of co-operatives can do something about the cost of living, can represent the consumer and in this area, Mr. Speaker, the Government is keeping faith with the people of the province. This is one more reason why I support the motion by the Hon. Member for Kerrobert-Kindersley (Mr. Taylor), seconded by the Hon. Member for Humboldt (Mr. Tchorzewski).

Wringing their hands and doing nothing was the only answer the other government had for the small businessman. The vote small businessmen gave us in the last election said loud and clear and without doubt that they expect us to go to bat for them. This speech from the throne holds out that prospect. Mr. Speaker, if we are going to have representatives for agriculture, advisors for the co-operatives, a guarantee for the steel mill, a guarantee for other businesses, then, Mr. Speaker, I maintain it is good sense to have management advisors for small businessmen and guarantee loans for inventory, guarantee loans for construction and expansion of small businesses. Mr. Speaker, if we are going to ask the small businessman to stake his assets in the future of Saskatchewan, then I think that as the Government of this Province we have to stake our assets alongside of his. Then and only then I predict, that bankruptcies in the small towns, the cities and the villages will stop. We should say to them the assistance that you will get financially and in an advisory capacity will be provided because we place a value on small business not only as an integral and necessary part of the community, but because the small businessman stands as a bastion against the conglomerates that would swallow up individual economic endeavour.

If there is going to be Canadian business activity, then I think, Mr. Speaker, we have not only an obligation but instructions from the people of this Province to stand by the small business people who are Canadian and who are trying to give service to the communities of Saskatchewan. Again, I think in this area we must in conscience if we are interested

March 2, 1972

in the welfare of small business support the Speech from the Throne.

In the rapidly changing world, methods that we use for job training change. The whole practice of cybernation in its different applications, Mr. Speaker, provides employment but changes the method of employment. The need for changing jobs, re-instruction in the use of new equipment on the same sort of job is real and necessary. An industrialist once told me that without trained people, I quote him, "I don't see how you can establish industry, privately or publicly owned."

Many people in my constituency, Mr. Speaker, are not at the stage in life where they need to train for a second job. The creation of community colleges to retrain these people, to introduce them to new employment, to keep them in step with the times, is necessary, commendable and practical. When in his wisdom the Minister establishes a community college in this city, I hope that he will establish one in North Regina, preferably in the rapidly growing Regina North West area because there are people there in need of this type of educational facility, people who will be benefited by this type of training, people who are looking forward to the organization of community colleges in order to provide a livelihood for themselves and for their families. Mr. Speaker, this Throne Speech holds out the possibility of community colleges. Again for this reason and on behalf of my constituents, I must support the Throne Speech.

Mr. Speaker, the urban centres of the province for years have needed extra consideration and attention. There is a need for research, there is a need for assistance and planning, programs such as long range urban transportation. Mr. Speaker, there is need for research in the hole field of maintaining costs of streets and the techniques for repairing streets. In the construction of schools along, the responsibility for providing a school and guaranteeing that a school will be constructed in areas being developed is often ignored. In my riding along there are districts without a school. A desperate need for financing of libraries, police protection, health services, transportation, capital expenses such as sewer and water. All of these things require research and planning. The need for these services within a Government Department so that every city and every urban area and every town and every village in Saskatchewan will receive this service is long overdue, Mr. Speaker.

Even the grant structure for cities and towns and villages has been on a hit and miss basis. The expenditure for arterial roads has been a piecemeal unplanned, unrealistic program. There is a need to provide staff to give assistance, Mr. Speaker, to urban municipalities to study the democratic structure that will provide a close liaison between the citizens and their elected representatives. At the present time this does not exist in many respects. Studies have to be made, Mr. Speaker, to find the best possible procedure to provide every citizen in an urban area with a procedure for expressing his or her opinion in the most practical manner so that democracy in civic government will benefit as a result. Mr. Speaker, the Speech from the Throne holds forth the prospect that legislation will be introduced that will assist the growing problems of urban centres, that will supply something those who live in urban centres across this province can apply. It is necessary, it is timely,

March 2, 1972

it should have been introduced before. This is one more reason, Mr. Speaker why I wholeheartedly endorse this document that is before us.

