

LEGISLATIVE ASSEMBLY OF SASKATCHEWAN
First Session - Eighteenth Legislature
7th Day

Friday, November 21, 1975.

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

On the Orders of the Day.

WELCOME TO SPECIAL GUESTS

MR. P.P. MOSTOWAY (Saskatoon Centre): — Mr. Speaker, seated in the galleries are a large number of senior citizens who are members of the Saskatoon Senior Citizens Action Now Association. In particular I should like to recognize Mr. Phelps from Saskatoon, the vice-president of the Association. I am not too sure if Mr. Gray, the president, who was ill is here or not. Mrs. Falk, the treasurer; and there is a possibility that Mrs. Volk, the National president of Pensioners Concerned of Toronto is here. Also, Mrs. Brown of Duck Lake, another director member, is seated in one of the galleries.

I understand that they held a two-day convention in Saskatoon and a one day convention in Regina. I hear that their convention was a success and it is to be hoped that all Assembly Members will give very serious attention to the petition tabled yesterday in the House on their behalf.

HON. MEMBERS: — Hear, hear!

MISS L.B. CLIFFORD (Wilkie): — Mr. Speaker, I'd like to share with the Hon. Member to welcome the senior citizens here today. Our caucus have met with them, and I, as the critic of Social Services am able to extend our welcome and assure them of our continued help and opportunity to meet with us any time.

HON. MEMBERS: — Hear, hear!

QUESTIONS

SOURCE OF MONEY FOR NATIONALIZATION OF POTASH INDUSTRY

MR. J.G. LANE (Qu'Appelle): — Mr. Speaker, I should like to direct a question to the Minister of Finance. There has been a lot of speculation about the sources of money for the nationalization, takeover, or purchase of the potash industry. The Member responsible for the expropriation is quoted as saying that the province has significant sums of money. I think he made that statement at the recent NDP convention. Included in those significant sums of money, he made reference to pension funds.

Is the Minister prepared and would he give the assurance to the people of Saskatchewan that pension funds and superannuation funds that are administered by the Government of Saskatchewan will not be used in any way, shape, or form for the purchase of financing of the expropriation or nationalization of the potash industry?

HON. A.E. BLAKENEY (Premier): — Mr. Speaker, I think I should like to reply to

that and to say that any funds used by this government for any industrial enterprise and where the funds are obtained from pension funds will be secured by the guarantee of the absolute obligation of the province of Saskatchewan. If the Member therefore is asking whether or not we will refrain from selling provincial securities to pension funds, the answer is no.

MR. LANE: — By way of supplementary, I would request that this failure to give the assurance to long time public service employees, Crown corporation employees, teachers, municipal employees in the province of Saskatchewan which the Premier has just indicated, then is the government, in effect, asking long time employees of the province of Saskatchewan to assume this awesome risk, and in effect to pay for a major part of the cost of this very risky venture of nationalization of the potash industry?

MR. BLAKENEY: — We are asking employees who have claims on superannuation funds and those who do not have claims on superannuation funds, i.e., public servants who are under the Public Service Superannuation Plan to rely upon the obligation, the general obligation of the province of Saskatchewan. That has been the situation since these pension funds were established. I anticipate it will continue to be the situation and I expect that just as many people will lose on that account in the next years as have lost in the last 30 or 40 years — number zero.

ASSURANCES RE INCREASED OIL FIELD ACTIVITY

MR. E.C. MALONE (Regina-Lakeview): — Mr. Speaker, before the Orders of the Day I should like to direct a question to the Minister of Mineral Resources (Mr. Whelan). The question arises out of the Minister's announcement yesterday as to the new oil royalty rates set by the province of Saskatchewan on the oil and gas industry.

Notwithstanding the changes in these rates, Mr. Speaker, it still shows that an oil company carrying on business in Saskatchewan would have to pay twice as much tax as it would if it carried on business in Alberta. In view of this I am intrigued by the Minister's statement yesterday where he said and I quote:

We have been assured by the oil industry that with those proposed changes they will increase activity.

Now I spoke today with the manager of the Canadian Petroleum Association in Regina and his counterpart with IPAC, the independent association in Calgary, they both assured me that at no time did they ever given the government any assurances such as indicated by the Minister. My question to the Minister is: other than Saskoil from whom have you received these assurances?

HON. E.C. WHELAN (Minister of Mineral Resources): — Mr. Speaker, in answer to the Hon. Member for Lakeview, we have met many oil companies. Some of them are members of IPAC and some of them CPA. I can assure you, Mr. Speaker, that the Hon. Member for Lakeview is making sweeping statements without the facts. We have plans and indications that these

that are undertaken care carefully set out. I think we would be giving away confidence if we gave them to the House. I'm sure that the Hon. Members do not want to see any activity. They are hoping that that will be the case. I think they are in for a surprise.

MR. MALONE: — On the contrary, we would very much like to see activity but the Minister will not name the companies from whom the assurances have been received. By way of supplementary, will he tell where this increased activity is going to take place, when it is going to start, and what amounts of money are involved.

MR. WHELAN: — Mr. Speaker, the answer to the Hon. Member is, it will be in the province of Saskatchewan. It has already begun. One of the big problems that we are really facing is the problem we have with the Federal Government. I hope he will use his good offices to get them to change some of their policies because they are hampering the activity and have been doing this for quite a long time. I think that the most recent announcement is indicative of the lack of an energy policy in the federal area. This is really putting a stop to oil activity and is making people wonder what is coming next.

INTERCONTINENTAL PACKERS LAYOFFS

MR. D.G. STEUART (Leader of the Opposition): — Mr. Speaker, I should like to direct a question to the Hon. Minister of Industry and Commerce (Mr. Messer). I gave him a bit of a notice on this the other day when I spoke. It concerns the Intercontinental Packers branch plant in Regina. Is he aware that there have been layoffs of up to 50 employees recently at the Intercon operations in the city of Regina.

HON. J.R. MESSER (Minister of Industry & Commerce): — Mr. Speaker, I am aware that there have been some layoffs. I believe the number is 28, not 50 in number. I may stand to be corrected on that, but the last information I had was that the number was 28. They were management employees who I have been informed have found employment elsewhere. No union employees have been laid off. The reason, Mr. Speaker, for the layoff was due to the decline in production of hogs in the province of Saskatchewan and consequently the plant was not operating at the level which would provide employment for those people. There has been some change in the operations of the Regina plant. It is now primarily a hog kill plant and they have undertaken to step up the cattle processing at that plant. It is expected that there will be no further layoffs unless there is some further reduction in the production or sales of slaughter hogs and cattle.

MR. STEUART: — A supplementary question, Mr. Speaker. Is the Minister aware that since their intrusion in the packing plant business we have seen the almost total closure of the Burns Plant at Prince Albert and we now see major layoffs in the plant in Regina. Is it not a fact that Intercon are just doing custom killing and that if this is a fact, does this not mean that the likelihood that total closure of this plant may be faced sometime in the future?

MR. MESSER: — I think it is hypothetical to assume at this time that the plant would be confronted with a decision to shut down in the future. The answer to the question in regard to whether they are now doing only custom killing is not accurate. They are doing a good deal more than that, although they have stepped up the activities of custom killing in the line of beef.

ADJOURNED DEBATES

ADDRESS-IN-REPLY

The Assembly resumed the adjourned debate on the proposed motion by Mr. Koskie (Quill Lakes) and the amendment thereto by Mr. Steuart (Leader of the Opposition) and the subamendment by Mr. Collver (Leader of the Progressive Conservatives).

MR. D.G. BANDA (Redberry): — Mr. Speaker, it is with great pleasure that I rise to take part in this Throne Speech debate.

It is indeed a privilege to be able to speak in support of such a progressive document that was presented by His Honour The Lieutenant-Governor.

SOME HON. MEMBERS: — Hear, hear!

MR. BANDA: — It is an honor and a privilege for me to represent the constituency of Redberry. This riding is a rural constituency made up of small towns and villages and supported by mixed farmers. We are fortunate to have many beautiful lakes and picnic sites in our constituency which attract people from all areas of this province. We are proud to have recreational sites such as the Battleford's Provincial Park at Jackfish Lake, regional parks at Martin's Lake, at Meeting Lake and the part south of Maymont.

The people of Redberry are proud of the NDP Government of Saskatchewan and are pleased with its response towards agriculture and the preservation of the rural way of life in this province. They have indicated their support by continuously electing an NDP Member to this Legislature since 1960.

SOME HON. MEMBERS: Hear, hear!

MR. BANDA: — During the last four years of NDP government we have witnessed the growth and prosperity of rural communities unparalleled in Saskatchewan history. The government has embarked on program which have aided and abetted this prosperity. Programs like the Community Capital Fund. The Community Capital Fund has provided a total of \$281,550 in unconditional grants over a five year period to be used as the communities in Redberry see fit. This has enable towns and villages in Redberry to put in projects like water purification plants, water systems, RM office buildings, oiling streets, building sidewalks and many other worthwhile projects to mention a few.

A large percentage of our towns and villages now have oiled main streets and access roads under the Open Roads and Main street programs. This makes them cleaner and better places to live.

Provincial winter works programs have benefitted many communities. A good example of this is the skating and curling rink complex at Leask. As a result of dramatic increases in school grants and Property Improvement Grants, Saskatchewan taxpayers, urban and rural have been the winners with 75 per cent of education costs now borne by the Saskatchewan government.

Mr. Speaker, I am proud to be part of a government which recognizes the needs and aspirations of our rural communities and I look forward with anticipation to this continued concern over the next four years.

SOME HON. MEMBERS: Hear, hear!

MR. BANDA: — Mr. Speaker, under the New Democrats Saskatchewan's most important industry has begun to come into its own.

The Land Bank Program has to a very great extent solved many problems that may have plagued the agricultural and rural section of this society for many years. Mr. Speaker, it is totally a voluntary program. Since its inception it has granted over 41 leases in Redberry alone. Mr. Speaker, that means 41 more people on the land who would not have been there had it not been for this program.

Other programs like Farmstart which have helped young farmers get a start in livestock enterprises, over 50 of these in Redberry alone. Unfortunately now this sector is in some difficulty. Mr. Speaker, the provincial government has urged the federal government to recognize the difficulties encountered by your livestock producers. We have offered our full co-operation, in an effort to provide stabilization to this industry. What has been their response?

They have reduced the stabilization guaranteed level on beef up to \$43.94 pre hundredweight, down from \$45.42. This will not cover production costs let alone encourage producers to keep up production. The cow-calf producer is forgotten.

And if that is not enough, Mr. Speaker, the federal government has again given in to the railways' demands. They have indicated that they will allow the railways to increase livestock freight rates by 25 per cent, effective November 14.

This is the third increase within the last ten months. On the basis of the three increases and the tariff paid previously, the cost of shipping livestock to eastern Canada via shipper-owner double deck cars will have increased 91.4 per cent and 86.9 per cent for rail owner cars. It would appear to me, Mr. Speaker, that the federal government is more interested in stabilizing the profit picture of the railway companies instead of that of the livestock producers.

SOME HON. MEMBERS: Hear, hear!

MR. BANDA: — Furthermore, in view of the fact that the federal government has launched a new battle against inflation I cannot see how the railways can justify this kind of an increase.

This government, Mr. Speaker, has asked continuously for a federal stabilization program to help the cow-calf operator, but

to no avail.

In response to federal inaction we have again approved the interest free cash advance to these producers to help them get over the hump, just as we did when the hog producers were in trouble. Unfortunately, producers are still awaiting a federal government announcement for assistance.

Mr. Speaker, the present government's highway program puts the help into rural areas where it is needed. There is more than \$10 million allocated for work in the northwest. Examples of this include: more than five million on new construction work on Highway No. 3 between Shellbrook and Spiritwood; Highway No. 4 from Sonningdale Corner to north of Cando; Highway No. 12 from Martin's Lake Regional Park to Big Grassy Lake; Highway No. 40 from North Battleford to Shellbrook; projects on Highway No. 55 and No. 155 and many others which were much needed.

About \$5 million of this paving work and more than half a million dollars of oil work is also underway in the northwest. In addition, work is progressing on the Meadow Lake airport and on new bridges crossing the Saskatchewan River at Maidstone and Maymont.

Mr. Speaker, I now that the people of northwest Saskatchewan appreciate this effort by the Minister and by the Department of Highways and we thank him for this.

SOME HON. MEMBERS: — Hear, hear!

MR. BANDA: — Mr. Speaker, there exists in our society a group of people who for too long have been ignored by governments. For too long they have been unable to obtain even a basic level of assistance to enable them to live their lives as useful and contributing citizens. I was disturbed when this group of people, the senior citizens, were callously used by both Opposition parties as pawns in order for them to make political gains during the election campaign.

SOME HON. MEMBERS: Hear, hear!

