

**LEGISLATIVE ASSEMBLY OF SASKATCHEWAN**  
**First Session - Eighteenth Legislature**  
**6th Day**

**Thursday, November 20, 1975.**

The Assembly met at 2:30 o'clock p.m.

On the Orders of the Day

**WELCOME TO STUDENTS**

**MR. M.J. KOSKIE (Quill Lakes):** — Mr. Speaker, through you and to the House I should like to introduce 40 students from the Grade Twelve class in Lanigan Collegiate. I should like to also welcome their teacher, Miss Phillips. I understand that she recently came to Canada from England and I hope that her stay here in Canada is enjoyable and for a considerable length of time.

I just want to say to the students that the business of the Legislature today will continue with the debate of the Speech from the Throne. Today you will have the opportunity to listen to the Hon. Member for Nipawin (Mr. Collver).

I hope that you enjoy yourselves here today and that you will take back with you some appreciation of the method in which the Legislature is conducted. I hope to have an opportunity of meeting with you later this afternoon.

**SOME HON. MEMBERS:** — Hear, hear!

**HON. E.L. TCHORZEWSKI (Humboldt):** — Mr. Speaker, I, too, would like to join in the comments of the Member for Quill Lakes and extend greetings to the students from the Lanigan High School. A number of the students are from the west side of the community of Lanigan and reside in the Humboldt constituency.

I wish to say to all of you that it is good to have you here. We do hope that you enjoy your stay and that you find your trip to Regina, and in particular your visit to the Legislative Building, a worthwhile one.

**SOME HON. MEMBERS:** — Hear, hear!

**MR. J.R. KOWALCHUK (Melville):** — Mr. Speaker, it gives me a great deal of pleasure today to introduce to you a number of students, 57 in number, from St. Henry's Separate School in Melville. They are a Grade Eight class. They are also here with their teachers Mr. Garth Gleisinger and Wally Oucharek.

I hope that their stay here today is going to be of benefit to them on the basis that I do think they have something to learn from the way this House conducts itself and the proceedings that go on in here. I want to welcome them on your behalf. I wish them well. They have been to a number of places in the city. I wish them a good stay here and also a good trip back home.

**HON. MEMBERS:** Hear, hear!

## ANNOUNCEMENT

### NEGOTIATIONS WITH OIL INDUSTRY

**HON. E.C. WHELAN (Minister of Mineral Resources):** — Mr. Speaker, I wish to make an announcement re our negotiations with the oil industry. The area of oil in Saskatchewan is of special concern to the Department of Mineral Resources. Since Bill 42 was introduced the federal government has made a number of unreasonable changes to the income tax structure. They are taxing provincial royalties. We had hoped that the June federal budget would have corrected this flagrant discrimination against the provinces but it did not.

In the past month we have had frank, objective and amicable talks with the petroleum industry concerning phases that will increase exploration activity, increase production and increase petroleum reserves. Briefly the policy will:

- (1) Replace the existing complex system of oil royalties and taxes with one simple royalty formula that will be applied according to the type of crude produced.
- (2) Increase incentives by refunding a portion of royalties and taxes for exploration and development work carried out in Saskatchewan.
- (3) Provide for maintenance credits. For every dollar spent on maintenance work, a percentage will be returned to the producer in the form of a credit.
- (4) Provide earned credits for exploration if the producers reinvest in Saskatchewan.

Those earned credits will be transferable between companies. This will allow smaller companies to enter into exploration ventures with larger companies. Discussions are continuing with the industry to work out the precise form this new structure will take.

I should like to point out, Mr. Speaker, that while the oil companies have had differences with us, we have always communicated and discussed our problems in a frank and constructive manner.

We have been assured by the oil industry that with these proposed changes they will increase activity. While the cost of our incentives to the oil industry will be significant, our action now will assure to the people of Saskatchewan in the future, a fair return on a resource that belongs to the people of Saskatchewan.

**SOME HON. MEMBERS:** — Hear, hear!

**MR. E.C. MALONE (Regina-Lakeview):** — Mr. Speaker, we certainly welcome the announcement by the Minister that he is trying to encourage further exploration by the oil industry but I wonder why he didn't go the complete way and repeal Bill 42 so that we could get something . . .

**SOME HON. MEMBERS:** — Hear, hear!

**MR. MALONE:** — . . . the particulars of the information that the Minister has given to us today. I may say though that unless the changes are such as to make the oil industry in Saskatchewan competitive with the oil industry in Alberta that it will do little good. I hope that I shall have an opportunity of getting full particulars of this information from the Minister in due course and will have a further statement at that time.

## QUESTIONS

### MISLEADING INFORMATION re UNIONS

**MISS L.B. CLIFFORD (Wilkie):** — Before the Orders of the Day I should like to direct a question to the Minister of Social Services (Mr. Rolfes). Are you aware that union representatives in the hospital-nursing home personnel area are purposely giving misleading information with respect to unionized personnel? Union people are telling the board and the staff that if they join the union, not only will their wages be increased but these increased wages will not affect the rental charges that they get from the home because there is a grant of \$100 per full staff member by the government. They are giving this information and they are insinuating that it will be effective until March, 1976. However, there are a few details that they have overlooked and that is that the agreement first has to be certified as of June 1 and the agreement has to be retroactive. Now this is not only being dishonest but it is being misleading and hurting the people in the senior citizens' home.

I should like to inquire about this and ask what will be done to protect homes from any similar injustice?

**MR. H.H. ROLFES (Minister of Social Services):** — Mr. Speaker, I don't know why the Hon. Member is asking me to respond. She is assuming that what she is saying is already true. She asked me a question. I am not aware that this is going on. I certainly will be very pleased to look into this matter for you. I would hope, however, that you would give me a few more details so that we can follow it up.

**MISS CLIFFORD:** — Mr. Speaker, a supplementary question, please. I am very aware that this is true because it is happening in my own constituency. I shall be glad to give you the information and the persons concerned, although I will not do it in the House. Will you be willing to set up a board of inquiry to investigate this situation?

**MR. ROLFES:** — Mr. Speaker, as I said

before I shall be willing to look into it. However, I do believe that this involves also the Minister of Labour (Mr. Snyder) and I would have to discuss it with him. I should appreciate, however, if the Member would give me some details so that we can check it out for her and I will be very pleased to do so.

### **SOURIS VALLEY FLOOD CONTROL PROGRAM**

**MR. R.A. LARTER (Estevan):** — Mr. Speaker, the Hon. Mr. Byers, Minister of the Environment, are there going to be any moneys available to people under the Souris Valley Flood Control from your department or any other department of the government to help them build dykes or any flood prevention? We understand there is nothing for helping other than the usual flood fund, but in flood prevention is there any help?

**HON. N.E. BYERS (Minister of Environment):** — The question is asked. Mr. Speaker, if the Department of the Environment will be providing funds to assist the citizens of communities in the Souris River to finance the construction of dykes. For the most part where any community that is eligible for funds for flood control protection the general rule is, it depends on the nature of the work, and depends on whether it is for an urban or a rural municipal jurisdiction. For the most part, if there is assistance supplied it is through the Department of Agriculture and not the Department of the Environment.

**MR. LARTER:** — A supplementary question, Mr. Speaker. The people in this area are getting no satisfaction from the money or help towards the prevention, even building dykes. I don't believe they are asking too much when they ask for some help in preventing of the flood damaging their homes and I think the department should come up with some means of assisting them in some way. Would you look into this, please?

**MR. BYERS:** — Mr. Speaker, the matter of organizing for flood protection against any possible flood threat for the coming spring is a responsibility of the Emergency Measures Organization. The Department of Municipal Affairs has assisted urban communities and rural municipalities to establish Emergency Measure Organizations and to assist them in designing programs for flood control measures. In the first case, this is the responsibility of the municipality and the municipalities are assisted through the various grants that are paid to them; namely, equalization grants or in the case of urban areas the community capital fund, and the unconditional grants which urban governments are free to use as they see fit for the kinds of works they plan to undertake and the extent of works that they plan to undertake.

### **POTASH INDUSTRY - BREDENBURY MINE**

**MR. C.P. MacDONALD (Indian Head-Wolseley):** — Mr. Speaker, before I ask the Minister to repeat the

answer, I should like to direct a question to the Premier. Would he not agree that he has publicly damned the potash industry for not providing information to the government? Would he also agree that the Government of Saskatchewan has provided little or no information about the cost estimates of the potash takeover to the public or to the Members of the Legislature? I was wondering if he would follow the tradition of the House and table the feasibility, all feasibility and cost estimates of the proposed construction of the government or the Crown corporation potash development at Bredenburg immediately, because of the urgency of the timing before the debate on these two very important Bills comes before the House, so that the public will have an opportunity to do an honest evaluation and comparison of the proposed new costs of this mine compared to the costs or any fair market value that might be paid to the potash industry.

**HON. A.E. BLAKENEY (Premier):** — Mr. Speaker, I think it would be best if the Hon. Member put on the Order Paper in the ordinary way just what he is asking us to table. It is always difficult to know what one is asked to table by way of complicated documents when the request is made orally. If the Hon. Member places a Motion for Return we will attempt to deal with that promptly since that is what we would like to do.

I should like to answer the other part of the Hon. Member's question. There is, I think, quite a great deal of difference between giving out estimates of what may happen one year hence with respect to the purchase of assets and what has happened last year and the year before with respect to the operation of potash mines in Saskatchewan where the law requires that such information be provided. It may well be that you would like to have information in this House. Fair enough. But the fact that information of what may happen in the future has not been tabled in this House, there is certainly no justification for anyone not following the clear law of this land requiring the tabling of information by potash companies. I propose to continue to criticize people who do not obey those laws.

**MR. MacDONALD:** — Mr. Speaker, a supplementary question. I take it then that the Premier has assured the Members of the Legislature and the public that he will table all documents, and I will put it on the Order paper, regarding all cost estimates, all feasibility studies, all correspondence to the potash institute or in relation to the now proposed construction of the mine at Bredenburg. I will take his word for it and I want to repeat, I will put it on the Order paper today and I hope before second reading of these two very important Bills that all Members of the House will have the opportunity to peruse that, as will the press and the public.

**MR. BLAKENEY:** — Mr. Speaker, I don't want the Hon. Member to take my word for it. I want him to follow the rules of this House. We, yesterday, heard reference to the advisability of following the rules of this House and I think that the point was well taken. If you want that information please put it on the Order paper detailing what you want and we shall be able to respond saying what we can file and what we cannot file. I am simply not going to agree to table what you will describe as

all documents, all reports and the rest. When you put the motion on the Order paper we will reveal what is in accordance with the rules of the House.

**MR. MacDONALD:** — I hope then that the Premier will not follow the normal rules of the House and the normal pattern of the NDP and table it four months hence.

## ADJOURNED DEBATES

### ADDRESS-IN-REPLY

The Assembly resumed the adjourned debate on the proposed motion by Mr. M. J. Koskie (Quill Lakes) and the amendment thereto moved by Mr. D.G. Steuart (Leader of the Opposition).

**MR. R. L. COLLVER (Leader of the Progressive Conservatives):** — Mr. Speaker, people of Saskatchewan are concerned, apprehensive and frightened about the future of our province, and in fact about the future of our country. Inflation as brought about by excessive government spending, which is the primary source of inflation, has taken away their buying power and their ability in fact to live. Continued strike action throughout the province of Saskatchewan and throughout Canada is bringing about a situation in which many of the necessary essential services of our country and of our province are not being met.

What the people of this country and Saskatchewan are looking for is leadership, leadership to beat this common enemy, inflation. They look first naturally to the federal government to provide this leadership and they have been looking for this leadership for some considerable time.

The federal government has recently taken action, this action perhaps is not what the Members opposite might have decided, this action is perhaps not what we would have decided; it is nevertheless an action that has been taken. We think that this action taken by the federal government is too much too late. There is some concern on our part as to whether or not people in Canada are going to support this legislation. We are also concerned that the leadership provided by the federal government pertaining to government spending with a \$6 billion deficit projected for this year is not in keeping with the leadership that is necessary for the defeat of inflation.

We, therefore, believe strongly that action is necessary at the provincial level to show the kind of leadership to our people that is needed. The Speech from the Throne does not indicate this leadership. There is nothing, no action in this Speech that indicates that the provincial government is prepared to exhibit leadership in this area. Edmund Burke said, "Example is the school of mankind, they will learn from no other." Yet this Speech does not show such example.

I cite a few instances from the Speech from the Throne pertaining to this lack of government initiative in controlling government expenditures which is the prime source of inflation.

The words, we admit, seem to indicate that the government supports the federal government initiative. But the action being taken does not support it.

First of all, it is suggested that certain classes of employees be exempt in Saskatchewan; public employees, teachers, nurses, construction workers — and we heard hospital workers mentioned before. We admit that some of these workers do not have equity and do not have parity with neighboring provinces. We admit that perhaps at some point in the future and perhaps in the near future when this enemy is brought under control that perhaps a look beyond the federal guidelines is possible. But unfortunately at this time, unless we are prepared to take action and show leadership in Saskatchewan, we do not believe that inflation will be defeated. In fact, it will continue.

The Speech suggests that professional incomes cannot be controlled, and we agree, by means of a mere examination of fee schedules. But is it the government's intention to look at overtime pay? Is it the government's intention to look at pay for piecework over and above hourly rates, because if it is, the army of bureaucrats mentioned by the Premier would have to increase to surpass the present bureaucracy in the province of Saskatchewan.

New government departments are being added in this Speech, some of them we think at some point in the future are of great merit. The agency for transportation is one of these agencies that is being added. But we believe very strongly that any new agencies at this time are not exhibiting leadership in the fight against inflation. The same is true for the new Department for the Status of Women, increased number of bureaucrats and therefore increased costs of government.

In addition, it is being suggested that the jurisdiction of the office of the Ombudsman be expanded. We think this too is a good idea, but not at this time. Again, it does not indicate the desire to lead in the fight against inflation.

And finally, Mr. Speaker, the proposed potash legislation to add thousands of workers to the Government of Saskatchewan's payroll. The Premier suggested that he is not going to increase the size of the civil service. How is he going to staff the potash mines? How is he going to staff the transportation agency? How is he going to staff the increase to the powers of the Ombudsman? How is he going to staff these new departments of government? He can't do it with mice, he has to do it with people, therefore those people have to be paid, and therefore will increase the cost of government in the province of Saskatchewan.

We believe the time is now to show leadership in the fight against inflation. It is the number one problem in our country and unless we can show this leadership in Saskatchewan no one else will do it for us.

The Premier mentioned the province of Alberta and I would suggest, Mr. Speaker, the province of Alberta has enacted its own guidelines for its own civil service and its own employees prior to the federal government legislation.

Just as an example of this tremendous increase in

government costs and government spending, I cite the latest figures in terms of government spending which increased over 20 per cent, while inflation ran at 10 per cent.

Now, Mr. Speaker, I should like to turn my attention to the proposed potash legislation. We believe this legislation is wrong! Fundamentally and basically wrong. It is wrong for nine reasons, among others.

- (1) First of all, it is grossly inflationary. There is no way that a government can expend thousands of dollars per man, woman and child in the province of Saskatchewan, without contributing to inflation. It indicates no leadership and no restraint.
- (2) It is a bad business deal. Ask any person who has had any experience in business today whether or not one should borrow at the highest possible interest rates to invest at the highest possible prices for potash.
- (3) It takes capital sorely needed to build roads and bridges. It was suggested to us yesterday, that roads and bridges would have to be given up in order to buy this potash industry. That we would have to give up in the North new roads and new bridges that are absolutely essential for the improved economic well-being of the northern part of Saskatchewan; that we would have to forego these in order to obtain these potash mines.
- (4) A government which suggest that the workers should be consulted by management, prior to any major decision taken by management or taken by those in charge of the workers and decides to convert thousand of Saskatchewan people into civil servants without consultation does not appear to be straightforward.
- (5) The legislation breaks the word of the Government of Saskatchewan, breaks the word of the former Premier of the province of Saskatchewan and breaks the contracts with the potash companies.

I should like to read into the record, Mr. Speaker, from the Debates and Proceedings of February 22, 1950, page 15, a statement given by Mr. Douglas, the then Premier of the province of Saskatchewan. I quote:

The third alternative, Mr. Speaker, is to combine one and two, the third alternative is to say that we will allow private interests to come in here and look for minerals and if they come in, we will give them security on two points: (1) that if they find certain resources they will be allowed to develop them; (2) that if they set up the machinery for developing them, they will not be expropriated.

Those two categorical assurances have been given and I repeat them here this afternoon. We have said that while we are allowing these people to look for these things and if they find them to develop the, the interests of the people of the province of Saskatchewan must be safeguarded and looked after.



- (6) It further centralizes power in the hands of a few individuals, 39 of them to be exact. It centralizes the power over thousands more Saskatchewan workers and thousands more already own their direct day to day existence to the government of the province of Saskatchewan.
- (7) It fails to take into account other alternatives. We have heard two sets of facts, one from the potash industry and one from the Government of Saskatchewan. It is hard for the people to know whom to believe. But let us assume for a moment the Government of Saskatchewan is correct in its facts. There are other ways besides Crown corporations to enable Saskatchewan citizens to participate in Saskatchewan resources. One is a joint stock company owned by the people of Saskatchewan, backed by the Government of Saskatchewan. Another is co-operative, backed by the Government of Saskatchewan. But there the power vests with other individuals besides those individuals opposite.
- (8) This situation on potash is totally different, totally different, from that with regard to SaskPower or SaskTel or Medicare or SGIO. Totally different because those are monopolies over which the Government of Saskatchewan exercises total control. If something goes wrong with SGIO, the government can add two cents a gallon to the gas tax to catch it up. This is not a monopoly. In this, the Government of Saskatchewan, if this legislation goes through, the Government of Saskatchewan will be in direct competition throughout the world with other organizations, and does not have monopoly power.

This is a precedent the people of this province had better be very careful about.

- (9) The Government of Saskatchewan has no mandate from the people for this particular takeover. None whatsoever!

No mention of expropriation of potash mines was brought out last June 11. It might interest the Members opposite, Mr. Speaker, to know that a survey conducted within the last week by an independent group in the cities of Regina and Saskatoon only, has come out with the following statistics: 53 per cent of those surveyed opposed the takeover; 33 per cent were in favour and 14 per cent had no opinion.

Let me say this, as a Member for a rural constituency, the feeling in the rural constituencies runs a lot higher than that against this proposed government legislation.

Mr. Speaker, I should like to turn my attention to two things I think are essential which seem to have been left out of the proposed government legislation. The first, is that governments are not required to account for themselves in accordance with generally accepted accounting principles and practice in the same way that other organizations in our society are.

Let me give you one example of that. Other organizations

are required to consolidate their financial statements. We think that if the government is going to insist on continuing to increase its power and effect on the day to day lives of the citizens of this province, that the least that the people of the province can expect is a consolidated statement of all organizations directly associated or affiliated with government so that people can find out the direct impact of government on their lives.

The second item which I believe has been left out of this particular document is that there is no legislation proposed to increase the power of local school boards and local municipal councils, who can operate more efficiently, in a less costly way, and therefore, improve the situation with regards to inflation. There is no legislation proposed to return any power, real power, and the means to exercise that power to local school boards and local municipal councils.

Therefore, Mr. Speaker, I cannot support the motion by the Member for Quill Lakes (Mr. Koskie). I can also not support the amendment because I do not believe that it is strong enough. Therefore, Mr. Speaker, I place the following motion before this Assembly to amend the amendment:

That the amendment be amended by deleting all of the words after "Assembly" and the following substituted therefor:

Condemns the policy of Your Honour's advisors regarding the content of the Throne Speech, for its failure in any area to exhibit leadership in the fight against inflation, which so materially affects the lives of all individuals in our province, and equally in every area for its failure to reverse the intrusion of further centralization of power in the hands of a few executives of our province.

**HON. R.J. ROMANOW (Attorney General):** — Mr. Speaker, before the Hon. Member for Nipawin (Mr. Collver) takes his seat, I wonder if he would be kind enough, since he referred in his speech to a survey taken by a firm, to table for the Members of the House a copy of the survey that he refers to in his speech. I believe the rules of the House are clear that once a Member refers to a document to support the argument that another Member can ask the Member who refers to it, to table a copy of the survey identifying its source and the additional material.

I am sure that the Hon. Member for Nipawin would have no objection to that. We would be very interested in seeing it.

**MR. COLLVER:** — Mr. Speaker, I am not prepared to table such a document, but I am prepared to take personal responsibility for the statistics which I presented during my speech.

**MR. R.N. NELSON (Yorkton):** — Mr. Speaker, I consider it a great privilege and honour to rise in this Assembly and speak on behalf of the Yorkton constituency. I must say that I am very pleased to be here associating with all the Hon. Members in the deliberations that will lead to a bright future for this great province.

I should like to thank all who voted for me and also

those from junior high school level to old age pensioners who worked for me in the June election campaign. I only hope that I shall be able to serve my constituency as ably and as conscientiously as our past MLA, Mr. Irving Carlson. Everyone in the Yorkton area knows that Mr. Carlson did an excellent job for his people.

**SOME HON. MEMBERS:** — Hear, hear!

**MR. NELSON:** — Mr. Speaker, I must confess surprise at some of the remarks yesterday of the Hon. Member for Nipawin (Mr. Collver) concerning House proceedings. With all due respect, I feel the remarks were not warranted. If the Hon. Member is sincere, and I must assume that he is, then he is challenging the very dean of all Canadian parliamentarians, the Rt. Hon. John D. Diefenbaker, who is the master of the job — the master of this style of rough and tumble parliamentary debate. He is challenging the former Prime Minister of this country and the former leader of the party of which the Hon. Member for Nipawin is also a member and provincial leader.

While I do not hold to the political views of the Rt. Hon. Mr. Diefenbaker, I think I speak for most of the Members of this House when I say that all of us here have a deep respect for him.

**SOME HON. MEMBERS:** Hear, hear!

**MR. NELSON:** — If the Hon. Member is not sincere in his criticisms then I can only assume that he is guilty of a flagrant political play, hoping to catch, what he believes, is the public opinion. Though the radio was off for his remarks, the press was amply visible to him.

Mr. Speaker, I sincerely ask the Hon. Member for Nipawin to reconsider his stand.