Mr. Speaker, this House will have before it two reports. One interim and one complete report from two Special Committees of this Assembly. Mr. Speaker, these committee travelled extensively and met the people of the province. As a vehicle for finding out what the people of this province are thinking, I think it works. These two Committees were effective and, Mr. Speaker, I should like to congratulate the Chairmen of the Committees, the Hon. Member for Melville (Mr. Kowalchuk) and the Hon. Minister of Public Works (Mr. Brockelbank) for the efficient and able manner in which they handled the task. I should like to commend the Government for their action in setting up such Committees and recommend to the Government that there are other areas, and I can think of two or three in particular, where they might consider the organization of similar Committees to consult the people of this province. I hope before this Session is over two or three Committees will be organized to meet between sessions to seek opinions and suggestions and ideas from the people we represent.

Mr. Speaker, the Speech from the Throne indicates that there will be action on the recommendations of the Committees. This is commendable. And the organization of the Committees as a vehicle for participation by the people is good democracy. Mr. Speaker, for this reason, I support the Speech from the Throne.

Some Hon. Members: — Hear, hear!

Mr. Whelan: — Mr. Speaker, let me sum up why I support the Speech from the Throne. It holds out the promise of organizing and developing a housing program, of revitalizing and activating the Department of Co-operatives, of initiating, investigating and developing a new program that will assist small businesses. Mr. Speaker, I endorse the Speech from the Throne because it predicts the organization of community colleges and indicates that the Government will be introducing legislation to deal with the growing problems of urban centres. Finally, Mr. Speaker, it endorses the idea of legislative committees and pledges the Government to give careful consideration to their recommendations. Mr. Speaker, there has been more activity in seven months by this Government than there was by the other Government in seven years.

Some Hon. Members: — Hear, hear!

Mr. Whelan: — Mr. Speaker, there are more programs in this one Speech from the Throne than there were in all the speeches in all the time that they were the Government.

Some Hon. Members: — Hear, hear!

Mr. Whelan: — Mr. Speaker, in this Speech from the Throne, there is optimism and proposed progressive legislation. Mr. Speaker, it is not my judgment that say so. It isn't the judgment of the Hon. Members opposite, it is the judgment of the people of the province who said to them, "We gave you a

March 2, 1972

chance and you blew it.” They robbed the people, Mr. Speaker, they robbed the people of this province of faith and democracy, they robbed them of confidence, they robbed them of hope. Mr. Speaker, this speech restores their hope, their faith and their confidence. I will support the motion. I will oppose the amendment.

Some Hon. Members: — Hear, hear!

Mr. T. M. Weatherald (Cannington): — Mr. Speaker, since this is the first opportunity I have had to address the House, I should like to congratulate the Member for Souris-Estevan (Hon. Mr. Thorson). He isn't here at this moment, but I should like to congratulate him on his victory. I was down there for a couple of days. Apparently, I didn't do too much damage. I should like to express my best wishes to him in his capacity as Minister and wish him well in that Department. I think it is a very important Department in our province and will be in the next four years. I also want to congratulate, Mr. Speaker, the Member for Morse (Mr. Wiebe) for whom I have very high regard. We all welcome him and we think he will make an admirable contribution. Mr. Speaker, I think at the earlier Session that we had the opportunity to congratulate yourself, but again, I should like to express my own personal feeling and I know of my colleagues, that you have done a very fine job and run the proceedings in this House in a very fine manner. Mr. Speaker, at this time I want to also congratulate the members opposite for winning the election. They won it in a fair fight despite the opposition. And that is our duty to put up a strong opposition, which we intend to do to make ourselves a viable alternative in the province in the next four years. I wish them well. I hope we can prove that we can do a better job but I hope that they do a good job for Saskatchewan because I think that is what we are all interested in basically despite our differences.

Some Hon. Members: — Hear, hear!

Mr. Weatherald: — Mr. Speaker, I want to talk, however, in a little different vein for a few moments because I think it is important and it is certainly becoming much more important to the public as time goes on as to how many of the Members in the Opposition have spoken on various issues and the apparent change of attitude that is now occurring since they have taken office. You know credibility is a word which receives a great deal of thought and usage in politics. In this regard I want to review some of the things that the Government said while they were in the Opposition. Some of my colleagues have done this but I don't think it will do any harm to go over this subject again.