MR. BANDA: — Mr. Speaker, this government doesn't propose to have all the answers. However, over the past four years we have tried to recognize and assist the aspirations of our senior citizens. I believe our efforts have not been in vain.

SOME HON. MEMBERS: — Hear, hear!

MR. BANDA: — Senior citizens' home repair programs have helped 295 of our senior citizens in Redberry constituency. These grants have not only helped these pioneers improve their living surroundings but have helped them to stay in their homes instead of having to seek help in an institution or pay out their savings in new housing facilities. We have recognized that inflation is affecting this class of people and we will be increasing the amount of this grant in this session.

We are pleased to have 20 senior citizens' units built in Radisson. These are now open for occupancy and I can assure my constituents that I will be doing whatever possible to get

our older people whatever level of facilities are necessary in this constituency in the years ahead.

I should like to turn for a moment to the future of our grain-handling and transportation system. In 1974, federal Transport Minister Marchand described Canada's transportation as a mess. What was a mess in 1974 is approaching chaos in 1975.

This province is faced with the task of maintaining the 3,470 miles of rail lines that are scheduled for abandonment. The submissions made to the Hall Commission so far are no surprise. The railways continue their sad tune over the amount of money they are losing in maintaining the lines. They maintain the lines are too costly to replace or upgrade. They say the Crow's Nest rates must go.

The future of our rural communities in Redberry and in this province are at stake and I want to say that my constituents are very concerned because of the fact that every line with the exception of the North Battleford-Dalmeny lines are up to abandonment. This affects four subdivisions in this constituency. To allow this to happen would be a crime against rural Saskatchewan.

SOME HON. MEMBERS: Hear, hear!

MR. BANDA: — My constituents are prepared to fight this challenge along with our party and I'll fight with them.

SOME HON. MEMBERS: — Hear, hear!

MR. BANDA: — I challenge those Members opposite to state clearly where they stand on this issue of rail line abandonment and the Crow's Nest rates. It appears that the provincial government stands alone with the farmers. Our Tory and Liberal friends have a knack of completely overlooking the issues of importance to the people of Saskatchewan.

The Tories often speak of cutting expenditures. Do they not realize, Mr. Speaker, what the loss in terms of real dollars would be to the farmers if rail line abandonment occurred or what the provincial government would be required to spend in order to maintain that highway system? I don't think they do.

In the June election we stated very clearly in our 'New Deal '75' where the NDP stood on these and all the issues.

Mr. Speaker, the people of this great province indicated where they stood when they elected 39 New Democrats to this House.

SOME HON. MEMBERS: — Hear, hear!

MR. BANDA: — The Throne Speech sets out clearly the course of action we are to take in the area of potash. Acquiring a controlling interest in the potash industry in this province is purely and simply a good investment. I want to emphasize that point. Apart from the important reasons for buying into the industry, such as acquiring effective control through ownership of one of

our major resources and making sure that it is developed in a sensible way, our purchase of the industry makes good business sense. It is a first rate investment. I want to say, Mr. Speaker, I also took a survey among this issue and I got a hundred per cent response in favor.

SOME HON. MEMBERS: — Hear, hear!

MR. BANDA: — We will be buying into this industry which produces a basic product which will be in demand for as long as there are hungry people in the world. The need for potash, the market, is growing every year. It is growing on the average at something like five to six percent per year. The industry has had its ups and downs, but the long-term trend is up. At present, each year the world market requires on the average another one and a quarter million tons of potash more than the year before. That's the production capacity of a large mine, like the mine at Rocanville, for example, and Saskatchewan has the western world's best and most accessible potash. We are a logical supplier for the increasing demands. The other logical supplier is the Soviet Union. But if our industry stagnates, it's a good bet that the Russians will pick up the markets that otherwise would be ours.

We are buying into an industry which makes a very handsome yearly profit, enough, we feel, to present no threat of a drain on the taxpayers' pocket. We'll use the profits to pay off the money we borrow to buy the industry. We won't be using the taxpayers' money, but we will be building up a taxpayers' asset. In business terms, the debt we incur to purchase the potash mines will be a self-liquidating debt. It's paid off by the profits generated by the mines. That's a pretty common business practice. It's a good business practice. And, of course, it's going on every day across Canada.

Most of our farmers and small businessmen can understand the principle because they follow that pattern themselves. A farmer decides he needs another quarter section of land to make his operation more efficient. So he borrows the money to buy the new land. The land itself is the collateral for the loan. The additional production and increased efficiency provide the increased profit the farmer uses to pay off the loan for the land. The farmer doesn't have to lower his standard of living to pay off the loan. He doesn't jeopardize his financial position. In fact, he is increasing his assets and improving his financial position. Businessmen follow exactly the same pattern.

Mr. Speaker, we're going to do all this by investing in Saskatchewan. By acquiring a controlling interest in the potash industry. By exercising our right to expand and develop this vital resource.

SOME HON. MEMBERS: — Hear, hear!

MR. BANDA: — We have a solid asset, which we are developing for the benefit of the people of this province by making some prudent investment decisions.

Our potash has been developed by outside companies for the benefit of their own shareholders. That seems to have been acceptable to many Saskatchewan businessmen over the years. Now

we are getting to the business ourselves on behalf of the original shareholders, the people of Saskatchewan. This is good business. This is a good investment. It's a good deal and it makes a lot of sense.

Mr. Speaker, I will be supporting the main motion and not the amendments.

SOME HON. MEMBERS: — Hear, hear!

MR. COLLVER: — Point of Order, Mr. Speaker. Would the Member for Redberry please table his survey?

MR. BANDA: — I will stand responsible for it.

SOME HON. MEMBERS: — Hear, hear!

MISS L.B. CLIFFORD (Wilkie): — Mr. Speaker, as a new Member for the Wilkie constituency, I should first like to thank my constituents for giving me the privilege of representing them in this Session, the first session of the Eighteenth Legislature and for the opportunity to take part in this Throne Speech debate.

For the past 26 years the Wilkie constituency has been represented by a Liberal in the Saskatchewan Legislature.

SOME HON. MEMBERS: — Hear, hear!

MISS CLIFFORD: — A reflection that constituency people are Liberal in their thinking and in support of the private enterprise system and the individual.

John Horsman, for 16 years and Cliff McIsaac, for ten years sat in the opposition and in the government, and both came to command a great respect from people all over the province, not only in their own constituency.

A debt of gratitude is indeed owed to these two men for the personal sacrifices they made in the cause of good representations to all people, no matter what their politics. Cliff, of course, is maintaining this same standard of representation as the MP for Battleford-Kindersley, and John Horsman is still active in Unity, 87 years young, and keeping a watchful eye on the Members opposite.

With thanks to a great team effort my many, I now pledge to continue representing the wishes of the people of my home constituency.

SOME HON. MEMBERS: — Hear, hear!

MISS CLIFFORD: — Mr. Speaker, I will not dwell at great length about my constituency, as some have done previously, except to say that my constituency has the hospitality, the prosperity and positive attitudes that are second to none, and anyone visiting there will always be welcome and recall with fond memories their stay, and look forward to coming back again.

SOME HON. MEMBERS: — Hear, hear!

MISS CLIFFORD: — I should also like to thank this House for giving me the opportunity to represent the Legislature as hosts to the Annual Canadian Regional Conference of the Commonwealth Parliamentary Association in August, held in Regina. Attendance at this conference not only afforded me the opportunity to help host Saskatchewan guests and meet other Members but provided valuable information regarding problems that face other legislatures and provinces.

I should like to relate briefly, Mr. Speaker, three topics of discussion debated at this conference that I feel are particularly important to our legislature.

The first topic was regarding the public image of politicians and politics. It seems to be a popular topic in some circles these days, Mr. Speaker, and all agreed that could be improved, beginning with House procedure and decorum.

One thing I realized, however, as time passed, as will other doubting Members, is that a lot of rewarding debates are found in committee and not necessarily recorded in Hansard. One must also realize that this House is the battleground of principles that each one of us believes strongly in. Without the ability to see humour in some situations very little would be done in a rational basis.

SOME HON. MEMBERS: — Hear, hear!

MISS CLIFFORD: — I would suggest, Mr. Speaker, that rather than condemn parliamentary procedure it would perhaps be wiser to conduct a program of public awareness and involvement. I am always glad to see students of all ages in the galleries, Mr. Speaker. If a system of debate, complexity of each department, and the responsibility of MLAs are clearly outlined, much more would be learned. For example, the public would realize that if a Member leaves the House when someone is speaking, it is not necessarily out of disrespect — perhaps a constituent is urgently calling the Member. All is not doom and gloom, Mr. Speaker, even students and teachers can learn and have fun at the same time.

SOME HON. MEMBERS: — Hear, hear!

MISS CLIFFORD: — The days of the rod and the writing of lines are over.

One further comment I should like to say that while I was deciding as to whether or not to turn for my nomination, I was told many times that politics was too rough for women and that I wouldn't be able to take the pressure. Well, Mr. Speaker, I made up my mind that if I believed strongly enough in my party's policies, I would be all right. And if I didn't and couldn't stand the atmosphere I would have to leave. It simply depends on whether your priorities are based on concerns for people's problem or on procedures.

SOME HON. MEMBERS: Hear, hear!

MISS CLIFFORD: — The second idea that hit home was that of proceedings in other Legislatures, especially regarding Question Periods.

I found that most provinces are more progressive than Saskatchewan is in this area. Some are allowing one or two days a week solely for question periods. The government in this case has to be responsible and answerable for programs and actions, and not simply be limited to the antiquated four questions as we are in Saskatchewan. I feel this is an important aspect of accountability, which all governments must face, and which we should move towards at great haste.

SOME HON. MEMBERS: — Hear, hear!

MISS CLIFFORD: — The last observation from this conference Mr. Speaker, was the sincere interest that everyone had in each others' provinces. Mr. Steuart has mentioned our complete willingness to work with the federal government to curb the problems of inflation for the benefit of Canada and Saskatchewan. It is our duty, Mr. Speaker, to work together and I would hope our government would take some positive steps in that direction.

Since the election, we have been assigned as Opposition critics to various departments. My two main areas of concern are Social Services and the Status of Women. I, like all my colleagues, Mr. Speaker, have been researching our areas.

I was interested in the Throne Speech's commitment to establish an agency or commission for the Status of Women. With this being International Women's Year much has been brought to the Commission on the Status of Women. There are many areas besides employment that the Task Force has reported on.

One of the main concerns at the moment is regarding the Law Reform Commission recommendations on marital property law and deferred participation. We must be careful however that this proposed agency does not become labelled like the Hog Commission or the SOW Commission or that it be simply a token proposal. We should also strive to look more broadly at legislation, not only regarding women in the working field and career opportunities, but legislation should be studied to promote opportunities for all employees of both sexes.

SOME HON. MEMBERS: — Hear, hear!

MISS CLIFFORD: — Just as I did not run in this election to represent only women but all constituents, so should we promote equal opportunities of all in the work force.

My second area of responsibility, Mr. Speaker, is Social Services. I believe in giving credit where credit is due. There are many good programs in Social Services and some hard working and sincere employees just as there are in every government. I have found in many areas, however, there is a duplication of services that could be reduced, thus economizing in this time of increased costs. At the same time there are a number of programs substantially in name only to give the illusion of a wider base that could be incorporated into other areas. An example of this is a case in my area where a young person had to have a kidney operation. Unfortunately due to no fault of her own because of lack of bed space, she had to go out of the province for this serious operation. The costs were paid partially by medicare, but she was still left a large hospital and

drug bill. Due to the seriousness of the illness and long recovery period, she has been forced to go on to welfare. To aid in this instance there is a program called the Chronic End-Stage Renal Disease Program.

It sounds as if this would be the answer, Mr. Speaker, but unfortunately it just covers the cost of drugs and does not solve any other problems. I agree that we should not give money away every time someone calls, but such a situation is drastic and necessary, and it is in such a case that hands of the employees of Social Services Department are tied. A program in name sounds wonderful, Mr. Speaker, but of little value, costs money and uses extra people. How many more cases are there like this?

It is rarely that I agree with the Hon. Member for the Battlefords (Mr. Kramer) especially regarding highways, but he also suggest at the opening of the new Social Services building in North Battleford a complete investigation of the Social Service Department.

SOME HON. MEMBERS: — Hear, hear!

MISS CLIFFORD: — Looking at the broader aspect of Social Services and welfare, Mr. Speaker, we must examine carefully the Department of Welfare. No government has the monopoly of concern for those needing jobs, finances or care. We, in the Liberal Party feel that for those who are genuinely in need their assistance should be increased; but on the other hand, Mr. Speaker, for those who are able, they must work for any assistance.

Too often there are excuses found for not working, and those who suffer are those who really need help.

SOME HON. MEMBERS: — Hear, hear!