Mr. Speaker, I would consider it an honour to say a few things about my constituency.

**SOME HON. MEMBERS:** — Hear, hear!

**MR. NELSON:** — The Yorkton constituency is now smaller in area after the rearrangement of the constituencies by the Independent Electoral Boundaries Commission last year. Now my constituency is a twelve by eighteen mile area around the city of Yorkton itself. So you see, ours is mostly an urban constituency with a good sprinkling of farm people to remind us of our rural origins. We find the Yorkton area to be a good mix in so many ways. We find almost every religious group there is in our midst with 27 churches built to testify to their religious faith. We find in our midst people from almost every region of the world, but the preponderance of our population originated from the Ukraine, with other large groups from Germany and the British Isles. And, although we do tell the odd ethnic joke, one needs only attend any function, social or otherwise, in our area, to see that we do not just show toleration for each others different origins, we fully accept and respect each other. Indeed, we encourage those difference for they make

the Yorkton area one of the most colorful and interesting places to live in our entire province.

**SOME HON. MEMBERS:** — Hear, hear!

**MR. NELSON:** — I am pleased to say that our provincial government recognizes the colour and richness that is brought to our lives by our various racial groups. Our government has provided grants to encourage these groups to study their backgrounds and to engage in the cultural activities of the lands of their origins.

The fine farms and the prosperity of our city testify to the intelligence and the ingenuity and the industriousness of the people of the Yorkton area.

Our city is a major shopping and service centre for the eastern part of the province. With its downtown business core, one major shopping centre completed and a new mall under construction, Yorkton is able to serve an area containing 250,000 people. Besides, our city, by prairie standards, is becoming a major manufacturing centre.

The large producers' co-operatives are located in Yorkton — a large regional plant of the Saskatchewan Dairy Producers and the Poultry Producers Co-op.

I am pleased that the Saskatchewan Government, through the Saskatchewan Economic Development Corporation saw fit to assist in the development of these two co-operative industries. To me, this was an excellent use of government funds for they help farm people to help themselves to decide upon and direct their own future.

**SOME HON. MEMBERS:** — Hear, hear!

**MR. NELSON:** — To mention a few more industries there are two prefabricated home factories that sell houses all over Canada. One of these companies, Webber Homes Limited, sells houses as far away as Inuvik in the North West Territories.

We have two farm machinery manufacturing plants that sell their products all over the prairie region of Canada and into the northern prairie States.

I am pleased to say again that our provincial government has played an important part in the industrial development of our city. In 1974 alone there were nearly two million dollars in loans and grants to assist businesses and to help in the development of jobs for people in the Yorkton area.

Mr. Speaker, it is interesting to listen to the statements of the Hon. Members opposite who seem to be making the claim that they are the only ones with the ability to develop our economy. But let us compare the record of the present government with that of the previous Liberal administration.

In the last full year of the Liberal times, the city of Yorkton received only \$25,000 in grants from that government. In 1975 Yorkton will have received \$220,000 in grants which the city may use in whatever way it sees fit. We shall receive another \$1,007,000 over the next five years in capital

grants.

During the long years of Liberal rule we, in Yorkton, were often kept busy counting the businesses that were leaving town. During 1968 there was scarcely a building permit issued in Yorkton. To this time in 1975 there have been over 179 housing starts in Yorkton with a value of \$5,511,030 and total construction in the Yorkton area this year has reached a value of \$10,209,189. Next year Yorkton is to open a new subdivision of 800 city lots and that is an excellent growth record for a city with a population of 15,000.

To keep up with the expected growth of the next 25 years, Yorkton is forced to annex land in the surrounding rural municipalities. Thus, our city will develop a land bank that will eliminate the land speculator who is so often found operating near major eastern Canadian cities. As a result of the land bank principle, a city lot for a house in service sells for as low as \$1,500, while a similar lot sells for \$30,000 or more near Toronto.

It seems obvious that someone is out to make a fast buck. It seems obvious that the land speculators and many other types of speculators are on the loose in our land, and it is the avowed intention of the New Democratic Party to eliminate the gouging of the ordinary citizen that comes from such speculation.

**SOME HON. MEMBERS:** — Hear, hear!

**MR. NELSON:** — The decentralization of government activities is another move that has brought benefits to the Yorkton area. Not only has it brought people to our city, but it has also made it more convenient for the people of the eastern region of Saskatchewan in that they no longer need to go to Regina to contact many different offices of our government, and more decentralization is coming, bringing government to the people to serve them better.

Mr. Speaker, the Yorkton area has for many years been without adequate air service. Once again, the Blakeney government has come to our assistance. In co-operation with the Government of Manitoba, an air service is ready to go, taking in such points as Saskatoon, Yorkton, Dauphin, Brandon, and Winnipeg. The two provincial governments, Manitoba and Saskatchewan, have agreed to use two 19-seat Saunders airplanes produced at Gimli, Manitoba. The Manitoba Government Air Services Division has agreed to give up to \$250,000 per year for two years to cover any losses the service may incur in its initial stages.

Originally, the federal government agreed to co-operate too. They agreed to buy the two aircraft needed and to lease the plans back to SkyWest at a very nominal rate. Very commendable, and I must say, Mr. Speaker, that the people of the Yorkton area certainly appreciated the move. But comes a fly into the ointment, and that fly is the Hon. Otto Lang.

He has convinced his federal colleagues to withdraw the offer to purchase the Saunders aircraft, pending the outcome of the Canadian Transport Commission hearings on the interventions that have been launched against SkyWest by the private

airlines. Such an action by a federal Cabinet Minister can only lend credence to the claims of the private companies. I fear such action can only further delay the development of a dependable air service through our city.

A great deal of time, effort and money has been put into making this airline a valuable service for the whole Yorkton region, as well as the Saskatoon area. But Yorkton, Saskatoon, Dauphin and Brandon are waiting for these air services.

We, in Yorkton, Mr. Speaker, urge Mr. Lang to do everything in his power to find a quick solution to the problem. We urge him to help us to get our airline operational soon.

Mr. Speaker, we in the Yorkton area are very pleased to see the continued emphasis that has been given in the Throne Speech to the Land Bank and FarmStart. In our area farmers have made good use of both of these valuable programs. Thirteen Yorkton constituency farmers received assistance through FarmStart. A total of \$251,069 of capital funds were distributed in 1974 and another \$63,306 was given in grants.

Let us compare that with the performance of the late Liberal government. At each election Liberals make great promises of loan and grant programs. But between 1964 and 1971 not one Saskatchewan farmer received one dollar. That, Mr. Speaker, is what I call performance.

**SOME HON. MEMBERS:** — Hear, hear!

**MR. NELSON:** — In the Land Bank program a total of 3,461 acres of land has been leased to 12 farmers in the two municipalities adjacent to Yorkton. These farmers were able to get started in farming or were able to expand existing small farms and not one whom I know regrets taking the land. None one whom I know wishes to use his option to buy the land at the end of the five year period. They are all extremely satisfied, Mr. Speaker.

**SOME HON. MEMBERS:** Hear, hear!

**MR. NELSON:** — I was amazed last Tuesday to hear the Hon. Member for Saskatoon Eastview (Mr. Penner) decry the lack of something new for education in the Throne Speech. Our government is willing to make changes but only after continuing consultation with teachers and trustees. And let us look at just a few of the changes that have been made since the inflexible days of the previous government.

Gone is the pupil-teacher ratio as a means of determining school grants. By the noises made from the benches opposite one would think that Liberals would now be willing to put teachers in the classroom with no students and still pay them increased salaries. Teachers are willing after all, Mr. Speaker, to teach students, that is their job. No matter how low the number in the class, there would always be a pupil-teacher ratio. I don't say that everything in education is rosy. I just say there have been some impressive improvements.

The old pupil-teacher ratio didn't harm the teachers. They simply adjusted, adapted to the load and were able to do less for the students. It was the student who suffered and there

are still Hon. Member on the benches opposite who were a part of that government that so rigidly applied that old 25 to 1 ratio. As a result I had classes that ran as high as 45 students with an average enrolment of 35. And today I teach classes with enrolment as low as 16.

I was amazed, too, to hear the Hon. Member for Saskatoon Eastview worrying about the teachers' salary contract. Surely, Mr. Speaker, he remembers the days of the previous Liberal government when the salary increases were dictated by that government. True, Saskatchewan teachers' salaries have fallen behind those of our neighboring provinces. But it must be remembered that at the time it looked as if the teachers got a reasonable good overall package on that two year agreement, especially when you consider such things as the superannuation improvements. Who could have imagined the sudden explosion in the inflationary trend? Certainly no Member on the opposite side of the House was willing to make such dire predictions.

The Hon. Member for Saskatoon Eastview moaned about the budget reviews for school boards. Again he seems to be demanding freedom to spend more money while demanding that our government stick to the inflation guidelines. And does he not remember that it was a Liberal government that brought in the budget reviews and dictated to the school boards again the exact mill rate they could levy?

It is strange to listen to the cries of freedom from ones who were so ready to dictate in the past.

Turning to the inflation question, Mr. Speaker. It is the farmer, the worker and the people on fixed incomes who are suffering the most from the price explosion that is fast crippling our land. Let me give a couple of examples to show the extent of the problem we Canadians are facing.

Recently, a farmer brought me a repair part for one of his machines. One year ago that part cost him \$2.20. This year that same part cost him \$6.50. Almost a 300 per cent increase in one year, Mr. Speaker. That part had undoubtedly been made at the time the original machine was manufactured. Therefore, no blame for the increase can be laid at the door of the worker. It would certainly be foolish to claim that any Canadian worker ever got a 300 per cent increase in wages in one year, and the farmer certainly hasn't had any 300 per cent increase in his returns.

Let us take a look at the pricing of supplies for the technical wing of the Yorkton Regional High School. Prices have been rising so rapidly that the suppliers refuse to quote prices on things like lumber before the goods are shipped. The working people aren't guilty of causing those price increases either. Their wages don't go up from week to week.

If the Liberal government at Ottawa is serious in its attempts to control inflation, it will take some positive steps, and I have a few suggestions that I consider essential.

First of all, with the points I have presented and with the evidence that millions of people see throughout this land, it is obvious that the federal government must take some very powerful stands on price increases. They should consider the rollback of many of the exorbitant price increases that we

have already had. If the federal government is serious about protecting the people and yet maintaining employment, they would make use of the Central Mortgage and Housing Corporation to provide loans at six per cent for new houses and for repairs to older ones.

To avoid the inflationary pressures that would result if that alone were done, tax concessions to corporations should be ended immediately and a surtax should be placed on all profit or professional fee increases that exceed their guidelines.

Mr. Speaker, let me quote to you from the Financial Post of November 15, 1975. The editorial speaks of Pierre Juneau being hired for the Prime Minister's office and of the cost of running that office, and I quote:

The cost of running the Prime Minister's office in the fiscal year 1975-76 is estimated by the government at about \$2 million. This compares with slightly more than \$1 million in 1970-71. An indication of the extent to which salaries in the Prime Minister's office have obviously risen is apparent from the fact that the number of 'man years' (the number of people required to run the Prime Minister's office in a given year) estimated for 1975-76 is 91, only slightly more than the 85 in 1970-71. The expenditure for the Prime Minister's office doesn't count for much in the total government spending picture. But what better place to set an example for restraint could there be than the Prime Minister's own office?

If the federal Liberal government is serious about controlling inflation it will begin its policies of restraint at home. It will also see to it that it has a balanced budget as Saskatchewan has done every year since 1971. If Conservatives opposite are serious about their inflation control requests they will insist that the Conservative Government of Ontario has a balanced budget this year and not run a nearly \$1 billion deficit as it did last year — \$1 billion as a deficit, Mr. Speaker, almost as much as the entire Saskatchewan provincial budget. If Conservatives do not call for a balanced budget in Ontario they leave themselves open to charges of hypocrisy. It is true that governments must practise restraint.

There is the conclusion that we can draw when we look at inflation. That is, that the main and basic cause of our problem is corporate greed, corporate irresponsibility in its excessive profit increases. Mr. Speaker, it is not the farmers' marketing boards that must be attacked and destroyed and we hear them being attacked constantly by the Anti-Inflation Board Chairman and co-chairman. It is not the working people of this land who must be attacked and described as villains. It is the corporations, national and multinational, with their vicious appetites for ever more profits that must be controlled.

Mr. Speaker, it is my contention that unless these corporate grants are controlled we shall soon see a depression that will make the 1930s look like a picnic.

It is with this view in mind that I now turn to the potash industry in Saskatchewan. Here are companies that took it upon



themselves to defy the laws of this province by refusing to pay their taxes and by refusing to show their account books. Just imagine what would happen to you and me, Mr. Speaker, if we decided to refuse to pay our federal income tax, or if we refused to open our books to the federal Income Tax Inspector. No ordinary citizen can expect to flout the laws of this land. No ordinary citizen can expect to flout the laws of this land. No corporation should expect to do so either.

**SOME HON. MEMBERS:** — Hear, hear!

**MR. NELSON:** — But perhaps the simplest and most compelling reason for entering the potash industry is that the present state of affairs cannot be allowed to continue. We really have no choice.

How did the present situation arise? In 1969 the potash industry was sick. At the request of the producers the Liberal Government of Saskatchewan instituted the prorationing program — a system of production quotas and guaranteed prices. Because of prorationing, the industry survived and recovered. According to the Attorney General at the time, who is now a judge of the Federal Court of Canada, prorationing had been cleared with Ottawa and they had been given the go-ahead. At any rate there was no action by the companies or the federal government to challenge the prorationing in the courts.

That was 1969. In 1971, the government changed, fortunately for us and Saskatchewan. In 1974 the same federal Liberal government that allegedly ‘cleared’ the prorationing went to court with the potash companies to have programs declared unconstitutional and force the NDP Government of Saskatchewan to withdraw it. Within months of this federal intervention on the side of the potash companies, another lawsuit was started, this time to have courts throw out the potash reserves tax. Several of the potash companies took it upon themselves to refuse to pay their taxes. They refused to do what every resident taxpayer of this province has to do — to obey the law and pay their taxes. Then they attempted to have the courts rule that their taxes would be refunded if the lawsuit succeeded.

In short, with the industry booming, the last few years have seen one attempt after another by the potash companies to avoid paying taxes, to keep the rising profits for themselves and contribute the lowest minimum possible to the benefit of the people of this province.

Some of these court cases are in the process of appeal, that process could drag on for three or four years. In the meantime, we will be marking time. Our potash industry won’t be expanding. There will be a long period of uncertainty while our rights, the right of the people of Saskatchewan, to regulate and tax private potash companies is established in the courts to the satisfaction of the producers.

This is an intolerable situation. Here we have the citizens of Saskatchewan, owners of the potash, being told by a handful of corporations that we have no claim to the benefits of our own resources. Not only do these corporations withhold their taxes, they challenge the very right of the province to pass a law to collect them. Your government believes the people of Saskatchewan do not approve of this corporate behaviour.

**SOME HON. MEMBERS:** — Hear, hear!

**MR. NELSON:** — People are tired of being told that outside developers are doing them a favour by coming here to develop our own potash. People are looking for leadership and I say we have found it. They are looking for someone who will stand up to these international bully-boys and let them know what Saskatchewan is not a banana republic.

**SOME HON. MEMBERS:** — Hear, hear!

**MR. NELSON:** — We know the resource is valuable. We know that it is desperately needed around the world, and we think the potash companies are going too far when they seek to keep the benefits for themselves.

Our province resource revenues are threatened, not only by corporate control, but also by the actions of the Liberal Government of Ottawa. Recent tax changes instituted by Ottawa are taking a heavy toll on the future potential of our potash industry. Ottawa will no longer allow royalties paid to the province to be deducted in calculating the companies' income tax. The companies are forced to pay income tax on their royalties as if the royalties had never been turned over to the province. It amounts, Mr. Speaker, to double taxation, with the clear intention of forcing us to cut our royalties.

Our government is not prepared to give us this clear constitutional right of the province, on behalf of the citizens, to tax resource industries. We have made this plan to both the Ottawa government and to the companies. The potash corporations have seized on the opening give by the Ottawa tax changes to hold up expansion of the Saskatchewan potash mines. They say our taxes are excessive, when in truth, it is the federal tax that is at the root of the matter. Ottawa and the companies have ganged up on us, and the result is stagnation of an industry whose growth is vital to future prosperity of Saskatchewan.

Saskatchewan cannot afford stagnation in potash. New markets are opening in the hungry nations of the world, markets in which Saskatchewan potash could be sold. We must keep pace with the need for our product or other producers will capture the markets and our great potential will remain just that — potential and not actual expansion and development.

Court battles, Mr. Speaker, have a way of dragging on and on, at great expense. No government could afford to leave a major part of its resource revenues in jeopardy for years at a time, not matter how small the size. Nor can this Saskatchewan government allow development plans for our potash resources to gather dust on the shelves of the corporate boardrooms, while we sit out a battle. We have no choice but to take action to protect the legitimate interests of our citizens of Saskatchewan.

The simplest means of guaranteeing the benefits of a resource for its owners is for the owners to develop it themselves. If we take effective control through ownership we automatically secure the benefits of development. That is what we propose to do.

For these reasons, among many others, Mr. Speaker, I and

my constituency firmly support the Speech from the Throne.

**SOME HON. MEMBERS:** — Hear, hear!

**MR. R. E. NELSON (Assiniboia-Gravelbourg):** — Mr. Speaker, in rising for the first time to speak in the Saskatchewan Legislature, I should first like to congratulate you to your appointment as Speaker of this Assembly. I should also like to congratulate each and every MLA on their election to the Legislature on June 11.

I represent the Assiniboia-Gravelbourg constituency and I will do my utmost to give good representation to the people of that area. Our constituency is one of the larges in our province in both area and in population. We are a rural area but have many active, progressive towns, villages and hamlets within our borders. Farming and ranching is our greatest industry and certainly anything that affects the economy of the lives of these people, affect the lives of all the people in our constituency.

I was somewhat surprised to hear the mover and seconder of the Throne Speech refer to the buoyant economy of our province and both trying to give credit to this Saskatchewan government. I think they were laying it on just a little.

**SOME HON. MEMBERS:** — Hear, hear!

**MR. NELSON:** — And it is not too difficult to understand that the Member for Melfort (Mr. Vickar) has in his vicinity fertile topsoil 16 inches deep.

They know, and all the citizens of this province know that this situation is related directly to the high return to the agricultural industry because of the high price of grain on the world market.

Certainly as well, our economy is good because of the high taxes and royalties paid by the potash and the oil companies of our province.

I should at this time like to thank the people of Assiniboia-Gravelbourg constituency for placing their confidence in me and electing me their representative on June 11. I should also like to thank my very active organization and all who worked on my behalf.

Mr. Speaker, I must confess I did have some assistance from some of the Members opposite. Certainly the Minister in charge of the proposed grassland park in my constituency did not hinder my cause when he stated to the press last spring that I and my member of parliament could not hold meetings to do with the park because he would not tolerate them. I can assure the former Minister he had little choice but to tolerate them, because for the first time the people directly involved in that area got some information as to the prospect of their future. There was no intention of any interference with anyone, nor was there any. What the Minister of that day was trying to cover up I do not know, but many of the things that he was out doing became apparent. The people of this area are not getting any answers

from this government. The Minister did nothing to inform them of their rights or how they may approach the future park hearings. The people in the proposed grassland park are very concerned with the lack of information coming from the provincial department. They held a meeting recently without the clearance of the non-toleration order by the Minister. Mr. Goodale, Member of Parliament for the area, Mr. Anderson, my colleague from Shaunavon constituency and myself were all present and we answered as many of their questions as we were able. I assure the former Minister these people are not happy with the lack of assistance coming from the department. It may look wise to him and to the Members opposite to try to keep the people in the dark, to rush hearings on the park without giving proper information to the people involved and then establish a huge park, disrupting and displacing citizens of our province.

We must keep all the people fully informed on this situation.

**SOME HON. MEMBERS:** — Hear, hear!

**MR. NELSON:** — My concern, Mr. Speaker, is to protect the legitimate and long-standing interests of these people who make their homes and earn their living in the area affected. If this park is to be developed in our district it must be done with the least possible disruption and with fair compensation for any disruption caused.

Mr. Speaker, the Government of Saskatchewan is putting politics ahead of people.

**SOME HON. MEMBERS:** — Hear, hear!

**MR. NELSON:** —The former Minister of Tourism and Renewable Resources proved this with his shabby treatment of this entire situation and his statements of those attempting to assist. I hope we that live in the area and understand the problems can look forward to working with the Department of Tourism.

Certainly another Minister who assisted my campaign was the former Minister of Education. No person has ever done more to hinder education in the province of Saskatchewan than this man.

**SOME HON. MEMBERS:** — Hear, hear!

**MR. NELSON:** — The most unfair and unreasonable legislation put on the statute books of Saskatchewan was put n under the guidance of the Hon. Member for Last Mountain-Touchwood (Mr. MacMurphy).

In the NDP's 1971 New Deal for People pamphlet, page 11, promise number three reads:

The New Democratic government will enable new legislation to replace The Teacher's Salary agreement Act, which will permit free collective bargaining and remove political interference from the bargaining process.

The people of the province were certainly hoodwinked by the Minister on this one.

The Minister's decision to include complete participation by the government in the bargaining process infringed on the rights of very individual in this province. The rights of parents and ratepayers to make their own decisions through their elected trustees is now a thing of the past in Saskatchewan.

While the Minister tried to tell us things were calm on the negotiating front, this is not the case and it has not been the case. Neither teachers nor trustees are happy with their situation. Local negotiations over this province have been far too slow and have not been a successful venture under the new Act.

Mr. Speaker, government and politicians have no place at the bargaining table with teachers and trustees and I would urge the new Minister to reassess this situation and to remove the government interference from the process of negotiating under The Teacher Collective Bargaining Act. The former Minister of Education made it abundantly clear he cares little for the rights of the individual and he too places politics over people.

**SOME HON. MEMBERS:** — Hear, hear!

**MR. NELSON:** — Mr. Speaker, I should like to congratulate the Minister of Agriculture on his appointment to the Cabinet. I'm sure it came as a surprise to many on that side of the House when the former Minister was removed from that office. I can assure you that it was no surprise to most of us in the rural area. It was well known the mess the Land Bank was in. We all knew well of the political manoeuvring that had been carried on. We knew well of the many young farmers who had been pushed aside in favour of the NDP political hacks.

