

LEGISLATIVE ASSEMBLY OF SASKATCHEWAN
March 6, 1972

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

INTRODUCTION OF PAGE BOY

Mr. Speaker: — Before the Orders of the Day I should like to announce to the Members that Miss Joanne Newman who was one of our page girls left because she obtained steady employment and we have now Mr. Doug Briggs as a page boy to take on the work that was done before by Joanne Newman. So Mr. Briggs is our new page boy.

Hon. Members: — Hear, hear!

RESOLUTION RE GRAIN-HANDLING

Mr. Speaker: — Also before I call the Orders of the Day I should like to advise the House that I have received a reply from Henry Allan Lawless, corresponding secretary to the Prime Minister of Canada, address to myself as follows:

Dear Sir:

I am instructed to acknowledge receipt of your February 25th letter which accompanied a copy destined for the Prime Minister of a Resolution re the grain-handling movement passed by the Legislative Assembly of Saskatchewan on February 25th. It is noted that copies of the above Resolution have been forwarded to the Minister of Transport and the Minister responsible for the Canadian Wheat Board. Response to the Resolution can be anticipated from them.

I wanted to make the House acquainted with the fact that I had received an answer to that correspondence.

WELCOME TO STUDENTS

Mr. H.H.P. Baker (Regina Wascana): — Mr. Speaker, I am very pleased to introduce a group of students from Thompson School, there are 20 in number. They are Grade Eight students located in the Speaker's Gallery, accompanied by Miss Gayton, the school Principal. Thompson School has always been considered my home school as my daughter had the privilege of taking her public school education there. We wish them a very pleasant stay this afternoon with us and that the proceedings will make a good contribution toward their studies.

Hon. Members: — Hear, hear!

Hon. A.E. Blakeney (Premier): — Mr. Speaker, I should like to associate myself with

March 6, 1972

the remarks of the Member who has just taken his seat in welcoming these students from Thompson School. I had the opportunity to meet them outside the House. They are a very lively and bright group of young people who have made a study of public affairs who are coming to this Legislature as part of their studies in current events. I trust that their view of the proceedings this afternoon will add to their knowledge of how we govern ourselves in Canada.

Hon. Members: — Hear, hear!

Hon. J.A. Pepper (Weyburn): — Mr. Speaker, I should like to welcome and introduce to you and through you to the other Members of the Legislature, a group of Grade Twelve students sitting in the Speaker's Gallery. They are from the High School at Goodwater. These students are accompanied here by their principal, Mr. Andy Medwid and their bus driver, Mr. Elmer Erickson. I am sure, Mr. Speaker, I am speaking for all the Members here when I say that I hope their visit here this afternoon will prove to be both beneficial and knowledgeable for them, and that they have had an opportunity to see the manner in which our Provincial Legislature operates. I also, Mr. Speaker, wish them a safe journey home.

Hon. Members: — Hear, hear!

Hon. W.A. Robbins (Saskatoon Nutana South): — Mr. Speaker, I should like to draw attention to the Members of the Assembly a group in the west gallery from Holliston School in my constituency in Saskatoon. They are accompanied by their teachers, Mrs. Epp and Mrs. Cook. I sincerely hope that they will have a very informative and educational afternoon in the Legislature and a safe journey home.

Hon. Members: — Hear, hear!

QUESTIONS

GOVERNMENT LAND BANK PROPOSAL

Mr. E.F. Gardner (Moosomin): — Mr. Speaker, I had a question for the Minister of Agriculture (Mr. Messer) and I see he is not in his seat. Perhaps the Government House Leader or the Premier can answer it. The Government Land Bank proposal has created a lot of interest throughout the province because of advance publicity and I think the people are expecting early details on the Land Bank. I would suggest that for careful consideration this Bill should be introduced as early as possible and I wonder if the Government House Leader could tell us when this Bill could be presented for our consideration?

Mr. R. Romanow (Attorney General): — Mr. Speaker, it is the intention of the Government to have the Bill before the Members of the House as quickly as possible. The Hon. Member will know the Minister of Agriculture has heard the representations of a great many farmers and he is taking these into consideration. All I can say to the Hon. Member that as soon as it is ready it will be on the table for the careful consideration of all

March 6, 1972

Members.

EXPLANATORY NOTES FOR BILLS

Mr. C.P. MacDonald (Milestone): — Mr. Speaker, before the Orders of the Day, I would like to ask the Government this question. As the House Leader and the Premier are aware Government business will be carried on in the Legislature on Wednesday and Thursday. As yet we have not received any explanatory notes for any of the Bills that have been presented to us as yet. Certainly if they expect the Opposition to carry on an intelligent debate Wednesday and Thursday we would certainly like to know when these will be available.

Mr. Romanow: — Mr. Speaker, all I can say is to reiterate all that the Premier said on Friday. We are struggling, frankly, with what I think will be one of the heaviest legislative workloads this House has every seen and my law officers are putting top priority on the Bills first. The explanatory notes are very important, they will be following up and as soon as we have them we will be forwarding them to the Hon. Members for consideration.

MINIMUM WAGE AS IT APPLIES TO FIRE FIGHTERS IN NORTHERN SASKATCHEWAN

Mr. A.R. Guy (Athabasca): — Mr. Speaker, before the Orders of the Day, I should like to direct a question to the Minister of Labour (Mr. Snyder). I wish to ask him if the minimum wage of \$1.70 an hour and a 40-hour week will apply to the fire fighters in Northern Saskatchewan this summer?

Mr. G.T. Snyder (Minister of Labour): — I have no reason to expect that there will be an exemption. There has not been an exemption provided at this stage and the question hasn't been raised with the Department at this point. If there is a point to be made I am sure the Department and the Labour Standards Branch particularly would be interested in looking into the arguments presented but at the present moment there is no exemption provided that I am aware.

Mr. Guy: — Mr. Speaker, I certainly want to congratulate the Minister of Labour. I am sure the people in Northern Saskatchewan will be pleased to know that they will be paid the \$1.70 an hour and also will be pleased to know that they will receive overtime for anything more than a 40-hour week during fire-fighting season.

Some Hon. Members: — Hear, hear!

Mr. Snyder: — I wonder if I might add a few words in regard to the question raised by the Hon. Member for Athabasca (Mr. Guy). As I suggested earlier there is not a specific exemption re fire fighters generally but with respect to the general exemption of all those areas north of township 62, an exemption is in effect and has been in effect for a number of years which applies in those areas which are regarded as being north of township 62. This is a general exemption which applies at

March 6, 1972

the moment.

Mr. Speaker: — I don't think we can start a debate on a question that was put on the Orders of the Day. If there is further information it can be exchanged between the minister and the Members concerned.

ANNOUNCEMENTS

MOOSE JAW FOURSOME WINNERS OF MIXED CURLING CHAMPIONSHIP

Mr. Snyder: — Mr. Speaker, I wonder if I might just beg the indulgence of the House for a brief moment to announce that a Moose Jaw foursome recently won the mixed curling championship and will be competing for the Dominion mixed championship on March 19th in Thunder Bay, Ontario. The Moose Jaw rink is skipped by Roger Anholdt, with third Vern Seel, second Wes Schuniak and lead, Art Bryant. I am sure all Members will want to join with me in extending our congratulations to them and our best wishes as they continue their quest for the Dominion championship.

ADJOURNED DEBATES

ADDRESS-IN-REPLY

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

Mr. G.B. Grant (Regina Whitmore Park): — Mr. Speaker, when I reached the point of 5:30 on Friday, I was commenting about a statement made by the Premier in connection with dismissals under the previous Liberal Government. I took exception to one particular statement, because he stated that the Liberals had chased such good men as Dr. Graham Clarkson and Art Wakabayashi out of the province. While he was absent on Friday and he is present now I felt I should repeat this portion for his information because I contacted Dr. Clarkson and he denied it without any reservations and indicated that I could quote him in the House that neither I nor the former Liberal Government chased him out of the province. I indicated to this House that he was a valued civil servant and that he did a good job for the NDP Government and did a good job for us and we were sincerely sorry for him to go. I believe, Mr. Speaker, that the Members opposite should make sure, as I know the Member for Kerrobert-Kindersley (Mr. Taylor) will, that their Premier is factual in these statements and doesn't make misleading statements.

Mr. Speaker, the Throne speech is loud and clear on one point, more bureaucracy, more commissions, more agencies, new departments, all involved in administering more and more laws and edicts, limiting and controlling the lives of fewer and fewer Saskatchewan people. The Members opposite justify all they do by saying that the people of this province endorsed their plans on June 23rd. I maintain, -ms that the people of Saskatchewan certainly did not give the Government opposite a blank cheque for additional bureaucrats and party workers on the pay roll.

March 6, 1972

Little or no reference is made in the Throne Speech to a very important part of our economy, namely the private sector. Nothing is set forth or proposed to make Saskatchewan attractive for economic development. Rather I can see all types of inferences which will make Saskatchewan unattractive to business. This is understandable, Mr. Speaker, how else can our Hon. Premier keep his left wing under control?

The Wafflers, through their spokesman, the Member from Saskatoon University (Mr. Richards) says let's get moving on the road to state ownership, nationalize the Imperial Oil, the potash industry. Last month they said that the Government had until next June to implement major programs of particular relevance to the economy. This was quoted in a Leader-Post article of February 24th and in the same article, "Cures proposed by Wafflers for the economic ailments included public ownership of the oil industry and possible nationalization of the potash industry." The same speaker saw the Land Bank scheme as the beginning of progress toward collective responsibility for a basic resource, Saskatchewan's land. I think that means something the same as the Regina Manifesto and that was in 1933 and some of the land socialization programs voiced by the members opposite in more recent years.

Now the Saskatchewan Government was told on Sunday, about December 4th, to get into the oil business by establishing an integrated oil company run as a Crown corporation. The resolution was passed on the last day of the Saskatchewan NDP Annual Convention here in Regina and it replaced two original resolutions submitted to closed panels calling for the Government to retain control of oil rights and to nationalize Imperial Oil. When the Premier was asked to comment he said he could not state the Government's position on the convention's resolution since the Government had not considered that type of proposition. I maintain, Mr. Speaker, that the Premier is walking a tight rope and that is another indication because of his unwillingness at that time to state his stand.

The same article indicates unrest in the back benches. They apparently had little or no influence on the Throne Speech. If there is restlessness already, just wait. The natives will get increasingly restless with Cabinet dictatorship such as limiting the Leader of the Opposition (Mr. Steuart) and his radio time. One only has to refer to any article in Canadian Dimension by Joe Warnock to learn which way the weather vane is pointing. This article refers to the December, 1971 convention of the Saskatchewan New Democratic Party because they felt it promised to be a very important indicator of the attitude of the new Blakeney Government towards the party as a whole. I am not going to take time to read the article but what it says is this:

Formerly the NDP thought that programs and policy originated with the members and that it was up to the Cabinet and caucus to carry them out. But it was quite apparent that Premier Blakeney and his Cabinet were the dominant forces and the hierarchy of a dozen or so gave more speeches than all the rank and file delegates put together.

That's the note that Mr. Warnock makes of that particular meeting.

March 6, 1972

For three days after the convention the people of Saskatchewan were treated to statements in the media by the Premier and the Cabinet on why the NDP Government was not obligated to translate any of the important resolutions adopted at the convention into legislation. Sooner or later the party rank and file will have to face up to the fact that despite the party constitution policy is made by the caucus when in opposition and by the Cabinet when in power.

Now here is a second controversy that arose and is quite interesting, a resolution prohibiting the party from accepting campaign contributions from corporations. Again this was defeated after speeches by Cabinet Ministers and others in the party hierarchy. It was revealed in the workshop that after the June election NDP officials had begun soliciting funds from the potash and oil cartel to cover party debts. Now, Mr. Speaker, one delegate wondered, "how the Party would keep its campaign pledge to end the potash cartel and consider nationalizing the oil industry while at the same time soliciting funds from them."

I only want to make passing reference to an article in the same magazine that relates to Manitoba but they have the same type of Government as we have here. Their question was who was going to determine the policy down there? They are running into the same thing as the party faithful here, apparently the Cabinet is dictating policy. They want to know who was to determine how more general party policies were going to be implemented, "such as shifting economic development from the private sector to Crown corporations and co-operators."

Mr. Grant: — Mr. Speaker, there you have one face of the Government opposite.

Let's move faster in influencing and directing the lives of our people Let's shift economic development from the private sector to Crown corporations and co-ops.

But wait, there is another face to the Party opposite, and I quote:

Minister says free enterprise is welcome.

I'm quoting from the Leader-Post of February 18:

The NDP Government welcomes free enterprise in Saskatchewan. But the speaker, the Hon. Minister of Industry, warned that they must be responsible citizens. It is important for Government to assist in creating a good climate for investment, he said. We welcome investment in Saskatchewan.

This is a new tone to me.

We welcome the initiative and the drive of people in the private sector of the economy. We think It proper that they should want to make a profit.

March 6, 1972

Now, it's really refreshing, Mr. Speaker, to find one Member opposite voicing this and I think he's doing it sincerely. They expect industry to be responsible citizens. They can't make a profit by polluting the environment, but at the same time just to make sure that they didn't run too wild with his welcome mat, they warned the oil industry that if they do not carry out more exploration on the Crown land someone else would, perhaps the Government.

Again I quote:

And the Government intends to make sure that resource jobs are kept in Saskatchewan.

Now, I don't know just what he means by that. It sounded good anyway. The oilmen were also warned to be prepared for the possibility they will have to pay higher revenues to the Provincial Government, for, and I quote:

Saskatchewan has not really come to grips with the problems of economic development.

Mr. Speaker, I gather that the message to the Minister of Industry by the Premier was, "Put your best foot forward to counteract those Wafflers"; but even he raised a big stick, warning the oil industry to get cracking or the Government will do it itself. If they really mean what the Minister of Industry has said why didn't they take advantage of the Throne Speech to say so because there are widely held doubts current in provincial and national and international business communities about the NDP Government's real policy position on economic development. They really had an opportunity in the Throne Speech to dispel this but they didn't do it.

Mr. Speaker, as I said earlier, this Party to your right are walking a tightrope. On one side, straight, unadulterated socialism, state ownership or what have you, on the other side, a feeble, tongue-in-cheek pretence of promoting a happy haven for free enterprise. The members opposite cannot agree where they are going. The Premier will have to be a magician, at least an acrobat, to stay on that tightrope. I maintain, Mr. Speaker, he cannot do it. With all the goodies they have promised he is going to run out of dollars from the affluent few in Saskatchewan or the hard-pressed corporations long before he carries out all the hair-brained schemes of his restless backbenchers.

Mr. Speaker, the Members opposite are naïve, unrealistic or irresponsible if they think they can fool businessmen as to their true intent. It hasn't really changed a bit since the Regina Manifesto, eradicate Capitalism and private ownership.

Let's look at this 'climate for investment' spoken about by the Minister of Industry. Well, first of all we have that Act which the implement people welcomed so well, The Saskatchewan Family Farm Protection Act. Now we have the succession duty taxes. The promised increase in corporate tax for business, that really attracts business. Larger Government and civil service, threats to the oil industry, reference to railways being highly irresponsible by the Attorney General (Mr. Romanow), shorter work hours, increased minimum wage and last but not least, this is a dandy, tenant unions for apartment blocks. I quote from the Leader-Post of December 7. The article said:

March 6, 1972

If the NDP followed the lead of its supporters the Province would get a new landlord-tenant Act providing tenants with the right to withhold rent. Tenant unions which would include the right to strike. The resolution was originally proposed by Regina Centre and it was understood that Attorney General Roy Romanow was one of those strongly opposed to some of the provisions but it was the Attorney General who seconded the motion for the tenant union provisions at the Sunday planning session. Mr. Gene David of the Regina Centre said, 'Tenants must be given the right to hold the hammer over the landlord'.

This is a wonderful way to attract business, to attract investment, by either the individual or the corporation.

Mr. Speaker, the Government's programs can do nothing except make Saskatchewan a still greater have-not Province. They have only announced plans to divide the pie differently, clip the haves, tax the producers. They have no plans to create productive employment, no plans to encourage new taxpayers.

They said, "We will make summer jobs for students and winter jobs for everyone". This is a poor excuse for industry and business-produced jobs. I believe mention has been made of a \$10 million public works program suggested, I believe, by the Premier. Let me point out that this is just slightly better than half of the dollar value of a good housing program in Regina. It runs between \$15 million and \$20 million and produces far more jobs than a \$10 million public works program.

Mr. Speaker, business has had enough setbacks of late. Let's really improve the business climate, not create a bigger civil service for them.

In the Star-Phoenix of February 21 there is an article headed "Equity or Loan".

The Premier said he would like to see the Government and the Canada Development Corporation evolve alternative ways to develop resources. Mr. Blakeney said he had no objections to American or other foreign money but "I would like it to be loan money, money that can be paid back, maintaining as much ownership as possible of resources by equity participation.

I maintain, Mr. Speaker, that his is weasel talk. He likes these foreign funds but only if he can repay them. This has never been a problem for government or business here in Saskatchewan. Millions and millions of dollars were borrowed in foreign countries and repaid. Mr. Fines, of whom I gave a brief historical account the other day, borrowed heavily in the United States to the province's advantage and to his own advantage. The Premier wants to retain as much as possible of resources by equity, participation. This is not peculiar to the Premier or his Party. It is a desire of all Canadians. I should like to point out that the Liberal Government introduced this principle long ago in many of its Saskatchewan Economic Development Corporation loans. I read into it and I trust correctly that he can live with foreign equity participation. If so, I congratulate him if I have accurately

March 6, 1972

interpreted his expression of realism.

How does the Member from Saskatoon University (Mr. Richards) view this stand? I imagine he cannot accept it. It is not true socialism. Mr. Speaker, this is another case of what I should like to term the two-horse system of the Premier, riding the private business horse but at the same time keeping a foot on that wild and woolly socialist horse and I warn him that he is headed for trouble if he thinks he can keep these two high spirited animals headed down a common path. Sooner or later one or the other is going to shy and leave him on one horse, where he belongs. Of course, there is another alternative. He could fall between his policy steeds and be trampled.

In 1967 the present Minister of Health (Mr. Smishek) made a big issue of a new phrase he had coined entitled "hate labour" referring to the Liberal Government. He suggested that the Liberals make it a plank in their platform. Following his example, I should like to suggest, Mr. Speaker, to the Government opposite that the NDP adopt as its slogan 'hate business' because up to the present they have done very little to help the Saskatchewan businessman. First of all, they chased a pulp mill out of Saskatchewan. They indefinitely shelved an iron mine. They threatened the potash industry and they suggested a provincially owned refining business. I understand that they have withdrawn printing business from small town printers, supposedly to be directed to the Service Printing Company. They have suggested, worst of all, to increase corporate taxation to pay for some of the social goodies that they have promised. How in the world, Mr. Speaker, can they have promised. How in the world, Mr. Speaker, can Members to your right pay lip service to business when they say and do everything possible to discourage the businessman? How can they hope to keep small business since none of them, with the possible exception of the Minister of Agriculture (Mr. Messer) has operated a successful business? I will repeat what I said last summer, the best way a government can help business is not to set up some more district advisers, the best way is to create a healthy business climate and let the Government keep its "cotton picking" fingers off them. I say, Mr. Speaker, that the Members to your right cannot do any better in encouraging business and helping the business man than they did years ago in running a shoe factory.

In June of 1971 during the heat of the election battle there seemed to be no end to all the health goodies to be made available by the NDP. Cost seemed to be of little consequence. And I refer to the abolition of utilization fees – six million dollars, no premiums to those over 65 – three million dollars, chiropractic service – million, million and a half, hearing aids – a quarter of a million, a drug plan – anything from one to ten million, a dental program – 12 million. The slogan might be described as "pull out all the stops, damn the cost". Now the Health Minister (Mr. Smishek) is alarmed at costs. "We did not say we would introduce a drug program", that's what he said on July 20, 1971. "A shortage of dentists presents a problem to the dental program. People are overusing our hospitals. We are cutting the number of patient days we will pay for". And as indicated the other day, that cut will roughly represent about six per cent reduction in hospital beds in this Province for many of the larger hospitals because of his reduction from five point six to five point three. He's not closing small hospitals, but believe me, Mr. Speaker, he's closing hospital beds. Does the Throne Speech say anything about these statements? Not a thing. A few short lines cover the Health and Welfare. Is this

March 6, 1972

the top of the iceberg, bigger things beneath the surface, or does it mean a change of heart? Slow down the ambitious program, the cost is running wild. I believe a Leader Post editorial commended the Minister of Health for being the first of the NDP Ministers to recognize and admit what I have been warning him about and did something about. I say, Mr. Speaker, the Minister either has or will find himself in the Treasury's squeeze too many ways to spend the same dollars. Besides warning the people in the Swift current area of rising costs and lowering the ratio of approved beds per thousand, I understand he is planning on winding up Saskatchewan's number one health region, the Swift current Health Region, and save \$100,000. I suppose the June 23rd mandate gave him the green light in this regard.

Mr. Speaker, it was suggested that I was going to take 90 minutes to wind up my remarks. I want to assure this House that I will not do so. The House Leader, the Hon. Attorney General (Mr. Romanow) was responsible for the conduct of business, and that I spoke for 75 minutes on Friday. I had no desire for radio time. I had offered it to the Leader of the Opposition but he was denied this privilege by the House Leader opposite. I do not plan to continue and I will wind up my remarks. It is my sincere hope, Mr. Speaker, that we will get back to the recognized procedure of this House.

Some Hon. Members: — Hear, hear!

Mr. Grant: — Mr. Speaker, the Throne Speech does not represent to me the program of a Government with a sense of economic responsibility. It does not scratch the surface of implementing the NDP promises of a New Deal for People. I cannot support the motion.

Some Hon. Members: — Hear, hear!

Mr. A. Oliver (Shaunavon): — Mr. Speaker, I should personally like to thank all the people of the Shaunavon constituency who worked so hard for me and also all those who supported me during the June 23 election and made it possible for me to be their representative in this House. I should also like to thank Mr. Vern Larochelle for a very vigorous but clean campaign. It seems to me he is a much greater gentleman than anybody that I have yet seen across the way.

Some Hon. Members: — Hear, hear!

Mr. Oliver: — I should also like to add my congratulations to the newly elected Members resulting from the December by-elections, namely, the Members for Souris-Estevan (Mr. Thorson) and the Members for Morse (Mr. Wiebe). Congratulations also to the Mover and Seconder of the Throne Speech for a job very well done.

Mr. Speaker, I wish to take a few minutes to describe the constituency of Shaunavon. It contains some of the most varied features in topography in all of Saskatchewan. The western part of the constituency is composed of the Cypress Hills which were never covered by the glaciers of the Ice Age. Proof of this fact is that certain forms of plant life grow here but

March 6, 1972

nowhere else on the North American continent. Bald Butte, the highest point in Saskatchewan, is located within the historical Cypress Hills Provincial Park. From this vantage point one can look north westward out across the miles and miles of rolling prairie. Older people really enjoy this view, while the younger people, the teenagers, take advantage of the flat farm lands south of the Frenchman River and extends southward to the US border. This relatively fertile farmland extends eastward along the US border to the Val Marie district. The Frenchman River has some of the strangest formations in it south east of Val Marie. These are often referred to as the bad lands and it is in this same district that Canada's entire population of prairie dogs live. This same area, in my estimation, has more than its share of rattlesnakes. Along the Frenchman River, near the town of Eastend, the lignite coal was mined in the early days. Large clay deposits also near Eastend supply the potteries in Medicine Hat. And it is from the same great river that some of the greatest archaeological finds of prehistoric skeletons have been discovered. Some of these bones are on display in the school in Eastend. Some good farmland is located along the northern edge of the constituency from Ponteix westward, especially in the oil rich Shaunavon and Dollard districts. The outer perimeter of the sprawling constituency is inhabited, but the entire centre is mostly composed of PFRA pastures and prairie lease lands. This makes travel difficult as the only roads across this central unpopulated area are PFRA fire guards.

The Shaunavon constituency is also rich in historical facts. The famous Turkey Track and 77 ranches were located here as was the historical Northwest Mounted Police Post of Fort Walsh. The Fort Walsh-Wood Mountain Trail that the Mounties travelled and restrained the whiskey bootleggers and maintained law and order, cuts diagonally across the constituency. This trail is now marked with stone cairns and the preservation of this important part of our history is due to the foresight and determination of one of Saskatchewan's most dedicated historians, Everett Baker of Shaunavon. This man is a prime example of a basic component needed in our society.