MISS CLIFFORD: — For instance, there are many good programs in CORE Services for people society often tens to excuse from work. These people don't want any excuses, Mr. Speaker. They are making their way on their own and contributing greatly to Saskatchewan. The Department of Welfare must undergo a thorough examination to derive the utmost benefit for all.

I am disturbed, Mr. Speaker, by a number of instances where ethics in government departments have been less than honest to the people of my constituency and Saskatchewan. I should like to elaborate on two cases as examples.

The first, regarding misinformation given by union representatives to prospective member, Mr. Speaker, which I mentioned yesterday in the question period. In this case the union representatives have been implying that if employees of nursing homes join the union the increased salaries will not affect the rental payments because the government will pay grants to compensate the increased costs. This information was purposely given to convince the employees to join the union. There was a grant of \$100 available for each full-time staff member for a two month period only, providing the agreement was retroactive and certified prior to June 1, 1975. But the boards were told that these grants would last until March, 1976.

The people who are being hurt are the guests — the senior citizens. Is this the type of treatment the government supports for people like our senior citizen groups that are here today? Mr. Speaker, the Hon. Member previous to myself has accused us of using the senior citizens as pawns in the election. I am proud to say that we listen, Mr. Speaker, to the voice of these people who built our province and our party adopted the Wartman Commission report as part of our policy for senior citizens.

SOME HON. MEMBERS: — Hear, hear!

MISS CLIFFORD: — If that is playing with pawns then the senior citizens in our party enjoy the game.

Another example of disregard for public problems was brought to my attention, Mr. Speaker, in the area of Municipal Affairs and grants. One progressive town in my constituency — and we have many, Mr. Speaker — has applied for NIP grants to pave the streets, renovate the pool and the community hall. They asked for \$434,000 and had \$284,000 approved. At the same time, Mr. Speaker, the town council applied for a LIP grant of \$10,000 to build bleachers in the town. As you well know, Mr. Speaker, both the NIP and the LIP grants originate at the federal level. The LIP grant in this case was approved by the federal Minister and is considered final. The funds for the NIP grants are given in bulk form and allotted by the provincial department. As I previously mentioned, Mr. Speaker, this town had been told they would get \$284,000 from NIP.

When the federal guidelines were announced the provincial department informed them that the total provincial grants would likely be cut down. They accepted this logic and thought they would be cut proportionately. The department representative stated, however, they likely wouldn't be getting any at all, stating they were cut all right but proportionately considering votes and as this area didn't vote right they wouldn't get the grants.

He also inferred the LIP grant, over which the province had no control, would be changed also. I am not saying this is necessarily the government's policy but it could be that of the government employees and departments. Is this the kind of government and scare tactics that we use? When a constituent contacts me about a problem, Mr. Speaker, I don't first ask what political party he belongs to before I decide whether to assist him.

SOME HON. MEMBERS: — Hear, hear!

MISS CLIFFORD: — Is this a government for the people or just for those who support their policies?

AN HON. MEMBER: — Just those who support their policies.

MISS CLIFFORD: — Could this possibly be why Highway 14 though my constituency has been permanently staked but never finished in the last five years.

Mr. Speaker, whereas may have dealt in great detail with

the Throne Speech. I guess I have intentionally dealt with problems at the local level in a general manner. I have done this for a number of reasons. First, I feel the people of my constituency are my first concern and their problems should be hard. Secondly, the process of looking at our Saskatchewan people as individuals helps us to govern more fairly. Thirdly, Mr. Speaker, if these examples show such lack of concern for the individual, the trusting and hard-working people of Saskatchewan, then it is easy to see why this same attitude was exemplified in the Throne Speech. Very few concrete proposals, Mr. Speaker, were outlined to deal with any major area — except the nationalization of potash.

Our province was built by hard-working people, Mr. Speaker, for a better way of life. Nowhere in the world can we find a more impressive monument to hard work coupled with vision and thrift and courage than the civilization which flourishes in Canada and in Saskatchewan. Vision, thrift and courage, Mr. Speaker — vision enough to see that where there is competition there will be good business and where there is not, we will not succeed. As a teacher many times I hear from parents, “My children don’t care how they do in school — what has happened to the desire to succeed — the competition ethic?”

What happens to the small town business if there is no competition, Mr. Speaker? A monopoly arises. The people of rural Saskatchewan know what the danger will be if this happens. What, for example, would happen if the media had no competition? They would be free to control or have a monopoly on all programs and reporting in the province, therefore only one viewpoint would be voiced. Mr. Speaker, this is what the government opposite is proposing to do — to eliminate competition in the potash industry in Saskatchewan. The financial risk of approximately \$2 billion in these inflationary times is unnecessary. Why not have our cake and eat it too? Go back to the potash companies and negotiate higher taxes. Only in the last few years has the industry made money — why get greedy now? Take our fair share and let them have the risk — it is only good business.

SOME HON. MEMBERS: — Hear, hear!

MISS CLIFFORD: — Many of you have seen a case where a prosperous business has changed hands and although it seemed to be an ideal investment at the time, the new owner can’t make a go of it. He just hasn’t got the business head or personality that the old owner had to draw customers. The same is applicable in government. Potash is the industry’s business, not the governments. Keeping and developing the markets we have will be a major problem and one we should have to worry about.

Mr. Speaker, during the election we warned the people of Saskatchewan that the government opposite had little faith in the people’s ability to manage their own affairs I campaigned on the fact that I was not an expert in the agricultural field or the potash field or the business world, but I simply cared about these problems and would carry the people’s expert advice to the Legislature. My constituents wanted this representation, and I pledge to give it to them, We are not experts, Mr. Speaker; we are representatives. It would be well to remember, Mr. Speaker, that 60 per cent of the people in this province felt we were not experts in the potash industry or on the business of farming and the government should stay out of

it and stick to being representatives.

SOME HON. MEMBERS: — Hear, hear!

MISS CLIFFORD: — Mr. Speaker, because I feel that the government is not listening to the individuals in the province, because they have no faith in the abilities of our people to manage their own affairs and because they do not have the vision, the thrift or the courage to realize there may be another way to benefit the people of Saskatchewan other than completely owing and dictating their way of life, I cannot support the Motion but will support the amendment.

SOME HON. MEMBERS: — Hear, hear!

MR. J.L. SKOBERG (Moose Jaw North): — Mr. Speaker, in rising in this House today, it gives me a great deal of pleasure to congratulate you on your position as Speaker of this House. I can say that as a new Member that I will do my utmost to oblige you in your decision that you make from the Chair. I should like to say that there is only one problem that I am finding insofar as the type of participatory democracy that we do see at this particular time. In the previous term that I had as a Member of Parliament at Ottawa, the desks that we had at that time opened up and at that time we could express our emotions and our feelings by using the desks to so urge the leaders that were speaking. I find here that you have to use your hand and it comes a bit difficult on the bottom of your hand in that type of expression.

I should also like to say that it seems rather remarkable that any Member from any party would suggest that we shouldn't express our emotions this way because after all, if you go into the House of Commons and you see the Dean of the parliamentarians such as Stanley Knowles and the Rt. Hon. John Diefenbaker and others, you see that they too become emotional at times and they, too, like to urge on their leaders; they, too, like to express their feelings in a way that everyone knows in the House and everyone knows in the country that really when we talk about participatory democracy we mean exactly that. I would suggest that if you went to a football game, a basketball game or a hockey game or anything else, you do see people express their feelings. I say that politics is a way of life and it's a way of life that the Hon. Members opposite, the third party, will find out that they too will participate or they are not in the game which we call democracy in this country.

SOME HON. MEMBERS: — Hear, hear!

MR. SKOBERG: — My sincere thanks to all the people in Moose Jaw, to all those who assisted in the last election and to all those who voted in the last election, regardless of the way in which they voted. We believe that in our city we do participate in democracy, we do vote, and we do express our feelings, and in that regard I do extend a cordial thank you to all the people in Moose Jaw, Moose Jaw North, Moose Jaw South, and all of the population who live in that fair city.

I can assure all of the citizens who live in Moose Jaw North and indeed all of the citizens of Moose Jaw that both

their MLAs are prepared and able to represent them, regardless of the political affiliation of those respective people, and it has been our belief, and has always been our belief that once the election is over, we are here to represent the people of that constituency and I ask them to contact us whenever and if ever they want to do so and they will be looked after.

Mr. Speaker, sometimes in the exuberance of the Hon. Members for Regina and Saskatoon, on this side of the House and on that side of the House, they fail to realize that the main centre of attraction at this particular time in our century in Saskatchewan happens to be Moose Jaw. Now we do have the main centre of attraction and we do have a boom going on second to no other area in Canada. We do have areas in that particular city that these other cities do not have. We may well go back into history just a wee bit and find out that it was only a fluke that Regina was the capital of this province, and really it should have been Moose Jaw, the hub of the entire province.

SOME HON. MEMBERS: — Hear, hear!

MR. SKOBERG: — Rift at this particular time, Mr. Speaker, the value of construction in Moose Jaw has exceeded some \$6 million in the last two years. The house building is going up consistently; we have a new provincial office building now housing ten departments of government at a cost of \$1.8 million and it is now open. Canada Packers is another one I might suggest, which is a tripartite type of an arrangement between the three levels of government at a cost of \$2.5 millions and it is now open and they expect expansion before too long.

Mr. Speaker, that's a clear indication that Moose Jaw is on the move, that there is room for participation by the three levels of government, and that's exactly what is happening.

A million dollar expansion in the telephone exchange, which is much needed in that city, has been brought about. A multi-million dollar transportation museum is soon to be opened, and in that museum, Mr. Speaker, I can assure the senior citizens that are here today that it will not be for recreational purposes. It will be for the purpose of exhibiting those things that they and their heritage brought about and we are prepared to see that used in that particular sense.

SOME HON. MEMBERS: Hear, hear!

MR. SKOBERG: — A provincial zoo, Mr. Speaker, will soon be opened. The arrangements have been made for the provincial zoo of the province of Saskatchewan to be located in the beautiful Moose Jaw River valley, and I can assure the Members here that if they find themselves able to drag themselves away from possibly Regina and Saskatoon and other areas they will find that zoo is one of the prime points in Saskatchewan and is something that all of us are proud of.

Mr. Speaker, Moose Jaw indicates that it has a very lengthening roster of various things going for the people. The table wines (and I suggest that the table wines are good); agricultural and industrial chemicals to concrete and concrete products; polyethylene pipe and potash; animal feeds and packing house meat products; salt production and sheet metal

products; petroleum products and printing; cured hides; dressed meats and industrial cleaners and roof coating; greenhouse products. And I might say one of the more important aspects is that we now have a co-op in the Moose Jaw River valley that has brought about the implementation of the market garden concept that is being held in Moose Jaw now and they also provide excellent produce in that co-op in the Moose Jaw River valley; men's and boy's clothing, steel fabrication, steel buildings, and agricultural machinery; sodium sulphate and dairy products; glass products and aluminum windows; tank car repairs and remanufactured engines, wood products, truss rafters, reflective glass beads and many others.

Mr. Speaker, I only say that in conversation most recently with some of the industrial people in Moose Jaw they say that they hardly have the time to keep answering the phone from people from all over Canada and North American inquiring as to the industrial capabilities and industrial locations in that fair city.

I am suggesting that Moose Jaw is a friendly city. It is the best city of North America. In that city we have thousands of senior citizens who are contributing their experienced life style insofar as the economy is concerned, just as Victoria, British Columbia is involved and also in the recreational and social life of Moose Jaw. I'm proud to see them there and hope they stay there forever.

We are ready and prepared for expansion in Moose Jaw, Mr. Speaker, and I can assure you that the current terms in Moose Jaw is that we will have expansion. It used to be a period of gloom and doom, but now that has been done away with forever and we do not expect to see those days return, regardless of the opinion of other people.

SOME HON. MEMBERS: — Hear, hear!

MR. SKOBERG: — Mr. Speaker, the Speech from the Throne gave a clear indication as to what is planned for this first Session of the Eighteenth Legislature. No government can drift from crisis to crisis. And this government under the leadership of Allan Blakeney has not allowed this to happen in Saskatchewan as is apparent at the federal level. The Hon. Member for Wilkie (Miss Clifford) who spoke just previously, indicates that she has a wonderful place to live in, and I'm suggest to her and to the other Members of this House the only reason for that is because of the leadership of the Premier of this province and the type of legislation being introduced.

SOME HON. MEMBERS: — Hear, hear!

MR. SKOBERG: — Positive steps and programs must be initiated in an ever-changing society if we are to keep pace with expectations and demands of our people. Our people today are realizing more and more that by forming huge corporations, many multinational in character, they have almost completely monopolized the market of the free World. Many of these conglomerates have assumed a law unto themselves disregarding the consumer needs, but pushing it down their throats nevertheless. This is certainly not a free market, but rather a well controlled system of beggaring the already hard-pressed people and throwing the whole nation from periods of boom to depression.