**SOME HON. MEMBERS:** — Hear, hear!

**MR. NELSON:** — I do however, have many reservations on this. The present Minister of Agriculture (Mr. Kaeding) has already proven he will not listen to the decision of the people of Saskatchewan who voted last June 11. He has decided he can rule without considering the wishes of the people. He has decided to add more of his political friends to the government payroll and to add more burden to the taxpayers of this province.

On August 15, 1975, the Minister of Agriculture sent a letter from his office that is a disgrace to the democratic system of our province. Mr. Speaker, I should like to read you that letter:

To all government MLAs in Saskatchewan south of Yellowhead Highway and Terry Hanson, Fillmore; Hayden Owens, Eston; Allan Oliver, Aneroid; Allan Engel, Woodrow. It is my intention to appoint an additional person to the Farm Ownership Board in the near future, preferably from southern Saskatchewan. The Farm

Ownership Board administers Saskatchewan Farm Ownership Act, 1975, and deals with applications to purchase, lease, and otherwise acquire land by persons who may be affected by the legislature.

Normally, the board will meet twelve times a year. I would appreciate your recommendations for this appointment before August 31.

And it is signed Edgar Kaeding, Minister of Agriculture.

Mr. Speaker, I will table this in the Legislature for anyone who may wish to see it.

As everyone knows the letter is addressed to all government MLAs as well as four defeated candidates from Weyburn, Kindersley, Shaunavon, and Assiniboia-Gravelbourg constituencies.

These people were rejected by the people of this province on June 11. Mr. Speaker, I should explain I did receive this in my name in the mail. I would guess that the Member for Yorkton did not receive his copy.

**SOME HON. MEMBERS:** Hear, hear!

**MR. NELSON:** —The new member appointed to the Saskatchewan Farm Ownership Board, as of September 9, 1975, turns out to be another defeated NDP candidate, and who no doubt recommended himself, Mr. Terry Hansen of Fillmore.

Again this is proof another Minister of this government is putting politics ahead of people.

**SOME HON. MEMBERS:** — Hear, hear!

**MR. NELSON:** — I should like to speak for a few moments on a subject and issue pertaining to the people in my constituency, as well as a very important item to all Saskatchewan citizens. As you are well aware the Saskatchewan Power Corporation is building a power station near Coronach in the southeast corner of the Assiniboia-Gravelbourg constituency. I am pleased to see this plant is being developed in our area. I am, however, not at all happy with the actions the government has taken in dealing with the people of the area.

The rural municipalities involved have gone out of their way to co-operate with the government and their officials, but in return they have not been receiving co-operation. The Government of Saskatchewan and the Saskatchewan Power Corporation have mistreated and ignored local governments far too often.

**SOME HON. MEMBERS:** Hear, hear!

**MR. NELSON:** —The people of Coronach area were very excited and pleased when they heard of the intentions of SPC to build a power plant on the Poplar River. That mood has definitely changed and I will explain to you why this has happened.

The power plant, the coal fields to supply the energy, the

transportation right of way, the dam and reservoir for the water to cool the generators take a considerable area of land. This land is made up of pastures for farmers who were able to raise cattle, of fertile fields where farmers raise some of the world's finest and highest protein grain. This land is also made up of farmsteads with barns, grain bins, gardens, lovely trees, flowers and even orchards. There are many lovely homes in the area and in these homes are young people who may not be able to farm because of this. But let me make it abundantly clear. I have spoken to many of these people being disrupted and they are willing to give full co-operation to the project and to SPC and they have not received such co-operation in return from this government.

The official announcement to proceed with the power river project was made February 4, 1975. On February 5, the landowners of the area met with SPC officials for the first time. They had further meetings with the officials on February 26, April 7, at which time the Minister in charge was at the meeting, then on April 10, April 17, April 23, and May 1. Then there was an election and they were not able to meet until October 17.

To explain further, Mr. Speaker, the tenders for the project closed on May 13, 1975. The tender was not awarded until after the election, July 12, 1975, a delay of 59 days. The contractor at that time was told to stay off private land, but he could use the roadways. On the 17th of July, 1975, the Saskatchewan Power Corporation issued papers to expropriate a farmer's land and on July 18 the contractor was first able to proceed with the work. He then had to move his heavy equipment in and to set up camp.

Mr. Speaker, to date the Government of Saskatchewan or SPC have not purchased one acre of land in the area. They have taken access to some by legal force. They have not attempted to treat the landowners in a fair way. They have given a poor relationship and public image in the area. They have cost the citizens of this province millions of dollars in revenue that will be lost because of the late opening of the power plant. This plan was scheduled to open in late 1978 and this will not happen. It will be late 1980 and possibly 1981.

The bungling and political manoeuvring of the former Minister of SPC and his directors have caused this delay. The proposal offered to SPC by the landowners could have and should have been accepted. It was more than reasonable. Anyone with any business sense at all would have gladly accepted it.

I want to make it clear the Minister presently in charge of SPC as well as the Hon. Member for Moose Jaw South share the blame as they were both directors of SPC.

**SOME HON. MEMBERS:** — Hear, hear!

**MR. NELSON:** — They must answer to the people of this province for the money they lose because of arrogance and political games.

The value of the land in the area as well as in all Saskatchewan has risen substantially since the first offer they were given. The final settlements will be much higher.

With the June election two months, two months were wasted because expropriation would have been unpopular. The awarding of the tender also waited until after the election. The delay caused hardship and money for those accepted the tender as well. The contractors were told necessary gravel supplies were in the area. Without access to the land they were not able to find out that no such supplies were there. They are now called on to find new supplies outside the vicinity. The entire project is well behind schedule. The delays have held the construction back so that the intended water supply to be held back this fall must be released.

While negotiations are dragging, private land is being flooded. Farmers are told to move fences only to find their land and fences under water. Farmers are forced to sell their cattle because fences have been torn down. These people are citizens of Saskatchewan and should be treated as such. They want fair negotiations and not expropriation.

**SOME HON. MEMBERS:** — Hear, hear!

**MR. NELSON:** —We need their co-operation for years to come to make this project successful. The forced agreement will not get this co-operation.

I believe it is time the Minister in charge of Saskatchewan Power Corporation started treating citizens and individuals as people. It is time the Minister took a little interest in the corporation of which he is chairman.

**SOME HON. MEMBERS:** — Hear, hear!

**MR. NELSON:** —Just a few months ago the Minister dismissed two senior employees for not immediately reporting a mistake of another employee. Mr. Speaker, I want to say that the Minister and present chairman was vice-chairman of the Board of Directors for the Saskatchewan Power Corporation in 1974. During 1974 until August 1st, 1975, while the Board held meetings on 32 different days he did not have the interest to attend one single meeting.

**SOME HON. MEMBERS:** — Hear, hear!

**MR. NELSON:** —Not one meeting. For the Minister now in charge of the Saskatchewan Power Corporation, that record is a disgrace.

**SOME HON. MEMBERS:** — Hear, hear!

**MR. NELSON:** —I think that it is time that a serious look be taken at having Opposition Members represented on the Board of Directors at SPC.

**SOME HON. MEMBERS:** — Hear, hear!

**MR. NELSON:** —If this were done it would safeguard against many of the political decisions that have been made. It would protect the citizens of Saskatchewan from losing large sums of money as has been done over the last year. When increases are



necessary they would be made. Coverups as we have seen in 1975 would not have waited until after the election. This would not happen.

Mr. Speaker, I support the amendment and not the sub-amendment of the motion.

**SOME HON. MEMBERS:** — Hear, hear!

**HON. J.R. MESSER (Minister of Industry & Commerce):** — Mr. Speaker, my . . .

**MR. STEUART:** — Tell us about the Land Bank.

**MR. MESSER:** — Yes, I will be telling you about the Land Bank, Mr. Member for Prince Albert-Duck Lake.

Mr. Speaker, my first words must be to congratulate you to your new position as Speaker of this House. I know that your actions will undertake to make this Assembly more democratic and more responsible.

Mr. Speaker, it is with some considerable pride that I congratulate the mover of the Throne Speech, the Member for Quill Lakes (Mr. Koskie) and the seconder of the Throne Speech, the Member for Melfort (Mr. Vickar), both I think, indicating to all Members of this Assembly the very competent leadership as MLA for their respective constituencies.

**SOME HON. MEMBERS:** — Hear, hear!

**MR. MESSER:** — I also welcome the newly elected Members on both sides of this Assembly to the Assembly and ask that they endeavor to represent their constituencies and the province well.

Mr. Speaker, it is with confidence that I take part in this Throne Speech. Not necessarily individual confidence, although, that is there, but confidence as a Member of this government. Confidence, because of the responsive policies and action of this government in its first four years of office, 1971-1975.

**SOME HON. MEMBERS:** — Hear, hear!

**MR. MESSER:** — Confidence, Mr. Speaker, because I know we will continue to be responsive in responding to the problems of the people of Saskatchewan and the concerns that they bring to our attention. Confidence, Mr. Speaker, knowing that the people of Saskatchewan support this New Democratic government.

**SOME HON. MEMBERS:** — Hear, hear!

**MR. MESSER:** — Mr. Speaker, I want, in that confidence, to relate and make comment on some of the replies to the Throne Speech, some of the statements that have been made by the Opposition Members.

In particular I might mention the Leader of the Opposition for Prince Albert-Duck Lake (Mr. Steuart), to a lesser degree the Member for Nipawin, the Leader of the Conservative Party (Mr. Collver), who is not now in his seat. Mr. Speaker, with all due regard to the Member for Nipawin in his absence, I appreciate to some extent the feeling he has to written speeches and I want to convey to him or at least to the records of this House, Mr. Speaker, that I shall follow my usual practice of using some extensive notes.

**SOME HON. MEMBERS:** — Hear, hear!

**MR. MESSER:** — Mr. Speaker, commenting first on some of the remarks that were made by the Member for Nipawin, in both his Victorian address of yesterday and the address of this afternoon, I felt and I believe that a good many Members of the Legislative Assembly felt likewise that there were a number of questionable and suspect remarks contained therein.

First, Mr. Speaker, the Member for Nipawin in his initial remarks, in his maiden speech in this Legislative Assembly, undertook to convince not only the Members of this Assembly but I suspect the press and the general public that the government, the Members to your right, and the official Opposition, the Members to your left have undertaken to intimidate those seven new Conservative Members. He made a statement and I quote it:

New boys should not be entitled to speak out.

His initial remarks in his maiden speech, Mr. Speaker, that doesn't make sense. Intimidate, how? He hadn't had the opportunity to address this Legislative Assembly yet. Yet on his opening remarks he tries to convey an image within this Legislative Assembly that we are trying to muzzle or intimidate him.

**SOME HON. MEMBERS:** Hear, hear!

**MR. MESSER:** — Mr. Speaker, I know that those who have been Members of this Assembly before, know that we extend the rules of the Legislative Assembly as far as possible in giving leeway to those Members who are new and are undertaking their maiden speeches.

**SOME HON. MEMBERS:** — Hear, hear!

**MR. MESSER:** — It has always been the practice of the Legislative Assembly, Mr. Speaker, I can't speak for, nor do I want to speak for, the official Opposition, but I believe I can speak for the government. We have not in the past, nor do we now, nor will we in the future, endeavor to muzzle or intimidate any Member of this Legislative Assembly.

**SOME HON. MEMBERS:** Hear, hear!

**MR. MESSER:** — In fact, Mr. Speaker, from the remarks of the Leader of the Conservative Party, one has to assume that he is in a roundabout way challenging the Speaker of the Chair of this

Assembly by saying that you in that position would allow either the government or the Leader of the Opposition of this Legislative Assembly to intimidate those Members. That is shameful, Mr. Speaker. I thought about this for a moment after listening to his remarks yesterday afternoon. I thought there must be some reason for him to undertake to present this false image of what happens in this Legislative Assembly. The reason, Mr. Speaker, is a deliberate attempt to misinterpret the conduct of this Legislative Assembly. A deliberate attempt so that he can go to that press that he says he does not want to command attention from, so he can go to the people of Saskatchewan to tell them that this government and the official Opposition is trying to muzzle and intimidate him.

**SOME HON. MEMBERS:** — Hear, hear!

**MR. MESSER:** — That is shameful, Mr. Speaker, because he is doing it for one reason only and that reason is publicity for cheap partisan politics.

**SOME HON. MEMBERS:** Hear, hear!

**MR. MESSER:** —It is shameful, Mr. Speaker, and it is a disgrace, a disgrace to the Members of this Legislative Assembly. Mr. Speaker, I am sorry he is not in his chair because I wanted to . . . I see he is coming back. Well, Mr. Speaker, I see the Member for Nipawin is back. I have a few moments to address to him.

**MR. STEUART:** — Say it all again.

**MR. MESSER:** —The Leader of the Opposition makes a good point, but I have yet more new material to come. Mr. Speaker, the Member for Nipawin also, and I can't quote him exactly although I took down the notes when he made the statement yesterday, in relating to the address of the Premier, said, and I quote:

The Premier appeared to be all things to all people.

He went on to say:

Lawyer, politician, accountant, economist, lumberman, sawmill operator, uranium expert, miner.

He mentioned a few others, I couldn't keep up with him. Insinuating that there is something wrong when the Premier tries to address himself to the problems and the concerns of those people whom he represents as Premier of the Province of Saskatchewan.

**SOME HON. MEMBERS:** — Hear, hear!

**MR. MESSER:** — Mr. Speaker, I want to tell the Member for Nipawin that this party represents all of the people of Saskatchewan.

**SOME HON. MEMBERS:** — Hear, hear!

**MR. MESSER:** —We are proud to have him as Premier. We are proud to

have an individual who can related to those people, those groups, those minority groups of people and represent them well in this Legislative Assembly.

**SOME HON. MEMBERS:** — Hear, hear!

**MR. MESSER:** — My recommendation to the Member for Nipawin and his six cohorts is that he had better learn that he is here to represent all people in Saskatchewan and not just a vested interest.

**SOME HON. MEMBERS:** — Hear, hear!

**MR. MESSER:** — Now, Mr. Speaker, I was going to go on and make some comments with regard to his statements re the constituency and highways and how we should play politics in regard to the highway program and Members' remuneration. But I am going to refrain from that.

**AN HON. MEMBER:** — Ah, come on, do it

**MR. MESSER:** — No, I am going to refrain from that. There will no doubt be better opportunities. But I do want to close in saying at least in regard to his remarks of yesterday afternoon that this Assembly is no longer an 18th Century debating club as it may have been when the last Conservative government left Saskatchewan.

**SOME HON. MEMBERS:** — Hear, hear!

**MR. MESSER:** — This Assembly is made up of some pretty important people, not necessarily as individuals, but because they represent constituencies in this province where people have put all their trust and faith and support in order to serve them.

**SOME HON. MEMBERS:** Hear, hear!

**MR. MESSER:** —These Member are here to express their views and they are here to talk about their constituency too, Mr. Member for Nipawin.

**SOME HON. MEMBERS:** Hear, hear!

**MR. MESSER:** — I take it that I am also going to have to now speak for Nipawin as well as Kelsey-Tisdale, seeing it is a neighbor.

**SOME HON. MEMBERS:** Hear, hear!

**MR. MESSER:** —They are here to convey the concerns of those people whom they represent. They are here to try and work out solutions, they are here to talk about their party policy, yes, they are here to express some principles that they feel very strongly about. And, yes, Mr. Speaker, even on occasion they will talk about philosophy and ideology.

**SOME HON. MEMBERS:** Hear, hear!

**MR. MESSER:** —But there is nothing wrong with that and I don't think the people of Saskatchewan think there is anything wrong with it either. They are also here to pass legislation. They are here to develop and to talk about programs. To debate policy. And, Mr. Speaker, to make laws, to make important laws. When you have this situation and the importance of the job, there is going to be some polarization of views, at least diverging opinions. The Members are subject to a considerable amount of pressure, certainly emotional and they have some strong feelings about the debates that are taking place. And, yes, to the Member for Nipawin, there are on occasion cat-calls, the odd Member who subjects himself to chewing gum in order to relieve his tensions, but Mr. Speaker, it is not legitimate for this Member to take a sanctimonious attitude that he can remove himself, excommunicate himself from all of these pressures and responsibilities of Members of the Legislative Assembly.

**SOME HON. MEMBERS:** — Hear, hear!

**MR. MESSER:** — Either that Member, Mr. Speaker, and his colleagues don't know what it is all about or why they are here, or they don't care.

**SOME HON. MEMBERS:** Hear, hear!

**MR. MESSER:** — And if it is for those reasons, Mr. Speaker, they don't deserve to be here and I suggest to you they won't be here for long.

**SOME HON. MEMBERS:** Hear, hear!

**MR. MESSER:** — Mr. Speaker, the Leader of the Opposition in his remarks several days ago undertook to insinuate that my new Cabinet duties represent something of a step downward. Well, let me inform the Hon. Member for Prince Albert-Duck Lake and also the Member for Assiniboia-Gravelbourg (Mr. Nelson) that this government's record in agriculture is one of which I, as Minister of that department, in our first four years of office, am extremely proud.

**SOME HON. MEMBERS:** Hear, hear!

**MR. MESSER:** — Mr. Speaker, I represent a rural riding and I would challenge any of the Member opposite to oppose me in any election in Kelsey-Tisdale on my record as Minister of Agriculture.

**SOME HON. MEMBERS:** Hear, hear!

**MR. MESSER:** — They lost, Mr. Speaker. We took the Conservative member's deposit and came within a hundred or so votes of taking the Liberal member's deposit.

**SOME HON. MEMBERS:** Hear, hear!

**MR. MESSER:** — The Liberal Members had a lot to say about the Land Bank, especially in the election just passed. They even referred to it again in the debate early this week. I challenge again, any Member of the Opposition to oppose me on that single issue in an election in my constituency or any other constituency in the province.

**SOME HON. MEMBERS:** Hear, hear!

**MR. MESSER:** — Mr. Speaker, the Member . . .

**AN HON. MEMBER:** — They are all related to you.

**MR. MESSER:** — Well, I have got something going for me anyway.

The Member for Prince Albert-Duck Lake and also the Member for Assiniboia-Gravelbourg (Mr. Nelson) who just took his seat suggested in their contribution to this debate, meagre that it was, Mr. Speaker, that they hoped the Liberal opposition to the Land Bank had resulted in this government introducing amendments to the Land Bank which guarantee a purchase option.

**SOME HON. MEMBERS:** — Hear, hear!

**MR. MESSER:** — Mr. Speaker, let me assure the Leader of the Opposition that there will be no amendment to the purchase option clause in The Land Bank Act.

**SOME HON. MEMBERS:** Hear, hear!

**MR. MESSER:** — The purchase option is guaranteed under the present circumstances and it will remain unchanged.

Mr. Speaker, I have alluded to the fact that this government's record in my constituency is well received by the voting public there. This government's record of achievement in Kelsey-Tisdale is an exciting one.

Mr. Speaker, in high construction, where it took a Liberal government seven long years to build 8 miles of paved highway west of Hudson Bay and 12 miles of paved highway south of Hudson Bay, the New Democratic government has completed the highway roadbed from 8 miles west of Hudson Bay through to Mistatim, a distance of 50 miles and paved 17 miles of it. Mr. Speaker, while the Liberal government was in power it seemed they hadn't heard of any place other than Hudson Bay in my constituency and at the speed that they built roads and the kind of recognition they gave that community, they wished they hadn't heard of the Liberal government.

Under the present New Democratic government we've taken steps to upgrade highways in the constituency, we have a very happy record as far as providing quality highway service for that constituency and that portion of Saskatchewan.

Industrial development too, has forged ahead in Kelsey-Tisdale. In recent years the effects of the NDP government policy to revitalize rural Saskatchewan has had a major impact

on the communities that I represent. In Tisdale, Fibre-Form Industries is almost ready to begin production from a \$1.2 million facility to manufacture products from northeastern Saskatchewan peat. Decentralization of government services has resulted in the construction of a new provincial office building that was opened in Tisdale on October 29th of this year. Lohr Industries has been in production in Tisdale for something over six months providing secure jobs for handicapped people in the Tisdale area. The Alfalfa Dehydrating Industry has expanded considerably in northeastern Saskatchewan. In my constituency alone, two new plants have been added, and a plan at Porcupine Plan is in its second year of production and a plant at Hudson Bay is about to begin production shortly.

Mr. Speaker, the town of Hudson Bay has benefited greatly from the careful planning launched in the Saskatchewan forest industry and carried out by the Saskatchewan Forest Products Corporation. The new plywood plant at Hudson Bay adds a new mill to the forest operation in that community with capital worth in excess of \$6 million, and provides 200 additional jobs to that community alone.

**SOME HON. MEMBERS:** Hear, hear!

**MR. MESSER:** — Now, Mr. Speaker, community services have expanded in that constituency, both as a result of direct government action and as a result of the optimism for the future which the residents of those communities have under this government.

Under the present New Democratic government, natural gas has been extended to communities such as Archerwill, Bjorkdale, Chelan and yes, even Hudson Bay. It is interesting to note that under the Liberals, the town of Hudson Bay was told on many occasions to forget about natural gas service in this community because you are too far away from any existing line.

An ambitious program of street paving was undertaken in all of the communities within the constituency to give them dust-free services for those small urban areas.

Individuals, Mr. Speaker, have undertaken business ventures with an optimistic view of the future, such as Can Fab Poly Products in Hudson Bay, which manufactures polyethylene products, such as tarps, ski-doo covers and temporary garage and warehouse structures. In Tisdale, we have a company manufacturing trailers. Nowhere, Mr. Speaker, is the evidence of the confidence in the future instilled by the program and policies of this government more obvious than in the constituency which I represent, Kelsey-Tisdale.

**SOME HON. MEMBERS:** — Hear, hear!

**MR. MESSER:** — Mr. Speaker, the Leader of the Opposition (Mr. Steuart) has made charges that this government's forest management policies are depleting those resources in northeastern Saskatchewan. Let me say, that timber is being cut over a much wider area than before, with controlled maximums being taken from each zone within those areas. Our forest management practices have resulted in timber being harvested farther north than the previous government even knew was still part of Saskatchewan.