Everett, among his numerous other qualities has an uncanny way of sizing up a person and of predicting elections. When I look back upon the events leading up to the June 23 election and their effect on all segments of our society, I can see what he meant when he said, "It's going to be another 1944 landslide". But I was pessimistic, to say the least, The Liberals had amassed a formidable arsenal of election weaponry and operated it with a meticulous strategy. They had the advantage of being the Government and began a long campaign of conditioning the electorate with such things as SaskPower and SaskTel ads engineered by a large Eastern advertising firm, but paid for by the Saskatchewan taxpayer. They used a favourite news media to keep them in the spotlight and an advertising campaign that was designed to brain-wash the public and to cost a fortune, belched forth from all forms of media, and to ensure victory they gerrymandered the constituencies. Some of the master minds of this caper now sit to your left, Mr. Speaker. Some postage stamp-sized constituencies of 18,000 voters, were created under the guise of future growth areas. Now, Mr. Speaker, that excuse is as useful as a screen door in a submarine.

Some Hon. Members: — Hear, hear!

March 6, 1972

Mr. Oliver: — The Liberals tried the divide and conquer method. They set farmer against labourer, teacher against trustee. They tried to make an issue out of our ginger group and create a split in our party. They played up this fact while saying the abdication of certain Federal Liberal Cabinet Ministers was nothing more than a difference of opinion even when one of these fellows began a brand new political party. I wonder what their feelings are and their thinking is now when they have their very own Wafflers 171 incorporated.

Some Hon. Members: — Hear, hear!

Mr. Oliver: — Mr. Speaker, all is not well in their own camp, in my opinion. Yes, the Liberals had everything going for them but they forgot one thing. They forgot to take into consideration the human factor. All their well planned advertising to brainwash the electorate backfired. The constant barrage of “vote Liberal” turned people off. It was an insult to their intelligence. On election night as the results came pouring in and Liberal cabinet minister and private Liberal member alike went down to defeat, the age old adage, that the pen is mightier than the sword proved to be true.

Some Hon. Members: — Hear, hear!

Mr. Oliver: — That night will long be remembered in history as the night democratic government returned to Saskatchewan.

Some Hon. Members: — Hear, hear!

Mr. Oliver: — After the election there was complete reversal of feelings, a relaxed attitude. Now an air of expectancy is prevalent throughout the province. A few people are in a rush to implement our program as outlined in our booklet, ‘A New Deal for People’, while the majority understand the problems this new Government has in trying to repair the damages done by seven years of Liberal mismanagement.

Some Hon. Members: — Hear, hear!

Mr. Oliver: — Our people are patient and have complete confidence in the new Government because it has the experienced Members to guide the legislation that is so necessary in rebuilding our province. The people were happy to have a summer session so the new Government could get on with an immediate beginning of the new programs. This program is a four-year program and it can't be rushed or crammed into the first year. The Throne Speech outlines a part of this first year of our continuing program. In the field of Agriculture the Land Bank will play a major role in preserving the family farm. But it must be understood that the Land Bank cannot by itself preserve the family farm. There must be a practical and competent program by the Federal Government in Agriculture and we, as the Government of Saskatchewan, are prepared to co-operate with the Federal Government in formulating and operating such a program. It must also be noted that we shall continue to press the Federal Government to assure that the farmers of Saskatchewan and Western Canada will get a fair and equitable deal, as we did during the Grains Income Stabilization fracas of last summer

March 6, 1972

that Mr. Otto Lang proposed, and as we are presently doing to press the Federal Government to ensure that grain deliveries to the West Coast will not be interrupted.

Some Hon. Members: — Hear, hear!

Mr. Oliver: — We have suggested a third rail route that isn't as prone to snow slides as the other roads are. The fellows across the way have voiced strong opposition to it. This situation is serious even though the Members opposite disagree with us than an emergency had arisen and the emergency debate, a week ago Friday, was in order. Mr. Speaker, I am naturally happy about the announced wheat sale to Russia that the Wheat Board has negotiated. But in the light of President Nixon's visit to China, the Wheat Board must make even a stronger effort in the same of Canadian grain. Once the President of the United States has succeeded in getting diplomatic recognition of Red China, his ambassadors won't be long in negotiating exporting agreements.

Mr. Speaker, I contend the situation is serious and every effort should be made to meet our sales commitments. Mr. Lang has stated that we may have to cut back in grain sales because of the snow slides causing a slow down on the CP and CN railways. But why doesn't he take immediate action on our third rail route proposal? Gross mismanagement by both the railways and the west port officials have resulted in insufficient grain in Vancouver terminals and caused the delay in the loading of some 27 ships now waiting in the harbour in Vancouver. Is the minister in charge of the Wheat Board in fact looking for a serious cut back in next year's grain sales and is he in fact conditioning the electorate for this so he can use the slow down as an excuse to save his political hide in some future election?

Mr. Speaker, it is interesting to note that the Federal Liberals seem to have taken lessons from the Members opposite on how to win elections. They are trying to soften up the electorate by using advertisements from Canada Man Power to make believe unemployment is under control. They are doing this with taxpayers' money. This is hardly fair pool and it is a poor example to set for the people of Canada. Indeed it is a sad state of affairs when men who have been entrusted with the administration of Canada can't set a better example for our youth. How can we expect our youth to have any respect for our older people when we have a Prime Minister who swears in the House of Commons.

We went through the fuddle-duddle issue and there was some question as to his guilt but not this time. This time it is recorded in *Hansard* and will remain as a black mark against all Canadians. He broke a law greater than any parliamentary rules, he broke one of the Ten Commandments and he didn't have the decency to apologize in or out of the House of Commons. What an example! I am sure the people of Canada will take this man's flagrant and arrogant attitude into consideration on election day.

Mr. Speaker, getting back to the Throne Speech, it included an item that will be of great interest to the farmers of Shaunavon and Dollard areas who have oil wells on their land. I am referring to the Surface Rights legislation. The time has come to put an end to the bullying tactics used by the oil companies to get a lower settlement from farmers regarding Surface Rights.

Some Hon. Members: — Hear, hear!

March 6, 1972

Mr. Oliver: — Legislation concerning the development of Co-ops and Credit Unions which really form the backbone of many small communities will be introduced. A much welcomed establishment of an Independent Electoral Boundaries Commission will also be legislated. This will take the temptation to gerrymander away from politicians and ensure representation by population that is so necessary in a democracy and if we as Members of this Legislature really believe in democracy we will build into this Act all the necessary clauses to guarantee that never again will there be such gross inequities in constituencies as there now exists.

Some Hon. Members: — Hear, hear!

Mr. Oliver: — If there is any one particular thing that the last election has brought clearly into focus it was that Members of the Government must listen to the common people. What these people are saying is “it is the people’s government, it is our government”. For it is only after listening to and caring for our people that we can rightly deserve the pride and confidence in this Government that the people of Saskatchewan now have. Mr. Speaker, we have a great task ahead of us in this Assembly to build a better Saskatchewan, a better Canada and indeed a better world and I know I can speak for each and every one of the 45 Members on this side of the House when I say that we are ready and willing to do everything we can to fulfil this obligation. Now how about you 15 fellows over there? Mr. Speaker, I support the Motion.

Some Hon. Members: — Hear, hear!

Mr. D.H. Lange (Assiniboia-Bengough): — Mr. Speaker, I wish to make an observation on behalf of this Assembly regarding the quibbling over radio time. I think it might be the same observation that was probably made after the Second World War by the Nazis and the Fascists and that is, to occupy does not necessarily mean to rule.

Mr. Speaker, I rise in support of the Throne Speech. I will deal with the establishment of the Department of Social Services and the Human Resources Development Agency.

Often we are told of the lazy, indolent, welfare recipient who revels in lassitude at the expense of the taxpayer. Often we are told that welfare destroys initiative and that incentive ceases to exist once individuals are on the bread line. Often we are told that poor people are poor because they deserve to be – or because they don’t take advantage of opportunities presented to them – or because they aren’t aggressive enough to pull themselves out of their squalor.

I shall, in the next few moments, dispel some of the popular notions about welfare as myths and show where the philosophy behind welfare has an enduring place in our society.

The term ‘welfare’ when applied by most people has a derogatory connotation. Welfare payment is regarded as a dole or charity on behalf of the state to someone who hasn’t the means or the will to support himself or his family. Let us look at some other forms of welfare that exist in our affluent society. All of us take advantage of them, but we do not regard

March 6, 1972

them as a dole or a charity, but rather as a right or a privilege.

Our educational institutions are primary examples. Are our public schools not forms of welfare? Anyone can go, yet no one is required to pay individually because it is supported by the state. But we don't call that welfare.

We don't consider the university student to be on welfare when he subscribes to a heavily tax-subsidized university program which caters to the upper class but which is paid for by all classes. But the widow who is unable to work because she has four children and, therefore, received a stipend from the state, we say is receiving welfare. We don't regard the cheapest medical insurance on the North American Continent as welfare, yet money allotted to the blind or the disabled we dub as welfare.

We don't call the SGIO a welfare institution, yet this, the cheapest and most comprehensive auto insurance program on the North American Continent is a state supported institution.

Only a few years ago compulsory medical care and automobile insurance were regarded by many as the epitome of welfare. It was even called Communism, I believe. Now they are regarded as essential services. Two week ago I was in Los Angeles where my hostess had been in hospital for 36 hours with a minor operation. Her bill for 36 hours was \$600. For \$600 in Saskatchewan a whole family can stay in hospital for eight years. Is this type of welfare a dole or a charity, or is it a necessity?

This is not the first time in history, society has changed its views on charity. When Ryerson tried to introduce free education in Upper and Lower Canada in the 1850s, his opposition said it couldn't be done. "The incentive of people would be destroyed if they didn't have to pay their own way. The schools would be filled with indolent, lazy, unappreciative students", they said. "All educational standards would disappear if people didn't have to pay for their learning". In spite of this scepticism free education was introduced in Upper and Lower Canada and it didn't destroy initiative. In fact, it created more incentive for people to go to school.

The attitude of people has changed...we now regard medical, educational and insurance programs as essential collective social services.

But how often have we heard that people on welfare deserve to be there because they're lackadaisical or indifferent to their lot in life, or they're poor because they haven't the initiative to help themselves? How often have we heard that welfare recipients should be made to do menial work for their money? How often have you sat in someone's comfortable living room and heard him say that welfare recipients should be made to shovel the snow out of his driveway?

Let me cite some of the statistics from the last quarter of the Saskatchewan Assistance plan:

Of the 17,000 welfare cases in Saskatchewan, 9,000 are over sixty years of age or are disabled. Are disabled people or people over sixty years of age lackadaisical? Should they be made to work? Of the 17,000 welfare cases, 3,000, the majority of which are women, are on welfare because of absence of the spouse. Should these women be made to leave their homes and families to work? About 3,500 of the 17,000 on welfare are unemployed.

March 6, 1972

These could be employed. But most are unemployed because they lack specialized training, so what will they do? The suggestion generally given is that they could shovel snow or some such job which is mindless, servile, boring, hateful or degrading. I would ask the Members of the House if they would do that kind of work? Further, if there is a machine to do the work, why should a man cut grass with his teeth?

I contend that more money should be spent on these people for their education and rehabilitation. People on welfare are kept there partially because the amount they receive in welfare payment is enough only to sustain their present way of life, but not enough to raise them to a position to take advantage of other opportunities. They are also kept there by the present administrative procedures of welfare which doesn't allow a welfare recipient to make extra money above the welfare stipend. Why should a man try to find work when every dollar he makes over a pitifully small amount is a dollar less he gets from the state?

People are on welfare in most cases through no fault of their own; but because they have grown up in a poor environment or because they haven't had educational opportunity, or because of alcohol problems – all of which are sociological problems for which the society should assume partial responsibility.

But the establishment is persistently trying to convince the nation that the welfare state has gone as far as it can go or should go and that there should be no further expenditures of public money to fight poverty, provide more educational opportunities, to raise present welfare payments to a realistic figure, to subsidize day nurseries or to allow the aged and the infirm to live in dignity and comfort.

But to have a plan one must first have a social attitude to support it. One way to change the attitude would be to get rid of that work 'welfare'. In an affluent society there ought to be an income floor under every man below which society will not allow him to go – and this ought to come as a right and not as a charity. Yet the business establishment continues to support the idea of a means test for all welfare payments, as it once supported the idea of a means test for anyone desiring free schooling.

On the face of it, this makes eminent sense to some people. But to help the needy only, you must label them objects of charity and this is intolerable. Having to prove need is degrading. It involves government snooping and more than that it freezes initiative.

A solution that has been proposed is a guaranteed annual income based on negative income tax. Such a scheme would be an expensive and controversial undertaking. One can hear the screams from the business community, "There is no such thing as free goodies for anyone", it will say. And as long as the business world talks as if such an approach was a luxury and not a necessity, a handout rather than an investment, then the public will balk at paying it. Oddly enough the public never balks at highways. Governments which spend the public's money on such things seem to be returned to office with clockwork regularity, although June 23rd was perhaps a memorable exception. But then, highways, dams, seaways, expositions, airlines, railways and expensive buildings are never presented as treats and goodies by speakers at business conventions. Stockholders never seem to question big business executives whose companies insure their lives for large sums – a form of security which is never seen

March 6, 1972

to be debilitating. Nor do they stand up at annual meetings and charge that those directors who insist on wall-to-wall carpeting in the executive suite are being spoon-fed.

Anyone who gets an income tax deduction for his wife, his children or his elderly mother, is receiving Government welfare though no one ever calls it that. Every well-to-do businessman who enjoys a company car or a fancy tax deductible pension scheme is getting public welfare too, though that word is never applied to people in the top income bracket and yet the community pays for a large portion of these goodies and treats. The community also pays for the tax concessions, incentive grants and royalty exemptions that corporations receive from Government. But I don't suppose that could be considered welfare. Could it?

The evidence shows that there is one segment of the population that has more money than it can spend and another that has less than it needs. Obviously the guaranteed annual wage must be supported by people who have more than they can use. But can't you hear the hue and cry that would be raised by major segments of the population if a guaranteed income were proposed. "It would break the country", they would say. "It would be the ruination of incentive to work. How could we afford it?" In other words, we would have the same haggard dogma that we heard when the public education, automobile insurance and medical care programs were introduced. Yet little comment is every made about the \$1.8 billion spent each year on defence in Canada. A good portion of which is spent at the moose Jaw Airforce Welfare Base. I can think of no better example of a group of welfare recipients than the Armed Forces. There is no other institution in our society which spends a greater portion of the tax dollar than the present day Canadian Armed Forces and who, by comparison, returns less to society except for, of course, the Canadian Senate. And yet, the Canadian Armed Forces personnel, or senators are not generally considered to we welfare recipients.

Some Hon. Members: — Hear, hear!

Mr. Lange: — Only people who are poor or are unfortunate are considered to be on welfare. All other classes of people who receive public aid regard it as a right or a privilege. Still, it is a portion of the same tax dollar that is shared by all. Our present system is based on economics. The only method we have of justifying distribution of goods and services in society is through money. Little account is taken of investing in an individual for the sake of human worth. We should consider money and time spent on rehabilitation of any segment of society to be an investment for the future. It may be costly now, but future generations will benefit from improved educational and living standards. Hopefully, we can change our attitude towards the gross national product to see that it should include health, brains, creativity, recreation and fine arts.

At the present time, the country is suffering as a result of the refusal of the well-to-do to invest in the underprivileged to the proper extent. Witness the FLQ crisis or the destruction of a once proud Indian civilization as a result of an improperly administered welfare program. When people talk about the waste in Government, they ought to consider the waste in human resources which the present system supports.

We have an economic structure, based upon waste and obsolescence and upon welfare for corporate industries. An

March 6, 1972

economic structure thriving upon the enhancement of technological achievement and monetary efficiency, oriented largely towards military aggrandizement.

No matter which political philosophy we may adhere to we must remember that our society has been built upon man's co-operation with other men. In the time since the industrial revolution the major direct recipients of this co-operation have been financial and industrial institutions, which have become present day corporations and will become future conglomerates. This form of co-operation has given us our technology and our modern way of life, but an indirect spin-off from the industrialization has been the welfare problem which exists. Now, a different sharing arrangement must be made with corporations. It is not a question of their elimination or of their nationalization but of a more equitable distribution of their wealth.

I commend this Government for taking a new attitude towards the welfare problem. Changing the name of the Department of Welfare to the department of Social Services is perhaps a minor bit of legislation but it will go a long way to eliminating the stigma associated with the word 'welfare', so that people who are unfortunate in society will be able to accept aid from the Government with the same dignity as those with higher incomes.

Before we talk of corporate takeover, of organization of people for specific purpose, we must first speak of meaningful participation by people so they can understand the society of which they are a part.

On this plane, I again commend the Government for the establishment of the Human Resources Development Agency. This agency is designed to promote the development of disadvantaged people in communities by self-involvement of the disadvantaged through their access to the highest levels of Government. These two Acts will be most meaningful to people who are underprivileged. Through these Acts the underprivileged will be able to play a meaningful part in their own destiny and social change. It is important for Government to recognize that people must be directly involved in their own life planning and to make available as much resources in the form of finance and personnel as is possible.

The Human Resources Development Agency is a very small attack on a very large problem – one that can't be handled provincially in its entirety; but provincially we can initiate the first steps towards a change in attitude which could, as it has in the past, under this Government, spread across Canada.

Some Hon. Members: — Hear, hear!

Mr. H.H. Rolfes (Saskatoon Nutana South): — Mr. Speaker, before I turn to the Throne Speech Debate, I should like to join with my colleagues in congratulating the Members from Souris-Estevan (Mr. Thorson) for being elected to this House and subsequently being selected to the Cabinet. In my short dealings with this Member he has certainly shown he has the interest of the people of Saskatchewan at heart and I know that he will do a commendable performance in that portfolio.

I also, Mr. Speaker, want to congratulate the Members from Morse (Mr. Wiebe). I thought the Member from Morse did a

March 6, 1972

commendable job in his maiden speech although I must admit, I didn't agree with everything he said. He did try to be objective. Furthermore, Mr. Speaker, I should like to congratulate my colleague from Saskatoon, the Hon. Members from Mayfair (Mr. Brockelbank) for being also selected to the Cabinet.

Mr. Speaker, the Members opposite, not only in this Session but in the first session of the 17th Legislature and in the past, have criticized the NDP policy in economics. It seems to be one of their favourite criticisms to say that the economy in 1964 was also to quote from a person who I think is well known in Saskatchewan, Norman Ward of the University of Saskatchewan. In an article in the August issue of Saturday Night, Mr. Ward had this to say about the economy of Saskatchewan in 1964. He wrote:

Only the truly biased could forget that the CCF's reign after 1944 included years of impressive progress, or that when the socialists were at last defeated in 1964, the Province had never, by any standard economic yardstick, been more prosperous.

Some Hon. Members: — Hear, hear!

Mr. Rolfes: — Mr. Speaker, I should like to repeat this for the Member from Whitmore Park (Mr. Grant), if he has a moment to listen. "By any economic yardstick never did the province have more successful progress than under the NDP Government."

Some Hon. Members: — Hear, hear!

Mr. Rolfes: — I wonder, Mr. Speaker, if that same Norman Ward today, would have the same praise for the seven long, lean, depressive years under the Members opposite?

Mr. Ward also had a few significant words to say about the quality of the Civil Service under the NDP. He apparently agrees with the Premier (Mr. Blakeney) that many of these people were chased out of this province. He writes:

The NDP program is vast and complex and the corps of distinguished administrators that the CCF Attracted after 1944, which gave Saskatchewan the best Civil Service in Canada, has gone.

Some Hon. Members: — Hear, hear!

Mr. Rolfes: — In the same article, Mr. Ward makes a further analysis of the June election. I wish to direct this today to the Hon. Member from Milestone. He does have a few choice words on the quality of the official Opposition. This is what Mr. Ward says:

The official Opposition is now weak and not only in numbers, some able Liberals fell in June 23rd, (One might disagree on that) and a few unimpressive ones did not.

This was written before the former Premier (Mr. Thatcher) died and he goes on to state:

Mr. Thatcher himself, whose ability no one could doubt, has

March 6, 1972

expressed a wish to retire soon and no plausible cavalier to put up against Mr. Blakeney is in sight.

Mr. Speaker, I feel honoured to be able to participate in this Throne Speech debate. I believe that this Government gives clear evidence, as it did in the first session of the 17th Legislature, that it intends to carry out its election promises.

Some Hon. Members: — Hear, hear!

Mr. Rolfes: — It is a good beginning of a four-year program, which will chart a new course for the people of Saskatchewan. By 1964 the NDP Government had not only established sound economic policies, but it had also developed the finest educational system that one could find anywhere on the North American continent.

Along with this, Mr. Speaker, the NDP Government had taken giant strides in enacting progressive legislation in the areas of social and medical reform and I think the first session of the 17th Legislature was another indication when we removed deterrent fees, when we removed medical and hospitalisation premiums for people 65 and over, that this Government continues to take strides in social and medical reform. After seven years of Liberal Government Saskatchewan residents needed some reassurance. This Government, Mr. Speaker, has given them that reassurance by proposing to bring in legislation which will protect their individual rights, legislation which will permit all groups of people to meaningfully participate in preserving and determining their own way of life, and legislation which will restore the democratic principle of representation by population.

Some Hon. Members: — Hear, hear!

Mr. Rolfes: — I believe, Mr. Speaker, that it is a fair assessment when I call this a People's Throne Speech. I say this, Mr. Speaker, not only because I want to boast about what this Government is doing but because I am convinced that when this Session adjourns and these pieces of legislation become law, it will be the people of Saskatchewan who will receive substantial benefits for many years to come.

Some Hon. Members: — Hear, hear!

Mr. Rolfes: — In my maiden speech, Mr. Speaker, in the last session, I spent considerable time talking about the youth of this province, and I did so, Mr. Speaker, because I believe, as I am sure most people in this Assembly do, that they are the most important resource that this Province has. And if this province is to have a future, then as legislators we must provide an environment which permits our youth to take an active and meaningful role in deciding their own development. And I do not, Mr. Speaker, apologize to this House by spending some more time speaking about our youth. I work with our youth today and I find many, many of them, Mr. Speaker, that are simple confused, they are frustrated and they are very disillusioned. And if I must say so, Mr. Speaker, any youth who was in this House last Friday certainly must be confused, certainly must start wondering about democratic government and certainly must start wondering about the quality of the people that sit on both sides in this House. I was disillusioned, Mr. Speaker, and in my maiden speech I did ask the experienced Members not to lead us astray, to show us the way by their examples, so

March 6, 1972

that we would not fall in the same trap and I must admit that I did fall into that trap. But again, Mr. Speaker, I am determined in these four years to abide by the rules of this House and to make sure that the people of Saskatchewan can feel proud to come and watch us function in the House and that they know that they will benefit from it.

Some Hon. Members: — Hear, hear!

Mr. Rolfes: — Mr. Speaker, the youth of this province have not accepted the goals and values of this society. It must be remembered, Mr. Speaker, that they were born in a very highly complex society. A society which is presently beset by pollution, by over-population, by wars and by poverty. A society which places little value on human life, be it in Vietnam or in Ireland, or in the Middle East, in an American or Canadian ghetto or be it, Mr. Speaker, an unborn child. In this society if a man of wealth or a man of position is violently killed it is a tragedy. If a hundred people are deliberately starved because of our economic policies, it is an accepted phenomenon, and if thousands of innocent unborn children are killed, it is to protect the rights of an adult person. In such a society, Mr. Speaker, who wouldn't be confused?

I want to commend this Government for the proposed legislation to establish a Department of Youth. It can become an excellent avenue for young people actively to participate in formulating policies concerning themselves; it should, Mr. Speaker, reassure them that this Government wants their suggestions, that this Government needs their criticisms and that this Government needs them to help build a truly free, peaceful and co-operative society.