Mr. Speaker, even Adam Smith acknowledged wherever there is great property there is great inequality. I suggest to this Legislature there is no need for huge amounts of property to be in the hands of so few and there is no need for the vast inequalities we have in our society at this time. The Members on the opposite side of the House can scream socialism all they want, but whom do they blame for the great depressions in the 1870s and 1930s when there wasn't a socialist government on the North American continent?

It appears to me, Mr. Speaker, these people are trying desperately to reassure themselves and the citizens of this country that their system of corporate power is working and with many hysterical editorials and press releases at their beckoning call, they believe the public will forever be hoodwinked into emotional acceptance, which I do not think will happen.

If we wish to live in a nation, not endlessly plagued by boom and bust, it will be necessary to break up the monopolies and again provide room for small private businesses in this province and in Canada as a whole.

An individual who wouldn't be recognized as a raving socialist, Mr. Speaker, a well-known person, Mr. Kierans, had this to say: He stated that the provinces' mineral resources should be put under effective public ownership and control within 10 years and set up Crown corporations for basic mining. This is his assumption of what could happen, or should happen. He warned that massive giveaways of mineral rights to multinational corporations would mean loss of control of the province's economic destiny. Mr. Kierans states, "it is not wildly imaginative to suggest that the day may not be far distant when Canada's resources will be controlled, not by the 10 provinces, but by few than 10 giant corporations."

Mr. Speaker, I am saying today that we cannot allow this to happen and this government will not allow this to happen.

SOME HON. MEMBERS: — Hear, hear!

MR. SKOBERG: — Mr. Speaker, there is one area in the Throne Speech in which my leader has much more confidence in the integrity of the federal government than I do have. I do not accept the competence of that federal government, nor the Anti-Inflation Board and I reject their guidelines as so enunciated in that bill before the federal House. A wage/price freeze means high prices and low wages. Working people know what inflation is doing to the household budgets of Canadians. Prices have gone up faster recently than at any other time since World War II, and no one in this House has to be reminded of that. No housewife has to be reminded of that and we know it is a fact. Everyone on fixed income and low income knows that fact. This has meant a cut in living standard for most Canadians, since wages haven't kept pace. Why then talk of wage controls like the Liberals and provincial Conservatives are doing, since wage earners obviously aren't the cause of inflation, but its victims. The answer is the Liberals, like the Tories, are the henchmen of big business and high finance. Freezing wages and prices today means freezing prices and profits high and wages low. In the United States, Mr. Speaker, wages and prices were frozen, with the result that the incomes of working people suffered even more from inflation than they did in Canada. And it was deliberately

planned. Here's what Arnold Weber, the first director of the United States Cost of Living Council, during the American wage price freeze in 1971 had to say:

Business had been leaning on Shultz and McCracken and they were the great friends of the working man — Nixon's economic advisers to do something about the economy, especially wages. The idea of the freeze and phase II was to zap labor, and we did.

That's exactly what the individual told Mr. Nixon and that was the policy they had.

Mr. Speaker, the Liberals have exactly the same policy in Canada and they have exactly the same policy in this House, in fact the two opposition parties have the same policy.

SOME HON. MEMBERS: — Hear, hear!

MR. SKOBERG: — Mr. Speaker, I am certain all of us in this and the federal chamber an argue that measures are years overdue in recognizing that something must be done insofar as the consumer goods and services are concerned. All of us can agree these people on fixed and low incomes have been subjected to the worst type of treatment imaginable in a nation of affluence. The people of our nation have been used and abused by manipulation and half-truths as to the cause of the spiralling cost of food, rents and major essentials. We have systematically been led down the garden path by clever public relations distortions. I say that we do not accept the federal anti-inflation program because there is only one main segment of our society which is being attacked, that being the wage and salaried worker. The entire program is directed at wage freeze and price guidelines without any intention of establishing any form of price control. Let us not forget that the farm producer, as well as the wage earner is directly affected by this program.

The Trudeau Anti-Inflation Board, Jean Luc Pepin, and Beryl Plumtre have directly attacked all forms of marketing boards. They attacked the marketing boards and their right to act as bargaining agents on behalf of the farmers. This means Trudeau's anti-inflation policy is prepared to make the farmer another scapegoat in his ill-planned program of wage and price controls.

In recent months many farm products not protected by marketing boards, such as beef, rapeseed, soybeans and corner, have dropped in price. At the same time costs of farm inputs such as trucks, tractors, farm chemicals and other things used in farm production have gone up. If this pattern continues the farmer, along with labor, will suffer most as a result of Trudeau's scatter gun approach to limit income only, without regard to costs.

Mr. Speaker, it should be clear that the cost of farm inputs, as mentioned above, will not be significantly affected by the program. It's only affect will be on the marketing boards.

Anyone who was watching the performance of Jean Luc Pepin and our dear friend Beryl Plumtre before the Standing Committee in the House of Commons dealing with this bill, knows that the Board is going to take a hard line on wages and marketing boards

and as Jean Luc said, but a very flexible easy line on profits and dividends.

Mr. Speaker, I say they can't have it both ways. Either they come out of their hard shell wage freeze policy and move to control and rollback prices of essential commodities necessary for every day living; unless they rollback and control interest rates, and they can do that; unless they allow greater income tax reductions or tax credits for those on low incomes; unless they remove excessive tax concessions to large corporate enterprises (which, by the way, are not enjoyed by the small businessman); unless they make known the regulations of this bill indicating whether it is fair and equitable to all the people of this province and of this nation, then I say no province should accept even the principle of a proposal which has as its only present basis, wage and marketing board control.

You know, Mr. Speaker, I had the very fortunate experience of sitting in the House of Commons from 1968 to 1972, representing the very great constituency of Moose Jaw. In that time I got to know the present chairman of the Anti-inflation Board. I thought he was sincere at that time, but he had one serious fault. He always smiled even when serious legislation was being discussed. I guess if he was in this House his smiling character would not be keeping with the third party. However, I am now convinced, Mr. Speaker, that he is chairman of an Anti-Inflation Board that has as its sinister plot to nail the wage earner and the farmer. I have only to refer to an article in the Leader-Post which didn't receive that much attention, that 110 of 178 companies responded on time:

Jean-Luc Pepin, Anti-inflation Board Chairman, said Friday 110 of 178 companies requested to provide the Board with detailed information on prices and profits within one week responded on time. He said in a prepared statement that a reminder will be sent Monday to the remaining companies.

We want to deal in a reasonable way with reasonable people, but everyone should recognize that the fight against inflation is a serious business and this Board will be firm when it has to be.

Mr. Speaker, I ask, does this look as if any real, meaningful action is going to take place in controlling prices, profits or interest rates, or what have you?

Another article in the Leader-Post of November 4, 1975 indicated clearly who the scapegoat is going to be in this whole program. It says:

Statistics Canada show that import prices which are not covered by the Government Anti-inflation Program now are rising twice as fast as Canadian export prices. These statistics tend to disprove the federal government's claim that high wage settlements are making Canada uncompetitive. This has been one of the main arguments for selling controls to the labor movement.

In the first half of this year export and import prices tended to rise fairly uniformly. Since then there has been a divergence. This is not, as the Federal Cabinet has argued, because inflation is getting out of hand in

Canada. It is because prices of foreign goods are rising faster.

The evidence supplied by the official prices index for trade make it inconvenient for the message which Mr. Trudeau, Mrs. Plumptre and the Cabinet are trying to put across.

Mr. Speaker, I say this does not look like a government that expects to do anything for the working people or the farming communities of this land. They are dedicated to destroying the very free collective bargaining of a democratic society with a program dedicated to that principle. For that reason I can not go along with that type of alleged prices, incomes control when there is nothing to it.

Mr. Speaker, I could go through some of the days that we saw in the House of Commons, insofar as knowing what to expect from that government, but I am suggesting that I think there has been enough evidence here that shows very well that this government does not plan to do anything whatsoever insofar as the controls are concerned. I agree that controls may be necessary, but I cannot agree that we should accept a program even in principle, until we know if this program has any intention of controlling prices, profits, dividends, rents and the likes of that.

Mr. Speaker, the action proposed by this government in the field of potash is now well known by the Members of this House. It is well known by the people of this province and of Canada, thanks to the Premier in making certain every avenue of communication was used in letting all segments of our society know what is contemplated. Nothing has been hidden. The people know what is planned and I will say the vast majority have responded positively to the action of this government. This type of information program is not the way corporate boards of directors make decisions on those things directly affecting the people in the country where they do business. Their concern is profit only oriented, the life blood of the community and or the people of that community are not considered. After all, decision making is far removed from the operation. I can perceive another hate campaign being established by the multinational corporations supported and abetted by the two parties opposite.

I can imagine instead of calling it the KOD campaign it will be called the KOP, Keep Our Potash corporations campaign. I can assure the Members opposite the people of this province will respond and say, potash, let's grow with it. All the kicking of doors and hysterical screaming by those opposite, the friends only of the multinationals cannot erase the fact that people all over the world are awakening to the fact they have a vested interest in resources of their land and those resources are needed for the many, many commodities needed to make life meaningful and a little more comfortable for the millions now living in abject poverty without hope and living in despair.

No one argues that a fair and reasonable return on one's investment should not be expected. The argument arises when one asks, What is reasonable? Is it reasonable that International Minerals and Chemical Corporation, as an example, should increase its earnings from \$57,400,000 or \$3.59 per share for fiscal year

ending June 1974 to \$161,800,000 or \$9.91 per share in 1975 and all of this without having to do any more exploration and with a minimum of marketing support. Is it reasonable because fertilizer demand exceeded supply and their industrial materials, chemicals were sold to markets least affected by the general economic recession, that this company should be able to capitalize on a hungry starving world sorely in need of fertilizer and food.

Mr. Speaker, fertilizer is needed in every area of the world. I am suggesting that in the proposal we have before us now, that will be guaranteeing that the starving millions of this world will be supplied. Of course we know that fertilizer is not being supplied, we know that there are still people striving in their profit motive dedication to keep the starving millions in their place and striving to extract every pound of flesh from the agricultural economy that must have fertilizer to produce the needed foodstuffs for these millions of people. Surely those Hon. Members opposite cannot sit idly by in a world which is so sorely in need of leadership if in fact we believe in any form of Christianity.

I can only remind the Hon. Members opposite that Canadian want and have a right to that which is derived from the country's resources.

The federal Liberal have held up uranium exports except in specific cases. The Conservative Albertans have held up coal mine expansion until they reassess their royalty regulations. All of this can only point to one conclusion The provinces and the nation need royalties to go ahead with much needed social planning. This cannot ever happen if our resources are systematically and continuously being exported to other countries for processing without resultant loss of jobs and if these same companies fight against the paying of royalties and taxes just as the normal taxpayer is obligated to pay.

Mr. Speaker, if any Member of this House or any citizen of this land fails to pay that which he is required to do by law, he ends up in jail or is fined. Why should the corporations be allowed to flout the laws of this land any more than the ordinary "john Doe". Of course we should remember they have financial resources obtained from the people's resources aided by several hon. gentlemen opposite and the Member of Parliament for Saskatoon-Humboldt to fight their case. The ordinary small businessman, farmer or worker has not such an array of cosy bedfellows.

Mr. Speaker, I support the position taken by our government and I urge them to go full steam ahead on behalf of the people of this province, and for the benefit of the worlds' starving population.

Mr. Speaker, I oppose the sub-amendment. I oppose the amendment and I support the main Motion as put forth.

SOME HON. MEMBERS: — Hear, hear!

MR. L.E. JOHNSON (Turtleford): — Mr. Speaker, does this mike work? Good. In Canada you have to check these kinds of things as I think Henry Kissinger can testify!

Mr. Speaker, I rise with great pleasure. I rise to take part in this Throne Speech debate. First, I should like to extend my congratulations to all the Members who were elected in this Assembly, although some of them are not here today. I should like to thank the people of Turtleford constituency for giving me their support.

SOME HON. MEMBERS: — Hear, hear!

MR. JOHNSON: — Mr. Speaker, I bring congratulations to you from Sally Nelson, my aunt who campaigned for your father in the old Tisdale constituency. She congratulates you on your appointment to the honored position of Speaker and passes along with this, this word of advice, “That you ride this Assembly with the same skill you rode the sheep on your father’s farm.”

SOME HON. MEMBERS: — Hear, hear!

MR. JOHNSON: — I should like to add my personal congratulations on your appointment, Mr. Speaker, and I know in all matters you will be fair.

Mr. Speaker, I am proud to be the elected spokesman for the Turtleford constituency, just as proud to be a Member of this Legislature. The Member for Nipawin (Mr. Collver) may suggest that we do not look after the needs of the constituency that we represent. He may not, but I most certainly intend to do so to the best of my ability.