The Leader of the Opposition also made charges that we have not increased the efficiency and the use of that forest product. I should like him to look over the operations between the Sask. Forest Products Plywood Plant and the Simpson Timber mill at Hudson Bay. Spruce is being utilized to make plywood veneer, with the centre core being shuttled over to Simpson's to be produced into 2 x 4s. Contrast this with the previous situation where larger areas were being utilized with considerable waste.

Let me make note also, Mr. Speaker, of the rather close working relationship between Simpson Timber in the private sector and the Sask. Forest Products Plywood Plant in the Crown corporation public ownership sector. We hear no complaints from the private sector about not being able to function in harmony with the publicly owned Sask. Forest Products Plywood Plant.

Mr. Speaker, the Member for Prince Albert-Duck Lake (Mr. Steuart) has also harkened back to his old pet project, the Doré Lake Pulp Mill. Let me remind the Hon. Member, that he has twice gone to the polls supporting that particular deal and in case he hasn't noticed, he has twice been asked to occupy the benches to the left, Mr. Speaker. The Dore Lake Pulp Mill was a poor business deal. We can thank the New Democratic Party and government headed by Allan Blakeney for getting Saskatchewan out of that deal that was no good for them.

**SOME HON. MEMBERS:** — Hear, hear!

**MR. MESSER:** — Mr. Speaker, the Hon. Member also made reference to lost jobs. We haven't lost jobs in the forest industry in this province. Far from it. New saw mills at Green lake, Big River, Carrot River and the wood treatment plant at Prince Albert have added new jobs to that industry. The Saskatchewan Forest Products Corporation has added over 1,000 jobs to the forest industry since 1971.

**SOME HON. MEMBERS:** — Hear, hear!

**MR. MESSER:** — Mr. Speaker, I challenge any of the Members opposite in this House to go to the polls a third time on the basis of New Democratic Party policy in the forest industry.

Mr. Speaker, in the Speech from the Throne the government laid the direction and course of action for Saskatchewan in the coming years. I should like to expand on the points mentioned and in particular, stress the objectives and new approach that the Department of Industry and Commerce and the Saskatchewan Economic Development Corporation have in mind for their operations.

We all realize that Saskatchewan's economy has been in a state of booming success in the past few years. In fact, Mr. Speaker, you might say it started in June of 1971, the year that ended the Liberal years of borderline depression; the Liberal years of declining population; the Liberal years of lack of opportunities and incentives for business; the Liberal years of suffering farm economy, and the years of near standstill production in the industrial sector of our economy.



Mr. Speaker, the past four years are a clear contrast to the Liberal years. They have been good years, they have been NDP years.

**SOME HON. MEMBERS:** — Hear, hear!

**MR. MESSER:** — We now have one of the lowest unemployment rates in the nation. Our population has stabilized and is now on the increase. As of July 1 this year the population stood at a total of 920,000, an increase of over 5,000 from 1974. This is a drastic change from the pattern of emigration that we were used to in the 1960s. Nowhere in Canada has a record of this level of economic buoyancy been established in such a short period of time.

One may ask — why the change? One of the major reasons is that we have learned how to diversify the agricultural base of our economy. Once this was started, the picture of the province changed. It is still changing. In 1974, the value of non-agricultural goods equalled the value of agricultural output. This happened at a time when the agricultural population and prices for agricultural commodities both rose dramatically. The value of manufactured goods shipped has continued to rise at an average annual rate in excess of 20 per cent. Whereas, prior to the 1970s less than 100 manufacturing jobs were created each year. We now are over 1,000 jobs added annually. The labor force increase totals in the neighborhood of 5,000 per year.

All of these factors are indicative of the relative prosperity of this province. We can be proud of the fact that we are situated in one of the best places to live in this country. Saskatchewan may well have been, at one time, 'poor little Saskatchewan', but that is far from an accurate description today. We no longer have a declining population. We no longer have to look elsewhere for jobs. We no longer have a lack of opportunity for expanding our provincial economy. We have acquired the knowledge and the confidence necessary to embark on major programs of diversification.

Over the past few years, we have tried to prove, with the help of the people in the Department of Industry and Commerce, the compatibility of the basic interests of Saskatchewan's business community and the provincial government. Unfortunately there are still people who cannot seem to accept the fact that we are not anti-business, as evidenced by the statements of certain groups of people who do not have the best interests of the province, or the people who inhabit it, in mind.

It is difficult to convince some people of the truth, even if we carefully show them the evidence. And we realize that this will always be the case with some elements of our society, particularly, Mr. Speaker, when they are falsely motivated by narrow political philosophy like that of the Member to your left.

Mr. Speaker, the point is that we do have a Department of Industry and Commerce, and we do have a Saskatchewan Economic Development Corporation. We have spent a good deal of time talking about our concern for business in this province and we have put a great deal into our policies and into our action

to assist those services.

What has this meant for the people of Saskatchewan, one might ask? Simply this — assistance is available in practically all forms imaginable. If you need money in the form of a grant or a loan, or if you need counselling on any problem area, such as financing, management, marketing, we have the people here to help you. I want to emphasize here that our role is not to support simply people, nor is it to run their businesses for them, nor is it to take their profits from them, nor is it to bear their losses for them. We believe in the healthiness of the individual enterprise and the individual freedom to start and, yes, to make good. If we, as a government have any concerns as to business operation and the need for government “interference” in private enterprise, it is only when the benefits of Saskatchewan people as a whole are at stake. If business threatens the interests of the majority of the people, it is asking for government interference. That is not a threat, Mr. Speaker, that is a policy.

**SOME HON. MEMBERS:** — Hear, hear!

**MR. MESSER:** — The Saskatchewan business community is, we all know, as concerned about expanding and stabilizing our economic base as is this government. We must attempt to co-operate in realizing our common objectives. This means action on both sides. As the government, we are prepared to do our bit, and even more, if necessary.

Mr. Speaker, the Department of Industry and Commerce has been around for some time. However, only recently has it been encouraged both in terms of effective responsibility and the staff resources necessary to deal with the development changes this province has offered.

I will remind you of the vivid contrast set by the former government — a development policy that starved the department of Industry and Commerce of competent and technically qualified staff and on many instances moved the major industrial negotiations from the Minister’s office. That policy sold both the province and the Department of Industry and Commerce short — short of development for this province and far short of even the most modest improvement in Saskatchewan’s economic circumstances from 1964 to 1971. In fact, 1971 left the present government a legacy of negative economic growth.

In rebuilding the Department of Industry and Commerce, this government has increased the department’s staff resources from a meagre 38 people in 1970-71 to 117 in the current fiscal year. This growth reflects our concern to strengthen and give significance to diversifying the Saskatchewan economy through industrial development and we make no apology for the increased staff that’s needed to carry that out. That clearly is a sharp contrast from the attitude of our predecessors, which, except for a few big splashy projects tended to neglect provincial talent and initiative.

Complementing our industrial efforts are:

- (1) the department’s small business assistance programs;
- (2) our trade assistance program directed towards

increasing the market penetration of Saskatchewan producers in out-of-province markets;  
and

- (3) a new development program for the disadvantaged, which is designed to draw out the full economic potential among unique groups in our society.

Mr. Speaker, we have created with this program, new opportunities for people who were not even recognized before. Not even recognized, Mr. Speaker, by the former governments of this province.

Recent statistics leave no doubt that the Saskatchewan economy holds the potential for expansion and diversification in part through manufacturing and processing development. But we have only begun to capitalize on that potential. Certainly much work lies ahead, for the Saskatchewan economy must continue to diversify in order to keep pace with the rest of Canada and to ensure a comparable standard of living for our people.

We intend to place increasing emphasis on developing the manufacturing sector of our economy. This sector is not only important in itself, but is also a creator of economic activity in other sectors. Developing the manufacturing sector will add to the Saskatchewan economy a further degree of diversity. We have learned from past experience the danger of relying too heavily on resource industries alone. In fact, our dependence on international markets was largely responsible for the recession of the late 60s and early 70s.

Work demand for our resources is at an all-time high, a fact which gives us a particular advantage in attracting investment and developing our resources on our own terms. Too often in the past our mineral and agricultural resources have been shipped out of the province in raw form to be processed elsewhere. Processing activities employ more people than do resource-extracting activities, so it is clearly in our interests to press industry to do more of the processing here within the borders of Saskatchewan.

What this all means for the various communities in Saskatchewan is that we have a great deal of careful planning to do. If uncontrolled, industrial growth may cause a greater shift to urbanization in this province, and with it all the associated problems. Consequently, we want to foster the development of industry in many centres of the province, and not to limit it to the larger centres, such as Regina and Saskatoon. Our aim is to achieve balanced economic development, and in Saskatchewan this is not an easy task.

It is not our position to call the shots all the way in this. We have to take feedback. It is public opinion that assists us in determining the direction we take. We are doing our utmost to promote a decentralization of government and take our programs to the people. But in return, they must come to us with their suggestion for change.

The role of Industry and Commerce is multi-faceted. First, I should like to emphasize the fact that this government is not interested in attracting industry only for industry's sake. We are interested in developing viable enterprises, which, though they may be less than spectacular in some instances, promise to be long-term propositions. This can be accomplished

in two ways. One is selectively to encourage new and promising industries to locate here. Equally important is the strengthening of industries which are already here, and enable them to expand.

Here in Saskatchewan we can take pride in the fact that a number of our home-grown industries have prospered, and continue to prosper. It's a point worth remembering, because at times we are inclined to think of industry as something which must come to Saskatchewan, forgetting that there may be potential right here in our own backyard. For example, a few years ago in Frontier, a village in southwestern Saskatchewan, a local farmer, Olaf Friggstad, decided to use the machine shop on his farm to build himself a cultivator. Being a farmer he was familiar with the advantages and disadvantages of the models that were then available to him. So you may expect that what he produced was an improvement on the then present commercial model. In fact, the cultivator was so good that Mr. Friggstad decided to go into business of manufacturing farm machinery. That was something over five years ago. Today Friggstad Manufacturing Limited, employs some 70 people and manufactures a line of cultivators, bale wagons and rock-pickers which are sold in Western Canada and in the United States. The business has expanded several times over those years and it is expected to employ 100 people sometime early in 1976.

**SOME HON. MEMBERS:** — Hear, hear!

**MR. MESSER:** — Take the case, Mr. Speaker, of Zenon Park Industry. In a village with a population of less than 300 people they have a modern plant employing more than 65 people in the manufacturing of a full line of down-filled ski jackets. These jackets are now being sold in many Saskatchewan stores and by 1976 the firm hopes to expand its market into other provinces. Zenon Park may be an exception among communities of comparable size, but it serves as a significant example of the continuing diversification of our industrial base and in both of these instances the assistance and the co-operation that they received from not only the Department of Industry and Commerce but financing through the Department of Economic Development.

Our basic role is this, Mr. Speaker: The provincial government is committed to ensuring balanced economic development for Saskatchewan. In cases where a new industry is considering locating here, and where that industry does not require a large urban centre for its operation, we undertake to influence the location by providing information on alternative sites.

In addition, the government is currently considering several program options which will further enable us to assist those communities where there are clearly identified opportunities for industrial development. Careful planning is necessary if we are to bring about industrial development with a minimum of disruption. Careful planning requires patience. So, while we have a good reason to be optimistic about Saskatchewan's future, we will benefit most in the long run by tempering our optimism with good planning and patience.

We have talked about policy. We have talked about action. The last few years have meant a great deal of planning as far as department policies and attitudes are concerned. We have established our basic philosophy and the desired approach to

changing the face of this province. We want to see Saskatchewan prosper with a diversified economic base. We have the room to expand from the basis of agriculture and we intend to use that as well as our secondary and other industrial growth section.

The time has come to put our words into action and this we are doing. I have given you examples of our success. We have a long way to go and I say that we are on our way.

**SOME HON. MEMBERS:** — Hear, hear!

**MR. MESSER:** — Now, Mr. Speaker, I want to make a few remarks in regard to the resources of this province. Because of the growing role of public involvement and management in our economic destiny, it is vitally important that everyone have a clear understanding of the role of the private and public sectors in achieving our targets for development. When such an understanding is reached, a harmonious working relationship can be established on the basis of ground rules which are then obvious to all concerned. The public sector should have a key role in the control, development and extraction of our non-agricultural raw materials. Resource taxation policies are designed to return to Saskatchewan people the maximum value from the resource extraction, leaving a reasonable rate of return to the corporate enterprise. The private sector has a clear and extensive role to play in the manufacturing and processing stage of resource based activities in this province. When an opportunity is identified in the secondary or perhaps service area, preference will be given to Saskatchewan-based firms where a choice exists and where local business has the capacity to develop into that new line of endeavor.

Resource upgrading should occur at the source of the raw material supply, to the extent that it is economically feasible to do so. The commercial or service sector should be encouraged to grow by way of Saskatchewan-based private enterprise.

I should like to make it very clear, therefore, that is the case of manufacturing and processing, our approach to the private sector is very different from the approach in the case of resource extraction. In manufacturing and processing development, much of the impetus for the initiative and the realization of industrial projects must lie to a considerable degree with the private sector. In the view of this government, this situation is both necessary and desirable.

I hear the Member for, I believe, Thunder Creek (Mr. Thatcher) wanting to talk about Intercontinental Packers. Here is somebody else looking for a leadership position, perhaps both of them are. The rumor is that they are both actively obtaining . . . The Member for Morse (Mr. Wiebe) mentioned Intercontinental Packers. And he knows full well that had not the government undertaken to involve itself as a partner in Intercontinental Packers that company would have been bought out by a conglomerate not located in Saskatchewan and quite likely would not now be operating in this province.

**SOME HON. MEMBERS:** — Hear, hear!

**MR. MESSER:** — Mr. Speaker, I am sure that both the Member for Regina Lakeview and for Morse will have an opportunity to partake in

this debate and I look forward to their contributions.

The resource policy of this government has been outlined in the Throne Speech, and it indicates that our priorities remain the same as they were in the past.

Mr. Speaker, the other day the Member for Prince Albert-Duck Lake (Mr. Steuart) made some ridiculous statements concerning uranium development in this province. If Mr. Steuart would refrain from resorting to the use of Liberal statistics and instead use plain facts, he wouldn't be so confused and wouldn't continue to mislead the Members of the Legislature. I suggest that the Leader of the Opposition check with the newspapers to find out the progress in uranium development if he can't rely on other sources of information.

Mr. Speaker, I will say, for the benefit of the other Members of this Legislature, that the development at Wollaston Lake is now well in progress. At Cluff Lake a tremendous ore body has been discovered and negotiations are now in their final stages. Uranium is our resource that has incredible potential and we are not by any means ignoring those possibilities.

The controversy surround our proposed potash legislation has already begun. It has been suggested that the purchase of the mines will be extremely inflationary. Also suggested is the unnecessary risk involved and the so-called bad timing of the action. And the usual tears have been instilled by certain and questionable political elements in our society. It is said that once we take over potash, we will go on to take over all private enterprises in this province. Nothing could be further from the truth, Mr. Speaker. The policy that resulted in this stand on potash was not desiring the benefits of government control so much as it was the last possible means of giving Saskatchewan people their fair share of benefits from the development of that non-renewable resource.

The resources of this province belong to the people. They do not belong to the oil and gas companies or the potash companies or any other industrial corporation for that matter. If these agencies are going to develop resources, they must in turn ensure that Saskatchewan people benefit from this development and these resources. These benefits come through public revenues, employment opportunities, and conservation of scarce resources for future generations. These all help to achieve for the people of Saskatchewan a greater control over their own destiny.

If the developers of our resources are not prepared to contribute fairly and ensure that these benefits are given to the people of the province, it is our responsibility as elected representatives of the people to take whatever action is necessary to right the situation. Anyone who does not support this action does not have the welfare of Saskatchewan people very high on his list of priorities. I should like to know whom he represents. If it is not the people who elected him, could it be, Mr. Speaker, that some who sit to your left represent other interests — perhaps corporate interests? I should like to know where the Member for Nipawin (Mr. Collver) stands. He states, Mr. Speaker, that the legislation we have introduced breaks the word of the government and of a former Premier. Mr. Speaker, who would have thought that in this hour

of need our latest corporate spokesman would turn to Tommy Douglas for that guidance. But that is exactly, Mr. Speaker, what the Member for Nipawin did. He went back to read some of Tommy's old speeches. It is not surprising that he didn't like anything that suited his purposes and I guess it is also not surprising that he undertook to distort what he did find.

Mr. Speaker, allow me to set the record straight about what Mr. Douglas really said in this House 25 years ago about the development of this province's natural resources. And again, Mr. Speaker, I am sorry he is not here in his seat to listen to this. This has been taken from Hansard, February 23, 1950. The very same speech in fact, Mr. Speaker, which our friend from Nipawin chose to distort not only in the media of last week but again here in this Legislative Assembly. On that day which was long before potash became important in this province, Mr. Douglas said much the same about our resources as we said last week in our Throne Speech and as we said at our convention last weekend.

**SOME HON. MEMBERS:** Hear, hear!

**MR. MESSER:** — He said, Mr. Speaker, and I quote:

We do not believe life is an economic jungle. We believe in the social development of our natural resources. We believe that our resources belong to the people of the community and we believe in the development of natural resources the people should be the main beneficiaries of that development.

But, Mr. Speaker, the Member for Nipawin and others who chose to distort and take out of context the comments made by a former Premier of this province, Tommy Douglas, don't chose to read what he really said in that speech, "Social development of our natural resources", "resources should belong to the people of the community, people should be the main beneficiaries."

Now Mr. Speaker, that is all in the first paragraph of Mr. Douglas's speech. It does have a familiar ring to it somehow, Mr. Speaker, my friend opposite chose to miss it. But let's go on and see what else he missed, just one paragraph below in the same speech that Mr. Douglas made as Premier of this province. He said, and I quote:

A provincial government has three alternatives with reference to the development of natural resources. The first is by turning them over to private enterprise and saying you go ahead and explore for them. If you can find them and develop them they are yours. Now that policy this government will not follow.

That Premier 25 years ago made it perfectly clear what he stated and I again quote:

That policy this government will not follow.

He did not follow it then and we choose not to follow it today.

Now Mr. Speaker, I know that is the policy my friends opposite want us to follow. But Tommy Douglas wouldn't do it then in oil and he wouldn't do it now with potash. I want to stop here for a moment just to clarify for some of the Members

opposite because I believe there has been some deliberate attempt to misinterpret what Mr. Douglas was talking about in his speech. Because it is interpreted or there is an attempt to interpret it, at least in the minds of the general public, that Mr. Douglas was talking about potash and he was not. He was making his remarks in regard to oil development at that time and that is further a deliberate attempt to mislead the general public in Saskatchewan and those Members who undertake to do that should be ashamed of themselves.

Now, Mr. Speaker, let's see what else Mr. Douglas said in that speech. One last quote:

The second alternative which faces a provincial government is the development of resources is for the provincial government to develop those resources themselves and that we believe in doing insofar as the provincial capacity of the province will permit.

Those are two of the factors that Mr. Douglas stated in regard to resource development. The third, some people have chosen to take out of context. But surely, Mr. Speaker, these people can't take that quotation and undertake to say that in the third position that Mr. Douglas brought forward and advocated is now being broken.

The third proposal was co-operation. But after launching that kind of co-operative development in the broadest terms for the resource industry, we can't, in isolation of circumstances that apply today, say that this government is undertaking to break his word of 25 years ago. A vast change has taken place in regard to that situation. Resource development now, compared to what he was talking about, specifically in regard to oil, and what we are confronted with in Saskatchewan today, are two different matters. And that is the basis that you have to consider whether anyone is undertaking to change the direction for a province. It was made 15 years ago and I say that the facts speak clearly for themselves and the people of Saskatchewan will support this government in undertaking the action that it has chosen to undertake in regard to potash development.

**SOME HON. MEMBERS:** — Hear, hear!

**MR. MESSER:** — Mr. Speaker, we are making a major investment, the biggest for Saskatchewan in a long time. We will see major returns on this investment, both financially and in other economic terms. Expansion will mean jobs with highly skilled people, some coming into the province from outside, others no doubt from within. It will also mean greater productivity with more benefits coming for Saskatchewan people in the future. Knowing that the government is in charge of such a development will mean for the people of this province an opportunity to again observe closely the legitimacy of government handling our resource management.

Our action will depend on their approval or rejection of various considerations. We are not concerned about the illegitimate opposition of political big business interests. Our action has not been a political move. It is a move of government, and a move of logic for the people of Saskatchewan who own those resources. Granted, it is likely that the other political factions of this House would not have even



considered such a move but we all know why that is. We all know why they would allow this province to be raped of the resources by non-Saskatchewan and non-Canadian industrialists.

We all know that many of the Liberals and Conservatives of this Legislature are not as concerned about serving the interests of their constituents so much as they are obsessed with preserving the power structure of big business. It is fascinating to listen to the arguments created by our critics, considering the real reasons for their stand. We are told that the Premier has launched the Saskatchewan people on the greatest risk in provincial history and this may well be true. But the risk is unquestionably justified. We realise the obstacles that we are up against. But we feel that the time has come for decisive and affirmative action on our part, if we are to ensure for Saskatchewan people the benefits from one of our greatest natural resources.

It is also said that our approach is based on the expected results from the potash companies going to the courts. Our attitude is described as being a 'we pass bad laws, you don't like it, so we'll take you over' approach. This may sound accurate to some people, but it is important to realize and appreciate basic fact. We are being challenged by the potash corporations. We are being challenged, the Government of Saskatchewan. These industrial interest largely foreign controlled are challenging the right of this province to fair returns on its potash. Whether or not the companies would have succeeded in their court battles, is not relevant to this discussion. The expression 'bad laws' is certainly inadequate in describing the legislation challenged by the companies I would understand better if the quoted critic has said 'unfair laws' instead, unless he in fact did not really mean 'unfair'. I would tend to call the legislation tough, but fair, and remember this, the fairness of our demands must be viewed in terms of the people of this province as much as, if not more so, than the potash companies themselves.

Remember, the spokesman of the potash companies are not speaking to you as concerned Canadians, they are speaking to you as concerned representatives of corporate interests. Now this may sound callous, true enough. But listen to their facts. I want to quote from a Mr. Mel Hurtig of the Committee for an Independent Canada. No doubt some Members who sit to your left, Mr. Speaker, know him because of some other affiliations he may have had and still may have. He says and I quote:

In the last 25-year period ending in 1974, non-residents have brought into Canada, in long-term and short-term capital over \$23 billion. In the same period of time, they sent out of Canada \$17 billion worth of dividends, \$7 billion worth of interest payments, and \$16 billion worth of Mickey Mouse things — the service charges the multinational corporations use to transfer payments from one country to another.