Recently, Mr. Speaker, my wife and I had the opportunity to represent this Government at the 7th annual Folk Festival in Saskatoon. I want publicly to congratulate Mr. Ernest Chan, President of the Saskatoon Folk Art Council. He deserves a lot of credit for his years of dedication in promoting multi-culturism in Saskatchewan. I began to realize more fully, Mr. Speaker, as I travelled that night around the world in the good ship Canadiana that the strength of Canada lies in the preserving and in the developing all our cultures. I also realized that Canada's cultural heritage is a gift, Mr. Speaker, from all parts of the world and that the resulting mosaic belongs to every Canadian no matter what his origin or his ethnic group may be.

Some Hon. Members: — Hear, hear!

Mr. Rolfes: — This Government, Mr. Speaker, should be commended for its wisdom in including proposed legislation which will establish the combined Department of Culture and Youth. By doing so it has recognized the need to ensure that the multi-culture activities of the people of Saskatchewan are freely developed and that resources both financial and human will be available for this purpose.

The proposed legislation in the Throne Speech, Mr. Speaker, which will abolish the Indian and Métis Department, and replace it with a new Human Resources Development Agency, I think is a good recommendation. The Indian and Métis Department has not been accepted by the Indian and Métis groups, it does seem discriminatory and furthermore it does not include other disadvantaged groups as the new agency will. I want, Mr. Speaker, at this time, to recognize the former Premier's efforts in this particular area. I think the former Premier realized that there was a

March 6, 1972

problem he tried to something about it. I want publicly to recognize his tireless efforts and his sincere desire to help these people.

Some Hon. Members: — Hear, hear!

Mr. Rolfes: — His limited success, in this area, must have been very disappointing to him. It is my hope, Mr. Speaker, that this agency will place considerable emphasis on giving all disadvantaged groups a genuine opportunity for meaningful participation in matters which deeply affect our own manner of life. I further hope that his agency will provide consultative services and facilitate in whatever way possible these groups in their efforts to work out their own destiny.

Permit me, Mr. Speaker, to speak a few words about the field of education. I do not intend, as I did in my first speech, to speak on the philosophy or goals of education but rather I want to discuss the present state of salary negotiations. The Opposition, Mr. Speaker, seemed to take delight in criticizing the appointment of a farmer trustee as Minister of Education (Mr. MacMurchy). Let us have a look at some of the things that that Minister of Education has done in the first seven or eight months that he has been in office. He has reorganized, Mr. Speaker, the Department, he has found a new approach to school grants, he has done away to all intents and purposed the teacher-pupil ratio. He has established committees, Mr. Speaker, to study kindergarten and community colleges. These, Mr. Speaker, are only a few and in my mind, Mr. Speaker, that is what I call performance. The Liberals in their seven years did virtually nothing for teachers in the area of superannuation. In fact, they severely penalized teachers who retired before the age of 60 even though the same teachers had given 30 or 35 years of good service to their community. The Liberals forced these teachers to remain in the classroom or they forced them to retire in poverty when they should have assisted them and let them live the remaining years of their lives in dignity.

I want, Mr. Speaker, to turn for a moment further to superannuation. Prior to July 1, 1970 there was a reduction factor applied to the pensions of teachers who retired prior to age 60 of about 2.4 per cent for each year less than 60. The actual reduction still at 55 went up to 11.9 per cent. Without warning, Mr. Speaker, the Members opposite came in on July 1, 1970 and raised the 2 per cent to 4.13 per cent, which meant that a teacher who retired at 55 did not have a reduction of 11.9, Mr. Speaker, but had a reduction of 20.65 per cent. So, effective July 1, 1970 there were 20 persons between the ages of 55 and 59 who were granted pensions. By applying the 1970 reduction table to these persons as opposed to the reduction tables effective immediately prior to the date, it resulted in a total of \$3,552.76, not very much to the Government of Saskatchewan, Mr. Speaker, but it did mean a lot to the individuals involved. If you peruse very quickly the Annual Report of superannuation that was just handed to us you will note, Mr. Speaker, that there are teachers right now who are receiving pensions less than \$2,000 a year for services in education of over 20 years. So, Mr. Speaker, I was very glad to hear that the Minister of Education has assured the teaching profession that substantial changes will be made in superannuation, changes that will allow them to retire earlier, changes that will allow them to retire with a little more dignity and changes that will permit a few more of our young graduates to enter the teaching profession.

March 6, 1972

Returning, Mr. Speaker, to area bargaining, let me say this. I believe that it is an accurate assessment when I say that the present difficulties in salary negotiations are due in large measure to the imposition by the former Government of a so-called 6 per cent guideline and secondly that same Government's decision to establish areas for the purpose of bargaining without getting first, the support of the two large groups involved, the teachers and the trustees. They would like us to believe that they have got the full support of all the trustees. The Hon. Member for Rosthern (Mr. Boldt), quoted from the Star-Phoenix on Tuesday last, that Dr. Egnatoff felt that there would be difficulties in education in 1972. I won't argue that point. If the Member from Rosthern, however, had checked a little more closely in that same Star-Phoenix he would have found that the same Dr. Egnatoff was quoted in 1968, January 13th edition of the Star-Phoenix as saying this about education. I quote:

The lights in education have never been lower in all the years that I have been associated with it.

Some Hon. Members: — Hear, hear!

Mr. Rolfes: — Dr. Egnatoff didn't stop there, Mr. Speaker, Dr. Egnatoff had this to say about The Teacher Salary Agreements Act of 1968 which introduced area bargaining. In that same January 13th issue of the Star-Phoenix he said this:

Premier Thatcher would not be heading Saskatchewan's Government today if recently proposed education legislation had been indicated during the election campaign last fall.

Furthermore he says:

I find it difficult to believe a Liberal Government would try to enact such reactionary legislation.

In my opinion, Mr. Speaker, area bargaining has not been successful. Each year since its inception, and I agree it has only been in for three years, but there have been conflicts and disputes several near strikes and some actual strokes.

Also, Mr. Speaker, the application over the past two years of a six per cent guideline has created a significant disparity in salaries received by teachers in Saskatchewan as compared with the salaries received by teachers in the Provinces of Manitoba, Alberta and British Columbia. An attempt by Saskatchewan teachers at present to want to close this gap is understandable.

In March of 1970 the present the Leader of the Opposition made it clear that his Government would not contribute to the cost of excessive wage settlements, excessive to him meant anything I think above the six per cent guideline. By June of 1970 he was threatening to put teachers under Bill 2 at a Special Session of the Legislature. In August he made it absolutely clear that if any school board ignored the Province's six per cent guideline the Government would not fee there was any need for an increase in grants that year. I remember very clearly, Mr. Speaker, that in area 6 we had signed an agreement but because the Government wouldn't accept it we had to have eight or nine different revisions of the interpretation of a six per cent

March 6, 1972

guideline before the Government would say 'yes', now you may sign. That I say, Mr. Speaker, was interference, that I say, is in part the cause of our present difficulties.

Some Hon. Members: — Hear, hear!

Mr. Rolfes: — Such intimidation, Mr. Speaker, effectively killed the process of free collective bargaining. There were, Mr. Speaker, no real area negotiations when the Members opposite were the Government because their continuous interferences made it inoperative. I maintain that there is little area bargaining going on today because both the Saskatchewan Teachers Federation and the Saskatchewan School Trustees Association are directing negotiations at a Provincial level.

In my humble opinion, Mr. Speaker, area bargaining is cumbersome, it is disruptive, it creates further animosity between teachers and trustees, and furthermore it simply doesn't work. The sooner this Government repeals that piece of legislation, the better things will be for education in Saskatchewan. In its place, Mr. Speaker, I would suggest this: that we enact new legislation and that we either revert to local negotiations, which is my own personal preference or provincial bargaining of a salary grid only, leaving all other conditions of employment to be negotiated at the local level. Mr. Speaker, I should like to repeat this because I know there is going to be some misinterpretations placed on what I have said. My first preference is to go back to local bargaining. If this is not possible and some people tell me it isn't, then I should like to go to provincial bargaining of the salary grid only and that all other conditions of employment be negotiated at the local level.

In summary, Mr. Speaker, I want to say that I believe this Throne Speech is a good beginning for this Government.

Some Hon. Members: — Hear, hear!

Mr. Rolfes: — I believe, Mr. Speaker, it gives reassurance to the people of Saskatchewan that we intend to carry out our promises. Thirdly, Mr. Speaker, I think that the people of Saskatchewan will be the real beneficiaries when these pieces of legislation become law. Therefore, Mr. Speaker, I support the motion.

Some Hon. Members: — Hear, hear!

Mr. E.F. Gardner (Moosomin): — I had intended to speak first on wildlife and some hunting problems that we are having. The former speaker made such a build-up from the Minister of Education I am tempted to give my education portion first. I am sure that we can defer that for a moment or two.

One sentence in the Throne Speech was of special interest to me and I should like to quote:

My Government intends to take comprehensive measures to preserve and enhance our natural environment.

The first speaker, the Members I believe for Kerrobert-Kindersley

March 6, 1972

(Mr. Taylor), said that we must protect our wildlife. Both of these statements are in direct contradiction to recent actions of the Department of Natural Resources. The present Minister of Natural Resources (Mr. Kramer), last fall, Mr. Speaker, presided over the greatest slaughter of our wildlife ever seen on the prairies since the buffalo were finally wiped out a hundred years ago. Perhaps his idea of celebrating the anniversary of that shameful massacre is to allow the massacre of the remainder of our wildlife. Even the new African nations are making a better effort at conservation than so-called civilized NDP Saskatchewan. Our wildlife is one of our most valuable natural resources, it must be preserved at all costs. The policies of the new NDP Government can only result in the wanton destruction of this great heritage. I am prepared to give you a few examples.

Most of you hear are familiar with the location of Moose Mountain Provincial Park. It is a hilly forested area in south-eastern Saskatchewan and it is a veritable oasis in the prairie which stretches for hundreds of miles in every direction. It is traditionally a sanctuary for birds and animals of many species. There are a few moose in the park and hence the name Moose Mountain. This small herd has struggled valiantly over the years to maintain itself in an area far from its natural northern habitat. Tourists and local people alike have watched over the past 50 years as this small herd, often nearing extinction, finally grew to a meagre total of about 250 animals in the last year. No one of course in all of that 50 years was ever allowed to shoot these animals. Last fall under the NDP a moose hunting season was opened in this sanctuary for the first time in history. This fine herd suffered a staggering blow from which it will probably never recover. There were confirmed kills of almost half the moose in the park. No one knows how many were wounded and died later. These tame and docile animals had never been shot at before and were slaughtered in a most unsportsmanlike and inhumane manner.

Some Hon. Members: — Hear, hear!

Mr. Gardner: — One group of people, Mr. Speaker, told me of watching a small aircraft herd a number of moose in a small area, by continually circling over and chasing them. A party of hunters was signalled to close in and as the group of moose stood shivering in fright, they were cut down by these so-called sportsmen. Is this the way the NDP are protecting our wildlife? This is a well confirmed event. The practice so sickened the Saskatchewan Wildlife Federation people that they passed a resolution at the recent convention in Yorkton asking, and I should like to quote:

Control over aircraft signalling hunters and herding big game animals during the big game Season in the Moose Mountain Provincial Park.

Moose Mountain has also been a breeding ground and a sanctuary for deer which then migrate out of this area for many miles, often 50 or 100 miles. Moose Mountain Park has the greatest number of tourists of any Provincial Park in Saskatchewan. The deer around the campground and golf course have become quite tame and are a novelty and an attraction for tourists. Last fall under the NDP we had a deer hunting season in this park that was almost unbelievable. As you know hordes of American hunters flooded Saskatchewan. In our area, the southeast part of the Province, they were not allowed to hunt except in the park. I repeat, Mr. Speaker, only in the park. Government regulations concentrated these numbers of American hunters in the small

March 6, 1972

park area. In addition to this, they were allowed to shoot not the usual one deer, but three. In order to maximize the slaughter the Government gave them a cheaper rate as they shot more deer. The license fee for an American hunter was \$40 for the first deer, \$20 for the second and \$10 for the third. The more you take, the cheaper they get, like selling bananas. With hundreds of Americans confined to this small area the deer had no chance, many of them tamed by tourists were shot by the hundreds. On the night of December 2nd, for example, I talked to a party of four Americans who had come in that day. They told me they had spent the afternoon sitting in a clump of willows and had shot nine deer without moving from the spot, as other hunters kept the deer in constant motion. They were going out the next morning to get the other three they were allowed and then go home.

In 1969 there were about 1,200 deer licenses sold to Americans. In the fall of 1971, this NDP Government sold over 5,200 deer licenses to Americans. This anti-American government apparently has no objection to letting them exploit our wildlife. The second Sunday after the season opened we walked back into the bush on a trail to check the situation. The area was alive with dozens of snowmobiles spotting deer. I met a party of Americans and they shook their heads in disbelief. I should like to quote the comment of one. This chap said to me:

You fellows up here must be nuts. You have a beautiful forest area, a good wildlife population and you are letting it be destroyed by this massive concentration of hunters.

Because of the many complaints I received I wrote a letter to the Minister of Natural Resources (Mr. Kramer) and I should like to thank him for a prompt reply. However, the subject matter of his letter was completely erroneous. I don't know whether the Minister knew this or whether his officials were trying to cover up and justify a series of mistakes. I will point out these errors to the Minister at a later time.

There is just one point that I should like to make at the moment and that is that no one, not the Department of Natural Resources, the Minister, not myself, no one knew how many hunters were in the park or how many deer were killed. No one had to check in or out of the park or report their kill. I personally saw American trucks loaded with dead deer leaving the park, going right through the gate, didn't even have to stop and report at the gate. We can't lay the blame entirely on the American hunter. He is merely making use of a situation that we have created and should have controlled. The deer hunting situation in the Yorkton area was also out of control and this is well known by everyone last fall due to reports in the Press and so on.

One farmer told me – we were up in that area – that he and his neighbours had locked up their German shepherd dogs. Trigger happy hunters had been shooting them for trophies thinking they were coyotes.

Now I am sure, Mr. Speaker, that the Minister will reply and I think he is already thinking of this, that many of these hunting regulations were set before he became the minister and he will thus deny the responsibility for the hunting mess that everyone knows we had last fall. However, he won't get off the hook so easily. It was not until early summer that game officials became aware of American season closures. This happened in

March 6, 1972

July and August throughout the northern United States and we found that the changes in the also down there made the possibility of a flood of American Hunters up here. An alert Minister and Department would still have had plenty of time to control the resulting fiasco. I have only used the Moose Mountain situation as an example, but the Minister of Natural Resources and his Department officials have shown a disregard for wildlife conservation in other areas. Many of you are familiar with the controversy over the Wascana geese. For years there has been no goose hunting around Regina to protect the tame geese which are encouraged to stay on and near Wascana Lake. These are enjoyed by the people of Regina and the tourists that come here.

Last fall, for the first time, the NDP Government opened the hunting season in certain areas around Regina. These tame birds which didn't fear man or guns were slaughtered by the hundreds.

Mr. Kramer is quoted as saying in the Leader-Post that the geese could adapt to these conditions. Presumably he meant that they could adapt to being dead because that is where most of them finished up.

Another recent change in regulations by Mr. Kramer and his Department allows the hunting of foxes and coyotes by snowmobiles. This amazing change in policy is certainly reminiscent of the barbaric fox hunting practices of old. But now instead of using horses and dogs, a horde of so-called sportsmen on snowmobiles will be able to chase a panic stricken fox or coyote until it is exhausted and finish it off in any manner they choose. I am amazed that the Saskatchewan people would stand for such a practice in a civilized country. They should demand an immediate withdrawal of this regulation.

Some Hon. Members: — Hear, hear!

Mr. Gardner: — Why, Mr. Speaker, should we have such a drastic change in policy? No one really knows. According to the Leader-Post, Mr. Kramer and two Department officials said they couldn't prove that there had been any increase in the number of foxes and coyotes.

Now, in addition to the above, we find that the Minister is going to allow hunting of big game on Sunday in some areas. As a reason for this he is quoted as saying that the moose doesn't really know whether it is Sunday or not. Now a moose may not know whether it is Sunday but I am sure that after being chased for six days by a pack of hunters, it would appreciate a day of rest like anyone else.

From a conservation point of view, Mr. Speaker, it would appear that big game hunting for six days out of seven certainly is enough. You know hunter-farmer relationships have become one of the major hunting problems and a major concern of everyone in the last few years. Some farmers have told me recently that if the NDP allows hunting of big game on Sunday in any place in this province they will post their land for the entire hunting season.

All people today, especially young people, are becoming more concerned about our environment. They are not going to be content to sit idly by and see our wildlife squandered by uncaring or incompetent officials. I hope that everyone will make it clear to this NDP Government, to the Minister of natural Resources, that our wildlife is part of our heritage and no one

March 6, 1972

will be allowed to destroy it.

Some Hon. Members: — Hear, hear!

Mr. Gardner: — Mr. Speaker, as the Members of the Legislature for Moosomin I feel obliged to make some comment on the recent controversy over dismissal of a teacher in the Moosomin School Unit.

I should like to point out at this time that I have so far, very carefully, refrained from making any statement in this regard. I have taken no part whatsoever in the controversy in the area. I wanted the Government, the local board, the investigating committee to have every opportunity to resolve the problem with as little interference as possible. However, as their representative in this Legislature, I feel that the local people expect me to make some comment. I might say also that for much of the last fall and during the winter, this problem was either before the investigating committee, or before the courts and now I believe that it may be appealed again, so I feel that at this time it is proper to make some comments.

I should also like to say that it is not my intention to criticize the teacher involved in any way nor attempt to pass judgement on her actions. This judgement is best left to the local people of the area.

Briefly let me review the situation for you. A teacher in the Moosomin School was dismissed by the board and the reason given was gross misconduct. The Minister of Education (Mr. MacMurchy) took on the job of trying to resolve the situation. He should have tried to do three things, Mr. Speaker. He should have seen that the teacher involved got a fair hearing and he should have satisfied the board, secondly, that a fair hearing was being held. And third, he should have satisfied the local people and the people of the province that justice had been done. The Minister failed in all three of these objectives. He failed for several reasons and I should like to go over these reasons for you.

His first mistake was in not making a greater effort to let the issue be solved on a local basis. This Government has talked about greater local autonomy but they are quick to erode away the democratic processes in local areas. Elected officials on local boards are voted in by the local people and parents involved and they can be voted out if the people are not satisfied with their actions.

This is the basis of democracy and democracy is in danger if senior governments can impose their will on elected local officials.

The Minister's second mistake was his most serious one. He appointed a three-man committee to investigate the allegations. And instead of finding three independent people he appointed a board consisting of one member who could be considered neutral and two sympathetic to the NDP.

Some Hon. Members: — Hear, hear!

Mr. Gardner: — This was a particularly serious error because the husband of the teacher involved is president of the Moosomin constituency NDP Association. So thus, the stage is set, Mr. Speaker, for the investigation.

March 6, 1972

The NDP Minister of Education has appointed an NDP dominated committee to rule on the conduct of the wife of the local NDP constituency president. The Minister asks us to believe that there are no political angles involved. Thus the Minister has destroyed the credibility of the committee before it had a chance to act. Under the circumstances no one expected an unbiased hearing and this was a disaster for everyone involved.

First of all, Mr. Speaker, it was an insult to the teaching profession. No teacher in such a situation would ever have the satisfaction of being able to say that he or she was exonerated by an independent board. The local people could not have the satisfaction of knowing that they had received a just hearing. And third, the parents and the citizens of the Moosomin area were not satisfied with the composition of the board, the hearings, or the results.

The results of the committee hearing were predictable, the two NDP members of the committee, appointed by the NDP Minister of Education ruled in favour of the teacher whose husband is the local NDP constituency president. The neutral member of the investigating committee filed a minority report in disagreement with the two NDP members. This, of course, made a farce of the entire proceedings. But the Minister was not satisfied with the fiasco to date. He made yet another blunder in this sordid affair. He refused to make public the report on proceedings of the committee. In doing so, he denied the Press and the public an opportunity to decide if the hearings were held in a fair manner and if the decision was just.

If he had nothing to hide and the proceedings were carried out in a proper manner, the Minister would have no reason for secrecy.

Mr. Romanow: — What did the court say?

Mr. Gardner: — The court had nothing to do with the judgment of the committee and you well know this. A group of high-priced lawyers from your Department were responsible for preventing the local board from getting the details of the committee brought before the court.

I received a copy of a petition, Mr. Speaker, which contains 750 names and it supports the action of the board. I am sure that the Minister also received this petition. This petition contains the names of people of all political parties and all walks of life. For example, it includes the name of many school teachers, it includes the principal of the school. The Minister has clearly gone against the wishes of the local people and the local teachers.

The Moosomin School Board was elected in a democratic manner and it is a serious matter to overrule their decision. Parents and teachers all over the Province are bewildered and uneasy because they are not sure of the implications of the Minister's decision. To justify his action the Minister clearly had an obligation to make public the report of the committee and he has refused to do this.

I said before that it is not my intention to pass judgement on the teacher or the article from the Georgia Strait. There has been a good deal of misunderstanding about the subject matter of the article in the Georgia Strait and many who have not seen it don't feel qualified to pass judgement.

March 6, 1972

I have here a copy of the article in question. The NDP Minister of Education and the NDP members of his inquiry committee seem to feel that it was not misconduct to present this material to 14 or 15 year old girls and boys at school. Following from this, Mr. Speaker, the Minister must therefore believe that it would not be misconduct for me to read the article to this Assembly. I have the article in front of me. However, in my opinion it is not suitable for a classroom and it is not suitable for this Assembly and I am not going to read it. However, I would invite the Minister of Education, when he speaks in this or subsequent debates, to read this article to the House at a later time if he feels that it is suitable matter for 14 or 15 year old children or for the people of this Province.

Some Hon. Members: — Hear, hear!

Mr. Gardner: — Mr. Speaker, I turn not to another subject. The NDP Land Bank Proposal has generated much discussion in recent months. The Government has been touring the Province with a slick propaganda machine. They have spent thousands of dollars of the taxpayers' money in an attempt to sell this program in rural Saskatchewan.

The Government has published a booklet spelling out in detail the operation of the NDP Land Bank. If the Bill is presented here, as outlined in this booklet and we have every reason to believe that it will be, it will be one of the most vicious and harmful pieces of legislation ever brought into Saskatchewan. It will eventually destroy a way of life cherished by many rural people.

I attended the Yorkton meeting and another local one. I have closely followed the Press reports and I have carefully read Chairman Messer's Thoughts as presented in his little brown book. The basic theme is always the same — the NDP will buy up a large quantity of Saskatchewan farm land. The NDP will lease, not sell, but lease this farm land back to the farmers. This is the basis of the plan. They spent most of their time at these meetings trying to convince the farmers that somehow renting is better than buying.

I urge all farmers to get a copy of Chairman Messer's Thoughts to read it carefully, especially the fine print. I should like to quote from the top of page four:

The Land Bank will create an opportunity for young capable farmers to lease land, thus eliminating the necessity to raise amounts of capital and to make commitment to burdensome principal payments over long periods.

This is what Mr. Messer says, but what is the truth? The simple truth is that over a long period of years it costs as much or more to rent than to buy the land. I have several examples worked out by the Agricultural Economics Department at the University, by the Farm Credit Corporation and others. Here is a typical example worked out at the University.

Take a half section of land valued at \$20,000. The young farmer, say 25 years old, rents this from the Land Bank and pays rent which would only cover the interest. It is made clear in the booklet that the rent is certainly going to cover the interest. So if he buys a half section for \$20,000 and pays rent it only covers the interest. His annual rental would be

March 6, 1972

\$1,400 and he would pay this continually until retirement age. If any of the administration costs, or any of the other costs are added, it would be more than that.

If he bought the land over a 40-year period and paid both principal and interest, at the same 7 per cent interest rate, his annual payment would be \$1,500.20. In both cases the farmer would be paying his own taxes. This means, in this particular instance, it would cost \$100 more per year to buy the land instead of renting.

The NDP in this booklet also say that the farmer must buy crop insurance, which would be at least \$1.50 per acre. So here is the situation: The young farmer buys a half section, he would pay \$1,500 per year and this would be his total payment. If he rents from the NDP Land Bank he would pay \$1,400 interest plus \$450 for the insurance, or \$1,850 per year. If he buys the land, when he becomes age 65 he owns the half section and he can sell it to retire in dignity or pass it on to his sons.