SOME HON. MEMBERS: — Hear, hear!

MR. JOHNSON: — And perhaps when it is in order and all agree, we can move a motion for the Member for Kelsey-Tisdale (Mr. Messer) to give him the responsibilities for both constituencies. At least he appeared willing.

Mr. Speaker, the Member for Regina Wascana (Mr. Merchant) indicated the length of his family tree who have supported the Liberal idea as Members of this Legislature. Mr. Speaker, this is commendable for the Member’s mother and grandfather, but for the Member himself it only shows why he sits to your left, three generations without a new idea, or a change of idea.

SOME HON. MEMBERS: — Hear, hear!

MR. JOHNSON: — Mr. Speaker, initially I wish to take the time to congratulate the Mover and Seconder, the Members for Quill Lake and Melfort respectively, for brining the events of the next year into perspective and for a job well done to indicate the improvements that programs implemented during the 17th Legislature have brought to their constituents.

Mr. Speaker, the new Turtleford constituency is surrounded by constituencies of equally good sense, being centred in the NDP northwest. Our constituency is bordered by that contentious area of Saskatchewan now known commonly as DNS — Department of Northern Saskatchewan — or the constituency of Athabasca in particular. As well my constituency is bordered on the north and west by the constituency of Meadow Lake, to the southwest

by the constituency of Cutknife-Lloydminster, to the south by Redberry and east by the constituency of Shellbrook. All those Members are sitting on this side of the House.

SOME HON. MEMBERS: — Hear, hear!

MR. JOHNSON: — Some of the people who make up the present Turtleford constituency used to live in the old Shellbrook and Redberry constituencies. I wish to welcome them to the Turtleford constituency.

Mr. Speaker, the new Turtleford constituency varies from parkland to timber. The people who live in this varied area make a livelihood related to their surroundings. Industry based on the timber resources of the North Saskatchewan forest reserve have an impact in the towns and villages of Big River, Leoville, and Glaslyn, as well as the area that follows the forest fringe. In fact, Mr. Speaker, I think that the town of Big River today holds something that no other town in the province of Saskatchewan has, two mills, one being a Liberal mill constructed in the 1960s that proved to be more related to a pulp chipper, the major type of construction in the minds of the government of that day, than a sawmill. This sawmill was very efficient in turning logs into sawdust rather than lumber and proved impossible to correct satisfactorily. A new mill is presently under construction and is expected to provide year round employment for the residents of this area.

SOME HON. MEMBERS: — Hear, hear!

MR. JOHNSON: — Mr. Speaker, I should like to bring to the attention of this Assembly some of the things that have taken place in the Turtleford constituency since the Assembly last sat. The Member for Prince Albert-Duck Lake made a little tour through the Turtleford constituency, maybe at the expense of some corporation a few months back, visiting five of the towns within the constituency. I now realize that his statement of last Monday indicating his disapproval of changes taking place regarding the Local Government Board that this Member followed his long established procedure in meeting the public, that is, to talk without listening. In the village of Edam I was told that the village was caused a financial loss of approximately \$6,000 due to the delay caused by the Local Government Board. I listened to a very explicit instruction as to what should be done with this Board by individuals directly concerned.

It is my hope that improvements in the operation of this Board are possible.

Mr. Speaker, the Turtleford constituency is covered with projects initiated under programs introduced during the Seventeenth Legislature, improvements in the school system by introducing and the construction of many more gyms and industrial art facilities which is a far more satisfactory approach to education than requiring some students to be bussed over 50 miles to comprehensive high schools, which was the Liberal plan for education in the province of Saskatchewan.

I can mention programs, such as the Community Capital Fund of \$75 per capita over five years which has been used for

many different programs in the communities including the purchase of a garbage truck. Other grants to senior citizens' groups in the constituency include grants for the operation of halls, such as the one in Debden; culture and youth grants to the different organizations in the constituency as well.

I note with pleasure a recent grant to the Lakeland Library some of which will be used in the branch at Glaslyn. I might add that Saskatchewan is a province that is noted for its library program, the librarians, facilities and the organization are looked up to by other provinces for their leadership. Other grants under winter works program have been utilized by villages such as Shell Lake to construct recreational facilities too numerous to mention.

I previously mentioned that the farm land of the Turtleford constituency is ideally suited for mixed farming. Should the railroads be successful in their attempt to abandon lines that they are requesting north of the North Saskatchewan River, the economy of grain in a large section of this area would deteriorate to the point where the only viable operation would be cattle, which has a very unprofitable picture today. For this reason, Mr. Speaker, I should like to comment on transportation, to be more precise, rail transportation.

During the past year while speaking to a group in St. Walburg I indicated that the residents of this district knew well what the term 'end of steel' meant, for one of the lines now up for abandonment ends in St. Walburg. Further to that, there are forces at work in the Canadian West intent on changing the meaning off the words, 'end of steel'; interests in the grain trade, rail companies and some of the people's choice in Ottawa.

I am happy, Mr. Speaker, to be a member of the government which recognizes the value of these lines and is doing its part to keep them. Without the wholehearted support by people of Saskatchewan, the ringing term, 'end of steel' will have a more solemn meaning to the residents of Vawn, Livelong, Edam, Spiritwood, Shell Lake or St. Walburg, as the rails are lifted.

In regard to rail transportation I think it is worthwhile to take time to look at the past, present and then the future. It has been brought to the attention of most people in the province of Saskatchewan, through briefs being presented to the Hall Commission, articles in papers or over the radio that railroads when constructing their lines were made land grants in the province of Saskatchewan of some 15 million acres. In fact one can say that land grants received over the period of rail construction in Canada are equal to that portion of land cultivated in the province of Saskatchewan somewhere in the neighborhood of 44 million acres. It should be noted as well that these land grants were not only surface rights, but to a large degree included the mineral resources thereunder. For these riches there was an implied if not an outright commitment on the part of the railroads that service would be continued to the communities in the Prairie Basin. That is the past.

Today the rail lines are applying to abandon some 3,400 miles of rail line in the province of Saskatchewan. They are forgetting some of the promises made in the past that allowed them the opportunity to construct these lines that secured for them land areas and mineral resources. Rather they are suggesting

the high cost of maintenance on branch lines as the reason for abandonment. Basically this is where we stand today.

In the future we must look at things probably in a manner related to transportation needs as the environment can provide them. I would like to quote from a brief presented to the Grain-Handling and Transportation Commission by the Retail Merchants Association.

In view of the reserves of oil and gas that will be available in the next ten to fifteen years, rail services will be required to be increased. The public will come to depend more and more on rail service as the use of automobiles, trucks and bus services diminish or until such time as other fuels are made available. It is therefore recommended that railway branch lines be kept up to workable standards as more and more use will be required of these branch line services.

It is my opinion that even today one can make a good case for rail transportation if one uses the ecology dollars, relating cost of transportation to the effect on the environment. An example is that seven times the land area is required for truck transportation to maintain the same volume of goods. Approximately four times the fuel is consumed by truck transportation than rail. As well trucks are hard pressed to use any other fuel than petroleum where rails can utilize electricity from coal for its energy requirement.

There is an increase of labor requirement for the movement of grain by truck than by rail. All of the items which I have previously mentioned weigh heavily in the favour of transportation by rail.

Mr. Speaker, at this time I should like to comment on some of the changes being made about our potash policy. Our new potash policy should come as a surprise to no one. As early as 1971 the New Democratic Party in its election platform announced that an NDP government will consider the feasibility of bringing the potash industry under public ownership. I realize that some people think an election promise is not worth the paper it is written on. One has only to recall successive Liberal promises to bring in a drug plan, to illustrate the point.

But the people of Saskatchewan know that an elected NDP government takes its promises seriously. I think the people of Saskatchewan know what we meant when we said we would consider bringing the potash industry under public ownership.

In the most recent election campaign we promised we would defend and protect the rights of Saskatchewan people in the future, benefit of their rightful heritage, the natural resources of this province. We also said that we would speed up direct government participation in exploration for and development of potash — to achieve a greater measure of public ownership.

So there is nothing particularly new or surprising in what we are doing. After all, Canadian ownership of Canadian resources is a goal which is considered desirable, not just in provinces with NDP governments, but right across the political spectrum.

We're not alone in that concern. Even American politicians are becoming alarmed at the large amount of foreign domination of their industry. The target of their concerns are Japanese, Germans and yes, even the Canadians. Remember the hard battle fought by Texas Gulf against the purchase of a controlling interest in it by Canadian Development Corporation, a federal Crown corporation.

The people of Saskatchewan know the position of this government on the ownership of the potash industry. They knew that position in 1971. They elected an NDP government. They knew our position in 1975. It was spelled out clearly in our election platform. The government involvement in the industry was clearly stated as a policy in the government's statement on potash policy announced in October of last year. And the people of Saskatchewan returned this government to office in June of this year.

In the years ahead, the wisdom of this policy will be obvious. Just as we today can see the wisdom of those who brought about electric power, telephones and insurance under public ownership.

SOME HON. MEMBERS: — Hear, hear!

MR. JOHNSON: — Twice the NDP has gone to people of province with a proposal to control the potash industry through ownership. Twice the people of the province has said, yes. Now, I think everyone has got the message.

Mr. Speaker, I will support the motion and oppose the amendments.

SOME HON. MEMBERS: — Hear, hear!

WELCOME TO STUDENTS

MR. D. LANGE (Bengough-Milestone): — Mr. Speaker, I wonder if I can interrupt the proceedings of the day to introduce a group of school students who have come in since the Orders of the Day.

I should like to introduce a group of 26 students in the Speaker's Gallery who are from Oungre, Saskatchewan, which is a town that is a few miles from the American border and almost straight south of Regina. Accompanying them are 28 students from Mobile, Newfoundland. The students from Mobile are here on an exchange visit under the Yung Voyageur Program. They came from a fishing village; they have been in the Oungre area for roughly a week during which time they have seen southern Saskatchewan and have visited Regina today. I should like welcome those students and ask the Newfoundland students to stand, please.

HON. MEMBERS: — Hear, hear!

MR. LANGE: — The Oungre students are accompanied by their teachers, Mr. Singh and Mr. Wyatt and the Newfoundland students are accompanied by escorts, Miss Moore and Mr. Kinzalla. The program for them has been co-ordinated by Mr. Harvey Watt from the Department of Education and he is also in attendance

today. For the information of the students we wish to point out to them that we are in the Throne Speech debate. This is a debate which rages for six days after the opening of the Session. During this debate Members can speak about anything they like. That is why, during the last half hour you have heard about potash, Moose Jaw and labor union. Only during the Throne Speech debate can this occur. This is also the first time in many, many years that we have had three parties in the House. The Party on this side of the house is the New Democratic Party, on the opposite side are the Liberals, towards the Speaker, and the gentlemen on the other side are the newly elected Conservatives. You probably have been watching our conduct with a careful eye, and you will have noted that the only part in the House that has any decorum are the Conservatives because they sit up straight and they don't chew gum. I should like to welcome the students.

HON. MEMBERS: — Hear, hear!

MR. R.A. LARTER (Estevan): — Mr. Speaker, Oungre being on the west half of the Estevan constituency, I too should like to welcome the students from there and I should like to tell the students from Newfoundland that we had some exchange students in Estevan this year. I spent one evening with them. We had a lot of fund with them. I sailed into Newfoundland ports during the war while on convoy duty and I enjoyed the Newfoundland people very much. I bid you welcome here today.

The Assembly resumed the interrupted debate on the Address-in-Reply.

MR. E. ANDERSON (Shaunavon): — Mr. Speaker, and Hon. Members, I wish to bring greetings to this legislature from my constituency of Shaunavon. The constituency is composed of a large portion of the southwest corner of the province and I am very proud to be elected as its MLA.

The area known as the Cypress Hills runs through the length of my constituency and it is a unique topographical feature of the province. The area is also swept by the chinook winds that blow in from the southwest and give us clean fresh air. As a result of this clean air, the people in the southwest think very clearly.

SOME HON. MEMBERS: — Hear, hear!

MR. ANDERSON: — They have proven this fact by electing a solid Liberal representative in the southwest of this province.

SOME HON. MEMBERS: — Hear, hear!

MR. ANDERSON: — Except, I should add, the city of Swift Current where we have a Conservative.

AN HON. MEMBER: — Well, they have got the gas fields there.

SOME HON. MEMBERS: — Hear, hear!

MR. ANDERSON: — In the past few days many

Members have shown a great proficiency in the quotations from Shakespeare and a big knowledge of fairy tales. Their words of wisdom have been very enlightening to an MLA such as myself. I found that seated to my left is Snow White and the Seven Dwarfs. I find that they intend to open the magic door to the treasure house, not with the words "Open, Sesame" but rather with the cry of 'nationalize potash.'