You know, my colleague and leader of our caucus today mentioned the potash pro-rationing stand the members opposite took while they were in the opposition. Well, I just want to review for a few moments what they said on potash pro-rationing which I have taken as an excerpt from the New Deal for People manifesto put out previous to the election. Very strong words, Mr. Speaker, because it said:

Regina Liberals make deals with US potash interests whereby American mines run at full capacity while Saskatchewan mines lay off one-third of its workers.

March 2, 1972

It went on to say that:

An NDP Government will restore employment by ending the present Government collaboration in a potash cartel.

Well, Mr. Speaker, I think that on a matter as serious as this and involving the type of investment of millions of dollars that we have in the potash industry in Saskatchewan, that a statement of that importance could hardly be taken lightly. And so I wish to review what the Minister now claims about the potash industry. He says on December 9, Mr. Bowerman says:

Potash pro-rationing will remain. If prorationing were dropped we might have a situation similar to the wheat situation.

Presumably, he is referring to the surplus position which we had occupied for some time in the wheat industry. He went on to say:

In this first year of operation pro-rationing had increased company revenues about 68 per cent and in the second year 100 per cent.

The Minister went on to say:

We believe that because of pro-rationing the province is entitled to some increase in revenues.

Well, Mr. Speaker, I should scarcely have to remind the House that there is no one more delighted that the potash pro-rationing experiment has turned out so well that the industry now is able to pay increased taxes which will be to the benefit of all of the people of Saskatchewan. I think that many people in Saskatchewan will take particular note of the position of the NDP in the cries of deals and bad deals by the Government when people will take very careful note of the promise published in the New Deal for People, the position then taken before the election and now a complete reversal.

I want to go on to another subject which received a great deal of attention and ridicule, I might add, from the Members opposite during the election period and previous to it over a two or three year period. The late Premier was a very energetic man. He travelled much in Saskatchewan, he put in many hours of hard work. I am sure this most bitter opponents will agree to this. And the result was he did use an aircraft in Saskatchewan for which he made no apology. For this, from the Members opposite he received nothing but ridicule. But, Mr. Speaker, I should think that any party which dwells upon honesty and fair lay would be now have sold that aircraft, especially after they had made such a great issue of it before the public and ran down that particular person who had used it. Well, Mr. Speaker, they haven't sold it, and to all intents and purposes they use it much more than he every did. And we shall be finding out as the time passes on in this Session just how much they have used it and just how much expenses they have accumulated in using it.

So again, we find the party very much lacking in the principles which they put forward before the election.

March 2, 1972

Let's take a look at education because probably the greatest gap exists in education in what they party opposite said and what they have done up until now. Area bargaining is a very typical situation where they spoke one way and now the action is in the completely opposite direction, despite the remarks and the position put forward by the New Deal for People and remarks put forward by many Members, for example the Member for Cutknife (Mr. Kwasnica), who was the critic for education at that time. I could review through Hansard many of his speeches on area bargaining. I think it would be a shock to all of us including the new Members. But I won't take the time in the House. I do urge the new Members to read what the Member for Cutknife used to say about area bargaining because it would be of a great deal of interest to them. I think of what the Member for Melville (Mr. Kowalchuk) used to say about area bargaining. He was a trustee, I believe, or had been, and he used to speak quite frequently about area bargaining. We had many speeches given about area bargaining, about its disadvantages, about the great hardships it would initiate and so on.

Last summer the party opposite opposed Bill 2 and to their credit after they had opposed it they later brought in an Act repealing Bill 2. It took a very few minutes to do so. Mr. Speaker, it seems to me that they could do likewise on area bargaining if they really intended to fulfil the promises and the talk that they had put forward when they were the Opposition. Personally, I hope they don't do that because I think that area bargaining can be made to work pretty satisfactorily in our province if all parties agree to sit down and try and make it work. But if it doesn't work, you're sitting over there, you can get rid of it. If you do, well, that's fine. So far you haven't done it and we'll wait and we'll see how your alternative works. We shall be very happy to find out how your system works.