Under the NDP Land Bank proposals he pays \$350 more per year and at the age 65, after serving the Socialist state for all of his productive life, he walks away with nothing. The above figures and similar examples, can be verified any place. You don't have to take my word for it. Any credit union, any bank manager, any school teacher, any farm credit farm corporation office, can figure out examples to show you exactly the same thing.

At every meeting Mr. Messer stressed the economic advantages of renting rather than buying. Mr. Messer must have known that this argument was completely false because it is very easily verified. We can only conclude that he was conducting a deliberate campaign to mislead the farmers of this Province and he has now been caught in the act.

The Minister of Agriculture has lost the confidence of the farm people because of his obvious attempts to deceive. We, therefore, feel that the only honourable thing for the Minister to do is to resign his position.

Some Hon. Members: — Hear, hear!

Mr. Gardner: — Any young farmer who gets tied up with a lease from the NDP Land Bank in its present form will certainly live to regret the day. We will have much more to say later on the Land Bank and will fight to have the Bill withdrawn or at least changed so that farmers will get a better deal. But, however, I should like to point out one or two other obvious defects in the plan.

On page eight it says, and again I quote from Chairman Messer's book:

Leases may specify the use which may be made of given parcels of land.

This simply means that some Socialist Government bureaucrat can tell you when and what to seed, how many cattle you can have, in effect, how to run your farm. Secondly, by being a renter and not owning any land, or any equity in land, a young farmer will not have collateral to borrow money for farming operations. Thirdly, on the top of page nine it says that rents will be paid on a cash basis which may be

March 6, 1972

impossible in certain years. So the farmer is not guaranteed a fixed rental fee. It will go up as land values go up and I quote from the top of page nine:

Rents may be adjusted annually and will be calculated as a certain percentage of the current value of the land.

Number four, and I've read a number of letters on this particular point, the NDP apparently plan on stationing political commissars around the province to control Land Bank proceedings, and again I quote from page nine of Chairman Messer's Thoughts:

Each sub-region will have a Land Bank officer, resident in the area.

Political interference in procurement and in allocation will be inevitable. And number five – I got a letter from a young farmer a few days ago, expressing a concern which didn't occur to me. He said he owns three quarters of land and hopes to buy another half section next year to make his family farm profitable. Now he feels that when suitable land comes up for sale it will be grabbed by the NDP Land Bank. He says in his letter and I quote from it:

How can a small farmer, like me, compete with the Government in buying land?

Sixth, the greatest fear of the proposed NDP Land Bank is associated with the reason it was brought in the first place. The Wafflers and the true Socialists have long advocated that the state should own all natural resources and means of production including farm land. They won't be satisfied until this is accomplished. After a period of years of the Land Bank the Socialist State will control a large part of the farm land of Saskatchewan. Rather than a Province of farmers free to manager their own affairs, we will have a Province of tenant rent payers. They will be told who can farm, how they must farm, how much cash they must pay to the State for the privilege. All this is outlined in the brown booklet.

I should like to tell the farmers that we of the Liberal party will fight for a realistic chance for farmers to be free to own their own land.

Some Hon. Members: — Hear, hear!

Mr. Gardner: —In all of Mr. Messer's book there is only one sentence referring to selling any land, and I quote from page eight, and I think farmers should be particularly interested in this one small paragraph in the large booklet which spends most of its time telling them why it's an advantage to rent. A quote from page eight:

Under certain conditions, tenants will have the opportunity to eventually purchase the land; sales will be on a cash basis, the sale price being the market value at time of sale, as determined by the Land Bank Commission.

You can see that it appears almost impossible for any young farmer to buy. Note it says, 'under certain conditions', which it doesn't name, but which will be spelled out later by the

March 6, 1972

socialists. It says 'eventually', which means certainly not now, maybe later. It says 'for cash only' and what deserving young farmer if he needs the land in the first place and deserves it, is going to be able to walk in with the cash. It says 'market value at time of sale' as determined by the socialists. So they can set any prohibitive value they like to prevent the farmer from buying.

I've received letters from farmers, NFU Locals, concerned citizens, expressing opposition to the Land Bank. I did receive a petition from an NFU local expressing these very same sentiments.

I hope these people (it's in my constituency), will continue to make their views known to us and to the Government. Obviously, Mr. Speaker, I will not support the motion.

Some Hon. Members: — Hear, hear!

Mr. D. Michayluk (Redberry): — Mr. Speaker, before the Hon. Member sits down will you permit me to ask him a question?

In your remarks you mentioned that the Hon. Minister of Agriculture has published a booklet, informing the farmers of Saskatchewan in respects of the Land Bank. Are you against giving this information to the people of Saskatchewan in this form?

Mr. Gardner: — What I'm against is the type of information which was presented and the misleading way that it was presented in the meetings to the people. For example, I attended a small meeting of a group of farmers, the party faithful were running around with a questionnaire there. They had Chairman Messer's little brown book and they were quoting from it and then they would go to him and say let's all get around in a little group, around the table, read from the booklet and then answer the questions. For example – to whom should the land be leased? List the priorities. Then you are supposed to look back in the book. How should Land Bank prices be determined? You know they've done this same type of thing in other parts of the world and I don't think it's been that successful.

Some Hon. Members: — Hear, hear!

Mr. Speaker: — Order, order! We can't permit questions and answers at the end of a speech. The Hon. Member still has reserved his right to speak. We can't permit this form of a question in this way.

Mr. G.T. Snyder (Minister of Labour and Minister of Welfare): — Mr. Speaker, I have risen under happier circumstances in this House. I believe that the events of the last number of days and the conduct in the House, during the Throne Speech Debate, have saddened a number of people who have a regard and a respect for the Parliamentary institution.

It's not surprising, Mr. Speaker, that increasing numbers of people are looking upon the democratic process with a good deal of scorn and distrust. Never, Mr. Speaker, have we in this House seen such a display of cheap theatrics and melodrama, with the former Minister of Health on Friday last holding forth for

March 6, 1972

almost an hour and a half with a speech that had no substance, no import, no principle; the only quality displayed was the length of that address.

It's apparent, Mr. Speaker, that the Opposition finds itself without a cause and floundering helplessly. They struck upon the idea of representing the 15-man Liberal Opposition as a down-trodden persecuted minority, being railroaded and desecrated by a hard-fisted Government.

Mr. Grant, Mr. Speaker, in his finest hour Friday last, even went so far as to equate the fate of the Liberal Opposition with the Christians facing a martyr's death in the Coliseum.

Some Hon. Members: — Hear, hear!

Mr. Snyder: — Now this is really too much, Mr. Speaker. It should be remembered, Mr. Speaker, that even following the Leader of the Opposition's infringement upon the rights and the privileges of other Members in this House our Whip approached the Opposition Whip, in an attempt to work out a mutually suitable agreement and we suggest to you that our Whip will continue to do so in order that we may provide for an orderly functioning of this House.

Some Hon. Members: — Hear, hear!

Mr. Snyder: — It's clear, Mr. Speaker, that Liberals opposite wish to hide their ineptness by attempting to appear to be the dominated and the persecuted group. Such is not the case, Mr. Speaker, and it can't be represented as that.

Well, Mr. Speaker, my first words in this Throne Speech today must be to extend my very sincere congratulations to the mover and seconder of the Address-in-Reply. I've had the good fortune, Mr. Speaker, to be on hand for consecutive Throne Speech debates since 1960 and I believe I can say quite sincerely that in more than a decade we in this House may not witnessed, nor have we listened to more articulate, sincere and well-reasoned presentations than those that were delivered by the Hon. Member for Kerrobert-Kindersley (Mr. Taylor) and the Member for Humboldt (Mr. Tchorzewski).

Some Hon. Members: — Hear, hear!

Mr. Snyder: — Their constituents, Mr. Speaker, have every reason to be proud of them and we on this side of the House are equally proud of our association with them and we look forward to a long and a rewarding relationship. May I also, Mr. Speaker, congratulate the Hon. Member for Souris-Estevan (Mr. Thorson) on his victory in that recent by-election and his subsequent appointment to the Executive Council. May I express, Mr. Speaker, our pleasure and our good fortune in having him in our midst. I believe, Mr. Speaker, the Member for Morse is also to be congratulated on his by-election victory and for the able manner in which he delivered his maiden speech. I don't believe it can be said, however, that he exhibited any unusual flashes of progressive brilliance and accordingly, I expect, he will fit comfortably into the Liberal caucus where he will be surrounded by his peers.

Some Hon. Members: — Hear, hear!

March 6, 1972

Mr. Snyder: — The Member for Morse (Mr. Wiebe), Mr. Speaker, found it necessary when he spoke during his maiden speech, to follow the very familiar pattern of Liberals who have gone before him and he hastened to assure the House that he, like his Liberal comrades was not anti-labour and then, I believe, he continued to lament that among other things the present Government should not have moved so quickly, that they should have taken a more gradual approach in the introduction of new labour laws and particularly the labour standard provisions which relate to the hours of work.

I expect, Mr. Speaker, that it's a futile sort of an undertaking to remind this new Member that the hours of work provisions of the Labour Standards Act remained unchanged since the year of our Lord 1947, 25 years ago, Mr. Speaker, one-quarter of century. Admittedly, Mr. Speaker, this may be too rapid a pace for Saskatchewan Liberals, but for most fair-minded people, Mr. Speaker, it's been a long, long trail.

Some Hon. Members: — Hear, hear!

Mr. Snyder: — I wonder, Mr. Speaker, just how long! I wonder just how long Saskatchewan's working men and women would have been asked to wait for the Liberals to bring Saskatchewan Labour laws into the last half of the twentieth century.

The Saskatchewan New Democratic Party, Mr. Speaker, was elected on June 23rd by the people of this Province, on the basis of a program which we presented to them in a straightforward manner. The Saskatchewan electorate, I believe, witnessed by Members opposite, spoke with a loud voice and it's our purpose to honour our pledges, a great number of which have already been implemented in large measure.

Mr. Speaker, I'm honoured to have some responsibility for two portfolios and I expect to have the opportunity during the Budget Debate to deal at some length, with the Welfare Department and with your permission today, Mr. Speaker, I should like to utilize the time at my disposal during this Debate to review the policies of the Government as they are translated in terms of the activities of the Department of Labour.

For the seven years prior to the summer of 1971, Mr. Speaker, an extremely low priority was assigned to the work of the Department of Labour and to labour oriented government programs. During this period the status of the Department was very severely down-graded, Mr. Speaker. There was a completely improper and shocking state of affairs in the Department of Labour at the point in time when the Government changed on June 23rd, Mr. Speaker. This was a shocking state of affairs when one considers the large segment of the population in our labour force. History has long recorded that it is a fatal error for any Government to fail to recognize that the labour of a human being is not just a commodity or an article of commerce. The vital input of working people to economic and social progress cannot be exaggerated, Mr. Speaker. For the past seven months or so, the Government of Saskatchewan has been endeavouring to rectify the negative situation which had evolved and we are attempting to perform this by strengthening existing functions and initiating new programs within the Department. I think, Mr. Speaker, that we have done a good job.

Some Hon. Members: — Hear, hear!

March 6, 1972

Mr. Snyder: — I trust, Mr. Speaker, that this won't be construed as a totally immodest claim. It's true, perhaps, in the words of Longfellow, that we judge ourselves by what we feel capable of, while others judge us by what we have already done. However, we have reason to believe that the general reaction to the measures that we have taken so far have been very favourable. At the same time, I shall be the first person to admit that much remains to be achieved in the labour field.

The improvements referred to as they involve the Department of Labour are being effected in four specific ways particularly, Mr. Speaker,. One, through legislative and regulatory changes, through the modification of procedures employed to implement the programs of the Department of Labour, through the acquisition by the Department of additional financial and personnel resources to facilitate the more effective accomplishment of the objectives of Government labour policy and finally through a reorganization of the Government's administrative structure in order to better co-ordinate the individual branch activities.

Since assuming the Labour portfolio it has come to my attention, Mr. Speaker, that many Saskatchewan citizens are not fully aware of the services that are made available through the Department of Labour.

The goals of all of the activities are directed towards the promotion of the well-being of the labour force and of the public generally, either directly or indirectly. As a measure of the extent to which the Department is actively engaged in meeting the needs of our citizens it is estimated that a daily average of over 100 persons visit the Department's Regina head office alone, to avail themselves of the services offered.

I feel it would be useful today, for a few moments, to explore the functions of the various branches of the Department in order to provide a brief outline of the modifications which have been and will be made in the not too distant future.

To expand first of all on the point relating to reorganization, Mr. Speaker, the Department in the past has, I am afraid, lacked any efficient formal system of communication under which individual branch plans and policies could operate in a mutually, consistent and cohesive manner. Under the new structure branches with a community of interest will be grouped into one of four major divisions, the directors of which will be responsible directly to the Deputy Minister. One division will include five branches concerned with labour relations, namely the Labour Standards Branch, Labour Relations Board Support Services, Industrial Relations, Pensions and Apprenticeship. The new Occupational Health and Safety Division will take in the gas, electrical, boiler and fire Commissioner branches, along with the present Occupational Health branch of the Department of Public Health and the Safety branch of the Workmen's Compensation Board.

The other two divisions, Administrative Services and Research and Planning will be assigned augmented duties. In addition, a planning group will be created consisting of the four division heads and the Deputy Minister. This body will be responsible for evaluating the programs of the Department and plotting the course for future activities.

When the reorganization is fully operative, Mr. Speaker, the programs of the various component branches will form part

March 6, 1972

of the well integrated departmental strategy in the labour sphere.

In the area of labour standards, the goals of Government policy as administered by the Labour Standards Branch are to provide for fair and reasonable minimum standards relative to wages, hours of work, holidays, and other conditions of employment. The major instrument of labour standards legislation, Mr. Speaker, is a labour Standards Act. To ensure compliance with this and related legislation, the Labour Standards Branch conducts periodic inspections of employers' payroll records and collects on behalf of employees, through the inspection staff or by court action, wages found to be owing to those employees.

Steps are being taken to provide the branch with the kind of enforcement machinery necessary to make labour standard laws meaningful. We are determined, Mr. Speaker, that this legislation will not be allowed to exist merely as window dressing. Even with a woefully inadequate inspection staff which we inherited on June 23rd the branch has collected approximately \$300,000 in wage adjustments in each of the last number of years. This highlights the need to re-introduce a system of regular inspections of all business firms, a procedure which has been allowed to deteriorate by the previous administration. To ensure that employees receive all payments to which they are entitled by law, two additional Labour Standards officers have already been engaged by the Department since I assumed the portfolio in July and we will be appointing additional officers to those positions in the near future.

Included in the Labour Standards Branch, Mr. Speaker, is a Women's Bureau, arrangements for which were made by the former CCF government early in 1964, to permit the investigation and the examination of legislation and conditions relevant to the employment of women in Saskatchewan's labour force. In the intervening years the Bureau has been forced to carry on without adequate resources and with no clearly defined functions. I can assure you, Mr. Speaker, that measures will be undertaken to assign the Bureau a role which will enable it to make a significant contribution to the affairs of the increasing number of members of the fair sex who are entering or have entered the world of work.

With regard to the extension of labour standards provisions, Mr. Speaker, you will be aware that an increase in minimum wage became effective on January 2nd of this year. The adjustment was recommended by a reconstituted Minimum wage Board which has been given genuine decision-making powers which I suggest today is a sharp contrast to the previous Board which functioned merely for the purpose of rubber-stamping decisions which were made in Executive Council chambers and forwarded to them for their ratification. The new minimum wage applicable to all employees regardless of age or place of work is \$1.70 per hour and it is estimated that some 70,000 employees were affected by the increase. The higher minimum wage, Mr. Speaker, I suggest will have a positive influence on the standard of living of the employees involved, of their families and will place the income of these persons above the poverty level as defined by the Economic Council of Canada. An important economic consequence will be the expansion of purchasing power, this in turn may be said to serve as a stimulus to demand for goods and services, to productivity, to employment, to the rate of economic growth. On July 1st a further hike to \$1.75 will be proclaimed and at that time the provincial minimum wage will equal that of the minimum wage which is set out by the Federal Government.

March 6, 1972

The Hours-of-Work amendment to the Labour Standards Act, which was passed at the special session of the Legislature last summer also came into force as you will recall on January 2nd, 1972. You will remember that the amendment established the principle of an 8-hour day, a 40-hour week, after which overtime at the rate of time and one-half is payable. Where previously longer hours have been reduced to 40, in conformity with the new legislation, there can be no loss in take-home pay. The erroneous impression seems to have been created in some quarters that employer-labour costs must automatically rise with the reduction of hours of work. I suggest to you that this is not necessarily so at all. On the contrary I am pleased to note that the impact of shorter hours is being absorbed in most areas with a minimum of difficulty. Most employers are discovering that with the expenditure of a little thought and a little effort, a process in which their employees are willing participants, appropriate adjustments to the new working conditions can be made. For example, work methods can be made more efficient, waste hours of business can be eliminated and productivity can be increased. It will be realized, however, that the legal work week, Mr. Speaker, has not been changed for a long, long time and some impact is to be anticipated. In some cases a slight advance in prices may be necessary. However, the new legislation should not be made the scapegoat for substantial hikes in the cost of consumer goods and services and the Government will be keeping a close eye on this situation. In any event it cannot be validly argued, Mr. Speaker, that there is any real reason for denying the minority of employees who are not on the 40-hour week before this year the opportunity to enjoy the benefits of increased leisure. Moreover the available evidence suggests that the contraction of the work week will likely lead to the direct growth of employment, a rise in productivity, an expanded demand for good and services, particularly those used in association with leisure time, a decline in absenteeism, sickness and occupational accidents, an increase in employee purchasing power and a general boost to the economy.

Among the services of the Department which I believe demand the wide-spread attention, and properly so, are those which involve the operation of the collective bargaining system. The Department administers the Trade Union Act which regulates certain aspects of labour-management relations and guarantees employees the right to bargain collectively through representatives of their choosing. The labour Relations Board is empowered to issue orders certifying trade unions as bargaining agents for appropriate units of employees and requiring persons to refrain from unfair labour practices.

The Industrial Relations office of the Department provides a voluntary conciliation service to assist employers and employees in resolving their disputes with a minimum of disruption. The industrial relations climate in Saskatchewan since 1964 has been characterized, Mr. Speaker, by uncertainty, by the excessive control of the collective bargaining process, by the restriction of the rights of employees to organize and exercise the legitimate economic powers which they have and by the erosion of the freedoms and the security of every man, woman and child in Saskatchewan.

One of the first actions of this Government, Mr. Speaker, was the repeal of the repressive, unnecessary, anti-labour Essential Services emergency Act. It was alleged at that time, Mr. Speaker, by Members opposite and by some of their prehistoric predecessors, that this action would produce dire consequences and would endanger the very lives of the people of Saskatchewan. In this connection I am reminded of the statement made by Benjamin Franklin to the

March 6, 1972

effect that those who would give up essential liberties to produce or purchase a little temporary safety deserve neither liberty nor safety.

But, Mr. Speaker, we now have circumstances which I believe facilitate liberty and safety. It is a completely artificial and irresponsible argument which holds that services may be withdrawn in Saskatchewan which would place life or property in jeopardy.

I want to point out to you today, Mr. Speaker, that no genuine emergency has arisen since the passage of Bill 2 in 1966 nor is one likely to occur. We have been without Bill 2, Mr. Speaker, for over six months. Well, Mr. Speaker, what has happened? Has there been a tremendous proliferation of labour disputes, have essential services been withheld, have human lives been endangered? Well, Mr. Speaker, I think the answer is well known to every Member of this Assembly. As a matter of fact it is apparent that the withdrawal of Bill 2 has exerted a favourable influence on labour-management relations in our Province.

During 1971, Saskatchewan half of which passed in the absence of Bill 2, just over 1,900 man-working days were lost in work stoppages under provincial jurisdiction. This represents merely $1\frac{1}{28}$ or 3.5 per cent of the 55,000 man-days lost in 1970 under a Liberal operation with Bill 2 in effect. It has also been asserted, Mr. Speaker, that without the kind of control imposed by compulsory arbitration exorbitant wage increases would be granted to organized employees and as a result inflation would run rampant. And this again I say, Mr. Speaker, is patent nonsense. Our statistics indicate that in fact no excessive pay revisions have occurred and, moreover, as the Woods' Take Force on labour relations points out it is virtually impossible to sort out the relative influences on the many forces which govern price levels. In addition to wages one must have a look at profits at interest rates, at rents, at government spending, at changes in demand, rising material costs, sales taxes and inefficient work practices, and a whole host of other things if one is to attempt to explain increased cost in any given sector or area. Instead, Mr. Speaker, of setting up working people and their unions as the fall guys for the misfirings of the economy in the recent past, the Hon. Members opposite I would suggest would be better advised to invest in a course of setting of priorities. The present Government is much more concerned about unemployment than it is about strikes. The reason is obvious, Mr. Speaker. In 1971 time losses attributable to unemployment in Saskatchewan were more than 1,600 times greater than time lost as a result of work stoppages. I will have something more to say on this subject at a later debate in this House.

Well, Mr. Speaker, very shortly this Legislature will be called upon to approve amendments to the Trade Union Act which will extend the kind of protection to employees and their organizations which the Act was originally intended to do. The rights of unions originally guaranteed in law have been interfered with by amendments over the last number of years. The revised Trade union Act will be strengthened and streamlined and will assist in the whole concept of organized collective bargaining as a mechanism for the settling of disputes between labour and management in our province. With regard to the administrative procedures required to carry out the provisions of the Act, a new labour Relations Board has been established.

March 6, 1972

This body in future will be more effective in executing the spirit and the intent of the Trade Union Act and regulations. At the same time the support services attached to the board will be bolstered and improved. It is our intention to develop a conciliation plan, Mr. Speaker, which will identify labour relations problems before they reach the status of serious disputes. To this end additional conciliation officers will be appointed and new activities will be launched.

One such program, Mr. Speaker, will involve the encouragement of a more constructive collective bargaining relationship. In the face of the increasing complexity of the collective bargaining system new approaches to the negotiating process are required to match the pace of advancing technology. It may well be that bargaining will have to become a continuous labour-management relations. To encourage the development of the concept, Saskatchewan the Department has embarked on a program of meetings with various labour and management groups to outline the rationale involved and to suggest the most practical means of establishing permanent labour-management committees. With the assistance of the Labour-Management Consultation Branch of the Canada Department of Labour, we arranged an in-camera conference on the construction labour relations aspect of this program in Regina early last month, attended by representatives of the North and South Saskatchewan Building Trades Council and the Saskatchewan Construction Association. It is very gratifying for me to be able to report that the conference was successful as gauged by the full and the very frank exchange of views which took place during that meeting.

Well, Mr. Speaker, time doesn't permit a thorough examination of the other many duties of the Department of Labour, all of them important and all of them devoted to the provision of service to employees and to the public generally. The Department is responsible for the administration of comprehensive safety programs relating to the prevention and suppression of fire, the safe construction and operation of pressure vessels, elevators and electrical and gas appliances. As I have mentioned the Department safety activities will be expanded by the transfer of responsibility for the occupational health and workmen's compensation safety programs. The new Occupational Health and Safety Division will be instrumental I believe in the furnishing of more adequate and better integrated safety services. One of the by-products of our technologically-oriented society seems to be the creation of a potential for more and different accidents and the emergency of new categories of diseases and disorders. I suppose the hectic pace of modern life and the use of more sophisticated industry apparatus and the growing diversification of the economy have all contributed to combine and cause attention to be focused on such questions as noise and atmospheric pollution, continuous fatigue and nervous tension. These concerns will be reflected in the intensification of the activities of the Occupational Health and Safety Division for the purpose of safeguarding the welfare of Saskatchewan employees and citizens outside of the labour force both in the work place and at home.

The Research and Planning Branch of the Department of Labour is also to be reconstituted as a major departmental division. There is an urgent need for resources to enable the Department to carry on research studies on the results of collective bargaining and the characteristics of the labour force. This will permit the assessment of the effectiveness of the

March 6, 1972

existing legislative programs and the determination of the direction in which new policies may be required to move. The staff is also required to meet the demand for services from employees, employers and the public, which are growing in number and complexity in the light of the diversification of the economy and the increasing sophistication of all aspects of labour-management relations. It is, therefore, proposed, Mr. Speaker, that the necessary personnel be acquired to allow the organization of the division into specialized working units each of them dealing with the major aspect of labour affairs.