SOME HON. MEMBERS: — Hear, hear!

MR. ALLEN: — You're supposed to be nice in your maiden speech.

MR. ANDERSON: — I'm sorry. I wasn't told. This rallying cry of nationalization seem ill-fitted to the other items in the Throne Speech. In the Throne Speech we find that new incentives to encourage private oil exploration and the development of uranium resources are to be considered. It would seem naive to suggest that private industry capital would consider entering a province where steps are now being taken to nationalize and to take over oil companies.

I would imagine that they would look upon any agreements made with this government in much the same way as the American Indians came to look upon treaties made in the early days with the American government. These treaties always contained a very flowing phrase, that they would stand as long as the streams flow and the grass does grow. But the Indians soon found that the streams froze over and the grass withered and the agreements were long forgotten.

In the very necessary attempts being made by the federal government to control the inflationary spiral, the action of the NDP government seems even more mystifying. The Throne Speech tells us that restraints in government expanding services will be implemented. Yet it was stated that there will be no corresponding cut in the staff of the civil service. This means more people to do less work and surely lower productivity. At the same time higher costs cannot lead to reduction in the rate of inflation.

The NDP government intends to purchase and nationalize the potash industry at a projected cost that could reach \$2 billion. This outlay of huge amounts of money will not create one new job or open any new mines. It is much the same way that our money was spent to acquire Intercontinental Packers and oil fields. This created no new job opportunities for young people. Created no new production to increase their income tax base of this province. They only created a debt load for the taxpayers of this province having to pay interest on capital payments. A waste of taxpayer dollars which could have been used to finance the needed government services that are now being cut back.

SOME HON. MEMBERS: — Hear, hear!

MR. ANDERSON: — I listened with interest to the statement that the NDP government is giving priority to transportation problems in this province. Before the June election, this government promised to extend STC passenger service to the town of Shaunavon by way of Ponteix. Since the election the bus has

turned out to be one more of the fairly tales that are so aptly quoted. It may come as a surprise to the Members present that the only STC service in the third largest constituency in this province runs for about 30 miles into the northeast corner. This leaves the people in my constituency from 70 to 100 miles away from any type of public transportation whatsoever.

Another promise that was made before the election was that a new hospital at Climax was to be built. This also seems to have been forgotten but I hope that among the many health innovations that this government is planning that they will remember this promise and will act on it.

Because in my constituency public transportation is non-existent, because of the large distances travelled to reach the necessary services, highways are important to us. In fact they are virtually a lifeline in the case of emergency. The present NDP government has allowed the highways in the southwest to deteriorate to the point that they are unsafe to drive upon. It is probably not realized by many Members of this government how important highways are in an area that is sparsely populated as is my constituency. Many of the families are up to 80 miles from services of hospitals, machinery, repairs, veterinary service, shopping facilities and even movie theatres or any other form of recreation.

In the school in my home area we have children coming up to 60 miles one way in the morning on the school bus. One hundred and twenty-six miles a day is a pretty rough ride for a six year old child. And the lack of good highways certainly does not make the ride more comfortable.

I feel that I must question the actions of the government which wishes to borrow millions to purchase potash mines and that tells us that we are going to fight inflation by cutting down on government services. This is a government that builds office building costing \$25 million and \$20 million, while in the rural areas hospitals, nursing homes, and low cost housing for the aged are in such short supply.

SOME HON. MEMBERS: — Hear, hear!

MR. ANDERSON: — The NDP seem more interested in ramming socialism down our throats at all costs rather than looking after the needs of the people of this province.

Hon. Members opposite stated that in the purchase of the potash industry they have the support of the people of this province. That they are following the wishes of the majority of the people of this province. I would certainly question these thoughts. The percentage of the popular vote that was received by the NDP certainly wasn't over the 50 per cent considered the majority.

In the election campaign not one mention was made of the plans to nationalize the potash industry. Much was said about a New Deal for People, but not mention was made of the legislation that we are now being asked to debate in the House.

If the NDP are so confident now that they represent the wishes of the people why did they not use that issue in the election campaign. Then they could have honestly said that we

are making a step, a step that one of the Hon. Members stated was one of the biggest decisions this province has ever taken with a true mandate from the people of this province.

One of the greatest problems facing this nation and this province today, Mr. Speaker, is our ever increasing inflation. I commend the federal government in taking measures to slow down inflation.

SOME HON. MEMBERS: — Hear, hear!

MR. ANDERSON: — I commend the Government of Saskatchewan for recognizing in the Throne Speech that it is a problem. I believe that it is not enough to say that it is a problem, a decisive action is needed and then not do anything.

The first order of business for this House is not in how we are going to fight the threat of inflation, we are not going to be debating legislation that would assure that price and wage controls would be applied properly and fairly to all people. We are going to be debating on borrowing billions of dollars to purchase a potash industry. While we debate potash, inflation goes on. Strikes go on because there have not been guidelines agreed on or discussed. The real losers in the inflation game the ones who have no protection against inflation, the aged, and low income workers continue to fall further and further behind. Inflation not only steals from those on fixed incomes as surely as if someone took the money from them with a gun, but also steals from the whole country. Inflation destroys the competitive position our country has had on the world market for years and years. Borrowing money to buy industry that is in place, increasing the cost of our bureaucracy by creating more and more agencies, committees, boards and commissions. There will be thousands of dollars worth of government offices that produce nothing and waste paper certainly will not and cannot stop inflation.

Mr. Speaker, we have heard much in the last year of the plight of the cattle industry. It is a very real and disastrous situation which is causing a bankruptcy of many of the farmers who make their living raising beef. A combination of many factors caused this disaster. One, I suppose was the efforts of governments to diversity agricultural production in Saskatchewan, in Canada, and in fact much of the world. These efforts coupled with the grain glut situation caused a very quick build-up in cattle numbers. These efforts were spurred by an ever increasing consumption of beef in nearly all the industrial countries of the world.

Projecting these figures, economists predicted that consumption would keep ahead of supply and the industry would prosper. The dangers in projecting figures and making prediction is that one cannot plan for the unforeseen. In this case the unforeseen part of the prediction was that the Arabs raised the price of their oil. The high cost of energy supplies caused countries which had imported large amounts of beef to cut out their imports to conserve their foreign exchange supplied to pay for the demand and increased cost of oil. This caused a sudden drastic oversupply of beef and the plummeting of prices and demand for our cattle. Coupled with this was a sudden shortage of feed grain supplies, a shortage in rapeseed and soy beans used in cattle supplements. This caused the input

costs to the beef industry to double and then triple at a time when the prices were the lowest. Other factors added to the increased cost of the oil and gas price increased, machinery prices soared sky-rocketing and interest rates climbing.

Many people suggested way of helping the people in the beef industry through this crisis. Subsidies have been suggested and in some cases they have been tried. The problem with subsidies — to be meaningful at this time they required use and lots of money. The other problem with subsidy programs is that they tend to build inefficiencies into an industry and quite often distort regional advantages.

The producers who really need the help now are the young farmers who started in business when the prices were at their highest. They are now trying to pay off loans when prices are so low that it is impossible. The established producer who is not carrying a debt load will have to tighten his belt but he should survive until the price returns to normal.

The Governments of Saskatchewan and Canada could assist the young farmer if they would put a moratorium on the payment of interest and capital on all government loans for the next two years. If a loan is an FCC loan for land or a Farmstart loan for the purchase of livestock, these loan payments could be stopped for two years and the payment period extended for two years at the end of the loan period.

SOME HON. MEMBERS: — Hear, hear!

MR. ANDERSON: — I am not suggesting that these payments and interest be cancelled. I am asking them not to be collected for two years now and then to be paid at the end of the loan period. I would suggest that this government initiate such a program immediately, and that they request the federal government to follow suit. If action of this sort is not taken immediately many of these young farmers won't be here to benefit by the many assistance plans that may come at a later date.

Mr. Speaker, much as been said of creating secondary industry in our province and increasing rural population by taking us away from a one crop economy. These are very commendable thoughts, but thought are not action and action is needed. With the creation of Gardiner Dam and Lake Diefenbaker we have the potential for a great increase in agriculture production in this province. The effect this would have on the agricultural productivity of this province and the increased opportunities for young people to enter agriculture in this province would be enormous. One only has to travel the irrigated areas of Alberta to see the sugar beet and potato growing areas to realize that potential irrigation has in revitalizing rural areas.

Why then is this government moving so slowly in the development of this potential. If the monies that are going to be spent in buying potash mines were used to develop irrigation potential it would do more for this province than any step that has been taken in the history of the province.

Mr. Speaker, I feel that I must mention the proposed grassland part in the Killdeer-Val Marie area, a large portion of which lies in my constituency.

Many statements have been printed and distributed by people who have not lived in the area and don't understand it. I have heard it seriously suggest that unless the park is established immediately that within ten years the whole area will be plowed up and farmed and this natural grassland lost forever. Whoever made that statement has certainly never travelled through the area or he would never make such a foolish suggestion.

Other people have made the suggestion that the ranching industry must be removed immediately so that the area can be preserved. They forget that the ranching industry has been there for 80 years now and has preserved it in its natural state. It has been suggested that the cattle and the ranchers be removed so the grass would be preserved. If you don't graze the grass, if it's not managed, you will soon burn it up with prairie fires. It's a fact, it's happened throughout history.

There is no reason why the ranching industry and the tourist industry cannot operate in that area side by side. Ranching industry is a part of our history and our heritage. It seems that we feel we must strike out part of our history to try to preserve another part.

One of the cruelest results of this controversy is that while the debate has raged around them, decisions were being made or discussed that would disrupt the way of life and destroy family ranches that have been in operation for four generations. Now it gives me great pleasure to have been told that hearings are being set up and that finally these people are going to be consulted.

Mr. Speaker, the Hon. Member for Kelsey-Tisdale (Mr. Messer) mentioned Friggstad Industries of Frontier, Saskatchewan. This industry is in my constituency and the Hon. Member was quite right in saying that it is a viable and fast growing industry. Such industries are very necessary in the area of the southwest, because our potential for farm diversification and intensive operation is very limited. Much of the Shaunavon constituency is not suited for grain farming. The rainfall is not great enough and much of the land is too rough ever to be used for anything but grazing cattle. The only way to supply jobs for our young people is in the manufacturing industries and I certainly support any program that can assist this being accomplished.

We in the extreme southwest portion of this province feel that we are quite often forgotten by the government of Regina. We are very distant from the capital and many of our problems are unique to the area. Many programs that are designed for the rest of the province are of no help to us. In fact, there are times when programs that probably work well elsewhere are harmful to us. I hope that in years to come I can help explain these problems and influence this government to extend and revisit programs so that we too may benefit to a greater degree.

Mr. Speaker, I should like to close by saying that I cannot support the motion. I will support the amendment.

SOME HON. MEMBERS: — Hear, hear!

MR. D.G. STEUART (Leader of the Opposition): — Mr. Speaker, I want to rise and just say a very few words about the sub-amendment that has been proposed to the amendment that has been moved to the main motion. I find that the sub-amendment, while it's not either as clear or as detailed or as effective as the amendment, is still one that I can support. My attitude since I came into this House has always been one that I would support any motion or any amendment that's put forward on my side of the House by any Member regardless of where he sits or what his party affiliation is, if I find that I can support the principle behind a motion.

Now, if I thought that by supporting this sub-amendment it would pass, it would mean that of course, we would never be able to support our own amendment and would vote against it. Of course, if this happened it would mean that a majority of the government Members over there would have come to their senses and realize that there is no leadership being shown in the fight against inflation by the government. They would realize that they are not doing anything to back off from more government centralization and the power grab by the government represented by the Cabinet, that they in fact, had come to their senses much more rapidly than I think they would have and it would in fact, be a vote of non-confidence in the government and we would have an election and the fifteen Members on this side would ride to victory and the majority of our people would recognize . . .

SOME HON. MEMBERS: — Hear, hear!

MR. STEUART: — . . . that they made 41 mistakes or 39 or whatever, or 46 or 51, no not quite 52, and we would be the government. Since this is highly unlikely it means that we will be able, of course, to vote if we wish, those of us who don't believe in the move to socialize the potash industry or any other or any more socializing, or any more power grab by the . . ., for the sub-amendment. We'll be able to vote for this sub-amendment as well as vote for the amendment that we put on the books.

So, Mr. Speaker, when we vote on this and we shall be voting on it very quickly, I intend to vote for this sub-amendment because I find that I can support it.

SOME HON. MEMBERS: — Hear, hear!

MR. L. LARSON (Pelly): — Mr. Speaker, it is with a great deal of pride and I suppose a great deal of satisfaction that I rise to take part in this Throne Speech of the First Session of the Eighteenth Legislature.