Note these figures, Mr. Speaker. In 25 years these non-residents of Canada brought in \$23 billion and sent out \$40 billion and they still have the original investment. We don't need this kind of interference. Mr. Hurtig went on to say, and I quote:

To the next person that threatens to not invest in Canada, or for that matter Saskatchewan, I say this:

Thank you very much, we've had too much of that kind of investment already.

Now we may not all agree to that statement, but it should encourage thought if not concern.

The next period of time may well be filled with conflict and bitterness, Mr. Speaker. The people of this province are going to hear the potash companies and associated interests, some of them political, tell them that their government is making a bad deal. They are going to hear that we cannot be trusted, and that we are against private enterprise totally in this province.

The Leader of the Opposition insists we should let these outside interests in to develop our potash industry. Why? To let the benefits be taken away from the people of Saskatchewan and this province? I say the people of Saskatchewan think differently. This is their resource and it should be developed in their best interests.

**SOME HON. MEMBERS:** — Hear, hear!

**MR. MESSER:** — Our priority is the well-being of the people of Saskatchewan and we make no apology for that, that is what they elected us to be responsive to. We have proven our commitment to the private and public sectors of the economy, both essential factors in provincial development. Look at the record, look at the Throne Speech, the facts are there and so is the commitment, Mr. Speaker.

Mr. Speaker, I had planned on making some other remarks in this Throne Speech relation to SEDCO, iron and steel development in the province of Saskatchewan and to some extent, agriculture. I will now choose to make those comments at some later date. I simply want to close in saying that I shall not support the amendments which have been brought forward, but will be supporting the main motion.

**SOME HON. MEMBERS:** — Hear, hear!

**MR. E.F.A. MERCHANT (Regina Wascana):** — I am honored, Mr. Speaker, to join this House. I am learning to like being called the Hon. Member for Regina Wascana, even with the way the Hon. Mr. Messer spits it out at me.

I must say that I am saddened in other way because the man whom I replace is Gordon Grant, he deservedly held the respect, not just of his constituency but of both sides of this House . . .

**SOME HON. MEMBERS:** — Hear, hear!

**MR. MERCHANT:** — . . . and he holds my very sincere gratitude for the help which he has given me over these past two years.

I am also honored, Mr. Speaker, to follow my family into this House. My mother had the pleasure to serve under the

Government of the Hon. Ross Thatcher; my grandfather had the pleasure to serve as a Liberal Member under the Hon. Mr. Gardiner. And though the word 'pleasure' doesn't quite fit from my mouth regarding the government of Mr. Blakeney, I am pleased to be here to follow in their footsteps and serve the residents of Regina Wascana.

**SOME HON. MEMBERS:** — Hear, hear!

**MR. MERCHANT:** — Mr. Speaker, I listened with interest to His Honour's address and to the comments of Hon. Members on both sides. In the next few months, there will be a number of matters that I hope to discuss with the government and hope to impress upon government Members

Before I go into that, I wanted to address myself briefly to the questions of decorum. Decorum comes to my mind. I have had occasion since yesterday to brush up on decorum and that included applying my mind to how one should sit through a childish impish lecture delivered by maidens or otherwise, of course, having been in this House for three full days, I too feel fully qualified to judge and suggest to . . .

**SOME HON. MEMBERS:** Hear, hear!

**MR. MERCHANT:** — Of course you have to remember that he did ride into two cities in the campaign on horseback. Today's speech was written by Ron Barclay and yesterday's by the voice of renown, Jack Harrington. No one will be too surprised if around Easter 'Happy Jack' is distributing palms and a rented donkey arrives at the foot of the stairs.

Mr. Speaker, it is fine to sit deaf and dumb and silent but most of the Members who have spoken in the Throne Speech debate thus far are also novice Members. I feared that the press would be a few weeks catching on to the Hon. Member for Nipawin but yesterday's message seems to have gotten through to them and I congratulate them.

**SOME HON. MEMBERS:** — Hear, hear!

**MR. MERCHANT:** — Of course, Mr. Speaker, we are all concerned about decorum in this House. Good manners were certainly tested to the full yesterday. I have some thoughts to add to the heinous gum chewing list for today. For instance, Mr. Speaker, what about the particularly despicable practice brought on by the Member for Morse (Mr. Wiebe) of bringing impressionable young students into this House and filling their heads with politics.

The Minister of Mineral Resources, Mr. Whelan, he is not here today; it's shameful. I was going to pint it out to the Member for Nipawin, he doesn't have the patch now, but he watched three full days of this debate with one eye, even listened to the speech of the Member for Nipawin.

**SOME HON. MEMBERS:** — Hear, hear!

**MR. MERCHANT:** — Of course, he is one of the senior Members of the House and he has been here since 1956 and they need the most help.

He and Mr. Kramer and Mr. Thibault have been here for 20 years. They have all been so concerned over decorum over the years and they didn't know what to do about it. Indeed they all asked me to thank the Hon. Member for his advice.

I am sorry that we couldn't hold his interest in the proceedings beyond the third day.

**SOME HON. MEMBERS:** — Hear, hear!

**MR. MERCHANT:** — Here he is!

I hate to be a tattletale, but while you were out this afternoon the Member for Rosthern (Mr. Katzman) and the Member for Rosetown-Elrose (Mr. Bailey) were both smiling. As a matter of fact they looked happy, but I noticed that you came back they stopped looking happy.

**SOME HON. MEMBERS:** — Hear, hear!

**MR. MERCHANT:** — Now you take your average maiden, Mr. Speaker, he ran third for mayor in Saskatoon. The next time he decided to stick his political toe in the water he moved a little farther away from home where he doesn't do business and people don't know him so well. That made it possible for the Hon. Member to go from the third least popular mayoralty candidate in Saskatoon to yesterday for an our or so when he was the 61st least popular Member of this House.

The Hon. Member reminds me of a friend who wanted desperately to go into politics but he always found he was too light to make the team. So much, Mr. Speaker, for a brief aberration which for an hour or so perhaps brought Liberals and NDP closer together than they've been for 40 years.

**SOME HON. MEMBERS:** — Hear, hear!

**MR. MERCHANT:** — Mr. Speaker, in the coming months there are a number of matters which I hope the government may consider. I shall be suggesting to the Attorney General certain changes in married women's property legislation which has been in force for some months, a simple amendment to the Deserted Wives' legislation. I will be suggesting a review of the operation of the Driver Licence Appeal Committee. I approve of the direction of those pieces of legislation, but as the hair dye ad says, do you know you are the best you can be? And I think there are things that should be done about them.

In a similar vein, Mr. Speaker, I have a specific change in legislation to suggest to the Minister of Consumer Affairs (Mr. Shillington) whom I welcome as a new Member of the Cabinet. He was a classmate of mine, which I assume is the reason he was appointed. In other areas, Mr. Speaker, people are fascinated by a \$25 million office building in Regina, \$20 million building in Saskatoon. Large expenditures, \$20 million, large expenditures in these supposed times of restraint. The handling prompted the Leader-Post to say there was secrecy and confusion shrouding construction. I am sure though, that with the new shuffle, the new Minister, whom I know is a kind and gentle man, particularly in the House, will sweep all that away.

I have, of course, Mr. Speaker, a special affection for the

workings of the Department of Labour. The operation of the Workers' Compensation Board, conciliation process, again good as far as they go. Well done in some ways by this government but only the best of a bad situation and more basic changes I suggest are required. To that department a month or so ago I proposed a positive action program for the employment of more women in management roles in the government.

I might just in passing mention that two provincial secretaries, Mr. Tchorzewski and his replacement both refused to release information about the numbers of women employed in management roles in the government. The government, I suggest, is embarrassed about their lack of leadership in utilizing females in employment roles. Ontario has a program, the federal government is talking about a program. I hope, Mr. Speaker,, that the words in the Speech from the Throne indicate that such a program is coming in Saskatchewan, that an affirmative action program will be brought down in this House. Our party would welcome such legislation. I am a bit concerned about the word in the Speech that says an 'agency' will deal with the program. An affirmative action program belongs to the Women's Bureau of the Department of Labour. I hope that we may establish in this province as we have not had in the past the best Women's Bureau in this country.

I will also propose, Mr. Speaker, certain amendments to some parts of the health legislation, and I will be proposing amendments regarding liquor legislation. The liquor legislation and regulations of this province are archaic. The special committee to review liquor regulations did an excellent job, yet the government after that large expenditure, both in time and money has ignored these recommendations; ignored those recommendations amidst growing alcoholic abuse and yesterday tabled a report which indicated that with the sales tax the profits from the sale of liquor in this province topped \$55 million.

I enjoyed the distortion of housing statistics by the Premier yesterday, if solely because I hope that this government may be prepared to supplement their controls program with strings-attached lending. A lending program similar to that which encourages apartment construction now in force in Alberta. If controls will ease the problems for apartment owners in the short-term, only construction will ease the problem in the long-term.

These problems, Mr. Speaker, come second to the urgent problems facing our economy and the question of potash.

The Potash Bill is not yet before us for debate but there are some parts of that Bill that I hope the Treasury Benches may consider now. Why, for instance is the Attorney General handling the Bill in the House? I wondered until I saw the Bill. The legislation is a lawyer's delight of intricacy and confusion. Indeed I don't make that suggestion in a particularly uncomplimentary way. I must say it crossed my mind that if the Premier is concerned about professional fees, this Act should keep lawyers in Regina going for some years. I can hear George Taylor smacking his chops from here. My first reaction was abhorrence, abhorrence to the takeover, abhorrence of a government that will kick anyone in the teeth. My second reaction was somewhat more sombre. Nationalization is irreversible and though I'll fight you doing it, if you intend to nationalize

then I hope that you do it well. As a citizen of this province I encourage you to nationalize well. Sign fair but good agreements. You carry the risk of destroying the financial future of this province, and though I fear destruction may be the outcome, I hope for the good of the province in the future that it is not. If as fools you march in where angels would fear to tread, then I hope that you do it well. If you want to roll the dice for the future of Saskatchewan like a river boat gambler, then I hope that the dice come up sevens.

There are some specifics I intend to deal with in the Potash Bill itself but I cannot, Mr. Speaker, deal with the Throne Speech debate without some brief reference to the Bill which will give meat to the intent of nationalization.

The court said that the reserves tax is bad. Nonetheless the Premier seems almost proud that this government quite shamelessly will then avoid that decision and legislate a takeover. He says we weren't taking the right of resort to the court from anyone. Though he full well knows that there is one lawsuit before the court on appeal that the government has lost, two more started and many more on the horizon.

45(5) of The Potash Development Act is proposed, Mr. Speaker, as a clever way to avoid the constitutional problems and it is crucial to making the nationalization work. 45(5) asks the courts to presume that the tax is proper. That same court that has just struck down the potash reserve tax will be asked to presume that the tax is valid. A colorable attempt I suggest to do by the side door what the court said was wrong through the front.

The province will pay the going concern price say my friends opposite provided that through a device the government can include in the calculations the very taxes struck down by the court and the very taxes that were strangling the industry.

Mr. Speaker, there is one other small matter which concerns me before the potash debate. The Bill does not protect unsecured creditors. It seems particularly cruel of a government that bleats I know not why about how it represents the little fellow and common man, to bring in legislation which protects the secured creditors who don't need the protection of legislation and not protect the unsecured who do, I fear that if this is not corrected local unsecured creditors will be left holding the bag as happened when the Parsons and Whittemore Pulp Mill was cancelled.

Mr. Speaker, I am moving from potash with one last thought. After the election I genuinely thought that Allan Blakeney was calmed. In "Sam "Slick", Haliburton wrote that nothing improves a man's manners like an election. I thought somehow it had worked on the Premier. He said himself on the radio that he took the rejection at the polls, quote:

As a warning that they were overstepping the wishes of perhaps a large portion of the population.

I have a tendency to look for the best from the government. I have a certain amount of grudging respect and confidence in the Cabinet. I am surprised.

Mr. Speaker, inflation. If the potash takeover by a

government that no longer holds the majority support of the people of this province was shocking, the failure of the government meaningfully to move on inflation was and is bitterly disappointing.

The Member for Quill Lakes (Mr. Koskie) talked about a revolution of rising expectations.

Without regard for the lack of growth in the gross national produce we in this country have been descending upon an inflationary self-indulgent train which gathers momentum every minute and every month. There are not easy painless ways for us the people or for you the government to stop. In the scramble for security only the big and the powerful are winning. The old, the middle income earners and unorganized labor are the biggest losers. The move from the altar of gross national product to quality of life is destroying the earnings of this country.

Average Canadian wage increases are 16.9 per cent. American wage increases are at the same time less than half.

Our biggest customer, our biggest supplier and our biggest competitor has been moving ahead of us in the world markets. The United States is emerging from their bout with inflation with an inflation rate of 6 to 7 per cent this year and next and we stay in the double digits. The United States is emerging from their bout with inflation, lean, tough, hungry and ready for competitive action. This country grows worse.

As we all demand more from the economy, our economy is producing less. There has been a massive shift to service, industries and government jobs particularly in this province where productivity gains are falling; difficult to make productivity gains in those areas. Our people by and large are working fewer less productive hours, caring less. It is time that the government acted.

Because of the political climate and excessive government spending, because of the demands increasingly made upon our government, we are taxing an ever enlarging pound of flesh from business, business which is not retooling our industries, not maintaining capital investment. The country floats in a malaise without consistent or constructive government policies to encourage sound growth and least of all consistent and constructive policies from this government to encourage sound growth. It is not this week's problem, it is not yesterday's problem. It has been coming for years. And during those same years when the Government of Ontario, last year for instance, cut back, this government has been fanning the inflationary fires of this province to a white hot pitch.

What have we had to fight inflation from Allan Blakeney? Brave talk and he is kind enough to indicate that as an employer they will impose wage guidelines on their own workers. What are they doing for this province and what are other provinces doing?

Manitoba, British Columbia, they moved quickly, though NDP. Newfoundland, Quebec, Alberta, New Brunswick, Prince Edward Island, they all seem to be moving faster than this government will move. Regan, on behalf of Nova Scotia pledged a Dunkirk spirit, Ontario is about to sign 4(3); sign for the

Anti-Inflation Board to have effect in his province. Quebec has already signed 4(4); is opting now to act in their province. Saskatchewan is to be last.

You can't have it both ways. You can't in one breath support the National Policy and refuse to fully act on it.

You can't support the concept and then get off the plane when it is fresh and new, as did the Minister of Labour (Mr. Snyder) and condemn the details without waiting for the details. The Minister of Labour got off the plane from Ottawa and said we are in an untenable situation before he knew what the situation was. And that is the approach that this government is following and that is the approach that this government now chooses for cheap political gain to back.

**SOME HON. MEMBERS:** — Hear, hear!

**MR. MERCHANT:** — You can't rail about the gaps in the price guidelines before the first test case hits the Anti-Inflation Board. You cannot, as a government, encourage support in others and in the same month announce increases above the guidelines for SaskTel and Government Insurance.

**SOME HON. MEMBERS:** — Hear, hear!

**MR. MERCHANT:** — Grasp the nettle. Accept as has the federal government that some of your traditional supporters will be frustrated and angry by the tough stand you must for the good of this province take.

I agree with the exceptions that the Premier mentioned yesterday. There is no dispute over those exceptions with our side, nor with Ottawa.

There may also be other grounds for exceptions such as increases necessary to maintain long established historical relationships between wages in closely related groups.

What else can it mean but that the four groups are clearly excepted. Whom does the government think it is kidding when they say that they will hang back to worry about those four groups when the federal legislation looks after them without a word from this government.

If I may say it without applause from Members opposite a construction and teachers' freeze now would be even less well times than the 6 per cent freeze of some years past. And that's the reason that the exception is built in.

Sign 4(3), get on with it. Face the Larry Browns as you know you must and as you know he knows you must.

**SOME HON. MEMBERS:** — Hear, hear!

**MR. MERCHANT:** — Keep fighting for the changes you think are required. I agree, for instance, with your position that prior approval should be required before sugar or steel or other base



commodities go up in price. But that is no reason for not join in battle in the fight now, particularly when the skirmishes with inflation are psychological.

Action is needed and action, Mr. Speaker, would result in the approval of all of us in this House and the approval of the people of this province.

**SOME HON. MEMBERS:** — Hear, hear!

**MR. MERCHANT:** — I support the amendment, Mr. Speaker.

The Assembly recessed from 5:30 o'clock to 7:00 o'clock p.m.

**MR. B. ALLEN (Regina Rosemont):** — Mr. Speaker, before I begin the formal part of my remarks, which won't be that formal, may I offer my congratulations to you on your election as Speaker of this Legislature and also to my friend the Member for Weyburn (Mr. Pepper) on his election as Deputy Speaker of the House. I should like to congratulate all Members on both sides of the House on their election, or re-election to the Legislature. I look forward to working with Members all over the House, in doing the best work that we can for the people of our province.

**SOME HON. MEMBERS:** — Hear, hear!

**MR. ALLEN:** — I should like to congratulate the new Members of the Cabinet, the Hon. Member for Saltcoats (Mr. Kaeding), Canora (Mr. Matsalla), Saskatoon Buena Vista (Mr. Rolfes), and Regina Centre (Mr. Shillington). I want to give special congratulations to the Hon. Member for Regina Northwest (Mr. Whelan). I guess it would be fair to say that if it wasn't for Ed Whelan I might not be here. Our family have known the Whelan family for a very long time. Pemrose Whelan and my mother were in the hospital together when their oldest daughter and my little sister were born. My family's children and their children went to Holy Rosary School together. We have known them for a very long time. In 1966 I was a page in the Legislature here.

**SOME HON. MEMBERS:** — Hear, hear!

**MR. ALLEN:** — Not quite as nice as the girls there, not many of the people complimented me on my figure, but rather my efficiency.

**SOME HON. MEMBERS:** — Hear, hear!

**MR. ALLEN:** — I should like to say I look forward to working with the Pages in the House as well, but anyway . . .

**SOME HON. MEMBERS:** — Hear, hear!

**MR. ALLEN:** — . . . What is this, you people are trying to frame me!

In 1966 Ed Whelan got me involved in this constituency

association, the old Regina North West. Over the years I held, I suppose every position in that organization. After re-distribution I happened to be living in Rosemont constituency and was fortunate enough to win our party's nomination for Rosemont.

**SOME HON. MEMBERS:** Hear, hear!

**MR. ALLEN:** — I am sure all citizens of all political persuasions in my constituency would want me to congratulate the Hon. Member for Regina North West on their behalf and wish him well in his new job.

**SOME HON. MEMBERS:** — Hear, hear!

**MR. ALLEN:** — Mr. Speaker, I said I might not be here if it wasn't for Ed Whelan. I know that I wouldn't be here if it wasn't for my father, and I should like to introduce him to this House, he is sitting in the gallery tonight.

**SOME HON. MEMBERS:** Hear, hear!

**MR. ALLEN:** — Mr. Speaker, I have the honor to represent Regina Rosemont and I am thankful to the people in the constituency for their support and confidence. I am not yet foolish enough to believe that I was elected either for my brains or my good looks. This was rudely brought home to me during the campaign. Members will be aware that the constituency of Rosemont and the constituency of Elphinstone run alongside of each other and the boundary is Pasqua Street. During the campaign I was knocking on doors along Pasqua Street. I knocked at a door, an elderly gentleman came to the door and I said, "Hi!, I am Bill Allen the NDP candidate." He said, "You're lying to me." I said, "No, I'm the NDP candidate." "Allan Blakeney is our candidate, can't you see the signs, on some of them he has got his first name and on some of them he has got his last name."

**SOME HON. MEMBERS:** Hear, hear!

**MR. ALLEN:** — Mr. Speaker, I think it would be fair to say that the reason I was elected to the Legislature was because of the tireless work of the members of the party in Rosemont constituency. Not only in this election but in other elections and over the years, for the people who came before me in our party whom the people in the province have come to have confidence in.

In that regard I should like to make special reference to a former Member of this House, who this year is celebrating the 40th anniversary of his first election to the House of Commons. I refer to T.C. Douglas. Tommy has set a standard for all person who aspire to public life. He is a man with compassion and with and wisdom. He has the ability to inspire people, particularly young people. He has been and is an inspiration to all of us on this side of the House.

**SOME HON. MEMBERS:** Hear, hear!

**MR. ALLEN:** — Mr. Speaker, I'm thankful to

all the people who supported our party in Rosemont in the last election, but the one group whose support I am the most proud of and I treasure the most is the support that we received from senior citizens in our constituency.

I have to admit that during the election campaign I was a little worried that some people might be fooled by the outlandish promises of the Members opposite. Senior citizens weren't fooled, Mr. Speaker.

**SOME HON. MEMBERS:** Hear, hear!

**MR. ALLEN:** — Senior citizens weren't fooled. Their memories go back a long time. Not only do they remember Thatcher, the Hon. Mr. Thatcher and the Patterson administration. They even remember the Anderson administration. They remember what a disaster that administration was.

**SOME HON. MEMBERS:** Hear, hear!

**MR. ALLEN:** — Well, Mr. Speaker, while in office the present opposition did nothing to advance the welfare of senior citizens. Indeed they did a great deal to harm them.

Mr. Speaker, in 1963 the CCF government of that time set up a Senior Citizens' Branch in the Department of Health. Mr. Speaker, in 1964 with the now Leader of the Opposition as Minister of Health, that branch was abolished. Well, our government has again established a Senior Citizens' Branch, this time in the Department of Social Services. Again the Leader of the Opposition and the Liberal Party are criticizing and opposing this move by the government.

**MR. ROMANOW:** — They say it's inflationary.

**MR. ALLEN:** — Inflationary, I haven't heard that argument yet, Mr. Attorney General, but I'm sure it will be advanced.

Mr. Speaker, senior citizens in Pioneer Village and all of Rosemont constituency want me to thank the government. They want me to thank the government for the Senior Citizens Branch. They want me to thank the government for abolishing deterrent fees and medicare premiums. They want to thank the government for the home repair program. They want to thank the government for providing hearing aids at greatly reduced costs. Mr. Speaker, they want to thank this government for the Prescription Drug Program and all the other programs that this government has introduced. Mr. Speaker, they thank the government and they look forward to the future and the implementation of those policies that we outlined in the election campaign.