The Department is also occupied through the apprenticeship and tradesmen qualification branch in the development of an adequate supply of skilled workers to meet the needs of Saskatchewan industry. This program is intended to be of benefit to the employee in terms of increased earning power and promotional opportunities, to the employer who has at his disposal skilled employees with the ability to turn out better work at a faster rate, and to the consumer who is assured of a high standard of workmanship.

Another Departmental undertaking which is directly applicable to employees is the administration of the Pension Benefits Act, the purpose of which is to promote the establishment, the extension and improvement of pension plans throughout the Province. Action will be initiated to empower these branches to offer a more adequate level of service in the months directly ahead.

Mr. Speaker, with the assistance of the very loyal and very competent staff of the Department of Labour, the Government intends to establish the Department as a viable and dynamic force stimulating the growth of a contented, well-trained and efficient complement of employees in the Province of Saskatchewan. The members of our labour force represent the heart of his Province. The legislative and administrative programs of the Department will be kept under continuous review, to ensure that they will continue to meet the changing requirements of the 1970s. It is safe to say, Mr. Speaker, that additional alterations to current labour legislation may be expected in the future. The root object of such measures will be the acknowledgement of the positive and constructive role played by working people in the continued progress and prosperity in the Province of Saskatchewan.

Before I take my seat, Mr. Speaker, I want to take this opportunity to make what I regard as an extremely important announcement with respect to a provincial employment program which we intend to evolve in the months directly ahead beginning on June 1st.

It will be remembered last year, Mr. Speaker, that the student temporary employment province was introduced to provide summer jobs for post-secondary students. This program, I think it has to be agreed, was inadequate in accomplishing its announced purpose and did nothing for additional categories of young people and others who were seeking employment. The Government is determined to take action to assist the groups in our society which are hardest hit by unemployment.

Accordingly, I am pleased to announce today, Mr. Speaker, that a greatly expanded Government-subsidized temporary employment program will be established, to be known as the Provincial Employment Program.

Some Hon. Members: — Hear, hear!

March 6, 1972

The program will operate in two major divisions. Division one will cover post-secondary students and Grade 12 students proceeding on to post-secondary institutions. Division two will apply to young people between the ages of 16 and 20 years who were outside the school system and permanently unemployed as of February 1, 1972, along with employable Saskatchewan Assistance Plan clients.

Precise details of the Plan will be made known in the very near future, Mr. Speaker. In the meantime, I can indicate that a Government subsidy of \$150 per employee month will be paid to employers hiring eligible applicants under the Program for newly-created temporary jobs. I suggest that the job will be properly done of screening all applicants to sort out any abuses which were very prevalent during the past summer.

The subsidy will be paid for up to four months. An initial budget of \$1.5 million has been allocated for the program, with the likelihood of an additional outlay of funds as the Plan progresses. Measures will be undertaken by the Department of Labour to ensure that the intent of the program is properly observed.

In addition, Mr. Speaker, the Government will be engaging a substantial number of persons for temporary positions within the Government Departments and agencies during the summer months.

I should like at this time, Mr. Speaker, to urge all employers and potential employers to earnestly consider participating in the program, in order to provide our young people, and other persons in need of employment, a chance to earn a productive living during the critical summer period.

This Program, Mr. Speaker, is another indication of the awareness and the sincerity of this Government in coming to grips with the problems of the day. This and other measures, contained in the Throne Speech and subsequently in the new Budget will provide new opportunities and a brighter future, and accordingly it is my very great pleasure to suggest that I will be only too pleased to support the main motion.

Some Hon. Members: — Hear, hear!

Mr. K.R. MacLeod (Regina Albert Park): — Mr. Speaker, in rising to speak in this debate I should like to congratulate the Members who have found their way into the House since the last session, and particularly to express my appreciation that our own numbers have not been diminished.

The task of a conscientious Opposition is burdensome and the addition of the two Members to our side of the House is going to increase greatly our efficiency in dealing with the burden of legislation that is coming before us at this time. Of course, the addition of the Hon. Member for Souris-Estevan (Mr. Thorson) and his elevation to the Cabinet is going to do a great deal to assist and make a great contribution to their operations.

Now, Mr. Speaker, I believe that the entire House would probably like to regard this moment as a 5:30 call.

The House recessed until 7:00 o'clock p.m.

March 6, 1972

Mr. MacLeod: — Mr. Speaker, at the time when I called 5:30 I was congratulating the new Members in the House and the Hon. Member who is now the Minister of Mineral Resources, (Mr. Thorson). I should also like to congratulate the mover of the resolution upon which we are now speaking, the Hon. Member for Kerrobert-Kindersley (Mr. Taylor). As the Member commenced his remarks I was very well taken with them and I made a number of notes.

His concern with the starvation and world population finds a pretty responsive chord, in myself, particularly his call to put aside partisanship, the call for both sides of the House to work together in a common endeavour. But I think there is in his speech a clear demonstration of that green-eyed monster that lives in each and every one of us. His speech, like all Gaul, was divided into three parts; one part was the very high moralistic plane touching the entire human condition throughout the world; another was a song of praise to the Government; and the third part was narrow political soul-destroying partisanship.

The lofty phrases and the noble words were reserved, Mr. Speaker, for those parts of his performance which were devoted to the world scene, but closer to home political habit emerged – and maybe it can't be avoided.

I don't want to detract from the obvious sincerity of his remarks by lingering long or unfairly on certain parts of them but I think he clearly and accurately demonstrated in one package the problem of his Party, and perhaps on occasion the problem in our Party.

He is concerned about the starving people in the world. I am concerned about the starving people in the world. But where in that Throne Speech is there any practical or meaningful offer of assistance to any of those who live beyond our border and who are in need? Does the Member know that of all the industrial countries in the world those countries which call themselves socialist have made the smallest per capita contribution to the undeveloped nations in the world?

Saskatchewan has a higher per capita income than more than two-thirds of the United Nations. In world terms we are rich. But where is the hand of fellowship filled with actual and real help and real hope. What he does offer is altruism without any effort.

You note that I have referred to countries that call themselves socialist. I don't like that word 'socialist' or the words 'free enterprise'. They have been so misused and abused that for a large part of our population, maybe all of us, as in Alice in wonderland, they mean just what the speaker chooses them to mean, but they have become so imprecise and uncertain as to have lost their meaning.

This group of governments which do call themselves socialist are on the bottom of the list when it comes to helping their neighbours. Sweden, which enjoys a very high standard of living, stands right at the bottom. Those desperate nations in which reside the four people who will die while we are talking, in the last ten seconds that I talked, get no help, or virtually no help from these people.

I am well aware, Mr. Speaker, that from the time that the Hon. Member rose to his feet to the time that he finished his

March 6, 1972

first paragraph, 20 people had died in the world, mostly from starvation, and mostly children.

But what Throne Speech was he talking about? He was not talking about the Throne Speech that opened the Second Session of the Seventeenth Legislature. That document was solely for the voters.

I suggest, Mr. Speaker, that their warm heart is for the needy people who vote elsewhere, but their warm cash is for the people who vote right here at home. And there is the green-eyed monster. Help someone if it doesn't hurt you, but keep the money at home. Humanity first – if those people are on the voters' list.

My one immediate impression from the Throne Speech is the number of congratulatory references to the Federal Government, sometimes spoken and sometimes implied. I should like to give the Members just a quick example.

Mr. Blakeney said after the 1971 election that the Province could do nothing, or very little, about unemployment or the economy. But the Throne Speech that we heard refers to a marked improvement in the economy. And having regard to the earlier remarks of the Premier that the Province could do very little to assist in the upward trend in the economy, I have no choice but to assume that his remarks in the Throne Speech are a clear congratulation to the Federal Government and we accept them as such.

Dealing quickly with the Federal-Provincial-Municipal effort to provide work, it is noted that over 13,000 man-months of employment were provided. Most of this came from the Federal Government.

The Federal Government made outright grants for worthwhile municipal projects and in addition it had a companion operation which made further loans, and it was the loan part only that was matched by the Provincial Government. If we assume that 10 per cent of the projects were provided by the municipal governments, then two-thirds of the remainder would undoubtedly be credited to the Federal Government and, therefore, most of the reduction in unemployment and most of the 13,000 man-months of employment, obviously relates to the federal plan.

Of course the increases in grain sales are the result of the prodigious efforts of the Hon. Otto Lang. Again the Government is to be commended for noting his effort in this regard.

With respect to The Grains Income Stabilization Plan, Mr. Speaker, this was the obvious brain-child of Mr. Otto Lang, but is now a child with more than one parent. It has been firmly adopted, in principle, by the NDP as is evidenced by the Throne Speech. There is, of course, a small amount of haggling over terms but the principle is one that the NDP have obviously accepted, and you are welcome to the idea. This is no time to be selfish, and we welcome your support, and the farmers of Saskatchewan welcome your support. They would be every so grateful if they could get, in addition to that, your co-operation to have the Bill passed in the House of Commons.

Some Hon. Members: — Hear, hear!

March 6, 1972

Mr. MacLeod: — The Government notes with some considerable approval the rapid increase in rapeseed production and welcomes the two-price system for wheat. All in all, Mr. Speaker, this has been a tremendous congratulatory message to the Federal Government. I suggest that they transmit these congratulations to them in formal words in due course.

Now there are some things which the Throne Speech did not mention. I thought that perhaps I could draw them to the attention of this body. To begin with I want to talk about teachers and school boards. I am very disappointed that the urgent problem of teachers and school boards in Saskatchewan has not been dealt with in the Throne Speech.

The Premier, again speaking last year, said that the Government had:

Removed the causes of friction between teachers and school boards.

Nothing could be further from the truth. It was fluff stuff. It was all talk. The Hon. Member from Saskatoon Nutana (Mr. Robbins) agrees with that. He said there is no negotiation because the Saskatchewan School Trustees Association and the Saskatchewan Federation of Teachers are bargaining on a provincial level and that is the cause of no progress whatsoever. The fact is that the present system is a total frustration, both to the teachers and to the trustees. Both parties have been led to expect that there would be some action from the Government. They have received no action at all. The teachers have been waiting for a train that has never arrived and probably never will arrive. Teachers would like to deal directly with the Provincial Government.

Trustees believe that they have been elected to serve their districts and they would like to do so.

The system has grown with patched up additions upon additions without removing any of the old school districts. The teachers tell us there are 13,000 trustees in the province and only 10,800 teachers. That is, there are substantially more trustees than there are teachers. This is because of the closing of some of the school districts. In many cases the district has no school but the trustees linger on. Never, however, have so many people had so little power.

The powers of the trustees are being stolen and they are being taken, Mr. Speaker, by the Hon. Minister of Education (Mr. MacMurchy). The school boards can't even fire teachers. The school boards can't negotiate without the knowledge of the amount of money they have. At least the Liberal Government told them how much money they had. The school boards today, frankly wonder what powers they really have.

If this Government is going to continue with its present conduct and remove all the powers of the school trustees, then this Government has no justification for refusing to deal directly with teachers, which, of course, is what the teachers have demanded. But what we cannot tolerate is the uncertainty surrounding the present situation.

Mr. Speaker, the biggest failure of this Throne Speech is the failure of the Government to come to grips with this major problem and it seems to me that the problem will undoubtedly

March 6, 1972

exist for months to come.

I am also disappointed with the problem of our superannuated pensioners. Absolutely no pensioners have suffered more than our elderly school teachers. There is one retired school teacher in Regina, after 40 years of service, who now receives a pension of \$154 per month. Quite an adequate sum when he started to receive it but no longer an adequate sum. Another school teacher who, after 40 years service, after a tremendous contribution which resulted in the people naming a school after him, receives a month cheque of \$209. I have a copy of this cheque in my files. These are only two examples of the teachers who no longer get adequate pensions as a result of the failure of this Government to come to grips with this particular problem. I realize they have had only a few months in office but I do call on the Government to take immediate action to rectify this gross inequity.

Mr. Speaker, I want to deal with and welcome another part of the Throne Speech, and that is the part that dealt with the culture, youth and recreation of our society. Man does not live by bread alone, and I have a couple of suggestions, if I may. First of all, Saskatchewan is not a hick Province. Its people can understand and appreciate the finer things of life. The construction of the Saskatchewan Centre of the Arts by the Hon. Member for Wascana (Mr. Baker) and the former Liberal Government is an excellent setting for cultural programming. The Globe Theatre is a start.

I asked the Government to provide a special grant to the Saskatchewan Centre of the Arts for the purpose of enabling it to form the nucleus of a symphony orchestra in the form of a chamber orchestra. This orchestra would reside in the Centre and would, of course, carry out its touring duties from that base. There are several advantages. To begin with, it would help the Centre to act more as a cultural centre for the Province and less as a hall-hiring organization for the city of Regina. The Centre administration could handle the administration of both the orchestra and the Centre, and thereby effect certain economies. And the Regina Symphony Orchestra would be improved. It would to some extent stop the outflow of dollars which results from the current popularity of American performers. Harry Belafonte drags in \$9,000 a week from his performances here. None of it stays in Saskatchewan.

I acknowledge that such an orchestra would not pay its way. But equally, no great centre, no great city, and no great province has ever existed without an orchestra, a symphony orchestra. It has been suggested to me that having a Saskatchewan Centre of the Arts without an orchestra is like having a football field without a football team.

There is another matter that I would like to suggest to the Department of Culture under this cultural program. Saskatchewan is a new Province but its pioneers are dying. In places like Ireland teams from the university are going forth, they record the old songs and the old ways before they are lost forever. I should like to see throughout the Province of Saskatchewan histories of our Province, the stories of the old timer and of the pioneers, men who grubbed out the trees and pioneered the land, stories of success and failure preserved before they are lost once and for all.

And I hope that they will continue to expand our ever-growing tourist and recreational facilities. I want this to

March 6, 1972

be a funland for Saskatchewan. A Saskatchewan holiday should be the number one priority in the holiday plans of everyone. And hopefully, it will not be so far away from our people that we cannot go away on weekends and holidays without travelling great distances.

There is another area in which I should like to have the Government give some attention. We are in for some pretty big changes in grain-handling in Saskatchewan. Many of our local elevators are going to close. Rail lines are being abandoned. Today's elevators exist in many areas and many centres where there are no stores, no more town sites except in the land titles office. Villages and hamlets depending entirely or mostly upon implement dealers and small post offices and elevator agents are going to disappear. I don't favour that trend but it's happening. Community life will be more centred around marketing centres in larger towns. People living in hamlets and villages in Saskatchewan which are dying out would like to relocate but they can't afford to do so. I call on the Government to provide a program to relocate people from these hamlets and villages as they desire to larger towns and villages in Saskatchewan. The same dislocations which have occurred to our farm families are occurring now to the people in these small villages and hamlets. Now, the federal and provincial governments are quite prepared to help the farmer sell his land, take uneconomic parcels out of production, assist the farmer to be retrained, transferred or moved, but nobody helps the storekeeper, the small homeowner and anyone else who is suffering from the loss of the adjacent population.

Good roads have hurt the small hamlets and villages. In many cases a new road has been the kiss of death to a merchant in a small village. Success brings failure.

I realize the Government has been in office too short a time to have a plan or a real plan for this kind of thing but I think the Government should think about it now. And I call on the Government to commence studies immediately and bring in a plan to the third Session of the Legislature to alleviate the suffering and the financial loss to homeowners and small businessmen in very small towns, small villages and hamlets and return to agriculture the registered town site plans and areas that are no longer required.

Another area of disappointment in the Throne Speech deals with the American ownership of our farmlands. This is an important aspect of foreign ownership of our resources. There is absolutely no purpose in permitting our farmlands to be sold to Americans unless they are prepared to come to Canada and live here and form part of our society. Young Canadians, in many cases, have been denied the right to acquire farmland because of sales to American purchasers. A serious omission in that Throne Speech is the failure of this Government to come to grips with that problem.

Another omission is the failure to make provision for an extension of legal services under the legal aid plan. Particularly, people with marital and domestic problems get the very least in legal services, the very worst in legal representation. It happens to be a losing proposition for most lawyers. And the contribution to lawyers by the Department of Welfare is rather poorly motivated. The Department is willing to help deserted wives to obtain money from deserting husband, and that isn't the right motivation for helping people who need real legal advice at the time of domestic crisis. At the present time these areas are largely subsidized by

March 6, 1972

the Law Society of Saskatchewan and the lawyers practising in Saskatchewan, but frankly, they are not prepared to continue to do it forever. And usually the service is provided by some junior lawyer or solicitor or student at law with the result that the very worst in legal services is provided to those people who are so desperately in need and usually without money.

I have been urging this for a long time and my colleague from Lumsden (Mr. Lane) himself has recently made a comment on this. I recommend that the Government give immediate attention to the problem and extend the legal aid plan to domestic relations.

I have predicted recently that because of the way the Attorney General (Mr. Romanow) has been handling his powers – and how he likes the use of power – he will take further powers to himself when the Ombudsman Bill is brought to the House. He made his office available to the four NDP Members (farmers) attacking the Stabilization Bill and the Government of Canada. The Attorney General fired a member of his Department without even answering a call from that employee. He treated the body repair shops with equal abruptness. There is no question of arbitration, he won't arbitrate. He tells you what you're going to get and that's what you get. Because of his track record in this area, in the exercise of power, I have no doubt the Ombudsman Bill will not be applied to the Attorney General. It will undoubtedly not apply to other Ministers of the Crown and undoubtedly he will be able to exempt other Ministers.

It was very interesting to me that when the Government passed the 40-hour week it also passed regulations exempting a large part of the employees of the Government to whom this 40-hour week would apply.

Mr. Snyder: — More than what?

Mr. MacLeod: — More exempt than ever before. The track record of the Attorney General and of the other Ministers is very clear.

Laws apply to everyone else but not the Government. As a result, I would not be surprised if the Ombudsman Bill and the other Bills give substantial additional powers to the Attorney General.

One of the main problems, of course, of the Throne Speech is that it has so many missing pages. It changes names, it shuffles people, it spends money and that's it, what else? Apart from the Land Bank and the Succession Duty, what contentious business do we have?

Well, it takes no stroke of genius to spend money. But where is the hum of industry that is going to produce the jobs that are needed to pay the money that this Government is going to spend. I think we have entered a new cycle in the history of Saskatchewan economics. We used to talk about boom and bust. Now we have entered a stage where we work and save money and then we enter upon a wild spending spree. Economically, Saskatchewan reminds me of the logger that goes to the woods and works and saves his money, that's the Liberal in you. Then he comes out of the woods and goes on a wild spending spree. That is the NDP. My suggestion is that he then returns to the forest and becomes a Liberal again.

Some Hon. Members: — Hear, hear!

March 6, 1972

Mr. MacLeod: — And he does the work too. If you want the real fruits of your labour I suggest you must stop being NDP. So we have had in Saskatchewan some NDP-CCF Governments that spend but they don't know how to make the money. There are some people that think there was a government in Saskatchewan that knew how to make it but didn't know how to spend it. As in life, moderation is the key.

Mr. Messer: — What's the key?

Mr. MacLeod: — Moderation. So I suspect that the best type of government is one that we have not yet had. It's the kind of government that goes forth, develops this country industrially and then spends it for the benefit of the people. We have not had that combination in a long time.

In closing I wish to talk briefly on a matter that is very regrettable and one that I wish had not come to the House, but I do comment briefly on the matter that came up the other day relating to the employment of Mrs. Romanow. It is not my desire that she should leave her job, nor the desire of any Member on this side of the House, and I personally hope that she does not leave her employment. The Attorney General tells us that she likes her job and she is good at it. Then she should continue. But I hope this lesson won't be forgotten. We are all subject to the law. There is not one law for the Government and one for everyone else, despite what this Government has attempted to prove up to now. If there is a law for me it should be the same law for you. And I hope this sorry and unfortunate event will not be repeated. The Premier stooped to political partisanship. And he tried to stroke a low blow. He missed and I think he struck the wife of the Attorney General. I think that should be a lesson to all of us. In the meantime, I do wish no harm to anyone and I very sincerely wish this lady retains her job.

Some Hon. Members: — Hear, hear!

Mr. MacLeod: — It's customary to say in conclusion, as I now say, Mr. Speaker, that regretfully I am not able to support the resolution favouring the Speech from the Throne.

Some Hon. Members: — Hear, hear!

Hon. W.E. Smishek (Minister of Public Health): — Mr. Speaker, let me join with other Members of this House and commend the mover and seconder of the customary motion of the Address-in-Reply. I believe these two new and young Members gave this Legislature two of the finest speeches that we have heard so far in this debate.

Some Hon. Members: — Hear, hear!

Mr. Smishek: — Mr. Speaker, may I also congratulate the Hon. Member for Morse (Mr. Wiebe) and for Estevan (Mr. Thorson) on their election as Members of the Legislature.

Some Hon. Members: — Hear, hear!

March 6, 1972

Mr. Smishek: — Congratulations are also due to the Hon. Members for Estevan and for Saskatoon-Mayfair (Mr. Brockelbank) on their appointment as Cabinet Ministers. They have only been in the Cabinet for a short period of time. I want to assure all Members of this House that they have proven to be very able Members of our Cabinet.

Some Hon. Members: — Hear, hear!

Mr. Smishek: — Mr. Speaker, I listened to the Hon. Member for Albert Park. I am surprised to hear the many ideas that he has now. I'm wondering where were his ideas during the seven years of Liberal administration.

Some Hon. Members: — Hear, hear!

Mr. Smishek: — Certainly, if he had those idea, he didn't have any influence on the former Administration to increase teacher pensions and provide funds for the symphony orchestra. He now wants Saskatchewan to be the funland. Well, Mr. Speaker, I think 1971 was a good fun year and it was a good working year. It was a great Homecoming 71 year for the people of Saskatchewan.

Some Hon. Members: — Hear, hear!

Mr. Smishek: — He talked about building good roads in the community. Well, Mr. Speaker, if we look at the budgets in the last seven years, certainly, the former administration spent a lot of money on building a lot of roads, or at least building a lot of expensive roads. The problem was that they were all leading out of Saskatchewan. And with these good roads, regrettably they drove too many people out of the Province of Saskatchewan.

Mr. Speaker, I was interested in him talking about increasing the legal aid, and at the same time, in the same breath, he was saying, 'Don't spend money'. How can you increase legal aid and not spend additional money? I don't know what formula he has of increasing payments and at the same time keep spending in moderation and not increasing expenditures.

Mr. Speaker, on Friday afternoon and again this afternoon the Hon. Member for Whitmore Park (Mr. Grant) made some trite remarks about the new formula in regard to grants for hospitals. Mr. Speaker, the Hon. Member should perhaps be aware that the new formula was in the making when he was still the Minister of Public Health. Therefore, the new formula shouldn't come to him as any surprise. I would presume that before the new formula was being considered by the Department that he had something to do with it in asking the Departmental officials to bring a new formula into being. He knows that Saskatchewan has a higher in-patient hospital utilization rate than any other province in the Dominion of Canada. And he is also aware that for some time there was a need to revise the formula, in the light of this comparison. I presume that he asked the Department officials to consider coming up with a new formula for the Government. Well, Mr. Speaker, he now says he's not critical. But let me say this, I think it is important that the Members of the House know what the new formula is. The factor of seven acute beds per 1,000 population served has been adjusted to provide an average of 1,945 days of care per 1,000 population based on the actual experience of all hospitals in Saskatchewan in 1970. In essence this will reduce the number of occupied beds from 5.6 or 80 per cent of the seven beds per 1,000 population to 5.3

March 6, 1972

per 1,000 population served. In comparison, for example, the Canadian average for 1969 was 1,527 days per 1,000 population for all the general hospitals.

Mr. Speaker, there is another factor that is included in the formula and that is the increase in the number of level four beds in the province as well as the number of level three beds that is also being considered in the formula. The other factor that is considered is the days of care rendered to Indians in 1970 which now amounts to 4,964 days per 1,000 Indian population allowed in 1972. Prior to that time SHSP accepted actual days of care rendered. This revision may be calculated or can be calculated as providing 13.6 occupied beds per 1,000 Indian population served. In addition in considering the new formula, Mr. Speaker, is the fact that in any hospital where the reduction was substantial we made provision that no adjustment would be beyond 10 per cent. While he makes the complaint, Mr. Speaker, I think this House should be made aware that since the new formula was proposed I have virtually received no complaints from the hospitals, so obviously it is a formula that seems to be acceptable to the hospitals in the province.