I take a great deal of pride in being associated with such able and capable men as the mover and the seconder. I have served in this House for a number of years and I don't believe I have heard a better or more competent job done than by these two gentlemen. I am referring to the Member for Quill Lakes (Mr. Koskie) and the Member for Melfort (Mr. Vickar).

SOME HON. MEMBERS: — Hear, hear!

MR. LARSON: — I want to congratulate them. I want to congratulate

yourself, Mr. Speaker, on your appointment to this important position. I look forward to co-operating and working with you.

I want to congratulate all the Members who were winners in the last election. I want to say that you've undertaken a very important and worthwhile job in servicing the people that elected you. It's an important job and one that should not be taken lightly.

To the new Members on this side I extend a very hearty welcome and look forward to working with you. I am sure your constituents made an excellent choice and that you will serve them for a long time to come.

To the new Member on the other side of the House, I extend the same best wishes, but I add, may your stay be both short and pleasant.

I extend a special welcome to the lady Members on the opposite side of the House. You certainly have done much to improve the scenery. A very special welcome to you.

To the Members of the Conservative Party I had looked forward to, with anticipation as to how your performance would be. I was very pleased when the Leader, the Hon. Member for Nipawin (Mr. Collver) rose the other day. I expected really a very worthwhile outline of his position and the position of his party. During the election campaign we heard, we believe a lot of generalities that really didn't make too much sense. I think the time has come when either he or someone in his party is going to have to start talking about more than your beliefs. I think the people of Saskatchewan are waiting for our position. I'm going to be watching with great interest how you vote and how you participate in the debates and in the bills and in the debates that will be coming before this House. Rather than an outline of your position, we got a rather severe reprimand. It was almost like some of the reprimands I used to get when I was in school. We had a rather crabby Irish school teacher. He took great pride in reprimanding us for chewing gum, for shooting papers across the hall, and this sort of thing. This was the sort of lecture we got from the Leader of the Conservative Party.

You know there is a rumor going around the building here, about the Hon. Member for Estevan (Mr. Larter) who yesterday made his first maiden catcall. The rumor is that he's been spending a lot of his spare time writing out 500 times, that I must not make catcalls in this House. I'm glad to see that he's through. I hope he doesn't have writer's cramp.

MR. ROMANOW: — I must not!

MR. LARSON: — Yes, I must not make catcalls in this House.

I certainly am still waiting, and I am certainly still going to be anxious, as I'm sure the people of Saskatchewan are, to find out where the Conservative Party stands on many of the issues, many of the programs that Saskatchewan people today are taking for granted and really are concerned about what will happen to them.

The Leader of the Opposition and the Liberal Party

discovered after 1964 they couldn't play around with these programs and stay in power. They discovered that deterrent fees, utilization fee, tax on the sick, hotdog tax and this kind of thing just wouldn't go down. Saskatchewan people are now going to be watching with anticipation what the Progressive Conservative Party will do with the same programs, with many others, I believe will not be satisfactory.

Now I want to say a word or two about the constituency of Pelly situated in the northeast central part of the province. It is principally an agricultural riding. Grain, cattle, hogs are raised in abundance. Other diversified crops include rapeseed, mustard seed and a few experiments in some of the other exotic crops.

The beautiful parkland scenery makes it a very attractive part of our beautiful province to live in.

Pelly constituency, thanks to the good Minister of Highways who I am sorry to say is not in his seat, is served by an excellent network of highways and grid roads. I want to say that I look forward to the co-operation of the Minister within the next four years to further improve this network.

Other major factors in our constituency are its natural recreational facilities and potential. The Duck Mountain Provincial Park is one of the most attractive and the most used in the province. Its present facilities for camping, fishing, golfing, skidoing, skiing, as well as the well equipped cottages for holidaying are appreciated and are well known in all parts of the prairies as well as outside. We have visitors from the United States that keep repeating their visits and enjoying the facilities and the beauties of our park.

The beautiful Assiniboine Valley adds another extra dimension to our scenery. It embraces some of the richest and most productive farm land to be found anywhere in the province.

The building of the Shellmouth Dam has created an extensive man-made lake that extends well into the constituency. This lake is well stocked with fish and offers excellent fishing and boating. Whether you are a traditional fisherman, Mr. Speaker, or an ice fisherman, we offer you year round fishing at its best.

I want to thank the people of the Pelly constituency for the honor of serving them during the Seventeenth Legislature and again in this, the Eighteenth. I will do my best to be of service to you. I invite you to contact me and to keep in touch with me and I will do my part to the best of my ability as I have done in the past.

SOME HON. MEMBERS: Hear, hear!

MR. LARSON: — I want, however, to take this opportunity to serve notice that I will, on behalf of my constituents, continue to press for and request some of the things that we need and are badly needed and that we must have.

I look forward to this task and feel confident that I will receive co-operation and satisfaction. My association with the Members of this government make me confident that this

co-operation and satisfaction will be forthcoming.

I am also pleased to welcome the new members of the Pelly constituency. Their acceptance and co-operation is greatly appreciated. In the months and years ahead I look forward to getting to know you better and to help you whenever and wherever I can.

I want to make a few comments on the Throne Speech. In spite of the utterances from your left, Mr. Speaker, I find it a timely, a forthright, and a well designed document, tailored to today and tomorrow and the future.

My colleagues, and particularly the Premier, have done a great deal of explaining and have done an extensive job of making known some of the priorities and some of the aspirations that we have for our people from this government.

I have great difficulty in understanding the disparaging remarks of the Members to your left. As I have listened to the desperate and irresponsible utterances I thought they must have lived in a different country. The fact of the matter, of course, is that their own performance while in office was so bad that they are now desperately trying to throw up a smoke screen to distract from their pitiful performance while in government.

The Leader of the Opposition's remarks both in and out of this House are without parallel and are almost unbelievable. It was very obvious the other day that his remarks were not in harmony with, or even appreciated by his followers. I can only conclude that his performance was aimed at paving his way into the Senate. It is very interesting to watch the jockeying and the shenanigans behind him and in front of him as well for this position. I wouldn't be surprised to see someone openly challenge and replace him before this Session ends.

With the quality of this Throne Speech that job will not be an enviable one. It's my guess that whoever he is he had better be prepared to spend a good deal of his career to your left, Mr. Speaker.

Now I cannot miss this opportunity to say something about the crucial situation of food and agriculture in the world. I suppose every Member of this Assembly, Mr. Speaker, would be very disturbed if I or some other Member were to announce that there is no longer sufficient food for the people in Canada. I'm sure that all Americans would feel the same way and would be equally disturbed.

Very fortunately this is not the case. However, such a statement should cause us to stop and ponder our reaction to similar statements about other parts of the world. We have not yet felt the personal effect of a deficient food supply. The recent developments in the outside world must make us aware and cognizant of the real possibility of this happening.

In the past few years we have seen an unfortunate combination of factors, including weather, that has resulted in the disappearance of the so-called food surpluses and the results are sharp increases in their prices. Many of us think this is a good thing. For Canadian farmers it has meant more money. It has meant better times. It has, I suppose, to some extent

contributed to inflation. Do we stop, do we consider the impact of those who suffer from the food shortage? This dramatic changing in the food supply has served to bring into focus a real problem and a fact which has always existed, but unfortunately has been ignored and that we have not been properly concerned about. I am, of course, referring to the severe shortfall between present food production and food requirements to feed the masses of the world.

When we examine the extent of the total world food shortage versus food requirements we cannot help but be appalled by the human suffering that exists. There is a very conservative estimate that right now, as I speak in this House, there are between 450 million to 500 million men, women, and children suffering from starvation, from malnutrition and not enough to eat. This is a situation made even more precarious by the steady decline in world foodstuffs, which has occurred in the past few years.

From 1962 to 1965 we find on examination that the cereal grain supplies for the world averaged 11 per cent of the yearly production. In 1972 grain stocks fell to six per cent of production and in 1973, Mr. Speaker, there was another drop of two per cent. These declining supplies include wheat, coarse grain and rice. These grains comprise a very large portion of the total world food production and consumption. Unfortunately . . .

MR. LANE: — Table your sources.

MR. LARSON: — Unfortunately, the gentlemen opposite are nattering and chattering about sources. I am sure that even in their ignorance they must have heard of DBS, FAO, The Bucharest Conference, the World Conference on Food, just to name a very few. They ought to do a little bit of research.

SOME HON. MEMBERS: — Hear, hear!

MR. LARSON: — Obviously they think it's a joke. Obviously they think that this is something you can shove under the rug and ignore, and play down. Unfortunately, this doesn't tell the whole story of supply and distribution of these grains. Even more alarming is the data showing the levels of consumption by the various regions of the world.

Information presented at the World Conference in Rome in January of this year showed that the average person in the developing countries of the world consumes 2,200 calories daily. This compares to us in the developed countries and the developed world where we are consuming an average of 3,150 calories per day. The very same relationship prevails in the intake of proteins. People living in the developing countries are now forced to make do with 60 per cent of the proteins consumed by the average person in the developed countries. Very unfortunately again, these figure do not tell the whole story.

In India the calories intake is 2,070 daily, and in Indonesia it is down to 1,790 calories. The Philippines are only slightly better off with 1,940. Compare this, Mr. Speaker, to Canada and to the developed world.

Canadian consume 3,180 calories, while the Americans consume 3,330. This is almost 25 per cent more than is considered necessary to maintain good health and good living standards.

This is a very brief and a very sketchy outline of some of the facts concerning food and its supply in the world. Current figures indicate that the present world food situation will continue to be very precarious and very unsatisfactory unless new means and new methods are found for increasing food production.

In the period 1962 to 1973 the rate of the increase in food production was only slightly ahead of the population increase. Over this period production increased 2.7 per cent, while population increased by a fraction under 2 per cent.

It must also be remembered that most of the production increases occurred in the developed countries of the world and this production very unfortunately was not available to those who are most in need of it.

This again, is a background, and a brief background of the problem of food that faces mankind. It would be very easy, Mr. Speaker, and it would be very comforting to sit back and say, as some of those who make catcalls on the other side would obviously like to do, who hum, what else is new. Haven't we heard of starvation for years, and hasn't starvation existed in the world forever, isn't a lot of this their own fault? What am I supposed to do about it.

Well I remind you of the predictions of Thomas Malthus, a rather gloomy economist when he predicted way back in 1798 that world population would outstrip food supply and that we would end up in brutality and starvation. I say, thank God this has not happened to us. But this is small comfort to those who are starving and to those who see their children suffer from malnutrition, from disease and never having enough to eat. These are the conditions that caused the Bangladesh delegate at the World Population Conference in Bucharest to cry out in utter despair — "My people are starving while you talk." Yes, Mr. Speaker, people are starving while we do talk.

For a time in recent years it was thought that through technology and through science we would get ourselves out of the food production trouble. It hasn't worked out that way. The so-called "green revolution" of the 1960s has failed, in spite of the fact that it did produce wheat of a strain that could withstand the blistering sun of Africa and of Asia. It developed a rice that would yield two or more crops a year. The problem was — the new wheat demanded water. It demanded fertilizer, it demanded spray. In other words, it cost more to grow the new kinds and the poor couldn't afford to grow it, and therefore, it was of little value to them. The wheat was a success, the people for whom it was intended got little benefit. Similarly, the miracle rice — it appeared, it was beautiful.

For the first time, briefly, the Philippines exported rice. However, the new crop matured quickly. It matured and was caught in the wet season. It had to be dried before it could be marketed. Small farmers couldn't afford drying equipment. They couldn't afford the expense of harvesting and making it marketable. They went, of course, back to the old rice. Again, the poor and the hungry were the chief losers.

The third world has lost faith in technology as its salvation. They don't believe that what applies and what works in our abundant country can be applied to them. So much so that a member of the African Environmental Study Group said at the Bucharest Conference, "Leave us alone, we have enough land in Africa. Let us return to an agrarian standard of living, a traditional way of African life." A challenge that ought to be heeded and out to teach us some very important lessons when we try to ram technology down the throats of those who are not ready for it. Decentralization, self-reliance and responsiveness to the African environment, those are the answers they require.

I want now to talk briefly about Canada and about Saskatchewan. What's happening here and what we are doing about it.

Canada is a new country. We have enjoyed abundances of many kinds. We've had many advantages. Let's consider and ponder few of them.

We have large tracts of land capable of producing food and many of the associated items with food. This land has not been farmed nor depleted of its nutrients as is the case of many countries. We have a favourable climate. We have normally plenty of rainfall. We have some of the richest soils found anywhere in the world. We have been, above all, blessed with thrifty and industrious farmers.

As well, we have been able to take advantage of the technology that has made farming easier and better. Because of this we have earned the title of "Bread Basket of the World". This has been, and is, an enviable position to be in. This is a position that has led us and made it possible for us to meet some of the challenges that exist in the less unfortunate countries.