Let's go on now, Mr. Speaker, to the teacher-pupil ratio. Well, Mr. Speaker, the Minister (Mr. MacMurchy) now talks about the pupil-teacher ratio being eliminated but what he has replaced it with is the right to go broke, the right to go broke by the local taxpayers. Because you can hire all of the people you like as long as you put up the money. That isn't very good news for most property taxpayers in rural Saskatchewan and, indeed, all of Saskatchewan. So I have suggested and I think most people in Saskatchewan if they look at it will agree that the Minister's new Act isn't a teacher-pupil ratio Act, it's the right to go bankrupt Act. And most property owners in Saskatchewan who are paying the bill for education will certainly find that out in the next mill levy that emerges.

Mr. Speaker, my colleagues have at considerable length mentioned legislative secretaries. I wouldn't like to at this moment, although I think we will be inclined to do in the next four years, go back to statements made by members on legislative secretaries. You take the Member for Regina North West (Mr. Whelan) who gave a speech today. I wouldn't even be surprised, Mr. Speaker, I wouldn't want to predict this happening but I certainly wouldn't be surprised if someday, someplace when he is giving a speech, a young idealistic person stands up and says, "Mr. Member from Regina North West, did you really say this about legislative secretaries?" You know, that might happen some place in Saskatchewan in the next four years. I really wouldn't be surprised if it did because there are a lot of people who expect when you make such strong statements as

March 2, 1972

that that it means something. In fact, even the Member for Saskatoon, who now has the job as legislative secretary, wrote a poem about it. We missed out on his poems for a four-year interlude here. He did write a poem about it. Now we have not only Members of the Cabinet who spoke very ‘versiferously’ against legislative secretaries. They convinced the Government of the day that they weren’t very worthwhile because the idea was dropped in 1967. I should hate to say that those words someplace, somewhere might come back to haunt those Members because those Members accepted those positions just a matter of a few weeks after the government went into office.

Now, I want to come to what I think is probably the most serious indictment of the Government opposite since they came to office. I was most interested the other evening, Mr. Speaker, to listen to the Premier about his attitude to business in Saskatchewan. One of the things that I should like to say to the Premier is that if he had the various views which I believe he does on the oil industry and on a number of other industries, he has particularly brought up the aspect of Home Oil. I think we can go into a great and complicated debate about what taxes actually are paid which probably wouldn’t be that meaningful here at this particular time. But I do want to remind him that it isn’t good enough any more to just complain about the taxes that the oil industry is paying because he now runs Saskatchewan. He has complete control and possibly the Waffle Group suggestion, which of course I don’t agree with, of nationalizing oil industry is treating us that badly.

No, he controls the leases, for example, of the oil companies. He controls all the regulations that they run under. So I should think that anybody who puts forth as strong a view about the situation of what a resource industry is contributing to our province, rather than complaining about it, should do something about it because I think this would be certainly much more in line with what people want if abuses are half as great as what he suggests. Now I want to make it very clear, Mr. Speaker. I simply don’t in any way agree with nationalizing the oil industry in our province, but I don’t quite agree with the abuse that he puts forward in that respect.

Now I want to talk for a few moments about the Government’s promise to help small businessmen because in rural Saskatchewan this is very, very important. One of the most important things in all of our province is retaining our smaller communities and towns. During the election the Government opposite managed to convince the few people – not very many I don’t think – but a few people in small business that they would actually bring about some measures that would be of assistance. I want to take a look for a few minutes at what the record is because, Mr. Speaker, undoubtedly up to date it has been a complete total disaster.

I can assure you, Mr. Speaker, that any man who has any money of any sizeable amount that isn’t presently in our province wouldn’t even consider our province for five minutes as a place to invest money, if he listened to the speeches that emanate from the Government benches in one single afternoon. I would predict, Mr. Speaker, that this Government is one of the most anti-business governments that has ever controlled a provincial legislature in this country.

March 2, 1972

Some Hon. Members: — Hear, hear!

Mr. Weatherald: — Your Members, Mr. Speaker, run down private initiative and any type of incentive by profit motive, day in and day out. If you really wonder why nobody is interested in Saskatchewan you should sit in the gallery and just listen to yourselves for a couple of afternoons and you would know why nobody is interested. And nobody is interested, Mr. Speaker. There just isn't anybody with any sizeable capital resources that is interested in Saskatchewan with the exception of the raw resource industries, because they have nowhere else they can get those resources. That is the one exception, Mr. Speaker, that in my view, the province of Saskatchewan has any hope of attracting investment in the next few years.