Mr. Speaker, it was just eight months ago that the people of Saskatchewan asked New Democratic Party to form a government. Both the people and our new Government knew that seven years of inactivity of the Liberal Government had created a log jam of unsolved problems, social inequities and a general deterioration of the public programs of our people.

Within a few hours of taking office as Minister of Public Health, I began to review the recorded list of outstanding problems and I discovered that the list went for pages and pages and pages. It has been said, Mr. Speaker, that the Liberal Government was a care-taker government. But when I see the state of our health –pros and when I see the endless list of problems which should have been solved years ago, I wonder what the Liberals ‘took care of’. Certainly it wasn’t the health care of the Saskatchewan people.

We came to office with a fifteen-point blueprint for health. You may note, Mr. Speaker, that the building materials in this blueprint are people and communities, and not the standard building product of the Liberals, more concrete, more bricks and more and more buildings which every citizen in this province has to pay for with increased taxes.

I know, Mr. Speaker, that it was always very difficult to know what the former government was up to, but I am certainly at a loss to figure out why, on the one hand the Saskatchewan held down the wage levels of our hospital workers, taxed the sick, prevented the poor from obtaining hospital and medical services, while at the same time they frantically undertook to approve and construct additional hospitals.

Who did they expect would use the buildings when with their taxes they were barricading the people from the buildings? Who did they think would staff the buildings when they were driving people out of the province by holding down salary levels? Who did they think would pay for the operation of the buildings?

This Mr. Speaker, is just a small insight into the chaos we inherited just eight months ago.

Mr. Speaker, while trying to sort out the grab bag of the former Liberal Government endless commitments, and while

March 6, 1972

urgently trying to break the log jam of seven years of unsolved problems, we have managed to make major strides to implement our health commitments to the people of Saskatchewan.

Mr. Speaker, I should like to tell you of some of our achievements and plans in health so that the people of Saskatchewan will know that their faith in our Government was well placed.

Mr. Speaker, before I talk about our achievements to date, I should like to restate our fifteen-point program because there are those who are trying to misinterpret or misconstrue what it is. I refer to our booklet 'New Deal for People'. Let me quote, we said:

Until recently Saskatchewan led North America in provision of health services. In the guise of fighting escalating health costs, the Liberal Government had abdicated this leadership. But the rising cost of medical and hospital care that has occurred in Saskatchewan, as elsewhere, is largely the result of outmoded organization and delivery of health care. This is reflected in overlap, wastage and duplication of medical facilities. As a result, many essential services are either non-existent or deficient.

The New Democratic Party will institute a program to provide a health rather than a sickness service, and will develop an organization which assures that Saskatchewan citizens receive more value for their health dollar.

A New Democratic Party will abolish deterrent fees.

This we have done, Mr. Speaker.

Some Hon. Members: — Hear, hear!

Mr. Smishek: —

Abolish medical and hospital premiums for people 65 years of age and over.

And this we have done, Mr. Speaker.

Some Hon. Members: — Hear, hear!

Mr. Smishek: — We said we would establish a prescription drug program based on a drug formulary and central purchasing to provide drugs at a greatly reduced cost. You will note that we did not promise an insured prescription drug plan. I shall be discussing this item in more detail this evening. We said we would provide hearing aids, eye glasses, braces and wheel chairs at greatly reduced cost. Again we did not promise an insured plan to cover these items but a program through which the people of Saskatchewan will be able to purchase these items at greatly reduced costs. Again I shall be discussing the progress made to date a little later.

We said we would establish an insured dental service, initially for those under the age of 12. We have initiated studies in this respect.

March 6, 1972

We said we would give better care to our senior and chronically disabled citizens through including extended nursing care. Level 4 is an insured service and by increasing government support of public and non-profit nursing homes and geriatric centres. The Department of Public Health is working on a plan to provide more level 4 beds where they are required. For example, in North Battleford and the north-western area of the province in Saskatoon, Moose Jaw and other communities, it is my belief that in certain communities if we increase the number of level 4 beds we ought to reduce the number of acute beds. I know, Mr. Speaker, that the Minister of Welfare (Mr. Snyder) is working on a new program for Nursing Home Care.

We said we would develop services for the mentally ill, young and old and those disabled by drugs and alcohol. In a later debate, I shall be discussing an expanded program in the field of alcoholism we propose to initiate this year, Mr. Speaker.

We said we would establish Regional Planning Councils composed of providers and consumers of services to be responsible for unified planning of public health, medical care and hospital services.

We said we would re-examine all proposals to close small hospitals and undertake any closure only after full consideration with communities concerned and provision for satisfactory alternative services to handle emergencies. We did not promise to open all hospitals closed by the Liberal administration nor did we say that no hospitals will ever be closed in the future, Mr. Speaker. Let me repeat our promise so that the former Minister of Public Health gets it straight. We said:

We would re-examine all proposals to close small hospitals and undertake any closures only after full consideration with communities concerned and provision for satisfactory alternative services to handle emergencies.

In the case of commitments made by our individual candidates, many of whom are now MLAs for their respective constituencies, they promised to work for either the opening of certain hospitals or to have the closed hospitals converted to alternate uses or to work for provision of alternate health services. Mr. Speaker, I can assure you, I can assure this Legislature and the people of Saskatchewan, that they have been working. They have made representations to my Department and to the Government and we have been working with them and the communities to provide adequate hospital and other health services to the communities. In a few minutes I shall discuss in more detail some of our proposals.

We said that we would expand health education programs with greater use of the media. This is being considered. We said that we would review and redefine roles of health workers and I have met our health educators in the university and in this area we are getting their co-operation. We said that through assistance in capital expenditure and alternative methods of payment we would encourage community health centres and other new forms of delivery of care that have demonstrated their ability to provide a higher quality of care at reduced health costs. In this respect considerable progress has already been made.

March 6, 1972

We said that we would improve accident and emergency services, including adequate ambulance services in both urban and rural areas.

We said we would provide an adequate occupational health service and in this regard later on in the Session you will be hearing about our program.

We said we would include chiropractic service as an insured benefit.

Mr. Speaker, Let me remind this Legislature that it is a four-year program not an eight-month program that we promised. But even within the eight months we can report considerable progress. I shall discuss in some detail the progress we have made. In fact, progress has been so significant that it will be necessary for me to speak several times during the Session to give you the full report.

Mr. Speaker, we promised the people of Saskatchewan that if we were elected we would insure chiropractic services. Chiropractic services are covered in the medical Care Plans for British Columbia, Alberta, Manitoba and Ontario and are recognized for payment purposes in Saskatchewan by the Workmen's Compensation Board and the Saskatchewan Government Insurance office.

We believe that there is a definite place in our health care system for the services of the chiropractor. While differences of opinion persist on the relative merits of this form of manipulative therapy, we believe that those people who wish to avail themselves of chiropractic services should have the right to do so. Mr. Speaker, the Throne Speech notes that enabling legislation would be introduced during this Session as an initial step towards an insured chiropractic program. We have already consulted with the Saskatchewan Chiropractic Association on several occasions on the proposed program and when this legislation is passed we shall be able to complete our negotiations and provide the people of Saskatchewan with this additional service. Mr. Speaker, this will not be several years from now but we expect the program to be initiated in 1972.

Some Hon. Members: — Hear, hear!

Mr. Smishek: — Mr. Speaker, we are vitally concerned about the dental health of the residents of this province. And in particular we are concerned about the dental health of our children.

Recent surveys by the Department of Public Health reveal that dental disease affects virtually all our school children.

- over 75 per cent of those children who were examined required one or more fillings.
- over 26 per cent needed one or more extractions.
- 36.5 per cent of the children were classified as having poor oral hygiene.
- 18 per cent had front teeth that needed orthodontic care.

We are of the opinion that dental disease, to a large extent, can be prevented by the diligent application of preventive dental health measures in homes and in schools. We are aware of the fact

March 6, 1972

that dental care services are not readily available to all our population.

Some of our people simply cannot afford dental services. I found it shocking that the dentists two months ago decided to increase their fee schedule by up to 20 per cent in a one-year period. A year in which many of our people are faced with unemployment and serious financial problems. A 20 per cent increase in one year seems a little steep, Mr. Speaker. We are going to combat these major health problems by first attending to the dental health care of our children. We shall do this by training and placing ancillary dental personnel throughout the province. A bill will be introduced into the House this Session to permit the establishment of education programs for ancillary dental personnel.

Mr. Speaker, in other countries dental auxiliaries or dental nurses have been used to meet dental health problems similar to those now found in the Province of Saskatchewan. For example, for more than 50 years New Zealand has attended to its children's dental health by using dental nurses. Great Britain has been using dental auxiliaries for the past 10 years. A similar program exists in Denmark.

In Saskatchewan, the Department of Public Health, in conjunction with the College of Dental Surgeons and the University of Saskatchewan and with the financial assistance of the Federal Government, is conducting an experimental dental care program for the children in the Oxbow area. This project has tested the feasibility of using dental nurses to meet most of the dental needs of children. Based on the project results to date we are satisfied that this approach is feasible for all of Saskatchewan.

Mr. Grant: — When was it started?

Mr. Smishek: — Two years ago. This is its third year. Mr. Speaker, the Hon. Member (Mr. Grant) shouldn't take that much credit for it. It was a Federal research project and he knows it...

Some Hon. Members: — Hear, hear!

Mr. Smishek: — ...and I have given it the credit. We shall be soliciting the help and support of the dental profession for the training and utilization of ancillary dental personnel for services to children.

Mr. Speaker, in a province as large as ours, with its widely scattered rural population there are real problems in providing acceptable health services to our people.

On the one hand we must bring services to them, while on the other hand we recognize that as our diagnostic and treatment facilities become more advanced and complex, patients from rural areas may have to travel to larger centres to receive some of their health care. While many rural communities share common problems in the provision of health services, each one is also unique and requires individual consideration. We are paying special attention to communities whose hospitals were closed by the former Government. Officials of my Department have met with representatives from communities such as Leroy, Neudorf, Hodgeville and Quill Lake and have also made visits to communities such as Maryfield, Hodgeville and Smeaton. In some cases I accompanied our officials. We believe that several of these closed community hospitals may prove suitable for conversion to health and social centres. I will agree with the Hon. Member for Whitmore Park

March 6, 1972

(Mr. Grant) that not all of the closed hospitals are suitable for such a conversion. We propose that various kinds of services can be made available to the people there. Through these community health and social centres we believe that the level of health and social services in rural areas may be significantly improved. The goal of this new development and the goal of our New Deal for People is to build a health service rather than a sickness service.

A few examples of the kinds of service which could be included in the community health and social centres are these:

- (i) out-patient treatment and diagnostic services provided by a visiting physician from the neighbouring community, an emergency treatment service to be provided in his absence by a registered nurse on a 24-hour call back basis.
- (ii) a home-care service which would provide co-ordinated medical and nursing social homemaker and related services to selected patients for whom the best care can be provided at his home.
- (iii) where necessary one, two or more emergency treatment beds to be used for a short period of time.
- (iv) a social activity centre located in the facility and available at regular periods for senior citizens in the community.
- (v) preventive health services provided by health region personnel on a regular visiting basis, such as maternity and child health clinics, immunization programs, health inspection services and health education services.
- (vi) ambulance services for patients in need of emergency transportation to hospital and medical services to neighbouring communities with appropriate hospital facilities.

It is realized that this emphasis on ambulatory care and health rather than sickness will require a change of attitude on the part of many of our citizens. Nevertheless we believe that we must look at new ways of delivering health care so as to encourage our citizens to maintain their good health in the most efficient way possible. Mr. Speaker, we are investing in people, servicing people in their own homes and communities rather than in building more institutions. We hope in the near future, Mr. Speaker, to establish a number of such community health and social centres as pilot projects in our rural areas as a means of bringing more comprehensive health and social services to our people.

Mr. Speaker, when we were sitting on the opposite side of this House we continually received requests from our constituents to look into the high cost of hearing aids. We made a promise to the electorate that we would do something about this high cost if we were asked to form the Government. When we became the Government we discovered how incredibly large the spread really is between the manufacturers' price for a hearing aid and the price charged to the consumer.

The present cost of hearing aids ranges from \$85 to \$475 with an average cost for the unit being about \$250. These

March 6, 1972

prices are, of course, doubled for any person who requires a hearing aid in each ear. When we investigated the manufacturers' prices we found that there are British made hearing aids that cost less than \$20 each. A number of North American produced models can be purchased for around \$30. Japanese models are available at a price of about \$30. Mr. Speaker, let me put to rest any fears that these lower cost hearing aids have an inferior quality. A number of lower cost hearing aids have already been tested for us by the National Research Council of Canada using fully qualified audiologists and they compare favourable in performance with the higher cost hearing aids which are presently on the market.

Mr. Speaker, let me give you an example of the nearly unbelievable profiteering which came to the attention of our hearing aid probe team. A sample instrument received for their inspection indicated the following difference between the manufacturer's price and the suggested retail price. The cost at the manufacturers was \$39.50, on the attached label the recommended retail price was \$309.50. This is a mark-up of nearly 800 per cent. Notwithstanding the costs for certain post sale service visits, one can only gasp at such mark-ups. It appears that the previous administration was struck dumb because they certainly didn't do anything about this situation even though they were aware of the excessive mark-up in the hearing aid industry.

Mr. Speaker, we believe that many of our citizens with hearing impairments are being denied life's pleasures and the opportunity to participate to the full in our society because they cannot afford the price of a hearing aid. Many others who have purchased hearing aids at these exorbitant prices have made great personal sacrifices to pay for the instruments, sacrifices which we believe are unreasonable, unfair and unnecessary.

Mr. Speaker, in addition to providing hearing aids at greatly reduced costs, we will establish facilities for distributing, testing and fitting hearing aid appliances. To accomplish this, we are hiring the services of a fully qualified audiologist who will assume responsibility within the department for our hearing aid program. We are negotiating to acquire the equipment and the staff of the Elks Lodge Hearing Centre and because of the co-operation of the Elks Lodge we shall be able to move forward quickly, Mr. Speaker.

We shall be talking more about hearing aids during this Session, Mr. Speaker,. I notice that the Hon. Member for Albert Park (Mr. MacLeod) has invited more talk by introducing a resolution calling for broadening the coverage of the Saskatchewan Medical Insurance Plan to include a basic hearing aid without cost for the hard of hearing. Our hearing aid program does not call for an insured service, but provision of hearing aids at greatly reduced cost and this we will do, Mr. Speaker.

Some Hon. Members: — Hear, hear!

Mr. Smishek: — Mr. Speaker, you may recall that when the Liberals were in office, a phrase that was often repeated in this House, I quote:

The NDP talk and the Liberals act.

Well Sir, the hearing aid story is one where the Liberals refused to talk, they refused to act, they chose to cover up,

March 6, 1972

cover up the hearing aid industry if you please. We propose to expose the facts of the Liberal failure and refusal to act even though they knew the facts, Mr. Speaker. When the whole story is told the Hon. Member for Albert Park may have some second thoughts about his resolution and his raising the question.

Mr. Speaker, the need for government action to overcome the high cost of prescription drugs is openly evident. A Federal Government publication called 'RX' documents an example of the high cost and the wide range of prices that prevail in the drug industry. This publication identified a particular anti-bacterial drug which is commonly used which ranged in price from \$1.08 per hundred pills to \$15.27 per hundred pills. In none of the instances studied by the Federal Government was there any variability in the quality of the drug prescription noted. The Federal Government officials could only conclude, and I quote:

A fifteen-fold variation in the price of identical brands of the same drug is therefore difficult to understand.

Mr. Speaker, we are advancing quickly with a plan which will enable the people of Saskatchewan to obtain their drugs at greatly reduced prices. Our investigative probe on prescription drugs has met with the Saskatchewan Pharmaceutical Association, the Saskatchewan Medical Association and National Drugs Limited to solicit their opinions and views about the high cost of drugs and ways for reducing these prices. While I have obtained the promise of the Federal Government to assist us in our goal to reduce current prices, in particular I raised this topic at the Council of Health Ministers meeting in Ottawa in December. At the meeting nearly all the other health ministers in Canada shared the Saskatchewan sentiment that action must be taken to enable citizens to obtain their drugs at reasonable costs. I was pleased that the Federal Health Minister, the Hon. John Munro, promised Saskatchewan that the Federal Government would co-operate with Saskatchewan to bulk purchase drugs. In addition, the Federal Government promised to assure the quality of these drugs through its own testing service.

All of our meetings with the drug interest groups have been cordial and co-operative. We are hopeful that the spirit of co-operation between ourselves and these groups will continue as we move towards the implementation of our program.

Some Hon. Members: — Hear, hear!

Mr. Smishek: — Mr. Speaker, it is my hope that before this Session ends I shall be able to give a further progress report on our investigations.

Mr. Speaker, I don't know how many Members watched the CBC Weekend program last night. I was interested in the program from a number of points of view. But it was interesting to observe, they talked about the monies that are being invested in stocks and the money that leaks out of Canada in various investment areas. Repeatedly they were saying that highest return on investments is in computer equipment, in photocopy equipment and the drug industry. If you invest any money in the drug industry you are bound to get a high return on your investment. Mr. Speaker, there is no industry, I suggest, that makes a higher profit today than the drug industry.

March 6, 1972

While the Hon. Members opposite might have short memories, the people of Saskatchewan did not forget that black Friday on March 1, 1968, when the Liberals introduced their tax on the sick. Did deterrent fees work? I think they did, Mr. Speaker, they placed a financial burden upon many thousands of people for their medical and hospital care, for old age pensioners and large families. These are the people that suffered the most. These are the people that experienced the hardship. Mr. Speaker, I should like to quote for the Hon. Members from a thorough study of this question undertaken by Professor Beck of the University in Saskatoon. An independent professional researcher in his concluding remarks, page 154 of his study says this:

In general the greatest reductions occurred among large families and among those families whose head was in the upper age classes. The utilization fee, therefore, resulted in reduced services to the aged and to large families.

Deterrent fees did reduce the cost to the Government for medical and hospital services, but during the deterrent fee period individual citizens paid out of their own pockets in excess of \$21 million for these services which the Government would normally have paid on their behalf. Of course, during the same period, the Province lost in excess of \$4.5 million in Federal cost-sharing because the Liberal deterrent fee scheme. You will be pleased to note, Mr. Speaker, that it only took one month of an NDP Government in office and we struck down the sick tax and saved the affected citizens \$7.5 million annually.

Then there was the tax on the families of the mentally ill. We have always supported the principle of free mental health care and treatment and we saw that this principle was incorporated in the provisions of the Mental Health Act. Unfortunately, the Liberals found themselves in need of money again. In April of 1968, and forced through an amendment to the Mental Health Act which taxed the families of deceased psychiatric patients. The former administration took money from the estate of the deceased and caused further hardship on the distressed family. We disposed of this tax at the July Session of the House when we amended the Mental Health Act to exempt that portion of a psychiatric patient's estate which is left to an immediate relative residing in Saskatchewan. How much money did the Liberal Government collect from the estates of deceased psychiatric patients? Well, here are the figures, Mr. Speaker. In 1968-69 - \$441,000; 1969-70 - \$371,000; 1970-71 - \$341,000; for a total of \$1,152,000, Mr. Speaker.

The Liberals maintained that they imposed this charge on the families of the deceased psychiatrically ill patients to correct what they termed, 'An unfair situation'. At the same time under the Estates Tax Rebate Act the rich were receiving refunds totalling close to \$2 million annually from the Liberal Government. One estate alone received in excess of \$150,000 during the 1970-71 fiscal year.

I shall leave it to the Members of this House and to the people of Saskatchewan to decide which one was the unfair situation.

Then, Mr. Speaker, there was the health tax on our elderly citizens. We are proud of the contributions of our senior citizens made to our province. Many of these citizens made great

March 6, 1972

sacrifices to develop this Province, and through their sacrifices we are blessed with a great many benefits and privileges today. We have a higher standard of living, easier living conditions, greater incomes, more security. For all these benefits and privileges we owe a great debt to our elders, Mr. Speaker. However, many of the citizens who made this possible for us are living on small pensions, do not get a fair share of the benefits of our present society, and do not have the means to assure their own health much less the peaceful retirement which they deserve.

Mr. Speaker, it was our responsibility as a society to assure our senior citizens of medical and hospital care without regard to their ability to pay for it. We removed this health tax on our elderly folk effective January 1, 1972. This was a tax saving to those over 65 years of age of about \$3.5 million.

Mr. Speaker, I should invite the Members to peruse some of the letters that I received from the senior citizens. They came by scores to our Department expressing their appreciation for receiving the free medical card.

Then the Liberals ran out of money again and imposed a 2 mill levy policy on the ratepayers of selected union hospital districts in the Province. For example, this taxation affected the people in Arborfield, Beechy, Dodsland, Edam, LaFleche, Pangman, Smeaton, Theodore and nine other communities. But it was not applied to communities in other parts of the province. In other words ratepayers in the selected communities. Were compelled to subsidize the consolidated revenue of the Government to the tune of 2 mills in order to keep their hospitals open. Since this policy was implemented six year ago, it cost the taxpayers of these districts about \$500,000. We abolished this discriminatory tax for funding hospitals and hospital operations on January 1, 1972. While the Saskatchewan have been patting each other on the back for modestly offsetting municipal property taxes through the Homeowners Grant, we have eliminated a greater tax burden in eight months than the Liberals did through their Homeowner Grant, Mr. Speaker. Let me repeat the tax savings passed to the people solely through the health programs - \$7.5 million by removing deterrent fees; \$3.5 million by providing free medical and hospital premiums for those citizens over 65; \$355,000 on the average to remove taxes on the estates of deceased psychiatric patients; \$55,000 this year to remove the 2 mill levy. Mr. Speaker, this is a tax saving to the people of Saskatchewan of close to \$11.5 million. It is a pity that the Hon. Members opposite do not have such an achievement record to stand on.

Although I have spoken of the sufficiency and distribution of health care, Mr. Speaker, I am vitally concerned with the quality of care that is being provided.

I am disturbed by the high rates of particular types of surgery performed throughout the province. I have drawn this matter to the attention of The College of Physicians and Surgeons of Saskatchewan and they in turn are examining the particularly high rates of surgery for appendectomies and hysterectomies. I am satisfied that these investigations will be penetrating and that the information will, in due course, assure the people of Saskatchewan that unnecessary surgery is not being performed. We note with satisfaction that two lay representatives have been included on a committee of the College investigating surgery. I hope that other professional groups will follow the example of The College of Physicians and surgeons and begin at once to include public and consumer representation on their membership.

March 6, 1972

Mr. Speaker, in the last few years, increasing public attention has been focused on the problems that are facing our youth. In the area of health, we have been slow to acknowledge the nature of the problems and respond sensibly by providing help to the youth to overcome their health difficulties. The most urgent health problems of our young people are the preventive and control problems, particularly in the area of venereal disease, counselling and treatment associated with the non-medical use of drugs and information and counselling services.

Because our existing public programs are apparently not helping many of our youth in a significant way, a number of young people are collectively providing for themselves types of health and social service which they need and in a manner which they can accept. Street clinics have been established in many communities in Saskatchewan where counselling services can be obtained on a 'no questions asked' basis. We recognize the value of this initiative in our young people and we will encourage and assist this movement by responding as a Government to reasonable requests for help from these citizens, and by adjusting our existing public programs to accommodate as far as possible the youth culture.

Mr. Speaker, women have been traditionally one of the greatest assets to the health system. By their role as knowledgeable, sensible mothers and wives, they have had greater impact on health than can ever be measured. Yet no Government has found fit to tap much of this helpful resource to improve our publicly supported health programs.

I should like to draw to your attention, Mr. Speaker, that for the first time in the history of our Province the voice of our women will be heard on the governing board of our Medical Care Insurance Commission. As a first step to involve women in the influential positions in health programs, we have appointed two women to The Medical Care Insurance Commission. I intend to expand this practice by increasing the representation of women on other government boards, committees and commissions. We should also like to see more women become involved in health planning at the local level. We should like to see more women appointed as members of hospital boards.