**SOME HON. MEMBERS:** Hear, hear!

**MR. ALLEN:** — Mr. Speaker, there are many things that we promised during that campaign and I want to name a few.

We promised to improve the minimum income plan; we promised to expand the Senior Citizens' Home Repair Program; we promised an expansion of health and homemaker services, in

the home, offering a realistic alternative to institutional care. We promised to make dentures, eye glasses available to these people at greatly reduced costs and they will be made available, Mr. Speaker.

**SOME HON. MEMBERS:** — Hear, hear!

**MR. ALLEN:** — We promised a foot care program for the elderly and that will be done.

Mr. Speaker, there were two feelings that were expressed to me during the election campaign by Senior citizens. The first was, you can eat Liberal and Conservative promises. The second was, Mr. Speaker, that while the socialists, whether you agree with them or not, and believe them or not, Mr. Speaker, there are one or two in my constituency that don't, socialists keep their promises.

**SOME HON. MEMBERS:** Hear, hear!

**MR. ALLEN:** — Mr. Speaker, the mover and the seconder of the Address-in-Reply to the Speech from the Throne did a masterful job, last Monday.

This wasn't a very difficult job. First of all both the Member for Quill Lakes (Mr. Koskie) and the Member for Melfort (Mr. Vickar) are masterful speakers, and Mr. Speaker, the material with which they had to work was of superior quality.

**SOME HON. MEMBERS:** — Hear, hear!

**MR. ALLEN:** — At no time in our history has the economy of our province been stronger. At no time have our agricultural producers enjoyed better incomes. At no time.

**AN HON. MEMBER:** — Hear, hear!

**MR. ALLEN:** — Pardon? At no time has our province enjoyed leadership, better leadership than today. I'm amazed at the Hon. Member for Estevan (Mr. Larter) throwing jibes at me in this House. My goodness, Mr. Speaker!

**SOME HON. MEMBERS:** — Hear, hear!

**MR. ALLEN:** — Mr. Speaker, although the Throne Speech was excellent in all respects I shall confine my remarks in two areas, potash and inflation. These two subjects are in some sense related.

I recall as I'm sure all Members of the House do, the 1974 federal election campaign. At that time the Prime Minister of Canada pointed out to Canadians that most of our inflation was imported. Our party pointed out that because our economy is in large measure controlled by forces outside of our country, most of the economic decision were not made in Regina and Ottawa but were being made in New York and Chicago and Denver. Well, Mr. Speaker, I'm getting a little confused. I can't understand the position of the Opposition in this House. They support the

anti-inflation program but oppose repatriating our economy so that we will be able to make economic decisions that make that kind of program effective.

**SOME HON. MEMBERS:** — Hear, hear!

**MR. ALLEN:** — Mr. Speaker, the Opposition is vigorously opposing the repatriation of our potash industry. They use many arguments but the one that rankles me the most, other than the nine pointed out by the Leader of the Conservative Party this afternoon, is that argument that we can't run the industry ourselves. The Leader of the Conservative party says Saskatchewan people re stupid, he speaks contemptuously of the abilities of Saskatchewan men and women. Our party simply does not accept that point of view.

**SOME HON. MEMBERS:** Hear, hear!

**MR. ALLEN:** — We have in Saskatchewan in my view some of the most hardworking, intelligent, diligent people in this world. Saskatchewan people are enormously successful in many fields. Let me use two examples.

Two of the leading federal civil servants in this country are former Saskatchewan public servants. They would probably still be here if it wasn't for you Hon. Members opposite. I refer t the Deputy Minister of Finance, Tommy Shoyama and I refer to Al Johnson, the former Deputy Minister of Health and Welfare, who is now the president of the Canadian Broadcasting Corporation. These people were stupid, according to the Members opposite.

We in our party believe that it's time that we opened up more opportunities for our people here at home.

**SOME HON. MEMBERS:** — Hear, hear!

**MR. ALLEN:** — To paraphrase a well-known jingle, 'if people know where they are going, they should be able to get there right here'.

**SOME HON. MEMBERS:** — Hear, hear!

**MR. ALLEN:** — And as of now they will be able to get here in the potash industry in Saskatchewan.

**SOME HON. MEMBERS:** — Hear, hear!

**MR. ALLEN:** — I for one can neither understand nor accept the lack of faith in our people which argues we can't do it. Therefore, the farms should be turned over to corporations, our forest to outsiders, our oil to international oil companies, our potash to the worlds fertilizer cartel.

Mr. Speaker, the Power Corporation, SaskTel, Medicare, Government Insurance, the Co-op and Credit Union movement are all vibrant reminders of the fact that if we have faith in ourselves almost anything is possible.

**SOME HON. MEMBERS:** Hear, hear!

**MR. ALLEN:** — Mr. Speaker, I turn now to the question of inflation. I'll have to be forgiven if in my remarks I sound pro-labor. You see, Mr. Speaker, I'm the son of working people. The children with whom I grew up were the sons and daughters of working people. The people I represent are working people. These people didn't send me here to be an apologist for the corporate elite of this country. They sent me here to speak for them, and I will speak for them.

**SOME HON. MEMBERS:** — Hear, hear!

**MR. ALLEN:** — Mr. Speaker, I have been listening with interest to the debate, both inside and outside this House on the question of the federal government's so-called anti-inflation program.

Mr. Speaker, I have listened with particular interest to the Hon. Leader of the Opposition and the Hon. Member for Nipawin. The night the program was announced the Leader of the Opposition (Mr. Steuart) said this program will only work if there are no exceptions as far as wage settlements are concerned. That was the Leader of the Opposition's initial response. That was what the Leader of the Opposition really believes should take place. Goodness knows, that was the position of the Leader of the Opposition in 1969, that was his position in 1970 and 1971, when he was in charge. Six per cent boys, take it or leave it, that was his position in those years. That was the case for teachers and civil servants and hospital workers in those years. Well, the workers took it, but they also took the Leader of the Opposition and the Liberal Party and booted them out of office.

**SOME HON. MEMBERS:** Hear, hear!

**MR. ALLEN:** — Well, what's the position of the Liberal Party today? I listened with interest to the Member for Wascana (Mr. Merchant) this afternoon. Well, I guess we'll have to look at prairie averages, I guess we'll have to look at the possibility of losing workers to other provinces. More important, I guess we'll have to look at the possibility of losing even more workers' votes than we've already lost. But so much for the Liberals.

What about the Conservative Party? What of the Leader of the Conservative Party, the Member for Nipawin? Oh, the Member for Nipawin, he says, "Dave, you were right in the first place. The position of the Conservative Party is, is that there shall be no exceptions. If you are a teacher and your salary is 15 or 20 or 25 per cent behind your counterpart in other provinces, tough luck Jack", say the Member for Nipawin. "Tough luck, the teachers of Saskatchewan will just have to grin and bear it."

The Member for Nipawin is saying to hospital workers, who are behind counterparts in other provinces, "Tough luck Jack, inflation must be beaten, grin and bear it." The Member for Nipawin is saying to all working people in Saskatchewan whose wage are behind and in some cases, substantially behind the prairie average, "Tough luck, grin and bear it, workers of Saskatchewan, inflation must be beaten, we in the Conservative Party believe that it will be beaten on your backs." That's the position of the Conservative Party.

I predict, Mr. Speaker, that four years from now when our workers are 30 and 40 and 50 per cent behind workers in other provinces, I predict the Leader of the Conservative party will be saying "God, that's terrible, that is terrible. People of Saskatchewan we have to get rid of Blakeney, kick Blakeney out, put me in, I'll take you to the promised land, high wages and a chicken in every basket". That will be the position of the Conservative Party.

Well, Mr. Speaker, both the Liberals and the Tories say the government is not acting with enough vigor to fight inflation. I want to point out to Hon. Members opposite as has been pointed out on a number of occasion, that the government is doing everything that it has been asked to do and more. Rent control, increase in the minimum wage, which the Liberal Party is opposing. We don't know what the Conservative Party is doing. Monitoring prices, that will be done, restraint in capital spending wage settlements with employees in the public sector in line with the guidelines, but taking into account traditional relationships.

What are the facts about inflation? Everybody likes to talk about high wages causing inflation. Sure, high wages contribute to inflation, no one can deny that. In 1972, '73 and '74 and up to today wages and salaries have risen about 38 per cent in Canada. That figure is an inflated figure, because it's the industrial composite and that doesn't take into consideration employees of companies with less than 20 employees. That's a fact. Three and a half years, four years, wages have gone up 38 per cent and have no doubt contributed to inflation. But everybody, Mr. Speaker, talks about the working man's wages, talks about the working man's wages causing inflation. What about corporation profits? Very few people talk about corporation profits contributing to inflation. Let's have a little look at the facts in this area.

In 1972 the amount of annual profits of corporation in Canada before taxes was \$10.8 billions. In 1974 the annual profits of corporations in Canadian before taxes were not \$10.8 billions, but \$18.3 billions, Mr. Speaker, an increase of about 70 per cent. For the working people of our country, 38 per cent; for the corporations of this country, 70 per cent. And yet the people who produce the real wealth of this country, our workers, are 'smitted' at and painted as being the villains in this fight by the Members of the Opposition.

Now, Mr. Speaker, in 1966 while I was going to university I had the opportunity to work at the General Hospital. The Liberal Party happened to be the government of the day and my wages were a staggering \$282 a month. Luckily the wife was working and we got by.

Now, I go on to the union, Mr. Speaker, I belonged to the union. The great enemy of everything that is sacred in this country, the Canadian Union of Public Employees. The largest union in the country. My union battled to raise wages. When the Liberals left office in 1971 an orderly starting at \$411 a month, finished up after 25 years or so with \$477 a month. Today, in 1975, an orderly at the General Hospital is in a range between \$699 per month and \$764 per month. This represents, Mr. Speaker, an increase of 42 or 43 per cent. I'm not that good at figures. About ten per cent a year. No doubt this has contributed to inflation. But what Member in this House would

deny the hospital workers at the General Hospital that increase in wages? None of you would do it publicly. Not one of you would do it publicly.

Now I ask the Members opposite to tell my friends at the hospital how they are going to put out \$200, \$300 or \$400 a month for a roof over their heads, how they are going to feed and clothe their children, how they are going to take the wife out maybe for a night out on the town every once in a while, or go on a vacation every two or three years. How they are going to send their kids to university, as you send yours to university on \$700 a month, plus 10 per cent, plus 8 per cent, plus 6 per cent, for three years? Mr. Speaker, not even that financial genius, the Member for Nipawin (Mr. Collver) can tell my friends how they are going to manage on that kind of money.

**SOME HON. MEMBERS:** — Hear, hear!

**MR. ALLEN:** — The Member for Nipawin said this afternoon that they will have to wait for the future. My friends can't wait for the future, they simply cannot live and wait for the future with the proposal like Mr. Collver is trying to make.

Let me say, Mr. Speaker, in conclusion on this subject. As responsible legislators we do, and must follow the laws of this country. But from my point of view, and I want to make it perfectly clear, the program as announced by the Prime Minister is his program. It's a program of the federal government. It's not our program. It's not my program. If it were our program prior approval would be needed for price increases in key commodities.

**SOME HON. MEMBERS:** Hear, hear!

**MR. ALLEN:** — If it were our program professional incomes would certainly be controlled. If it were your program workers would not seem to be the only group in society whose incomes are at this point being effectively controlled.

Now, Mr. Speaker, because I believe this government will, and has treated working people fairly because our resource policies are, in my view, sound and sensible because the Speech from the Throne is superior in every way, I will support the Motion, and I will oppose the amendment.

**SOME HON. MEMBERS:** Hear, hear!

**HON. G. MacMURCHY (Last Mountain-Touchwood):** — Mr. Speaker, it is with pleasure that I enter the first Throne Speech debate since the NDP government was re-elected last June 11th. But let me first take this opportunity to welcome all the new Members to this Legislature. In particular I congratulate the new Members on the speeches that they have delivered so far in the Legislature. I compliment them all. In particular though I want to welcome my colleagues, the Member for Athabasca (Mr. Thompson) and the Member for Cumberland (Mr. MacAuley).

**SOME HON. MEMBERS:** — Hear, hear!



**MR. MacMURCHY:** — One of the most interesting experiences I had as Minister of Education was in the first year of office to take a tour of northern Saskatchewan, to visit the schools there. Accompanying me at that time were the Chairman of the Board, now the Member for Cumberland, and Chief David Ahenakew. I was amazed at the Member for Cumberland's ability to speak to the native people in northern Saskatchewan in Cree.

**SOME HON. MEMBERS:** — Hear, hear!

**MR. MacMURCHY:** — As far as I know I think he is the first Cree speaking Member to sit in this Assembly and we welcome him.

**SOME HON. MEMBERS:** — Hear, hear!

**MR. MacMURCHY:** — But of more importance, Mr. Speaker, the election of these two Members demonstrates in a very conclusive manner the strength and the success of the northern Saskatchewan policies of this government.

**SOME HON. MEMBERS:** — Hear, hear!

**MR. MacMURCHY:** — I also congratulate the Members for Saskatoon Buena Vista (Mr. Rolfes) and Regina Centre (Mr. Shillington) and Canora (Mr. Matsalla) on their appointments to the Cabinet. I particularly want to express my congratulations to you, Mr. Speaker, on the election to this very high office. I know you will fill this office very capably.

**SOME HON. MEMBERS:** — Hear, hear!

**MR. MacMURCHY:** — I have two very real regrets, Mr. Speaker. I have lost a very fine desk mate, one who helped me a good deal in my early experiences in this Legislature, because of the experience that you, sir, had. And I must also say that I miss the candies that you had in your drawer. As a matter of fact I'm in real trouble, Mr. Speaker, because the Member for Weyburn (Mr. Pepper) who was Mr. Whip during the last Legislature used to sit here and if you didn't have them, he had them. By the way, Mr. Speaker, I raised this with my seatmate now, the Member for Saskatoon Nutana (Mr. Robbins) and I asked him if he had any candies in his drawer and he said, "Mr. Minister, candies only make you sexy."

**SOME HON. MEMBERS:** — Hear, hear!

**MR. MacMURCHY:** — Mr. Speaker, the Speech from the Throne outlines a number of areas in which there is, or certainly there will be, intense activity in the new few months. The national and provincial economies are entering a phase of withdrawal from the effects of the most serious inflationary cycle in decades. Our rural economy is entering a period of massive change as the rail network faces rationalization or abandonment. Acquisition of control of our potash industry will constitute the largest single investment ever made in this province and I expect one of the most profitable for our children and our children's children.

**SOME HON. MEMBERS:** — Hear, hear!

**MR. MacMURCHY:** — The prosperity brought to this province by world shortages, the demand for our products, the prosperity brought to this province by the last four years of good NDP government has demanded a major effort in housing in this province. I want to touch on each one of these in my address tonight.

Let me first refer to housing, to indicate the directions that we expect our policies to take in the month ahead. To understand the programs of our housing corporation let's be aware of all the factors that affect housing in Saskatchewan.

I want to take the Members of this Assembly back, Mr. Deputy Speaker, to when we came into power in 1971. At that time Saskatchewan was in the midst of one of the worst depressions it ever faced in the housing industry. In 1970, less than 1,800 housing units were started throughout the whole province of Saskatchewan. Little had been done to provide housing for those people who could not afford decent housing on their own. Other than the Assisted Home Ownership Program, the only real assistance available to low income families and individuals of Saskatchewan was a limited number of public housing and non-profit housing units which were built in the late '50s and in the early '60s. In 1972, when the Saskatchewan Housing Corporation was formed three main challenges were faced by that corporation.

- (i) a need for new housing;
- (ii) a need to improve existing housing;
- (iii) a need for housing for our senior citizens and our low income families.

These three challenges are still with us today, but the relative rate has been changed. For example, in January 1, 1975 the actions of the Saskatchewan Housing Corporation will have made home ownership possible to more than 2,150 families earning less than \$10,000 a year. It will have helped 3,500 families and senior citizens to improve their existing homes; it will have extended public housing to 500 low income families and senior citizens, the majority of which are in smaller centres, and all that is from September, 1975 to the end of the year 1975.

Saskatchewan Housing Corporation is designed to deliver a broad range of housing programs for Saskatchewan citizens. These new programs include assistance to low and moderate income families to enable them to purchase a new housing unit, or repair their current homes. An expanded program of low rental public housing for families and senior citizens, increased assistance to non-profit groups to provide housing for senior citizens to ensure an adequate supply of serviced lots. In addition to implementing these program we have given the housing corporation a specific mandate to ensure that an adequate amount of assistance under these housing programs goes to people living in the smaller communities in Saskatchewan.

For example, in 1971 only a limited number of Saskatchewan communities, all of them centres with populations in excess of 1,000 were eligible for assistance under public housing programs. By 1974 we had successfully convinced the federal government

that many Saskatchewan smaller communities should also receive assistance under this program. Thus, today, families and senior citizen who seek to find adequate housing accommodation no longer are forced to look in our larger urban centres. They can stay right at home and get their housing in their small communities.

Now in the past two years the Housing Corporation has continued to introduce new housing programs and to expand the established programs. The House Building assistance — the objective of this program is to assist people of low and moderate income in meeting the down payment requirements associated with the purchase of a new home. In this Session we will be submitting a bill to amend this program in keeping with our promises in the June election.

The Subsidy and Self-help Program for Homeowners — the main objective of this program is to make home ownership possible for persons earning as little as \$4,600 per year, the minimum wage in Saskatchewan. Secondly, its purpose is to encourage people to participate in the construction of their own home.

The Co-op Housing Program — this program was introduced last year. It's goal is to help families by enabling them to save substantial amounts of money through co-operative building. Under the Co-operative Housing Program groups of six families or more may work together to construct their homes co-operatively. Some co-operative groups have been able to contribute almost all of the labor involved in constructing that new home. Other groups who are unable to provide this amount of owner equity through their own labor will nevertheless save substantial sums of money through the bulk purchasing of materials, the bulk contracting of labor services and the elimination of the contractors' normal overhead and margin profits. The families who have participated under this new program this year have been able, for a total mortgage cost of \$28,000, to construct between \$33,000 and \$38,000. For those families, who in spite of the large saving they have achieved in the final cost of the home, were still unable to afford the monthly mortgage payments on that home, the Saskatchewan Housing Corporation, in conjunction with the federal government is providing subsidies to the monthly mortgage payments similar to those available under the regular assisted Home Ownership Program.

But that's not all, Mr. Speaker. Because of the lower cost of these homes the subsidies are lower than they would be under the Assisted Homeownership Program. Everyone benefits from this program — the co-op member who gets a better house because he does it himself; the neighbors in the area because of the better housing being built have a better quality neighborhood; and the taxpayer, who through the government, pays lower subsidies.

As a result of this new program, 74 units have been constructed in Regina and Saskatoon. This program is being expanded and in 1976 the Corporation will assist at least 500 families to build their homes under the Co-operative Housing Program. These units will be located, including Regina and Saskatoon, throughout the whole province.

Public meetings will begin shortly. At these meetings our

staff will inform the public of the availability of the program. Co-operative groups will be formed early in 1976 and an extensive training program will begin to inform them of the techniques necessary to construct their houses co-operatively.

The great interest expressed in this program, Mr. Speaker, in a short period of time since it was introduced, has convinced me that the co-operative program will form a very effective vehicle in enabling families throughout Saskatchewan to acquire good housing accommodation at very reasonable cost.

**SOME HON. MEMBERS:** — Hear, hear!

**MR. MacMURCHY:** — The Rural Housing Program — the other major new program introduced by the Saskatchewan Housing Corporation this year is the Rural Housing Program. This program was developed by the corporation because of the great need for housing in our smaller communities — communities smaller than 1,000 people; a need that was not being met by the existing programs.

The federal government's Assisted Home Ownership Program had been directed almost exclusively to the larger centres in Saskatchewan. But we made repeated requests that more funds be allocated to our smaller communities and we have been successful, through the Rural Housing Program.

In 1975, Mr. Speaker, we expect that up to 130 units will be started under this program and expansion each year with a target of 2,000 units between 1975 and 1978.

Public Housing — the objective of this program is to provide suitable rental accommodation for people on limited incomes, at rents related to the income and ability to pay.

The government has started a record 1,100 public housing units in 1974 and still another 650 units to the end of September, 1975, and we expect an additional 500 units to be approved for construction between September and the beginning of the year. In the future we expect, looking at 1976, 1,500 units of public housing.

Land Assembly — the objective of this program is to maintain an adequate supply of land for residential construction. Although this activity has helped to increase the supply of reasonably priced land, it is evident we still have a big problem and this is an area to which the Housing Corporation and the government will be giving full attention. I hope to introduce new policies very shortly. But I want to make it clear, in the months ahead, Mr. Speaker, that our efforts will concentrate in three areas:

- (1) increasing the number of rental units for senior citizens;
- (2) emphasizing the co-op aspect of house building; and
- (3) to continue to expand our program into smaller Saskatchewan communities.

Mr. Speaker, the ravages of inflation are perhaps the greatest threat to the orderly development and social change facing the western economy. Continued rises in the cost of

living have reduce many groups to a level of debtors and are creating wider gaps between those who have and those who have not. We cannot afford to continue on this course much longer without undermining confidence in the basic democratic institutions. The need for economic reform has never been more obvious.

Here in Saskatchewan, Mr. Speaker, we have been spared the severe effects of inflation, largely for two reasons. Because in Saskatchewan we have a mixed economy, public and private; secondly, our economy's strength has allowed us to keep pace with, or to exceed, rising costs. But no province in Canada can hope for long to stand as an island of prosperity particularly when there is a content of economic upheaval. This fact prompted our government to call some time ago for a national program of leadership against inflation. It was our Premier of Saskatchewan who raised the first call, not the Members opposite, nor their leaders in Ottawa. In specific terms our Premier requested a system of specific price controls on key commodities, like fertilizer, steel, lumber, cement. We indicated we were prepared to participate in a comprehensive program of income control. Therefore, as a government, we welcome the belated recognition by Ottawa of its responsibility and we will do all in our power to ensure that the program is even handed and is effective and we hope to co-operate to that end.