The potash industry, the oil industry possibly — and very, very possibly — uranium because the mine is here. There are some minerals, Mr. Speaker, that we probably will have some investment in. I think it will be small because they are certainly looking at other alternatives where a more favourable atmosphere exists. But certainly anyone with any choice whatsoever that is investing sizeable amounts of money in manufacturing or other industries along that line certainly is not looking at all with favour on our province. In fact, with the Government of Alberta and a government reasonably — and I say reasonably and I think that is a very, very fair statement — because I think all governments are placing more controls on business and rightly so, today, Mr. Speaker, but I think with the Government of Alberta as close to us as they are that most industry that has a choice will certainly take a much, much kinder view to that province. I subscribe, most of the time, to one of the Winnipeg papers and even in that province I think that business will find much more favourable treatment than they do here.

Mr. Speaker, in the field of small business which I think is of great concern to all of us, the government probably has done more to hurt the small businessman in the last seven months than they could have dreamed of. You know, Mr. Speaker, The Family Farm Protection Act has had severe consequences on many small implement dealers. The Minister has told them to get their house in order for next year and they don't even know what that means, and we will be asking him later what he does mean by that statement because most of the garage operators don't know what it means. They have been told to either get their shop in shape within the next year or else something severe is going to come in. But nobody knows exactly what he means by that.

Mr. Speaker, despite the election propaganda put out by the Government opposite previous to the election they have done a great deal to bring about the decline of small businesses in rural Saskatchewan.

I want to talk for one minute about the minimum wage and I want to make very clear that the minimum wage in many instances in the large centres and in the cities is warranted. I think that everyone shares the opinion that we want to raise the level of the lower paid workers. For the large companies and so forth this is certainly no problem, for say, Loblaws, Dominion Stores, they have employees who are on the minimum wage. The wage increase has raised those employees to a better

March 2, 1972

standard of living, and rightly so. But make no mistake, the change in the minimum wage to the \$1.70 level has caused severe hardship in much of the rural parts of our province. Small cafes are not forced to pay women employees \$1.70 per hour to serve coffee in the afternoon. Part time employees received this pay. Grocery stores which just hire young boys after school to move a few boxes for them or clean off the snow, now pay \$1.70 wages and at least three hours of employment if that person comes into the operation. Service stations are also in the same situation. Throughout rural Saskatchewan and particularly in my own constituency that has quite a number of thriving small towns, it is very obvious that there are now more unemployed people in those towns than every before, because the part time people, the young people that are working after school are now out of work, not because the employer doesn't want the, but because the employer's net income is too low to pay this type of wage. But even more severely what this means, Mr. Speaker, is that over a period of time families are determining that the long hours of work that they themselves are forced to put in to keep the family business operating are so unattractive that they are going to have the desire to get rid of it. And when they get rid of it the only alternative is the large high volume store or service station which may operate near there in another town.

I want to put an example of what actually happened in one of the towns in my constituency with a newspaperman. He publishes a very good local newspaper. He hires young people to come in after school to fold the papers at \$1.70 per hour. He hires to help with the type setting and he has trained a lot of young people around there who are now prints all across the country. He doesn't make much money and he doesn't even have a very good building. There is no way, he tells me, that he can possibly pay three or four young people to come in for a few hours a week and fold up the newspaper to send out through the mail. He simply can't do it. What has he done? He is closing up his operation, making up the newspaper but sending it to Regina for printing. There are a number of papers in Saskatchewan that are already doing that. It results in a severe loss of employment in that community. You will find more of this happening constantly. This newspaperman says that he anticipates doing this in the very near future. That he will continue to publish the paper and put it together but it will be printed in Regina and then he will receive the several hundreds of copies contracted for, back on the bus and he will mail it out from there, but his labour cost will be substantially lower because he can no longer afford to employ young people who are still going to school at the wages which are required.

I don't think that most of these young people ever really minded the wage that they were receiving. It was good training for them, good experience, they learned the work, they learned the trade, it was pocket money for them. But under the law this is no longer allowed.