Mr. Speaker, I have become aware that very serious difficulties have been created for some of our women because of the lack of family planning information. We are going to take greater leadership to provide women with the desired information on family planning and birth control.

Mr. Speaker, I have already given first reading to four Bills, The Mental Health Act, The Health Services Act, The Public Health Act, The South Saskatchewan Hospital Centre Act. In the days that are ahead in this Session, I will be bringing in Bills to amend The Saskatchewan Hospitalization Act, The Hospital Standards Act, The Union Hospital Act, The Cancer Control Act. We have had a request from The Saskatchewan Medical Association and The College of Physicians and Surgeons to amend The Medical Profession Act. I have already advised this Legislature that a new act will be introduced for the training of ancillary dental personnel. The act will likely be entitled The Ancillary Dental Personnel Education Act. Other health legislation is in the drafting stage or being considered by the Cabinet.

March 6, 1972

I thought I should give notice now to the Opposition of the health legislative program for this Session. They, the Opposition, as well as we, the Government, have plenty of work cut out for us. It seems to me that the sooner the Opposition settle down and stop playing silly games as they have in the last few days, the sooner we shall be able to move ahead with our programs and to make the necessary changes to our laws in the interest of the people. Mr. Speaker, I am prepared to work co-operatively with the Opposition to give them the necessary information to evaluate the legislation but, Mr. Speaker, co-operation is a two-way street.

Mr. Speaker, there are other areas that I should like to talk about. I hope that there will be an opportunity for me to give you a more comprehensive report, a fuller report in the days ahead. I should like to conclude by saying that I have described the chaotic conditions which we inherited and I have identified the discriminatory health taxes imposed by the former Liberal Government. We have removed these offensive and unjust taxes. We have eliminated the burden of tax payments from those who can least afford it.

I have told you of some of the measures we are taking to provide a more comprehensive health program for the people of Saskatchewan. Our Government recognizes the fantastic mark-ups on hearing aids and drugs, as did the former Liberal government. But we, Mr. Speaker, are taking action. We are acting with all possible speed. I have identified a number of pressing deficiencies in the health program for our young people. We are promising legislation and other action to rectify their health needs. We are committing ourselves to assist individuals and communities who are meeting their special problems through self-initiated endeavours. We are supporting people, all types of people without discrimination.

I have spoken specifically of women and youth, children and the elderly. I have worked closely with the professional health associations, with the university educators, physicians, nurses, dentists and many others. We have worked co-operatively. With all these groups I have found a willingness and a desire to experiment and improve our health services and our health system.

Equally we have developed extensive relationships with other governments in Canada in order to learn and share with them. This summer I shall be host in Regina to a meeting of Health Ministers of Canada. This spring I have been asked by the Premiers of Alberta, Saskatchewan and Manitoba to convene a meeting of Health Ministers of the three Prairie Provinces and to invite the Minister of Health for British Columbia to discuss some of our mutual problems and how we can co-operate within the three provinces or the western provinces to reduce costs and to develop programs of mutual interest. We want public and consumer involvement and active participation at all levels of health planning and program development. Our Government believes that people from all walks of life must have the right to determine the public services they will receive. I am determined to achieve this objective as Minister of Public Health.

Mr. Speaker, obviously from the remarks you have heard I will be supporting the motion.

Some Hon. Members: — Hear, hear!

March 6, 1972

Hon. G. MacMurchy (Minister of Education): — Mr. Speaker, on entering this debate on the Throne Speech, I should like to congratulate the mover and the seconder of the Address-in-Reply. Like myself they are new to this Assembly and they did a commendable job, a very commendable job indeed in demonstrating why the New Democratic Party is in the Government while the Liberal Party is in oblivion.

Some Hon. Members: — Hear, hear!

Mr. MacMurchy: — I should also like to congratulate those Members who have entered the House since June 23rd, the Member for Morse (Mr. Wiebe) and the Member for Souris-Estevan (Mr. Thorson). I am sure they will do themselves and their constituents credit in this Legislature.

Mr. Speaker, I am pleased to represent the rural constituency of Last Mountain. I should qualify that. Mr. Speaker, I am pleased to represent what is left of Last Mountain. After two Liberal gerrymanders in seven years there remains only a sliver of the old constituency, about 12 miles on either side of Highway No. 20. Even Last Mountain itself is now in the Touchwood riding. Nevertheless I am pleased to have what the Liberals left me. With the Independent Boundaries Commission established we shall never again see the unprincipled butchering of democratic representation that the Members opposite inflicted on Saskatchewan.

Last Mountain constituency has a tradition of supporting progressive movements that dates back 40 to 50 years. In the old days when Western Liberals were liberal instead of reactionary, Last Mountain voted for them. The Hon. Sam Latta represented the seat from 1912 to 1929. Farmers in the constituency were early supporters of the Progressive Party. In 1929 Jacob Benson ran on the Progressive ticket. He was elected as one of the five Progressive members who withstood the Conservative victory. He ran again in 1934 as the farmer-labour candidate but lost by 23 votes. In 1938, this time as a CCF representative, Jacob Benson returned to the Legislature where he remained for 14 years. In 1952 Russ Brown became the CCF candidate and held the seat to 1964. Last Mountain has also produced a number of leaders of Saskatchewan farm movements. George Williams, the first CCF Agriculture Minister farmed near Semans. Tom Johnson, one of the solid men who built this Province and who built the CCF and who was a highly respected Speaker of this Assembly for 12 years farmed southwest of Semans near Cymric. The people of Last Mountain are themselves involved in the self-help organizations founded in Saskatchewan to meet our needs. The Co-ops, the Wheat Pool and many others. It is indeed, Mr. Speaker, a privilege to represent such a riding in this Government.

Mr. Speaker, many of the Members on this side of the House have listened with a great deal of interest to the speeches delivered in this debate. We have been particularly interested in what the Liberal Members have had to say and in what they based their attacks on. Hon. Members will recall the Leadership convention held by the Liberal Party last December. Members will recall some of the speeches made at that convention, speeches about change, speeches about reform, speeches about a great new Liberal Party and a great new Liberal philosophy. There was talk about a new party, a Liberal Party that would listen to its Members and maybe even listen to the ordinary people of Saskatchewan.

March 6, 1972

Those speeches sounded pretty good, Mr. Speaker, frankly, I thought they might have had some meaning. I can tell you now, Mr. Speaker, all those expectations have been completely squashed by the Liberal speakers in this debate so far.

Some Hon. Members: — Hear, hear!

Mr. MacMurchy: — I ask you, have we heard of a new Liberal Party? Have we heard a new approach? Did the Minister opposite put forward new idea, new philosophies? Are they now a progressive party? I ask, just what have we heard from the Liberal representatives. I would suggest to you, Mr. Speaker, that the Liberal Party has shown itself to be the same outdated, stone-age party that it was when the people of Saskatchewan sent them down the road last June 23rd. For really we have heard nothing new. We hear the same old right wing rhetoric, the same old hard line defence of foreign capital, the same old defence of corporate enterprise, the same devotion to resource give-aways, the same devotion to the fast-buck philosophy. We hear no reference to principle whatsoever. In fact I would suggest to you, Mr. Speaker, the Liberal Members display in this House a very sad and sorry sight, a spectacle of a party in decline, a spectacle of a party in decay. They have been a disappointment both to the Members of their party and to the people of this Province.

Mr. Speaker, my colleague, the Member for Regina North West (Mr. Whelan) has commented in his remarks that the Members opposite would do themselves a favour if they would just realize the people of this Province rejected their policies last June and the score was 45 to 15.

Some Hon. Members: — Hear, hear!

Mr. MacMurchy: — I should like to devote some time to some of the factors leading to that result and to our party's position in relation to them.

Setting aside for the moment the specific issues, Mr. Speaker, I believe we can find one basic motivation in the Saskatchewan electorate to account for the response last June. That motivation is the strong instinct among our people to value and to protect what is unique in this Province.

I refer to the sense of community. I refer to the independence of the rural life style. These things have been threatened in the last seven years, especially since 1970, when the Liberals brought out their Task Force Report. And make no mistake about it, that Report is still around. That Report is still a threat. Saskatchewan reacted to this threat, strongly and decisively, as they have done so in the past under similar circumstances. Our people have united against the threat posed by Liberal farm policy. They united against arrogance and disdain of the former Government which gave no evidence of having any interest in the welfare of our people.

The Member for Kerrobert-Kindersley (Mr. Taylor) in his remarks touched upon a very important point. He noted that our people have become aware that all things labelled as progress are not always progressive. They know that things don't necessarily improve and that change is not always for the better. They know that if they want improvement they will have to work

March 6, 1972

positively for those improvements, very often against political outside forces.

This realization has found its political expression in the election of the New Democratic Government. I refer to the Report of the Task Force on Agriculture, submitted in 1970 to the Liberals in Ottawa.

This Report was commissioned in 1967 to study the future of farming and related industries. It consisted of five men, Mr. Speaker, all of them living east of Winnipeg. All of them, so-called experts. Not one of them a farmer. They brought in a Report which read as you might expect it to read, a report glorifying the concept of economic efficiency, taking no account of human values that are so vitally involved.

Mr. Speaker, one excerpt from the Task Force Report serves to illustrate this point. I want to quote from Page 34, where the philosophy of both the Liberal Party and the Task Force is captured in just one sentence.

Progress cannot be stopped even to reduce the number of casualties caused by technological innovation.

I would suggest to this Assembly that it is precisely this attitude to which the Saskatchewan people objected so much. We are not prepared to accept the idea that this Province must lie down and be steamrollered. We are not prepared to see two in every three farms disappear at the say so of some inhuman bureaucrat. We do not care if the Liberals call it progress. This isn't progress and to accept it meekly would be to disgrace the traditions upon which this Province was built.

Mr. Speaker, it makes no sense in anybody's language to strip away the rural population. There is no advantage in piling people like ants into a few urban areas. On the other hand there are plenty of good reasons for maintaining a reasonable distribution of people, urban and rural. These reasons are human. They are social, they are political. Most of all they are what our people in Saskatchewan want. If there is to be a viable rural life in Canada we must act now. It will be necessary to divert a fair share of the national income to rural areas so people can live there decently, because rural life is based on the farm situation. The rural problem boils down to the farm income question. Basically what we need is a federal government committed to making rural life viable and our cities liveable. A government that will face up to the forces of our corporate economy. No Liberal or Conservative Government has ever displayed this commitment and that, indeed, is very unfortunate.

Mr. Speaker, I should like to deal much more fully with rural problems, possibly the Land Bank legislation which will present such an opportunity. But before concluding I should like to touch on another matter related to the implementation of policy in education.

When the New Democratic Party took over the reins of office last July 1st, we took over one of the demoralized governments in Canada. The Civil Service was in a state of near collapse. It was disorganized, it was uncoordinated. There was virtually no capacity for planning. In fact the word planning itself was almost

March 6, 1972

never used. We found the research section weak and in disrepair, it if hadn't already disappeared.

The Civil Service was edgy. It was hesitant about executing policy because under the Members opposite was changed or reversed with little consultation and with little notice. Mr. Speaker, for a government who claimed so often to be efficient, for a government who claimed so often to be responsible, the Liberals were a joke and a bad one at that.

Some Hon. Members: — Hear, hear!

Mr. MacMurchy: — Mr. Speaker, if the Liberals ran a bad show generally they were absolutely incredible in the Department of Education. This Department, as Members will know, spends about one third of the entire Budget in this Province. Yet when we took it over, in the entire staff there were only two people who did research. There was no one engaged in planning.

Here we had a major Department of Government, responsible for expenditures of some \$150 million and with a mere two, overworked harassed individuals engaged in studying what the whole operation was doing. Mr. Speaker, the Liberals talk about businesslike government. I submit to you that not a single business in Canada could hope to survive under the conditions the Liberals used in the Department of Education.

Some Hon. Members: — Hear, hear!

Mr. MacMurchy: — Mr. Speaker, the disastrous history of the Liberals in education is made all the worse when it is contrasted with the needs.

Education is a field crying for reform. It is a field in which experimentation, innovation, so long repressed, must be given every possible encouragement if the system is to live up to what is expected of it. The job to do done is simply enormous.

Now in the last seven months, Mr. Speaker, I believe we have made headway in this effort. We have begun a major reorganization of the Department of Education. And unlike the Liberals, Mr. Speaker, we are not paying tens of thousands of dollars to an eastern consulting firm to do this work; instead the New Democratic Government is using Saskatchewan people who have volunteered their talents. A major part of the reorganization has already been completed. This reorganization has brought together the education and administration divisions of the Department, eliminating the false separation of program and how it is paid for. A new Research and Planning Branch has been set up to study our operations, to look ahead. This new Branch is now working with a ten man advisory committee, studying the possibility of a province-wide kindergarten program. A report should be in my hands this summer.

It is worth noting that the kindergarten committee has not holed up in an ivory tower to ponder this question, Mr. Speaker. Instead it held a series of hearings in 21 communities around this Province. They have received some 140 briefs and presentations. We are finding an exceptional response to the idea of public involvement and my Department intends to develop this tool even further in the future.

March 6, 1972

Since last June we have also developed and instituted a new formula for school grants. I shall have more to say on this new initiative in later debates, Mr. Speaker. For the moment it is sufficient to say that one of the major accomplishments of the new formula is to abolish the pupil-teacher ratio.

Some Hon. Members: — Hear, hear!

Mr. MacMurchy: — The New Democratic Government has returned the decision making power to local board authorities who know the situation first hand. We are no longer in the business of telling school boards whom to hire, how many and when. And our education system is much the better for it.

Along with the return of more authority to boards, Mr. Speaker, we have changed the budget reviews from regulation procedures to a consultative and advisory situation.

The reviews going on this year have as a result of this change proven to be more valuable to both the Department and to the boards.

Mr. Speaker, a very new important program begun by this Government, is the development of a community college program for Saskatchewan. The Liberals left us with a proposal, Mr. Speaker, but we set it aside because it was totally inadequate to meet the needs of rural education. The new community college program will be directed particularly to the rural and community needs and will be a great step forward in decentralizing the whole of education. I hope to have more to say on this later in another debate, Mr. Speaker,.

I could continue at some length in this vein. There is the Innovative Project Plan which provides grants for experiments and innovation in our schools. This idea, Mr. Speaker, was brought forward to the Liberal Government but they took no action. We are proud to have made this idea a reality.

Some Hon. Members: — Hear, hear!

Mr. MacMurchy: — There are other changes too, Mr. Speaker, such as the Bursary Scheme which will aid some 3,000 students this year. There is the Curriculum Project now beginning, a part of which involved two workshops on agricultural education just completed. These workshops, Mr. Speaker, brought together two students from each unit in the Province to discuss ways of improving agricultural education in the schools. A first in Canada, Mr. Speaker, as far as we can determine. The workshops were held at the Prairie Christian Training Centre at Fort Qu'Appelle, at St. Peter's College in Muenster. From all reports they were highly successful. We will use this method again, Mr. Speaker.

The implementation of new policies in Education demands a new attitude towards school operation. It demands new idea. It demands new people. The people of this Province have unmistakably declared their concern that our school system be updated and over-hauled, not so much in the interest of saving dollars, but in the interest in getting real education value for the total commitment of tie, of energy, of funds. The days of the school as a babysitter and a teacher of the three 'Rs' are very rapidly fading away. At the same time, however, the rate of adaptation in

March 6, 1972

the system is lagging. A serious discrepancy between what is expected and what is happening is developing.

Mr. Speaker, it is the responsibility of the Department of Education to give leadership in making the necessary reforms. Reform has as much to do with people as it has to do with the organizational structure that they work in. We are, therefore, looking for an orientation towards reform in our staff. We want to see the Department attractive to people with new ideas. And it is people with the reform-type of philosophy that we are interested in.

Mr. Speaker, the Speech from the Throne indicates the commitment of this Government and this Party to reform. It contains many valuable programs for Saskatchewan and especially it contains many valuable new programs for the rural people of Saskatchewan. It has left our friends opposite badly outflanked as evidenced in their feeble, their irrelevant effort at flogging the dead horse of right wing philosophy.

Mr. Speaker, I will be pleased to support the motion.

Some Hon. Members: — Hear, hear!

Mr. J.G. Lane (Lumsden): — Mr. Speaker, as I rise to speak on the Throne Speech I should like to join with the other Members of the House in congratulating the newly elected Members.

I realize that the Member for Souris-Estevan (Mr. Thorson) has been here once before but we welcome him back. I should like to welcome, of course, my new colleague, Mr. Wiebe, from the Constituency of Morse. I should like to congratulate the newly elected Leader of the Liberal Party (Mr. Steuart).

Mr. Speaker, with the leave of the House I am going to try to stand for as long as I can. If I am not able to make it I will then sit down. I am glad there is agreement because nobody should take the Throne Speech sitting down.

Mr. Speaker, there has been one topic that has been ignored by the Government since it took office and it is a topic which was ignored through 20 years of co-operative Commonwealth Federation, the New Democratic Party governments, and it is a topic which should be ignored no longer by the Members opposite. And that is the future of our great Province.

Saskatchewan is blessed with industrious people and in most cases abundant resources. Most of these people who live in this province, residents of this province, would love to stay here, Mr. Speaker, but the New Democratic Party has begun its proposals and its policies of encouraging an exodus from the province and in destroying the pride in the province that people have.

The people in this province have pride in this province, Mr. Premier, and it is being destroyed by the NDP proposals. And the policy of exodus was begun with the closing of the proposed pup mill and the Choiceland Iron Mine and no alternatives have been proposed. The only suggestion we have, Mr. Speaker, is that the Government — and this was made by the new Minister of Industry and Commerce (Mr. Thorson) — that the Government go into oil production. Now this ignores two factors, Mr. Premier, that the only possible new fields of exploration are the deep horizons, and you can get that out of the implications of the

March 6, 1972

speech given by the Minister, where he says there is geological evidence to suggest reserves of petroleum in some of the deeper horizons that have not yet been developed. The deep ones that are too expensive to exploit at this time.

The second factor that's ignored by the Government proposal to go into production is the fact that the Government does not have the management to enter into this competitive field. I'm going to refer to a treatise that should be read by all Government's Members opposite and especially by their Waffle supporters when they talk about nationalization. I'm going to refer to the "American Challenge" by John Jacques Servan-Schreiber who is facing the same problem in writing about the same problem of American take-over in France. What does he say on Page 44? He gives a beautiful example, Mr. Speaker, about nationalization.

Suppose a new regime wanted to 'nationalize' IBM – France, which has several modern plants and a research laboratory at La Guade in Provence. Having taken control of these handsome installations, the Government would find that it had mistaken the shadow for the substance. What counts today for a corporation is not the walls or the machines, but the intangible elements that cannot be nationalized. Just as in biology the cell is different from the sum of its component molecules, so a modern corporation is different from the production factors that go into it. By nationalizing (and he is referring to France, of course), by nationalizing IBM we would simply force its managers and technicians to emigrate. We would be committing, on the scientific strategic level, the kind of 'intellectual suicide' that Hitler's anti-Semitic policies produced in Germany 30 years ago.

I submit, Mr. Speaker, that you are acting too late in the field of petroleum resources. Of major fields there are only the deep horizons, by admission of your own Minister. If your predecessors in the 1950s had acted in the matter of petroleum industry, we wouldn't have the threats that we are getting today, and we would not be in the economic bind that this Province finds itself in. And you were part of that Government, Mr. Premier, as both a politician and a civil servant and the blame is yours.

What happened in the 1950s when we had ample supply of oil and gas resources? Our resources were in demand. What did you do? Nothing. You let well qualified, highly trained people move to Calgary and Edmonton. You let head-office, and office staff move to Calgary and Edmonton and did nothing about it. People went out of here by the hundreds, Mr. Premier, and your Government, your predecessors did absolutely nothing. And now when circumstances have changed and our petroleum resources are relatively nearly depleted you are going to put the full weight of the Government into the action. To use an apt phrase of one of your confreres, James Laxer, Mr. Premier, 'the Energy Poker Game', you are betting 17 when playing against the dealer. You can't win, Mr. Premier. You can't win politically either, Mr. Premier, because your innocuous proposals provide no jobs and no improvement for Saskatchewan citizens. You should be the joker on the cover of that book of Laxer's.

You know, the previous Liberal Government was accused of sell-outs to the big, bad Americans. We heard that for many, many years and we're still hearing it. But you have sold out,

March 6, 1972

Mr. Premier, not to the Americans, not to Eastern Canada, but you have sold this Province out to the neighbouring Provinces of Manitoba and Alberta. These two Provinces, Mr. Premier, can, because of geography, can and do service this Province. What have you done about it? You make it easier by this strident, anti-American, political approach that you've taken. Let's look at some of the examples of the approach of this Government. I'm not saying the blatant sell-out that we were accused of, but the insidious sell-out to two neighbouring provinces that can service us. Let's look at some of the quotes from the Premier's speech in this very Throne Speech debate. And I'm quoting and I'm not taking out of context for the purposes of this, Mr. Premier:

We believe that much more could be done to promote industries based on resources development, not on resources development, but rather on manufacturing goods for people here in the prairie basin.

The other two are based upon the market which is available for their products here in the prairie basin and they are prospering.

It will be the aim of the Government, as it was in the pre 1964 Government, that brought those plants to Regina, to do solid research, research on the needs of the prairie basin.

There are many products which are not imported into the prairie basin, imported from distant points which could be manufactured here, and as freight rates increase as our population in the prairie basin becomes more industrialized and more urban, the opportunities for the manufacture of more products rose almost daily.

In a further quote:

We believe in encouraging the manufacture for the prairie basin market.

What's wrong with a 'Saskatchewan Basin', Mr. Premier – why a 'Prairie Basin'?

Your intent to continue this sell-out is further evidenced by your Government's approach to co-operation with Alberta and Manitoba. I have no quarrel with co-operation in itself, Mr. Premier, but not to the detriment of Saskatchewan's interests, as you and your Government are doing.

I'm going to refer again to the speech of the Minister of Industry and Commerce (Mr. Thorson) to the Canadian Petroleum Association. Thirdly, he quotes:

We should avoid wasteful competition for industry in the prairie region among provinces and among communities in our own Province.

A very laudable statement, Mr. Minister, but make no mistake, the other two provinces concerned are competing against us and will continue to do so.

March 6, 1972

Now, Mr. Premier, you and I both attended the one Prairie Province enquiry in Lethbridge, but I think I learned something and I'm not so sure you did. Alberta does not want to be considered part of a prairie community, Mr. Premier, and if you didn't get that out of the one Prairie Province enquiry, maybe if I quote from the speech of Mr. Getty, Minister of Intergovernmental Affairs of the Province of Alberta it will help. I think you know him! In the quotation the heading is this: "Alberta does not want label Prairie Province".

Alberta does not want to be labelled a "Prairie Province", Mr. Don Getty, Minister of Intergovernmental Affairs said today.

The label Prairie Province suggests that Alberta is just part of a region for Ottawa to deal with instead of doing business separately with this Province, the Minister said.

Alberta is not a Prairie Province, but rather an industrial and parkland Province with also a high level of commerce.

Mr. Getty was speaking in an interview following his return (from where?) from Regina, after speaking to the Premier at the Prairie Economic Council meeting.

Alberta can't afford to take over our per capita debt of \$679 and some odd cents, which unification would certainly have to take into account. Any amalgamation will have to include an absorption of part of this debt by Albertans and they won't go for it. Why should they? They can already service us.

Manitoba's per capita debt on the other side is over \$1,100 and who wants part of that?

So where does that leave us, Mr. Premier? It, Mr. Speaker, leaves us with a province on one side which wants no part of it and a province on the other side which is in worse shape than we are.

As I say, I favour co-operation, but only when it is to Saskatchewan's advantage and Mr. Premier, I can assure you that the other Ministers only act for their advantage in the other two provinces.

If you had acted in the 1950s to stop the exodus of companies from this Province, as I say, we shouldn't be in this bind we're in now and we should have had an ample supply of industrial jobs for our people. You didn't act then, you're not acting now and it's getting too late.

Yet, you persist in selling the false idea that we are part of a prairie community, that we'll be able to work with Alberta and Manitoba and that these two Provinces will be of assistance to us. They will not be of assistance to us, Mr. Premier, and your suggestion that they will is deceitful. If it is to their advantage to co-operate, they will co-operate and if it is not, they will not.