Canada is a federal country, Mr. Speaker. The powers are divided between the central and the provincial governments. Additionally we are a country of regions, each with its own distinctive economic and social situations. These differences need flexible guidelines if the program is to be accepted and if it is to succeed. We believe the program as outlined by the Ottawa government will have to be modified in certain respects to make it appropriate, not only to Saskatchewan conditions but additionally to Western conditions. One change our government will seek is a variable rate for wage and salary increases. Certain negotiating groups need to reach some sort of parity of balance in terms of the traditional relationships with similar groups elsewhere in the prairies.

Our Saskatchewan wages and salaries are not the highest in Canada and are not leading in the upward spiral and in this sense they are not a cause for any national inflationary pressures. We do have a shortage of people, a shortage of people to fill jobs in all levels in our booming economy. These two facts, lower wages and a shortage of employees mean we cannot afford to accept in many, many cases the increases of eight per cent or 10 per cent or 12 per cent. Unless our pay rates fall in line at least with the prairie average, we will be unable to hold, we will be unable to attract people we need. A shortage of people, of working people, of staff, will sap the strength of our economy and will eventually lead to greater, not less, inflationary pressure.

**SOME HON. MEMBERS:** — Hear, hear!

**MR. MacMURCHY:** — Secondly, we believe the program must not only be effective but it must be seen to be effective. People will co-operate to beat inflation. If they see prices being limited in the same way their own incomes are limited. The present federal plan will certainly control income but it requires some change if it is going to control prices. Our proposal is that

the price increases on key commodities be allowed only if they are approved in advance and only within the limits of the guidelines. This is the only way to ensure, to guarantee real controls on prices and it is, in our opinion an essential step if we hope to gain public support for the total program.

The provincial government itself will be taking steps to control costs, to hold down increases. We will introduce a program of rent controls with a Bill to be introduced in this Legislature very shortly. We will enforce a limit on capital construction projects to take some of the pressure off the building industry. We will continue to balance the provincial budget, to spend only what we take in and avoid borrowing where capital assets do not exist to back the loan.

I don't know what the businessmen and the lawyers know about financing but the farmers know this, deficit budgets in good times are one of the basic causes of inflation because they require borrowing. When loans must be taken out for operating expenses you are living beyond your means and the result is bound to be inflationary. Saskatchewan has not, and it will not engage in this practice.

**SOME HON. MEMBERS:** Hear, hear!

**MR. MacMURCHY:** — Despite what the Member for Regina Wascana (Mr. Merchant) suggested with respect to Ontario, it is fine for the Member to refer to Conservative Ontario and how they have cut back. They had to cut back. Their deficit last year was more than our provincial budget, \$1.4 billion. One step we do not propose to take is a cutback from the level of public spending. If they are suggesting that we should cutback on a budget of \$1 billion, then we are not going to do that. We do not believe this is necessary because we are balancing our budget and we will balance our budget. And those Members opposite who call for reduce spending when the budget is already in balance are really calling for cutbacks in public services. That is what they are calling for. Cutbacks on services — medicare, grants to school, job training, income support, equalization to municipalities, highways in Nipawin. On the whole this kind of public spending tends to even out the inequities in our society. If they are cut back the result is more demands for higher wages to make up the loss. And blind adherence to this kind of notion tends to worsen the inflation psychology among our wage earners and amongst our taxpayers . . .

**SOME HON. MEMBERS:** — Hear, hear!

**MR. MacMURCHY:** — . . . which is exactly what I say in this Legislature, Mr. Speaker, that restraint is one thing, but cutbacks are another in this struggle that we face today.

I will now turn, Mr. Speaker, to our decision to acquire the control of the potash industry. As my colleague, the Member for Melfort (Mr. Vickar), the mayor of Melfort, indicated earlier, the acquisition of potash mines by the public is a milestone in Saskatchewan's economic development, equal to the formation of SaskTel in 1909, the Pool in the '20s, SPC in the '40s and IPSCO in the '50s. I believe it is potentially one of the most profitable investments we shall make as a province.

In the media we are now seeing the start of what could become a contest for the support of the people of Saskatchewan and that contest is not between Members opposite and the government Members, the contest is between the elected government and the potash companies.

**SOME HON. MEMBERS:** — Hear, hear!

**MR. MacMURCHY:** — And the issue, Mr. Speaker, is straightforward. Who is entitled to the major benefit from the development of our resources? The position, Mr. Speaker, taken by the government Members to your right is simple. We say the people own the potash, and they do. Under the amended British North America Act introduced into the House of Commons by our friends opposite, the Conservatives and the Liberals, the control and ownership of resources is given to the provinces. Up to the present, Mr. Speaker, the province has rented out the right to develop potash to a number of companies. We have charged these companies rent, rent in the form of royalties, in the form of municipal taxes, in the form of corporation taxes, in the form of a reserve tax. Until very recently, Mr. Speaker, the companies paid the rent and there were no unusual problems. But last year, 1974, the federal Liberal government at Ottawa introduced a budget containing a provision that cancelled the rights of the companies to deduct their provincial taxes as expense when doing their federal income tax. Now those of us who farm understand this pretty clearly, because we are involved in deducting our property tax on our farm land when we do our income tax. When the federal Liberal government at Ottawa moved their budget they said the potash corporation would have to count their rent payments to the province as income and pay taxes on it.

**AN HON. MEMBER:** — Farms are next.

**MR. MacMURCHY:** — Farms are next. Double taxation for the resource industry and as the Member suggests, double taxation for the farmers and small businessmen next. But it led to a situation where a sizeable portion of the companies' profits were being taken away in taxes. And the companies decided to fight, Mr. Speaker. And I don't blame them for fighting. I don't blame them for getting angry, but whom did they choose to fight? Whom did they direct the challenge to? Not to the federal Liberal government, but against the provincial rents. Now we don't question their rights or anybody else's rights to challenge our laws if they think they are wrong. The companies are not doing anything illegal but at the same time we can't sit on the sidelines and see our resource revenues disappear because of federal taxes and resource companies' objections. We say the owners of the resource should be the major beneficiaries from its development. We are prepared to defend this position using the legal rights and the powers that are available to us.

**SOME HON. MEMBERS:** — Hear, hear!

**MR. MacMURCHY:** — Now it is a simple and straightforward issue. Our taxes and our rents are being questioned in the courts by whom? By the potash companies and by Ottawa. And we face a legal battle that could take several years to resolve. Supposing the judges decide against us. The province stands

to lose, Mr. Speaker, its right to receive major benefits out of resource developments. As a matter of fact, Mr. Speaker, we could also be ordered to pay back several hundred millions of dollars in taxes. Obviously this would result in an undermining of our financial stability. It would mean higher taxes on the individual citizen, more money out of your pocket and my pocket to make up the lost revenue. Or, alternatively, it could force cutbacks in the essential public services that I talked about a few minutes ago.

I don't know how, Mr. Speaker, any responsible government of any political stripe can afford to let its revenues be so seriously threatened. And I say in this Legislature that this is no bush league contest. It involves the fundamental principles of taxation in our federal-provincial system of government. Additionally, potash represents one of the major opportunities for Saskatchewan to lift itself out of the ranks of the have-not provinces to become self-sufficient, to stand in the world along with wheat and with potash, as a major contributor to world development. And if the potash companies wish to challenge this opportunity we have no choice but to defend ourselves against it with all the legal powers at our disposal.

The simplest route it seems to me to be open to us to defend Saskatchewan's rights and Saskatchewan's revenues is to develop the resources ourselves.

**SOME HON. MEMBERS:** — Hear, hear!

**MR. MacMURCHY:** — This is not a new thing, Mr. Speaker, this has been chosen by other provinces. Good old Conservative Newfoundland, is using this approach in developing its electric power resources. Good old Liberal Quebec is using this route in its development of the James Bay resources, and even, Mr. Speaker, Liberal Ottawa has followed this route in developing northern oil and gas through PanArctic explorations. All of these ventures involve a major capital financing, all of these ventures involve considerable risk. All these government in those provinces say as we say, if the risk, Mr. Speaker, is worth taking by a private company then by the same token it is worthwhile for a government to take it, on behalf of the citizens that it represents.

**SOME HON. MEMBERS:** — Hear, hear!

**MR. MacMURCHY:** — If we want the benefits of this great potash resource, we should be prepared to do the work and this is precisely what we have chosen to do here in Saskatchewan.

Mr. Speaker, in closing, I want to deal very briefly with the number one issue of concern in Saskatchewan, the prospect of rail line abandonment. More than any other single factor rail service and what happens to it will directly affect hundreds of towns and thousands of families across the province.

Now everyone in this Legislature will agree that our rail network must be overhauled, that it must be updated. The present lines were built years ago. Some are worn out and some of them may no longer be necessary. The layout of the branch lines can only be considered or described as helter-skelter,



built on the principle of competition and not according to any kind of rational plan. Today, Mr. Speaker, we must begin to correct the lack of planning. We must design a system that will serve our farmers and our small towns rather than destroy them. When I look at this question of abandonment, to me it is a matter of what costs should be counted and decided on in the change. But what do the railways say? The railways say it is too expensive to retain the present branch line system. They say that freight rates on grain are too low, too low to meet their costs. There are too many of those little old whistle stops where the cars must be spotted and picked up.

The railways want basic changes and it is interesting in their presentations to the Hall Commission. The CNR the Crown company said, "Wholesale abandonment of branch lines". Their friends, CPR said: "Replace the Crow's Nest rates."

Now in terms of moving grain alone, it's likely that companies show little overall profit, but we don't know. We can't find out. It would be nice to find out. Undoubtedly it can be proven that some Branch lines are inefficient. But this is only part of a picture, Mr. Speaker, and I submit only a small part of it. Since we are talking much more than about CP's and CN's profit and loss statement. We are talking about the economics of farming, we are talking about small town life in Saskatchewan and in fact we are talking about small town life and farming in all of western Canada.

**SOME HON. MEMBERS:** — Hear, hear!

**MR. MacMURCHY:** — It should be recognized, Mr. Speaker, that the Crow's Nest rates are part of a larger agreement under which the CPR received extensive grants, millions of acres of land, mineral rights to large tracts of land in British Columbia. The agreements with the CPR resulted in rail service for the West, which was profitable then. And if we could find out, I suspect it is profitable today.

But additionally, they also provided a base on which CP has expanded into shipping, hotels, real estate, communications, airlines, resource development and trucking. Because of their agreements CP today is one of the most profitable and successful corporate empires on the North American continent, with assets over \$2 billion. All of this Mr. Speaker, came from government grants years ago when they built the rail system in the West. It is in this context then that we should examine whether the Crow's nest rates are profitable or whether they are not profitable and whether the railway has an obligation to serve the country that made its wealth possible.

You can't separate the Crow's Nest rates from rail line abandonment. These rates are tied up with railway abandonment because loss of rates is really a back door means of forcing abandonment. What if the Crow's Nest rates are lost? If they're lost rail companies will be free to charge different rates on different lines, more where they want traffic to decline and less where they want traffic to go.

We have as farmers, some sense of economics. If we find our delivery point has a higher rate, we will begin to deliver to some other delivery point which has a lower rate. We will abandon just as effectively the rail lines as if we didn't make

any move towards rail line abandonment.

Without a uniform rate system then abandonment will proceed behind the scenes. We believe this would be wrong. And it would lead to more problems than we could solve. So abandonment and the Crow's Nest rates must be out in the open where it can be handled with common sense with an eye to the public as well as an eye to the rail company needs. And when all the reports and the studies are in, we must be ready in Saskatchewan to make the decision and know the reasons why.

Our Government is ready to look at new proposals. But we must be sure that service is available. That the changes are made according to a plan that puts communities ahead of straight railway economics. What does this mean? This means the railway must agree to such proposals as joint running rights on each other's lines, common switching yards, trading lines, rebuilding lines, building new connectors. It means an agreement to maintain the prairie rail network in good condition.

I want to remind the Member for Nipawin and his colleagues that creation of a provincial transportation agency does not involve hiring a whole new body of civil servants that he apparently believes. Nearly all of the staff of the new agency is already employed in the government. By creating this agency we are drawing together these scattered groups, organizing them into a coordinated body to deal with what every sensible person in Saskatchewan must agree is a very high priority issue.

**SOME HON. MEMBERS:** — Hear, hear!

**MR. MacMURCHY:** — That priority issue is the survival and the development of our country grain collection system.

I believe that this warrants the organization of an agency to deal with it. It warrants it now and I challenge the Members opposite to vote against the Bill when it is introduced in this Legislature.

**SOME HON. MEMBERS:** Hear, hear!

**MR. MacMURCHY:** — I say, Mr. Speaker, it is cowardly for the Members opposite to hid behind the bogeyman of the bureaucracy, when in truth what we are attacking are public services that the vast majority of our citizens expect and do not want to be dispensed with. It is easy and it is simple to criticize the public service, to criticise the work that they do. It is not so easy to tell the public what you are going to take away, that you take away the benefits of their efforts. I say to the Members opposite that if they are truly people of courage that they claim to be, they should stop flogging the dying horse of bureaucracy and come out with specific, substantial explanation of what services they think that the people of Saskatchewan deserve.

**SOME HON. MEMBERS:** — Hear, hear!

**MR. MacMURCHY:** — More than at any other time, Mr. Speaker, this Throne Speech demands of the Members of this Legislature to indicate where they stand. It outlines a series of programs that I

believe will mark the first Session of the 18th Legislature as one of the most important ever in the history of Saskatchewan.

**SOME HON. MEMBERS:** Hear, hear!

**MR. MacMURCHY:** — Mr. Speaker, I will be opposing the amendments. I shall be pleased to support the motion.

**SOME HON. MEMBERS:** — Hear, hear!

**MRS. E.G. EDWARDS (Saskatoon-Sutherland):** — Mr. Speaker, it is indeed an honor for me as an elected representative for the new constituency of Saskatoon-Sutherland to speak for the first time in this Legislative Assembly.

May I add my congratulations to you, Mr. Speaker, or your appointment. I am very happy to see you in the Speaker's Chair.

While this is the first opportunity for me to speak to this Chamber, I did have the privilege of joining with other delegates meeting in this beautiful building last August when Saskatchewan hosted the Regional Parliamentary Conference. The former Speaker of the House, Mr. Dewhurst and Mrs. Dewhurst, Mr. and Mrs. Thibault and Mr. and Mr. Feschuk welcome three of us newly elected MLAs, Miss Clifford, Mr. Birkbeck and myself to the Saskatchewan delegation. May I take this opportunity to thank them for the kind hospitality shown to us at that time.

Attending the Parliamentary Conference after being so recently elected was an educational, interesting and enjoyable experience for me. After spending a week with elected representatives from all parts of Canada I came to the conclusion that most of the parliamentarians had several things in common.

First, a genuine and sincere desire to serve the people of their community, their province and Canada to the best of their ability.

Second, the delegates attending the conference, while at all times fully aware of the heavy responsibilities they carried as elected representatives, at the same time possessed a fine sense of humor, marvellous wit and the unique ability to respect and enjoy both the debate and the lighter moments together, regardless of political affiliation.

**SOME HON. MEMBERS:** — Hear, hear!

**MRS. EDWARDS:** — The varied and complex problems facing all levels of government in these days of double digit inflation and unrest both inside and outside of Canada are not easy problems to deal with and I am sure discourage many good people from ever seeking public office.

Each time I look at the national news on television and watch the overwhelming problems in so many countries of this world, I realize time and time again how fortunate we are to be

living in Canada. Canada is a great country — a country that has developed under the free enterprise system — with the result that Canadians enjoy a freedom and a standard of living envied by millions in other parts of the world. People from communist and bankrupt socialist nations are clamouring to emigrate to this great country of ours. A country where we can have social reforms with federal programs such as: old age pensions, family allowance, Canada Pension Plan, unemployment insurance, cost sharing in health and welfare program, and housing. All of these program and many others, aiding our people and all within a free enterprise system of government.

**SOME HON. MEMBERS:** — Hear, hear!

**MRS. EDWARDS:** — There are some in Canada who would change our free enterprise system of government and replace it with the socialist system of countries such as great Britain and Denmark. The NDP who believe a socialist government would be a change for the better in Canada would do well to take a close look at what is happening in Britain and Denmark.

**SOME HON. MEMBERS:** Hear, hear!

**MRS. EDWARDS:** — Socialism with its policy of nationalizing all of Britain's' industries has not solved their problems. It has created them. A prominent female British leader speaking in Canada recently said: "The problems of Britain were not a crisis of capitalism but a crisis of socialism". She blamed their system for record unemployment and inflation of 25 per cent.

In the Star-Phoenix recently October 1st to be exact, a recent report from Copenhagen had headlines that read:

Super welfare state facing problems. Something rotten in Denmark.

Denmark acknowledges that it is in trouble. May I quote:

The Country has been Western Europe's leader in unemployment for the past year with up to 13 per cent of the blue collar work force jobless. Emigration ran to 40,000 in 1974 — the proportionate equivalent to 1.6 million people leaving the United States and now is up 25 per cent, the highest rate in a century. And since 1971, when they reached 44 per cent, taxes here have represented a grater part of the gross national product than anywhere else in the industrialized world. Beyond the statistical horror show, the problem is that Denmark's troubles outpace recession and involve the functioning and growth of its super welfare state. Many Danes now believe that the country's recovery depends not only on the standard economic stimulants, but a deep decision on whether people want to continue in the direction the welfare state has brought them.

When people in Saskatchewan see the economic crisis socialism has brought upon countries such as England and Denmark and others, it is little wonder there was a reaction of shock, dismay and alarm at the announcement that our Saskatchewan NDP government plans to nationalize the potash industry in this province.

Due to drought and poor crops in past years, Saskatchewan has had its economic difficulties. Many people have vivid memories of the depression and the hardships of the '30s. With such a history behind us, little wonder there was great rejoicing when it was discovered Saskatchewan had huge potash deposits beneath the prairie soil.

Mr. Speaker, in spite of what the Hon. Member for Kelsey-Tisdale (Mr. Messer) said this afternoon. I will still say a former Premier of this province, Hon. T.C. Douglas negotiated with potash companies to come to Saskatchewan and develop mines. He promised them security, fair taxation and an assurance that they would not be expropriated.

**SOME HON. MEMBERS:** Hear, hear!

**MRS. EDWARDS:** — The potash companies came to our province investing millions to build and develop mines. Mines we did not have the expertise or money to build and operate.

Mr. Speaker, I can recall it being said over and over again that potash would do for Saskatchewan what oil had done for Alberta. It was expected that fair taxation and royalties as they have done in Alberta, would provide funds which through the years would improve the quality of life for every man, woman, and child in our province. At a time when Saskatchewan was on the verge of becoming a 'have' province rather than a 'have not'. At a time when this government has voiced its concern about inflation and has been preaching restraint to spending. This government is now planning to spend billions of dollars, borrowing at today's high interest rates, risking our money to buy potash mines that may or may not produce the revenues they anticipate.

The Saskatchewan NDP government does not have a good track record as far as business ventures go.

**SOME HON. MEMBERS:** — Hear, hear!

**MRS. EDWARDS:** — One reason may be that most government-run enterprises take ten times as many employees to get 1/10 of the productivity as that achieved by the private sector.

**SOME HON. MEMBERS:** — Hear, hear!

**MRS. EDWARDS:** — It is to be hoped that the move of this government to enter directly into the potash business will not end in failure and disaster as did the shoe factory, the woollen mill and the box factory.

**AN HON. MEMBER:** — Don't date yourself!

**MRS. EDWARDS:** — If such should be the case and if could well be, we in Saskatchewan could find ourselves sitting on our pot — Mr. Speaker, I am sorry, I mean our potash . . .

**SOME HON. MEMBERS:** — Hear, hear!

**MRS. EDWARDS:** — . . . forever while the companies we have chased from our doors have developed mines elsewhere and taken over the world markets.

Mr. Speaker, government takeovers are popular with three kinds of people. Those who have nothing to be expropriated and therefore nothing to lose. And those who think it is great providing it is happening to someone else, and those who are anxious to sell anything at an inflated price and taking their money, laugh all the way to the bank at the expense of the public purse.

The Throne Speech say, and I quote:

This government has adopted a flexible approach, sometimes innovative, but never doctrinaire.

Such words have a hollow and insincere ring to those who have experience the heavy hand of government expropriation.

Mr. Speaker, the Throne Speech goes on to say, and I quote:

It is recognized fully that now and in the future Saskatchewan will need expertise and capital from outside of the province. Opportunities for broadening and expanding our economic base must be pursued.

Mr. Speaker, no one in Saskatchewan could disagree with such statements. I put the question to this Assembly: what investor will now risk coming to this province as long as there is an NDP government in power?

Over the past four years and in the Throne Speech there has been such a negative and hostile attitude to business and industrial development, the people working for the Department of Industry and Commerce and the department of Regional Expansion will have to be super salesman indeed to overcome the odds that have been set up against them.

Now, Mr. Speaker, if I may turn to matters of health. As one who has been involved in the health field as a nurse and a hospital trustee, I welcome the new emphasis that is being placed on preventive health measures by the federal Health Minister, the Hon. Marc Lalonde and the former Saskatchewan Minister of Health, the Hon. Member for Regina North East (Mr. Smishek). If I may mention one particular area. We must all be concerned about the heavy toll particularly on our youth, highway accidents are causing. I would urge this Assembly to give serious consideration to the recommendations of the Saskatchewan Safety Council so that needless accidents on our highways may be prevented.

I should like to commend the former Minister of Health and his department for health education programs that have been started. I would urge they be increased and improved.

Mr. Speaker, it is important that we as a people, particularly our young people (because it is perhaps too late to re-educate many of the older generation), it is important that all of us realize that much of the sickness and disease suffered by people today is self-inflicted, caused by obesity, smoking, drug and alcohol misuse and abuse, lack of exercise and

needless accidents. We must encourage the citizens of this province to accept the responsibility of taking seriously preventive health measures in order to preserve and maintain their own state of well-being.

Mr. Speaker, a tight lid has been placed on hospital spending, those providing health services have been warned not to stack new programs on existing programs. Anyone seriously concerned about health costs would have difficulty to argue against such a policy. However, the former Minister of Health did not heed his own advice. He has started many new expensive health programs. I say fine, if we can afford them and if they are not at the expense of essential existing programs, such as acute care in hospitals, where there are long waiting lists, and where at the present time there is talk of further cutbacks in the quantity and quality of care.