Mr. Speaker, I think this is of substantial concern and I hope that the Government will take a look at the type of problem that they are really creating for the small businessperson and the disappearance of part time employment, part time jobs in many of our smaller towns. And as I mentioned previously, I think that the repercussions will be so severe the Government

March 2, 1972

will find that many small businesses, finding it so difficult to operate, the hours so long, the profit margin in most of them so very, very low, that eventually in the next short period of time, the next two or three years probably, that these businesses will decide to fold up or move out.

Mr. Speaker, I want to talk now about the Land Bank for few moments. My colleague, this afternoon, put forward eloquently many of the objections which we will have to the Land Bank and I can assure you we will pushing very, very hard for some major changes.

I want to go into a few details on the Land Bank that I think are objectionable and that I think will be the result of the present proposals. I put them forward these criticisms of the present plan, more as a farmer than as a political issue, Mr. Speaker. Suffice it to say that if the cash rental under the Land Bank, as proposed by the Government, plus the cash rental of the interest, the compulsory crop insurance charges and the taxes will amount to so much that it will be no help to any individual marginal or young farmer. The only farmers actually able to meet this rental commitment will be those farmers who are already very well established and then they will meet in with difficulty. In my particular area I know of no single instance where rental is higher than \$8 per acre. That rental is paid on a cash basis, Mr. Speaker, but it only includes the taxes and no crop insurance charges.

I find that those people – and I only know of two or three that are actually paying that rental who find that lease very onerous. In most cases the lease was negotiated four or five years ago when things were buoyant in agriculture. They are now finding it difficult to meet the lease charges and probably as soon as the four or five-year period it was negotiated for elapses, they will drop it or ask for new terms.

Mr. Speaker, I want to bring to the Government's attention, that many farmers believe that this rental rate is simply too high and we will press for a substantial change in that regard. Mr. Speaker, my colleague also put forward our contention on the cash only buying basis. We feel this is not objectionable and we know, and have read newspaper reports, that the Waffle Group have insisted or have made very well known their views that they much prefer and actually insist that the provisions should eliminate any option to buy. We are concerned that the party opposite is coming full circle to accepting the Waffle Group proposal that no land be sold but only leased, that they are in a circuitous manner bringing the provision in, you might say, through the back door. Really by providing in the Land Bank proposal booklet that the land can only be bought on a cash basis, is really a way of bringing it in through the back door. As the Member for Prince Albert West pointed out, the farmer renting a quarter section valued say at \$10,000 is very unlikely to be able to walk in, in these times with that amount of cash and say he would like to buy it.

Mr. Speaker, the political dangers of the Government owning this amount of land is also well known. There is no Member in this Assembly would dare stand up and say, for example, that there could not be tremendous political pressure in the buying of land. It is very obvious that there are going to be very many sellers. There are going to be very many sellers – perhaps seven or eight in that particular area – who have a

March 2, 1972

quarter section that they would like to sell. The Government probably can't buy it all. Okay, the Government picks out only one or two quarters. From whom, Mr. Speaker, do they pick out one or two quarters and at what price?

The possibility of financial haggling over price, the possibility of favouritism, boggles the imagination. Only yesterday a farmer brought to my attention that he had made an agreement with a young person to sell land – a tentative agreement. The Land Bank proposal, he said would be worth \$10 an acre more than he had with the young person and so he is not going through with it now. It is obvious that people wishing to sell and with some modest political influence, are very apt under these circumstances to make full use of them. I don't think there is a member here that denies that this will actually happen.

Mr. Speaker, the wholesale government intervention in land as proposed creates great concern for people of all political parties. It is one thing, Mr. Speaker, to go to the bank and ask for a Farm Improvement Loan. The bank decides on the loan on its merits, whether you are a Conservative, Liberal, NDP or whatever you like, the bank manager doesn't care. When you go for a Farm Improvement Loan, Mr. Speaker, he allocates the loan on its merits.

The wholesale intervention of the Government in this deal certainly opens up a completely new set of problems.