March 6, 1972

Let's look at some examples of co-operation where it would be of advantage to Saskatchewan. The Port of Churchill. The expansion of the Port of Churchill would be a great boon to the Province of Saskatchewan yet Manitoba does nothing. Why? Because populous Southern Manitoba can be serviced more cheaply by the Lakehead. They are not doing anything for us.

Let's look at another form of possible co-operation and we look at the Minister's statement again that we must remove wasteful competition. The Pas pulp mill in The Pas, Manitoba, an inefficient and obsolete mill the day it was opened, is going to cost the Government of Manitoba millions of dollars. Why don't you get your NDP friends on that side of the fence to close that one down and guarantee the viability of a second pulp mill for Saskatchewan? You know it won't happen; where's your co-operation?

Your attempts, Mr. Premier, to co-operate with Alberta and Manitoba are simply a return to the sell-out of Saskatchewan that was practised by the CCF Government for twenty years. Start to put this Province first. We're not second-class citizens in this Province and we don't have to have a sell-out policy to neighbouring Provinces. I fail to see how a so-called sell-out to American people, which guarantees us jobs and social benefits, is worse than a sell-out to neighbouring Provinces for which we get no return whatsoever.

Mr. Premier, it's about time you started fighting for the people of this Province. This Province does not have the political power or the economic power, we all know that. Talking about co-operation does absolutely nothing to add to it.

This is not a Maritime Province that had to have Government grants to get into Confederation, Mr. Premier. We're not mendicants. We don't have to crawl to anyone. I was shocked to read your statement in the Leader Post of February 1st and 2nd: "Blakeney says more money needed".

Provincial Governments across the country are in serious trouble unless they can get more money, says Premier Allan Blakeney.

The Leader Post of the 2nd: "Saskatchewan expects more money".

Premier Blakeney Wednesday, predicted the Federal Government will probably find ways to give the programs a greater share of tax revenue. He made the forecast at a press conference on his return from the Federal-Provincial Finance Ministers' meeting in Jasper.

Failure of the Federal Government to give the Provinces more money would put pressure on Provincial Governments that could result in very serious social problems.

We know that you're a Maritimer who has come from a province that's used to begging the Federal Government for money, for

March 6, 1972

moneys to fund provincial expenditures, but things are different out here. We're not second class citizens and I thought your display of begging for money was an embarrassment to the people of this Province.

Some Hon. Members: — Hear, hear!

Mr. Lane: — As an aside on this matter, - and the Premier has given an awful lot of Press on this matter - on the matter of equalization grants and he referred to it in the Throne Speech. The consensus at the one Prairie Province enquiry, Mr. Premier, was that Saskatchewan is not a 'have not' province and what we pay in indirect taxes and tariffs more than offsets any subsidy or equalization grant. And, if that is the case, Mr. Premier, we should quite talking about equalization grants and I hope that somebody on the Government side will get these facts for us into a study of that particular situation, because the term 'equalization grant' implies a subsidy which I don't like.

There's another potentially dangerous slogan which your Party has endorsed and which particular factions of your Party strongly promote, dangerous to the people of Saskatchewan, and I'm referring to the concept of economic nationalism. Economic nationalism, without adequate safeguards for Saskatchewan, will simply mean that Eastern Canadian industrialists will have a Twentieth Century version of the tariff policy of the Nineteenth Century. We're all aware of what harm that policy has done for Western Canada. Yet, what does your Party do? During the election campaign it argued that a second pulp mill in Saskatchewan was going to put people out of work in Alberta, in British Columbia and in Quebec. It's nice to be concerned about the other programs, but what about work in Saskatchewan? Why should Saskatchewan support obsolete and inefficient pulp mills in other parts of this country? Yet, for cheap political expediency this is what your party argued.

We heard speeches in this House last summer, protesting against the control by multi-national corporations and I refer to the speech in particular - the speech of the Member from Notukeu-Willowbunch (Mr. Engel). Aside from the resources industries against which you were acting too late, Mr. Premier, what multi-national corporations have a big affect on Saskatchewan? Name one - the same ones that your front bench railed against in emergency debate. Maybe their names will help you realize where these companies are located - the Canadian Pacific Railway is one, The Canadian national Railway is another, Hudson Bay Company, with its vast mineral rights. These are Canadian companies, not the big, bad American corporations. These are Canadian companies that often act detrimentally to the interests of Saskatchewan.

A prime example of the harm that the Canadian industry can do to Saskatchewan was the Athabasca pulp mill. Merits of the mill aside, for these purposes, Mr. Speaker, who lobbied hardest against Parsons and Whittemore getting a Department of Regional economic Expansion Grant? It was the Canadian pulp industry that was trying to stop the mill. Were they acting in Saskatchewan's interest as determined by the elected people? Certainly they were not. The NDP has fallen into the beautiful trap and it's funny to watch it work, to view the Waffle group on one side advocating economic nationalism-control by the Canadian people, and Eastern industrialists arguing exactly the

March 6, 1972

same thing. They want control. That program of economic nationalism, without adequate safeguards and without the right for Saskatchewan to obtain outside capital, is detrimental to the future of this Province.

Another matter that was raised in the Edmonton Journal, Mr. Speaker, which reflects quite effectively on the Saskatchewan Government's position was this. I was amazed to read in the Edmonton Journal that Alberta is considering a basic steel industry. Now our known iron ore deposits are considerably greater than Alberta's and more accessible. We have 170 million tons of iron ore deposits in the Province. Why are they considering a basic steel industry? If your decision to cancel the Choiceland iron mine means a basic steel industry for the Province of Alberta, that is the biggest sell-out this Province will have every had and you will have sold out for cheap political gain the birthright of thousands of Saskatchewan citizens.

Some Hon. Members: — Hear, hear!

Mr. Lane: — You will have guaranteed that we shall be second-class citizens and that our people will not have jobs and will have to leave this Province.

We've got another interesting quote in this document by the Minister of Mineral Resources (Mr. Thorson), page 3:

In the Government of Saskatchewan we are determined that during the current term of office we will employ every means at our disposal to develop our resources.

Well, you've already shot that one down.

And increase our wealth production in the form of goods and services.

What's wrong with wealth production in the form of manufacturing, Mr. Premier? Why just goods and services and every indication from the people that you've hired is that your words 'goods and services' mean Governmental 'goods and services'?

If it is your intention, Mr. Premier, that this Province is to remain a purely agrarian society, say so. Stand up and have the courage to tell the people of this Province that the only ones who will be left are the large land holders, the only ones who can afford to pay for the social services. Let the people start planning now to send their children out of the Province. Tell the teachers, the educators, the labourers, the businessmen that there's no future in the Province for them and they won't be needed. If you want jobs for our people, then cut out these cheap, political attacks on potential investors that is coming from the opposite side of the House.

Even your friends in Manitoba, Mr. Premier, didn't go around attacking investors. The first think Schreyer did when he was elected was go to New York and say "we welcome investors".

Another example of the ridiculous approach of the Government opposite with regard to the position of Saskatchewan as related to the other two provinces, Manitoba and Alberta, is the succession duties. It takes no brains whatsoever to figure

March 6, 1972

out, Mr. Premier, that we have a tax and Alberta doesn't have such a tax, that people are going to move there. Now why should people move out of this Province – why should we force them to leave whether they are rich or poor and 13 thousand man-months of work means that the working man is also being driven out? Why do we want anyone to leave? Why bring in a tax when we have a competitor on the other side who doesn't have one?

The Throne Speech is a New Deal for the people of Manitoba and the people of Alberta. I realize, Mr. Speaker, that my remarks to this point have been a very provincialist approach for which I make no apology. It is about time we started talking about this Province and it is about time we looked at this Province in relation to two other Prairie Provinces which are competing against us.

Here are some of the aspects of the Throne Speech I should like to turn to, Mr. Speaker. First of all the matter of franchises. I support the proposed legislation. I hope that the legislation not only deals with pyramid plans, Mr. Attorney General, I hope it will deal with all aspects of franchises, and as I say not just pyramid plans. In the United States there is a growing problem with franchises and once they become economically successful the franchisee begins to make efforts to take over and close the man out who has built up the franchise. I think that that protection should be given the franchise holders in this Province.

I welcome the legislation to deal with credit reporting agencies, subject to the rider that we don't overburden the small businessman if this is the part of the Act who supplies his own credit. I would hope, also, that the Government will require these credit reporting agencies to keep their records in Saskatchewan. With the use of computers as all Members are aware, the information can be stored anywhere and I would hope that the Government opposite will support the Federal Government in its attempt to derive a policy on data information being stored in Canada.

I note the suggestion, Mr. Speaker, in the Throne Speech for a constitutional secretariat. It is under the heading, "Fiscal Arrangement". "My Government is alarmed at suggestions that such tax sharing arrangements are unconstitutional". Alarmed that equalization grants which are a subsidy are going to be taken away is what they mean.

My Ministers are preparing to defend with vigour the constitutionality of these arrangements.

Just make sure we get some money that's coming to us.

A constitutional secretariat will be established to protect Saskatchewan's interest in these matters.

This proposal is typical of the Premier's side. We have got to protect the money that we are getting from other people, we don't go out and make our own, we protect what other people are going to give us and make sure they don't take it away. That's why he sets up a secretariat, make sure we get all the money we can from other people, make sure we don't lose any that they are giving us already. The latter approach and the

March 6, 1972

Government's approach I find personally demeaning. If there is no equalization grant there is no worry is there?

Mr. Romanow: — Oppose British Columbia or...

Mr. Lane: — If there are no equalization grants which I asked you earlier Mr. Attorney General, to study, then the problem doesn't arise and you don't need a secretariat.

With regard to the matters of departmental reorganization, of course we have to wait to see what the policies are going to be, it is the policies that are important, not the forum.

This whole Throne Speech, Mr. Speaker, is an exercise in futility. What has it got, 13,000 man-months of work, 1,000 jobs for six months. A little better than six, that's all it has come up with. A secretariat to protect our so-called equalization grants.

Some attempt to get respectability with the provision for franchise legislation provisions for the control of credit reporting agencies and the Human Rights commission. An Ombudsman, of course, is just a recognition that you don't know how to solve a problem and you have got to get somebody else in to do it for you. I hope that the Government opposite doesn't intend to appoint either a police officer or a civil servant to that particular position.

The Throne Speech, Mr. Speaker, does not implement a New Deal for the people of Saskatchewan. Perhaps some speech and some action by some of the Members opposite will tell us what the deal is. In the second address in the Throne Speech we had a speech from the Hon. Member from Humboldt (Mr. Tchorzewski). I am going to read this because *Hansard* is entitled to this little bit of hypocrisy for two reasons. I am going to quote the Hon. Member and perhaps the Minister of Education will be interested in listening to these remarks?

I am very pleased to be able to make a comment on the legislation which will be brought in to remove the fixing of constituency boundaries from the influence of partisan politics. The destiny...

Some Hon. Members: — Hear, hear!

Mr. Lane: —

...of any nation will be determined by the political process. This process must be allowed to function freely without interference by unscrupulous politicians or political parties who may become more concerned about their power than their responsibility to the people they represent.

For these reasons the right of the vote must be cherished by any democratic nation. Political parties must be honest, they must be sincere and sensitive to the people. And a political party should go to the people during an election campaign with a philosophy,

March 6, 1972

a program and a platform. Its candidates should be expected to go out and articulate that platform. And any political party that doesn't have the courage to do this on a fair electoral boundaries commission doesn't deserve the consideration of the electorate. And any political party that doesn't have the courage to do this on fair electoral boundaries cannot be trusted with the responsibilities of Government.

When I spoke in the House last summer, Mr. Speaker, I brought to the attention of this House that when I voted in 1964, the first time I voted, I had to vote for five people in the city of Saskatoon. There was no natural boundary, it couldn't be divided up. Regina at that same time had six separate seats. Now who was a Member of that Government? Have you called your Premier an unscrupulous politician in caucus? Are you aware, Mr. Minister of Education, he was part of that gerrymander in 1964? What about him, does he deserve the support of the electorate when he gerrymanders? And any political party that doesn't have the courage to admit this disregard for fair electoral boundaries cannot be trusted with the responsibilities of government. Your words, your Premier, doesn't deserve to be trusted according to your theory.

Some Hon. Members: — Hear, hear!

Mr. Lane: — Well both parties of course have realized at the present time that it is about time we had an Electoral Boundaries Commission and I welcome an independent and a fair one. But cut out the pious platitudes and get on with it! Many of your own colleagues were guilty of gerrymandering.

Some Hon. Members: — Oh, oh!

Mr. Lane: — Then we have another statement from the Minister of Industry and Commerce. A little laudatory, perhaps, but a nice statement.

It is only fair that you should understand that I belong to a political party which has a very strong tradition of humanitarianism and those of us who are in the Party (whether they be in office or not) pursue the objective of social justice for all.

Let's tie these two speeches together. A tradition of humanitarianism and an abhorrence of gerrymandering. As I advised, the gerrymandering went on before by some of your own colleagues and I hope you have got the political courage to get up in the House and make sure that that Boundaries Commission you are proposing is fair and independent.

Let's look at another example of humanitarianism as stated by the Minister of Natural Resources. Mr. Romanow the humanitarian Attorney General, humanitarian Provincial Secretary, the humanitarian Deputy Leader, the humanitarian House Leader, the humanitarian heir apparent. A man who closes down lawfully constituted public meetings, and I am referring to the Koscot meeting, Mr. Attorney General. Why didn't you just come up with a public warning and why break the law in a case like that? That is a frightening precedent, Mr. Attorney General, and I hope it isn't continued.

March 6, 1972

Let's look at the humanitarian heir apparent's record on fair play. Forty minutes notice to a senior civil servant and he has to get his deputy minister to do it. That's the type of leader he will be. A man who is grasping for publicity has got him warning the people of this Province about snowmobiles that haven't even come here yet. Whose grasping for publicity has caused him to issue misleading press statements on licence fees and insurance fees. A man who doesn't have the courage to call in a man and tell him he has been fired. A man on forty minutes notice will have his deputy minister do it. There's a man who is driving for the chair to his right and he's so confident of that chair that he can take all sorts of junkets to Europe, Vancouver, Ottawa and come back with nothing. It is nice to welcome you to the House, Mr. Attorney General.

The humanitarian Attorney General is also the humanitarian Provincial Secretary, the giver of grants to organizations composed of the sons of defeated NDP candidates and unwise Members of his House. The humanitarian Attorney General who is now ruling by decree and issues directives to the people of this Province. Hail Caesar, eh Roy! The man who got up in this House last summer and accused and chastised the previous Liberal Government for government by regulation. Well, at least regulations were gazetted. What about your decrees? Are you ensuring, people have a place to go where they can read your decrees and find out what you are saying in all matters? Are you prepared to stand up in this House and guarantee that every decree you issue is received by those affected by it? At least, with the regulations they were gazetted and they knew where to look.

If you are going to be responsible for the administration of justice, Mr. Attorney General, you are obviously going to have to be reminded of your stature. Your colleagues, Mr. Attorney General, now know full well that when you are Premier and leader of that Party they could lose their cabinet posts on forty minutes notice or are you going to apply the same criteria to both of them?

Humanitarian? Ask the Saskatchewan Government Insurance Office how humanitarian he is. Ask the body shop operators how humanitarian he is. Ask the implement dealers how humanitarian he is. That's the humanitarian Attorney General.

There are other matters sin the Throne Speech, the Land Bank, which for all practical purposes, Mr. Speaker, will not allow a young farmer to buy the land. A plan that in effect makes a man a serf for the rest of his life and what has he go at the end of that when he retires? A first priority for his son to become a serf. Make it easier, Mr. Minister, for the young farmer to own the land that he is going to work. The Messer Manifesto, the only redeeming feature of which is the fact that farmers who wish to retire now have a buyer of last resort. Hopefully these people will be able to leave the farm with dignity. We await the Bill with some interest, Mr. Speaker.

I have already criticized the implementation of succession duties as being an unwise tax in light of the position of our neighbouring province. The tax is also unfair, because it is double taxation. The gift tax removal or changes that you have proposed are also unfair, they remove the once in a lifetime \$10,000 gift and they penalize the small working man who wants to give something to his wife and, in particular, I refer to the home that they usually build and put in joint tenancy.

March 6, 1972

Mr. Speaker, there is one other matter before I finish, and it is a matter raised by the Premier outside the House and it is a question of two sessions Mr. Premier, and I am not being critical of the Government opposite, as long as we have a system of government in this country, a system of government by Cabinet, then I suggest to you that two sessions are a waste of time. I shall oppose any such move, Mr. Premier, unless there are drastic changes in the role of the non-Cabinet Minister Member. I am sure that if you are prepared to consider a drastic upgrading of that role, we will be interested in your proposals. But as it stands when we have government by Cabinet, two sessions are a complete waste of time.

I think, Mr. Speaker, from my comments that I cannot support the Throne Speech.

Some Hon. Members: — Hear, hear!

Mr. W.A. Robbins (Saskatoon Nutana Centre): — Mr. Speaker, may I first congratulate you on your appointment as Speaker of this Assembly. A very important post and obviously one that is not easy. There is clear evidence of that already in this Second Session of the Seventeenth Legislature.

I should also like to take a few minutes to congratulate the elected member from Souris-Estevan (Mr. Thorson) who is now a member of the Executive Council and also the Member for Morse (Mr. Wiebe). I note that the Member for Rosthern (Mr. Boldt) decided that he wouldn't give congratulations to the Member for Souris-Estevan because he would have preferred to have someone else in his place. I might say I spent a day or two in Morse constituency attempting to see that Mr. Wiebe didn't get here, and I obviously wasn't very successful. But nevertheless I think it is pretty narrow minded and not a very Liberal approach to use when you say you will not congratulate the person who happens to be elected from the other side I certainly offer my congratulations to Mr. Wiebe on his election.

Some Hon. Members: — Hear, hear!

Mr. Robbins: — I should also like to offer my congratulations to the Hon. John Brockelbank, the Member for Saskatoon Mayfair, who became a member of the Executive Council since the last session.

The previous speaker made reference to the gerrymander and the proposed Electoral Boundaries Commission. I should like to make one or two comments on it, with respect to my own particular constituency of Nutana Centre. The former Government really couldn't find any way to cut anything off Nutana Centre on the sides, it's too thin, they would miss it when they took a swing at it. They cut some off the ends. I should like Members to take particular note of the particular situation that arose with respect to that constituency. Did they take roughly 1,000 voters off the end of Nutana Centre and put them in Riversdale, because there happened to be more voters in Nutana Centre than in Riversdale? No. there actually were more voters in Riversdale before this action was taken. I wonder if the fact that I happened to have a majority of 151 votes in that particular part of the constituency in 1967 election had anything to do with it, Mr. Speaker. After the new arrangement, Nutana Centre was reduced

March 6, 1972

from roughly 15,000 voters to 14,000 and Riversdale raised from roughly 15,500 to 16,500. Some clear evidence of the approach the previous Government took in relation to electoral boundaries. I contend, Mr. Speaker, that is one of the main reasons why I came back to this House, because of the obviously unfair and very foolish gerrymander that occurred.

I should like to offer my congratulations to the mover and seconder of the Speech from the Throne. They set an excellent tone for this debate. When the Hon. Member for Athabasca (Mr. Guy) entered the debate, prematurely I might add, because of the demure, shy, rather bashful Leader of the Opposition, the tenor of the debate plummeted precipitously. That's a perfectly normal result in any debate in which the Hon. Member from Athabasca participates, past, present or future.

The Hon. Member for Kerrobert-Kindersley (Mr. Taylor) was, Mr. Speaker, taken to task in a recent Leader-Post Editorial concerning his contribution to the Throne Speech debate. The main theme of its criticism was levelled at the Hon. Member's assertion that the Federal Government had deliberately created unemployment. Yet the Prime Minister of this country has admitted quite openly that his Governments monetary policies designed to control inflation would as a side effect increase unemployment. The Leader-Post berates the Hon. Member for Kerrobert-Kindersley for this assertion that the Federal Government used policies of restraint which created unemployment. Yet that is exactly what was done, notwithstanding the contentions of that editorial.

When will we learn that thrift and frugality are necessities in our world? The world has some limitations pertaining to available resources. Reasonable men are able to face the reality of this fact. The Hon. Member for Regina Whitmore Park (Mr. Grant) talked about facing problems and finding solutions to those problems which confront our society. One does not solve the —problems by maintaining the status quo, yet this is the very approach the Members of the Opposition have been taking. Mr. Speaker, really they are conservatives by nature, by temperament, and by their lack of action. Mr. Speaker, all a conservative is, is a fellow who will fight to the death to prevent from passing out when his father fought to the death to prevent from coming in.

Some Hon. Members: — Hear, hear!

Mr. Robbins: — Perhaps, the greatest hope for some reasonable actions in our world today lie with the youth of today. The youth of today, in general, are much more mature and much more socially aware than the youth of a decade or two ago. Most of them are rather determined to change society, in their view, for the better. Many are actively working for political and social change. Even though the behaviour of some of them, in the opinion of some of us, is somewhat reprehensible, few have approached the level of irresponsibility, manifested by certain politicians, some of them, Mr. Speaker, seated to the left of you. To a major extent college students today have a realistic view of the world, a more realistic view of the world, a more realistic view of the world than their parents do, perhaps because they do not see it through rather rose coloured glasses. Young people who matured prior to World War II were young during a time when personal financial security was an over-riding consideration of a large proportion of the population. Today's youth are growing up in a period when financial security can be either taken for granted or is not classified as a matter of

March 6, 1972

major concern or importance. These people are growing up in a period of unprecedented change. They live in a world which is daily brought into their homes through the medium of TV and they are, in fact, forced into a global viewpoint.

The youth of today favour change. They are concerned about other people and they think of work problems in world terms. That they exhibit such concern should not be viewed as anything but a hopeful sign.

Liberals opposite are frightened by change. They are even frightened by the mere suggestion or possibility of change. This is in keeping with the whole Liberal approach. Give them the Party line and they will defend it to the death. Change the Party line and they will defend it with equal vigour and blind allegiance. Not only proving that the first line was right but that the second one was right also and that the Party was right in changing from the first to the second. Logic, reason, and reality to do, Mr. Speaker, enter the picture insofar as the Liberal Members opposite are concerned. Clearly the best evidence of this fact is apparent when one peruses the 75-minute radio effort of the hon. Member from the constituency of Athabasca (Mr. Guy). Perhaps, the best description of the contribution of the Member for Athabasca to the Throne Speech can be set out in rollicking rhyme. Because of a general inclination to use this approach, I have succumbed to this tendency and therefore, Mr. Speaker, I ask leave of this Assembly to conclude my remarks with a verse entitled: "That Guy". It is as follows:

The Member from Athabasca, long winded and blind
Stood up in the Throne Speech and began to unwind.
Red in the face and shining with pride
He ranted and roared, and was fit to be tied.
His figures were strange, his tactics unkind
He was clearly unhappy and caught in a bind.
He was rabid, ridiculous, erratic and sad
The Opposition was good and the Government bad.
The tactics he used, devoid of political taint
Proved once and for all
That this fine northern saint; with a long hairy brush
Heavily dipped in coal tar
Could prove things quite different than they really are.
According to him the truth must be told
Industry is harassed and lo and behold
Pulp, iron, oil development will go
They will melt away quickly like the new fallen snow.
The Socialists are nasty, their dogma holds sway
They wrecked all our dreams for ever – always.
In conclusion he ended, thank goodness for that
Haggard, confused, bewildered and flat
The results are now with us; inevitable, clear
Political demise of the Member gradually draws near.
The reasons are evident, don't ask us just why
It's a case of the voter can't put up with that Guy.

Some Hon. Members: — Hear, hear!

Mr. Robbins: — Mr. Speaker, it should be readily realized by the Members of this Legislature that I strongly support the main motion in the Reply to the Speech from the Throne.

March 6, 1972

Some Hon. Members: — Hear, hear!

Mr. M. Feduniak (Turtleford): — I was to speak earlier but due to the illegitimate manoeuvring by the Members on the opposite side, I shall have the opportunity to speak tomorrow. Mr. Speaker, I beg leave to adjourn the debate.

Debate adjourned.

The Assembly adjourned at 9:30 o'clock p.m.