Mr. Speaker, it is little comfort for a sick person anxiously waiting and waiting for a hospital bed, or for any elderly person with a stroke to know that he could have a free hearing aid or some free drugs or a free cane.

**SOME HON. MEMBERS:** Hear, hear!

**MRS. EDWARDS:** — Mr. Speaker, it is little comfort for those people if they have no place to lay their head, no one to bathe them and no one to feed them.

**SOME HON. MEMBERS:** — Hear, hear!

**MRS. EDWARDS:** — When health dollars are scarce, priorities on spending must be of prime importance. In our rush to bring in new programs, I emphasize once again, we must not neglect and cutback on existing vital and essential programs, such as Level III and Level IV care; programs which are already falling far short of meeting the health needs of our senior citizens.

Regarding the Prescription Drug Plan, I would be quick to agree that those who cannot afford to buy prescription drugs should receive, and many were, in fact receiving assistance in this area. I do question, however, priorities in the spending of the health dollar when the government decided to provide free prescription drugs to 90 per cent of our people who are more affluent and more capable of paying for their own drugs than ever before.

Mr. Speaker, there are many faults and difficulties in the present drug plan. I will be interested in seeing the amendments which will be brought in. In my opinion the Saskatchewan Plan is awkward and unworkable.

**SOME HON. MEMBERS:** Hear, hear!

**MRS. EDWARDS:** — I say it should be scrapped and replaced with a more sensible and realistic plan similar to the one in Manitoba.

**SOME HON. MEMBERS:** — Hear, hear!

**MRS. EDWARDS:** — Mr. Speaker, the Throne

Speech promises that the health delivery system will be streamlined. That is good news, for it is badly needed. Hopefully, streamlining means that all levels of care will be administered by one department of government, the Department of Health. There are many of us who have advocated this for years. The present system with Levels I, II and II being administered by the Department of Social Services and Levels IV, V and VI being administered by the Department of Health, leads to inefficiencies and fragmentation of the system and frustration for those giving care and those receiving care.

Mr. Speaker, I will look forward to the proposed changes that will streamline our health delivery system.

I should now like to speak about the city of Saskatoon. It was an honor and a privilege for me to serve as an alderman in the Saskatoon City Council during the time that Mr. Sidney Buckwold, now Senator Buckwold, was the mayor.

**SOME HON. MEMBERS: — Hear, hear!**

**MRS. EDWARDS:** — The effects of his outstanding and dedicated leadership will long be seen and remembered in our city and throughout Canada.

The city of Saskatoon has had good municipal government over the years. Good planning has resulted in Saskatoon earning the reputation in the municipal field of being one of the jewels of the prairies. The moving of the CNR station, the development of the Mid-Town Plaza, the building of our own auditorium and a modern . . .

**SOME HON. MEMBERS: — Hear, hear!**

**MRS. EDWARDS:** — . . . sorry Mayor Baker is not here . . . the building of a modern freeway, all these major projects won the city the Vincent Massey Award for excellence in design in 1971. The building of a ski mountain and hosting the Canada Winter Games brought national fame to our city that same year.

With a long tradition and history of good responsible local government the council and citizens of Saskatoon were quite capable of deciding how their municipal elections should be conducted. It was shocking to have the provincial NDP government force the Ward System upon us. Such callous disregard for the municipality and local autonomy was beyond believing.

Mr. Speaker, the Ward System has not been an improvement for the city of Saskatoon as the NDP government promised it would be. In fact, it has worked quite in the reverse. I will give you some reasons:

- (1) With very little or no city-wide public advertising by candidates there is even greater apathy by the general public to municipal elections.
- (2) Again with no city-wide advertising and no city-wide public meeting the voters have no way of learning about other candidates seeking office except those in their own ward.
- (3) The voters do not have the opportunity, as they had



under the former system, with one vote for each alderman to be elected — to vote in a balanced council.

- (4) Mr. Speaker, perhaps this is more on a personal note but it is my opinion that it makes it very difficult for a woman to be elected to council. In most wards she would have to run in a one to one battle against a male incumbent. I am sorry to say that such odds make it almost impossible for a woman to win. As a result at this time there are no women serving on the Saskatoon City Council.

It was interesting to note that when the Ward System was forced on the city of Saskatoon, not one of our elected NDP MLAs stood up against such outrageous legislation in defense of local autonomy for our city.

Earlier this week Premier Blakeney brought to the attention of this Assembly a resume of the projects and facilities the provincial government has provide for the city of Regina. And once again I am sorry Mayor Baker isn't here because I should like to congratulate him and the city of Regina for their good fortune. I just hope there is some money left for Saskatoon. I would ask the other MLAs from our city to join with me in urging this provincial government to give equal consideration to a similar sized city, the city of Saskatoon with as many needs as the city of Regina.

One of our most urgent concerns is the need for a new northern river crossing which would become part of the Yellowhead Highway Route linking the northern industrial area with the University and Sutherland. I would urge the Minister of Highway (Mr. Kramer) to take the lead and I emphasize, take the lead, instead of dragging his feet, and set up negotiations with federal and local authorities to hasten cost sharing arrangements, so that an early start can be made on a new bridge for Saskatoon.

It concerns me, Mr. Speaker, to hear the Premier say, after all the boasting about what his government has done for Regina, that this project may have to wait because of austerity measures. Surely it would be better for our citizens if a moratorium were placed on the construction of new government office buildings and the hiring of civil servants to fill them than delay the building of a vital link in our transportation system.

**SOME HON. MEMBERS:** — Hear, hear!

**MRS. EDWARDS:** — On this important issue, once again, I hope the other MLAs will join with me in insisting that this project is given prompt priority for our city.

Saskatoon faces the problems of most fast growing urban centres. The shortage of housing and rental accommodation is about number one on the list at the present time. It is interesting to note how quickly the housing situation can change. I can well remember the situation as it was in 1969 and 1971. The years, the Premier brought to our attention yesterday — when he pointed out the amount of money the Liberal government of that day put into housing starts and rental units.

As an alderman of Saskatoon I was a member of the planning

and development committee. One of our very real problems was that Saskatoon was over-built with apartments, so much so that when the three levels of government decided to provide more low rental units instead of building new apartment I suggested, and we were able to buy at a price less than it would have cost us to build the, three relatively new apartment blocks. Many of the people who had invested in high rise apartments in those day had difficulty in renting suites. They were offering reduced rents and even a month's free rent to entice people to move into half vacant high rise apartments. Many of these businessmen were close to bankruptcy. Builders at that time were meeting with the planning and development committee of city council to buy back serviced lots there was no demand for and they had no hope of building houses on them. The housing industry at that time was left with 350 to 400 unsold and unsaleable houses.

In comparing the number of housing starts ad the money allocated by the provincial government in 1969 and 1970 the Premier could have told the whole story and included the facts on the lack of demand and the slump the building trade as in at that time.

In those years our agricultural industry was in the doldrums. Prices were low and grain quotas were almost non-existent. The result was a Saskatchewan recession.

To suggest that the turnaround in housing starts in the past couple of years is to the credit of the present government, clearly indicates a lack of understanding of the forces effecting our economy in this province. The present demand for housing is directly related to our buoyant economy resulting from record crops, record prices and record world markets.

Mr. Speaker, regarding rent controls. For the people and many of whom are living on limited incomes who have been faced with unreasonable rent increases, I welcome news of some form of rent control as a short term remedy. We all realize rent controls are not the answer in the long run. New starts must be encouraged if an adequate supply and choice of rental accommodation is to be made available. Therefore, I was pleased to hear the Premier say yesterday that newly constructed rental units will be exempt form rent controls. Otherwise we might have been faced with no new starts on this type of accommodation and the problem of a shortage in rental accommodation would have been further aggravated.

Incentives to encourage new housing starts are always welcome. But I should like to bring to the attention of this Assembly that rehabilitation of other housing in older areas of our cities and towns where services such as roads and schools and buses are already in existence should not be neglected or forgotten. I urge this government to take the lead with federal and local authorities to set up a plan whereby people wishing to sell an older home could do so for cash and young people wishing to buy such a home could do so with a low down payment receiving the same assistance with financing and grants as those buying new homes.

Such a plan would do much to revitalize older areas in our communities and help both our senior citizens wishing to get their equity in cash and young people who wish to purchase their first home but do not have the money for a large down payment.

Mr. Speaker, there are many new and innovative ideas in land use and housing being built in other parts of this country. I was pleased to hear the previous speaker, speak of the Saskatchewan Housing Corporation and some of the new programs that they are beginning. It is to be hoped that this will ease our housing situation in Saskatchewan. I would also like to thank him for recognizing the major part that the Liberal federal government plays in the financing of all these housing starts.

**SOME HON. MEMBERS:** — Hear, hear!

**MRS. EDWARDS:** — Mr. Speaker, the shortage of rental accommodation for students at the University of Saskatchewan is always a pressing problem. One of my campaign promises was the provision of more student housing on the university campus. We are pleased to see that another sorely needed high rise is now being built in McEwen Park. On behalf of the students who will be housed in that facility, I would express my appreciation to Premier Blakeney and his government.

Mr. Speaker, while I commend the government for their attempt, with this new building, to meet the needs of students, it was disappointing and almost unbelievable to learn this fall that when Emmanuel St. Chads' Anglican residence, right on the campus was offered to the Board of Governors of the university at a reasonable price, the money was not made available by this government for the purchase.

Before closing, Mr. Speaker, may I as one of the only two women elected to this Assembly, pay tribute at this time to the six women who served as Members of the Saskatchewan Legislature in the past: Sarah Ramsland, 1919-1925; Beatrice Trew, 1944-1948; Mary Batten 1956-1964; Gladys Strum, 1960-1964; Sally Merchant, 1964-1967.

**SOME HON. MEMBERS:** — Hear, hear!

**MRS. EDWARDS:** — Mrs. Merchant has the added distinction of being the mother of the Hon. Member for Regina Wascana.

**MRS. EDWARDS:** — Marjorie Cooper, 1952-1967. The fact that since the Legislature first came into existence only six women have been elected, with Miss Clifford and me now bringing the total to eight, would lead one to ask why so few women MLAs?

Such a question, would no doubt bring a variety of answers and probably, all answers would be at least partially correct.

Mr. Speaker, I consider it a privilege and an honor to recognize the courageous leadership given by the avant-garde women of past provincial assemblies. Women who chose to move in the political arena at a time when it was generally regarded as a man's world and sometimes I think it still is.

The women I speak of, would no doubt be as pleased as I was to know that the Throne Speech mentions the need of opening new

career opportunities to women in the public service and the promotion of greater opportunities for women who work in the community at large.

At this time I should also like to take this opportunity to commend the work of Mrs. Margaret Harris, a member of my constituency who has given outstanding leadership in many worthwhile endeavours in Saskatoon. At the present time Mrs. Harris is chairman for the Saskatchewan Advisory Committee on the Status of Women.

As you all know this is international Women's year, hopefully the beginning of a new era for women in Canada and in this province.

Perhaps the effect may even be felt in this Legislature and after the next election Miss Clifford and I will not be so badly outnumbered.

Mr. Speaker, I take pleasure in supporting the amendment.

**SOME HON. MEMBERS:** Hear, hear!

**HON. A.S. MATSALLA (Minister of Tourism and Renewable Resources):** — Mr. Speaker, it is indeed a privilege for me to have this opportunity to participate in this very important Throne Speech debate.

At the outset, I want to congratulate you, Sir, on your appointment as Speaker. I have every confidence that your impartiality and good judgment will further enhance the prestige and respect which your predecessors have earned in the past.

Mr. Speaker, I should like to join with previous speakers in extending a warm welcome to the new Members of this Assembly. I want to wish them well, and I hope that they enjoy the work of being in the Legislature as well as the work of serving their constituents. The mover and the seconder wasted little time in leaving the impression of their capabilities in providing good representation for their constituents and the people of Saskatchewan. I have faith that other new Members on both sides of the House will attempt to give their best in contribution to the good of this Legislature as well as the people of this province.

Having said that, Mr. Speaker, I have some concern about the attitudes of the new Liberal backbenchers in this House, as I fear their pre-occupation will be with upstaging the Leader of the Opposition in attempts to gain points as they scramble towards the leadership race.

To the small group of Conservatives, Mr. Speaker, I can only assume that the Members are whipped into line and are resigning themselves to the reality that their Leader will occupy that position for at least the next four years. I was somewhat amused when the Hon. Member for Nipawin spoke the other day. He attempted to give this Assembly a lecture on House decorum and on what Members should and should not do when in this House. To some of his points I can agree, but as to others I would describe them as childish.

**SOME HON. MEMBERS:** — Hear, hear!

**MR. MATSALLA:** — With reference to some of the comments made by the Hon. Member who just spoke, with respect to the relationship of the Saskatoon city council and the Yellowhead Highway Association, I'd like to keep the record straight. I want to say that the city council dropped out of participating in the Yellowhead Project Association. It is quite obvious that they didn't put a very high priority on this very important and vital link running across our province.

Mr. Speaker, I was particularly interested in the comments of the Opposition when they positioned themselves in relationship to the Throne Speech.

One would have thought lessons would have been learned following the last election. However, such was not the case. It is the same tired deposition, some of the names have changed but the policy remains the same — bankrupt of ideas and no alternatives to offer.

Criticise, complain and condemn — already, Mr. Speaker, these have become trademarks of Tories and Liberals alike.

**SOME HON. MEMBERS:** — Hear, hear!

**MR. MATSALLA:** — This includes the Hon. Member for Nipawin. He portrays himself above all others, but there is little doubt that he is falling into the pattern set by the Hon. Member for Prince Albert-Duck Lake.

Mr. Speaker, Her Majesty's Loyal Opposition have the right and responsibility to criticize when they see things happening which displease their particular philosophies. However, with that right to criticize also come the responsibility to be constructive, to offer alternatives and to seek better solutions.

So far, we have heard nothing but rhetoric from the Members opposite. Surely, Mr. Speaker, the people of Saskatchewan deserve more.

The reason for that is that this Throne Speech is indeed difficult to condemn. It reflects the commitment of this New Democratic Party government to continue offering leadership and determination to build a better province.

**SOME HON. MEMBERS:** — Hear, hear!

**MR. MATSALLA:** — To build a Saskatchewan symbolizing economic and social justice.

Mr. Speaker, on the 11th day of June, the people of this province went to the polls and said very clearly that they endorse the direction in which Premier Blakeney and his government is heading.

**SOME HON. MEMBERS:** — Hear, hear!

**MR. MATSALLA:** — Mr. Speaker, our election victory was very decisive.

It provided us with the mandate necessary to bring to the people of Saskatchewan four more years of responsible government.

**SOME HON. MEMBERS:** — Hear, hear!

**MR. MATSALLA:** — There is no question, Mr. Speaker, one of the most important issues in the last election was that of leadership. We had the dynamic and tested leadership of Premier Blakeney and the people of Saskatchewan chose Allan Blakeney and his NDP government. I want to take this opportunity to congratulate our Premier for the positive and realistic manner in which he carried our party through the last election campaign. It was a job well done.

**SOME HON. MEMBERS:** — Hear, hear!

**MR. MATSALLA:** — Mr. Speaker, I commend this government of presenting this Legislature with a positive document in the Speech from the Throne. There can be little argument respecting the issues involved, and likewise it is clear to all how Members opposite have joined forces in offering their joint rejection.

When one stops to think that former Liberal Finance Minister John Turner could turn around and jump on the Conservative Leadership bandwagon and be considered as one of the favourites, there is little surprise in the fact their provincial cousins are also getting along well, despite their little private war to assert themselves as the official opposition and the spokesmen for free enterprise and big business.

Mr. Speaker, the Throne Speech reaffirms our commitment and determination to build a better Saskatchewan. Already we are shedding that 'have not' image and replacing it with an image which reflects confidence and growth.

Our population is on the upswing. We continue to enjoy the lowest unemployment rate in Canada as more people than at any other time in our history continue to work. While every other province in Canada experienced a decline in their house construction programs, our program achieved a record 7,700 starts last year and an even greater acceleration is occurring this year.

Mr. Speaker, when Members opposite say things are bad and we are not doing our job, the people of the province, I am sure, know better and they will not believe them. The remarkable thing, Mr. Speaker, is the fact that much of our development and growth has taken place in spite of, rather than because of, federal government involvement.

In agriculture, where income stability remains the key to future viability, the government in Ottawa continues to shirk its responsibilities. This government, Mr. Speaker, is not sitting idly by, but has shown concern and action through implementation of various agricultural programs. To mention a few, the Land bank, FarmStart, Hog Price Stabilization and the Cow-Calf Advance Program. All these have been significant in stabilizing our agriculture industry.

This government, Mr. Speaker, has sown itself to be responsible by offering support and co-operation towards the

federal anti-inflation program.

Prior to the last federal election Mr. Speaker, the Prime Minister said he would wrestle inflation to the ground. But it wasn't too long after that that he changed his tune, telling the press that his inflation fighting program could cost him the next election. It is obvious, Mr. Speaker, he was playing politics with the economic fate of our country.

Well, one thing is for certain, Mr. Speaker, it took a near tragic economic situation before he reacted and, despite the program's deficiencies, I want to commend our Premier and this New Democratic government for co-operating in the war against inflation.

Incidentally, Mr. Speaker, it was interesting to watch the recent Ontario election with the Conservative Party attempting to blame all the province's troubles on the Liberal government in Ottawa, while the Liberal Party was blaming everything on the provincial Conservatives. The lesson to be learned here, however, is found in the fact that it was only the New Democratic Party which stuck to the real issues, issues which were dealt with in a responsible manner and in turn led to a major breakthrough for the Ontario New Democrats.

Mr. Speaker, the problem with the federal anti-inflation program is that it still will not offer the necessary muscle if we are to wrestle this economic problem to the ground. The Throne Speech clearly articulates the program's shortcomings and other speakers in this debate have done an excellent job in further expanding the concerns.

Mr. Speaker, I would like to offer a few comments on the development of our resources.

As stated in the Speech from the Throne, our policy is well known, and I quote:

The cornerstone of that policy is the right of the people of Saskatchewan to receive their fair share of benefits from the development of their resources: benefits in public revenues, benefits in jobs from the harvesting and processing of resources, benefits in conservation of scarce resources for future generations and, benefits in achieving a greater control over their own destiny.

Mr. Speaker, if ever there was a single issue which clarifies the differences in philosophy between this government and Members opposite, it is the issue of resource development. The Liberal record is still all too clear in our minds. One of the major reasons for their annihilation in 1971 was their complete pre-occupation in selling our northern timber resources for next to nothing, while at the same time doing everything in their power to satisfy their corporate friends. The infamous Doré Lake pulp mill proposal will long remain as the monument of Liberal resource policy. We all remember how they opposed and condemned this government for repatriating our forests to the rightful owners, the people of Saskatchewan.

We remember what they did to the timber board when they sat in government. We remember the then Finance Minister, the Member for Prince Albert-Duck Lake, for his arrogance in signing away millions of taxpayer dollars, just a few days before the

1971 election and we remember how the Liberals virtually gave away all of the North's merchantable timber stands to the three giant foreign-owned corporations.

That, Mr. Speaker, is testimony of the Liberal record respecting resources.

What about our oil resource? Our government opposed the federal oil policy and fought for a better share of revenue derived from this non-renewable resource.

Where did the Liberals stand? What position did they take? The record is again clear, Mr. Speaker. They said we would drive away oil companies out of this province. They said we were being too hard on the multinational corporation which were making millions and returning little in benefits to Saskatchewan people.

The debates and proceedings of this Legislature record the position of the Liberal Party. They show clearly that Members opposite do not have a responsible policy respecting resource development. In fact, their only policy is, "Fellas, come in. Take what you want, it's there for the asking."

Mr. Speaker, the people of Saskatchewan will not stand for that. This government will not stand for that, an I am proud to be part of a government which has the determination to fight for what is ours despite the outcry of the two old line parties and their corporate friends.

The Leader of the Opposition and the Member for Nipawin said they were shocked that this government would move into the potash industry. They both said it was a bad deal, they said it was a risk, they said it would result in the mass exodus of all industry from the province.

Well, Mr. Speaker, I don't really know when to take them seriously, or for that matter, when to believe them. They seem to believe the illusion that all is well in the potash arena. They seem to thin that it is okay if we just let corporations have their own way with this invaluable non-renewable resource. Saskatchewan has some of the best potash reserves in the world and as a government we have a responsibility for the development of these reserves in the best interest of the people of this province.

**SOME HON. MEMBERS:** — Hear, hear!

**MR. MATSALLA:** — We also have a responsibility to our children and their children to ensure that these benefits are passed on from generation to generation.

Mr. Speaker, it is said our potash initiative is going to loom as the biggest political battle since medicare. This New Democratic Party government is committed to fulfil its promises to the people of Saskatchewan, and it is prepared to lead in this battle. Our resource policy has been spelled out clearly many times in the past. It has the general widespread support of the people and I commend this government for having the courage to take on the fight of restoring this important resource into the hands of Saskatchewan people.



Mr. Speaker, I should briefly to deal with another resource which is proving very valuable to the people of this province. This resource is our forests.

Our government is continuing to develop the forest industry for our benefit. Highly valued products are now being produced in the new plywood mill at Hudson Bay. This industrial development is providing greater returns in revenue and jobs to the people of Saskatchewan. At the same time, through our forest management, conservation practices, we are assuring that our great forest resource will continue to be available for future generations. Both industry and government are making contributions towards the reforestation program. In addition, Mr. Speaker, in order to retain control over our forest resource, large tracts of forests are being gradually changed to commitments for specific volumes of wood, thus leaving the necessary flexibility in the hands of the people of Saskatchewan for the proper management of our forest resource.

Mr. Speaker, I believe in the philosophy of this government and I have confidence in the direction it is moving to develop a great province for its understanding and resourceful people. The Speech from the Throne is in line with this philosophy and it promises further resource development and greater things for the people of Saskatchewan.

I will not be supporting the amendments but I will give my full support to the main motion.

**SOME HON. MEMBERS:** — Hear, hear!

The Assembly adjourned at 9:00 o'clock p.m. on the motion of Mr. Romanow.