Mr. Speaker, I want also to suggest that the Land Bank proposal is being used, intentionally or otherwise I'm not sure, to give the impression to many people that it will keep large farms from getting larger. And in one sense this is possible. Let's make it completely clear, Mr. Speaker, that unless the Government is going to outbid everyone the large farmer having supposedly 10 sections, has nothing to stop him from borrowing money from the Farm Credit Corporation and buying out another half section. All he has to do is to put up more money than anyone else has, Mr. Speaker. So the proposal, unless the Government is proposing legislation later on that will limit farm size, certainly the Land Bank proposal as put forward will not in any way substantially stop big farms from buying up little farms if they desire to do so.

Mr. Speaker, I think it should also be of considerable concern and it is a certainty that the Government's intervention will have a substantial effect on increases in the price of land. It has to, simply because you increased the number of buyers. If the Government intends to buy any land at all then we have another buyer entering the market who will have to outbid everyone else. It is most certain that this will result in an increase in the price of land for any others who are interested in it.

I want to give an illustration, Mr. Speaker, and my colleagues have used other examples. This is not an example put forward by myself to try to justify the situation because it is taken from the Saskatchewan Federation of Agriculture's statement to the Minister of Agriculture as of February 16, 1972. It brings home a fact that the charges as have been suggested are simply too high. Here's the illustration, Mr. Speaker, based on a quarter section of land and the Saskatchewan Federation of Agriculture in its statement has what they think are

March 2, 1972

realistic prices for land they suggest that probably the average price of land bought will be around \$70 an acre. On a quarter section of land the cash rental arrangement provides for interest probably of around 7 per cent on \$70 or \$4.90. Now I am going to reiterate these are not my figures these are the Saskatchewan Federation of Agriculture's in their booklet published which I think all Members probably received. This \$4.90 per acre does not include anything for compulsory crop insurance or taxes, because I presume that the taxes will have to be paid under any set of circumstances.

Let's take for example, Mr. Speaker, that I rented this land and I am paying 7 per cent on it to the Government for \$4.90. Let's take, for example, I buy it through the Farm Credit Corporation which the Federation of Agriculture says it will cost me about \$6 an acre over 25 years. The Federation of Agriculture example says that you would save about \$176 per quarter section under the rental agreement per year. However, Mr. Speaker, at the end of the 25 years, that person owns nothing. Through the Farm Credit Corporation you would own that particular quarter section.

Mr. Bowerman: — You know you pay . . .

Mr. Weatherald: — What do you mean, you pay for it every year through 25 years, why wouldn't you?

Mr. Bowerman: — Check your figures . . .

Mr. Weatherald: — Well, if I put it wrong I'll go through it again. I am taking it straight from their bulletin, so it I . . . In any event the value is \$70 an acre, you pay \$4.90 per year under the rental agreement. Under the Farm Credit Corporation you pay \$6 an acre per year which is \$176 more than you would under the rental agreement per year.

Mr. Romanow: — \$176?

Mr. Weatherald: — \$176 more, if you didn't understand it the first time. In the one case by putting up \$176 more per year in 25 years you own it. It will cost you \$176 more every year for 25 years. Well, under the rental agreement you won't own it in 25 years you won't own anything. Under the Farm Credit Corporation you pay it every year, \$176 more to boot, but you will own it in 25 years.

Let's go on. I am talking about the possibility of me getting a rental agreement and paying the Government 7 per cent on the money or going through the Farm Credit Corporation. For \$176 more over 25 years I would own the land.

An Hon. Member: — . . .

Mr. Weatherald: — Well, I'll give you the book! I think it is an important point because as a farmer, Mr. Speaker, I am going to consider which is the better deal, to buy it or rent it. If I rent it I would save \$176 a year. Over 25 years which is what it is going to take to pay for it and own it, I would put up \$4,470 more because I would own the land. In other words buying

March 2, 1972

it through the Farm Credit Corporation under the present plan in 25 years I would put up \$4.470 more, \$176 per year more. Mr. Speaker, over 25 years I would own one-quarter section of land for \$4.470. This land in the initial instance was worth \$11,200. What it means, Mr. Speaker, is that buying that land rather than renting it is probably the best pension plan I could every have because for \$176 more per year I own an asset in 25 years worth \$11,200. Renting I own nothing! Mr. Speaker, I can assure you that any young farmer at the age of 30 starting up there isn't anything better he can do than put \$176 for the next 25 years more and end up with an investment worth \$11,200. I also can tell you that there is a good chance in 25 years that that quarter section will be worth more than he paid for it today.

Mr. Speaker, this illustrates to the Government that the cash rental arrangements they have put forward simply are not sensible as an alternative. We hope that they will make changes in this regard.

Now, Mr. Speaker, I want to talk for a moment about some of the promises made in my own constituency of which I will remind the Government opposite. The Premier the other day said, that we had added a few more on. Well I should be very pleased to present him with this file on mine if he really wants them in writing and as printed during the election campaign. There is a municipal road north of Kisbey – this one you can look up with your own staff because it is in all the papers – a number of promises on hospitals; a number of promises on nursing homes; and I think one more grid road. There is also a promise on Number 16 Highway. I have and will be reminding the Government of some of those promises and I think the people of my constituency will be.

I want to say, Mr. Speaker, in coming to the conclusion of my remarks that I have attempted to point out some of the words of wisdom the Members opposite shed upon us when they were the Opposition, in contrast to those which we now receive on the same subjects. There has been a fantastic and great change which brings me to the conclusion that really many of the members are more opportunists than they are lovers of truth. Mr. Speaker, I hope that his will improve in the future, I think it would be for their own good if it does, if it isn't improved in the future then possibly they will be more severely reminded in the next three and a half years.

Mr. Speaker, I am sure that you will determine from my remarks that I will not be supporting the Speech from the Throne, but will be supporting the amendment.

Some Hon. Members: — Hear, hear!

The amendment was negated on the following recorded division.

**YEAS - 15
Messieurs**

Stuart	Boldt	MacLeod
Coupland	MacDonald (Milestone)	McPherson
Loken		Lane
Guy	McIsaac	MacDonald (Moose Jaw N.)
Grant	Weatherald	Wiebe

March 2, 1972

NAYS - 40

Blakeney	Baker	Matsalla
Dyck	Brockelbank	Cowley
Wood	Pepper	Cody
Smishek	Michayluk	Gross
Romanow	Byers	Feduniak
Messer	Whelan	Comer
Snyder	Kwasnica	Rolfes
Bowerman	Carlson	Lange
Kramer	Engel	Hanson
Thibault	Tchorzewski	Oliver
Larson	Richards	Feschuk
Kowalchuk	Owens	Flash
Meakes	MacMurchy	Faris
		Kaeding

The debate continues on the motion.

Mr. E. F. Flasch (Maple Creek): — I've only been around here a short time, Mr. Speaker, but I do believe that stock of the leadership of the Liberal Party took quite a drop on the market today.

Some Hon. Members: — Hear, hear!

Mr. Flasch: — The Liberal Leader opposite is now again crying about airtime. I thought he was going to relent a little bit yesterday but he was back at it today. It seems to me that we used to have something like 20 hours of airtime when we were the Government before and I believe the Liberals reduced it to 13 hours or thereabouts. This would seem to indicate to me that they didn't want to be heard then by the people in this Province.

Some Hon. Members: — Hear, hear!

Mr. Flasch: — I really don't know what the Leader of the Opposition is raising such a fuss about today. He is really backing away from his previous stand. He says nobody is going to tell him, Mr. Speaker, when he is going to speak and how much airtime he is going to use. That's very obvious. He had that attitude last year and the people of Saskatchewan threw him out of office. We don't want that type around here any more . . .

Some Hon. Members: — Hear, hear!

Mr. Flasch: — . . . He doesn't even care how much time he takes away from his backbenchers, Mr. Speaker . . .

Some Hon. Members: — Hear, hear!

Mr. Flasch: — . . . It is the old story of the elephant among the chickens. It is Liberal philosophy being applied right in their own ranks.

Some Hon. Members: — Hear, hear!

Mr. Flasch: — Mr. Speaker, I won't go into the discussion of

March 2, 1972

party hacks. I know lots of them that we really should get rid of. But we happen to have a little bit of consideration for people. We think that every man has a right to win the bread for his family and we know a lot of them need jobs. We are going easy.

Mr. Speaker, I have a good deal more to say tomorrow. I beg leave to adjourn the debate.

Some Hon. Members: — Hear, hear!

Debate adjourned.

The Assembly adjourned at 5:37 o'clock p.m.