Let's look what we have done with it. In the late '60s and early '70s when there was a so-called surplus we reacted rather strangely. With food literally coming out of our ears and with starvation and suffering going on around us in the outside world, we reacted rather than acted. Well we knew the world was in the throes of a population explosion following World War II, and while we knew the balance of the world food production versus food supplies and need was not keeping pace, we allowed this to happen in our country. We allowed our farm lands to be destroyed at an alarming rate. We are losing productive farm land at a rate of something like 220,000 acres a year. In Ontario alone the Federation of Agriculture estimates that at least, Mr. Speaker, 26 acres of prime farm land every hour of every day and every night of every day of the year is lost to urban sprawl, to dams, to parking lots, hydro lines, pipe lines and the like. The salient fact is that land is lost forever as a source of food production.

We allowed our farm population to dwindle to an alarming low. Consider the following: We are losing farmers at a rate of about 13,000 or more every year. Every 41 minutes a farmer either passes on or retires or just simply gives up and quits and no one replaces him. We are, to take one of the starkest examples, producing 2 billion pounds of milk less than we did four years ago. In the prairie provinces the best we could do during the times of bursting grain bins and overproduction was to allow the price of grain to drop far below production cost

and to see the government of the day invent the infamous LIFT program. In brief, it coerced farms to take out of production for a small fee land that should have been producing so as to enable them to sell what was already in storage.

Yes, Mr. Chairman, in agriculture our margin of affluence is getting thin and precarious. Only about 8 per cent of our vast landmass is occupied in farm land and is declining. Only 6 per cent of our population are farmers and this is declining. If present trends are allowed to continue it can be expected that before the turn of the century we will have moved from a position of one of the world's great granaries to one of a net food shortage.

In summary, then, we see that we are losing our favored position as far as food is concerned. The big question is: what to do about it?

Several prospects face us. Several decisions must be made. Time is not on our side.

First we must face the fact that we cannot continue to underpay and to cheat our farmers. To alleviate this situation I suggest that the nation must face this fact squarely and fairly. In the same context, Canada as a nation, must face its responsibility in the world community with regard to the role as a food producer. To achieve income equity for farmers I suggest several things must be done.

I suggest that speculation and profit taking must be taken out of the handling and distribution of food after it leaves the farm gate. Income stabilization programs must be put into place that will give farmers some stability and security when price fluctuations over which they have no control affect their income and their bargaining positions.

I suggest that marketing machinery of a permanent nature be established that will be empowered to take speculation and profit taking out of the vital food industry.

I suggest that a transportation system that does not discriminate because of geographic problems must be developed and enshrined in legislation to establish once for all this kind of need for the whole food-producing industry.

SOME HON. MEMBERS: — Hear, hear!

MR. LARSON: — I suggest that in view of the energy crisis, which I have not even mentioned and which time doesn't permit me to mention be given proper and prior consideration to establish a source of energy to ensure that food producers can do any effective job.

I am happy to report, Mr. Speaker, that the Saskatchewan government is in total agreement with these suggestions. We have reacted to income stability very positively. Our submissions to the federal government indicate that this government feels that this is a priority item . . .

The Speaker interrupted the debate and the question being put on the sub-amendment, it was negatived on the following recorded division:

YEAS — 15
Messieurs

Steuart	Cameron	Bailey
Lane	Anderson	Berntson
Wiebe	Merchant	Ham
Malone	Collver	Katzman
MacDonald	Larter	Birkbeck

NAYS - 30
Messieurs

Blakeney	Faris	Rolfes
Pepper	MacMurchy	Skoberg
Thibault	Mostoway	Vickar
Smishek	Larson	Nelson (Yorkton)
Romanow	Whelan	Allen
Messer	McNeill	Koskie
Snyder	MacAuley	Johnson
Byers	Feschuk	Thompson
Lange	Shillington	Banda

The debate continues on the motion and the amendment.

MR. LARSON: — I was speaking, Mr. Speaker, about the reaction of this provincial government to some of the problems that I mentioned. I mention the Hog Marketing Commission, one of the positive steps that this government has taken in the attempt to take speculation and profit taking out of the food marketing.

Recent developments in the grain marketing system in Canada have alarmed farmers as well as the government. The opening of the Winnipeg Commodity Exchange to grain speculation poses a major threat to the Canadian Wheat Board and as such, a threat to the concept of orderly marketing and must be opposed.

In the field of transportation this government is acting very positively and is deeply involved. Land use establishes a realistic program of land use and land distribution by way of the Land Bank. The Land Bank is new; it is being studied. It has great potential. It will certainly be a milestone in the history of land use in, not only Saskatchewan but Canada as such.

I could go on, Mr. Speaker, but in summing up I would say that the gut issue and the essence of the whole food production and distribution problem are summed up very well by the Federal Minister of Agriculture when he said:

The gut issue is Canada's concern for the hungry and the poor in other nations. The issue is how much are we willing to sacrifice in order to help out less fortunate brothers and sisters.

I want to say a word or two before I conclude, Mr. Speaker, about potash. It has been rather depressing to listen to some of the statements that have been made. I want to draw particular attention to some of the tales dealing with the present ownership of these mines. To listen to Members opposite you

would think they were owned by poor, poverty-stricken companies that are struggling to make a go of it. It would seem that people of Saskatchewan own them a debt of gratitude that should continue into perpetuity. This position is enhanced by members of the industry itself. The suffering, sacrificing image is obviously designed to arouse public opinion into believing that a very great injustice is being perpetrated on them.

What are the facts with regard to these poverty-stricken suffering victims of the potash industry? Ownership of the potash industry in Saskatchewan is a pretty complex business. By that I mean you can't tell at a glance who actually owns our potash mines. As a matter of fact you can't even get out and buy a share in a Saskatchewan potash mine. Let me give you an example: The potash mine at Duval, about seven miles southwest of Saskatoon, is owned by the Duval Corporation of Canada. Now you might think you could buy shares in the Duval Corporation, say a few shares, but what is the fact again.

First, you would find that the Head Office of the Duval Corporation of Canada is in Houston, Texas. If you went to Houston to buy a few shares you'd learn that the Duval Corporation of Canada, Head Office, Houston is a subsidiary of the Duval Corporation which is registered in Delaware. Duval at Delaware is in turn, a wholly-owned subsidiary of Pennzoil Company, also of Delaware. It is a large resource company with interest in oil and gas in North America and the North Sea, copper, gold and silver in the United States and a potash mine in New Mexico.

Pennzoil's net income in 1973 was almost \$84 million. Their total assets after depreciation and other charges come to \$1,545,000,000.

AN HON. MEMBER: — One of those little mines.

MR. LARSON: — That's just to give you some idea of its size. Now I imagine you could buy shares in Pennzoil, if you wanted to buy into this gigantic corporation, but that's just a drop in Pennzoil's big bucket.

Let's look at another example: The Sylvite Mine at Rocanville. Sylvite is a division of Hudson Bay Mining and Smelting Company, which is in part owned by the Anglo American Corporation of South Africa which in turn is involved with the giant De Beers Consolidated Mining Company of South Africa. It gets pretty involved as you see, but the pattern of ownership is much the same throughout the whole country. The Kalium mine, west of Regina, turns out to be owned by a company which is a wholly-owned subsidiary of PPG Industries of Pittsburgh, Pennsylvania. PPG was formerly known as Pittsburgh Plate Glass Company and is one of the world's largest producers of sheet glass and chemicals. Potash is just a tiny part of the operation.

The Potash Company of America mine just east of Saskatoon is owned by a cement, railroad and real estate conglomerate called Ideal Basic Industries with headquarters in Denver, Colorado.

International Minerals and Chemical Corporation (Canada) with its two largest mines in the Esterhazy area is a wholly-owned

subsidiary of International Minerals and Chemical Corporation of Libertyville, Illinois, the world's largest producer of chemical fertilizer and fertilizer material. They certainly know where they're going. But I'm not sure we want them to get there right here in Saskatchewan.

Other mines are owned in part or wholly by British, French, German and other companies. They share one common feature. Virtually all of our mines are owned by financial conglomerates, whose primary interest is not necessarily the production of potash in Saskatchewan. In some cases, potash production is just a minor interest. Not one of our mines is owned by Saskatchewan interests. Not one is Saskatchewan based.

Now, I'm not being critical when I make that statement. That's the way these giant businesses operate. They go wherever in the world they can make a buck. They go wherever people will let them in. If one area of the business operation becomes temporarily unprofitable or runs into difficulties, the decision may be made to close down that operation or else sell it off, or cut off staff or to postpone expansion.

My question is a simple one: Is this the best ownership structure for our important potash industry? Will it ensure the stability and sensible development in the industry?

Might it not be better for the industry to be owned by a Crown corporation on behalf of the people of Saskatchewan? A corporation with headquarters here in Saskatchewan? A corporation that has only one business interest and only one priority? A corporation that people of Saskatchewan can invest in and produce their own product for their own benefit? A corporation that places effective control on our potash right in the hands of the people of the province. A Crown corporation that assures for all time that the full benefits of our potash will come to the taxpayers of Saskatchewan. I'm talking about the Potash Corporation of Saskatchewan.

I should like, Mr. Speaker, at this time, to beg leave to adjourn the debate because I have other things that I wish to say at a later date.

SOME HON. MEMBERS: — Hear, hear!

Debate adjourned.

MR. R.A. LARTER (Estevan): — Mr. Speaker, on a point of order. I should like to correct the Hon. Member for Petty and remind him that the Hon. Member for Regina Rosemont (Mr. Allen) may have good hearing but he has very poor eyesight. I should like to tell him that it was the Hon. Member for Thunder Creek (Mr. Thatcher) who made his maiden catcall. I just might make one but I will have to give it some serious thoughts.

QUESTIONS

MINIMUM PROVINCIAL GOVERNMENT WAGE

MR. R. KATZMAN (Rosthern): — Mr. Speaker, before the Orders of the Day, I have a deferred oral question. I should like to direct my question to the Minister of Labour (Mr. Snyder). Would the

Minister please tell me what the minimum hourly wage paid by the government to its employees is?

MR. BLAKENEY: — I'll ask the Public Service Commission to offer a comment.

HON. W.E. SMISHEK (Minister of Finance): — Mr. Speaker, in the case of the labor service where the collective bargaining agreement has been reached, the minimum rate there is \$3.60 an hour. In the case of the regular public service, collective bargaining is still in progress, that agreement has not been concluded. I am not able to give a precise rate because with that rate is the cost of living bonus. I think it was \$2.74 plus the cost of living, which was \$40 per month in addition. You can do your own calculation.

MR. KATZMAN: — Supplementary question, please. Does the Minister believe that the minimum level for the employees of the government are worth more than the minimum level for outside employees?

MR. SMISHEK: — Mr. Speaker, the Hon. Member might be aware that minimum wages are established or recommended by the Minimum Wage Board. The Minimum Wage Board has made a recommendation for the last time to establish the minimum wage of \$2.50 per hour, which is the current minimum wage. The Minimum Wage Board has recommended that the minimum wage be increased to \$2.80 as of January 1st. The government has accepted the recommendation of that Board and has announced in the Throne Speech that effective January 1st our minimum wage will be raised to \$2.80 per hour. I might inform the Member that it will be the highest minimum wage in Canada.

In the case of the employees within the government service, they bargain collectively, their wages are established through the collective bargaining process. At the present time the labour service minimum wage rate is \$3.60 per hour.

MR. KATZMAN: — I believe he ignored my question completely.

STATEMENT

ORAL QUESTIONS

HON. R.J. ROMANOW (Attorney General): — Mr. Speaker, may I just have the indulgence of the House to say very briefly that on oral question period, and I don't mean this in any aggressive sense, I know that there are a number of first time Members here, that it is in my respectful judgment, we'll be setting up a committee to be looking at it in detail, but not proper for individual Members to ask Cabinet Ministers detailed questions, such as, what is the ordinary rate of pay in a certain area, or the average question that was raised by the Member for Rosthern (Mr. Katzman) today. This is a detailed question. The general rule on question period is the government should be asked a question which is of public urgency in an area of public policy. And I don't mean that by way of any aggressive political comment, but I believe that's the case. When you ask a Minister and if you ask him when

someone gets up in the House and say to the Attorney General - will you please tell me what the fee is that you pay Justices of the Peace every time they issue a summons, that's not the way it is followed in the House of Commons and it's not the way it is followed in the House of Commons in England, and I would simply say that I would ask Members to keep that in mind when they ask a question along those lines.

MR. MacDONALD: — Are you taking over?

MR. ROMANOW: — Other have done it, so I will give my try this time round too.

MR. SPEAKER: — The book is clear on the questions. I think generally speaking the questions must be short, without preamble and of a more or less urgent nature. The answers must be short as well. If the Cabinet Minister cannot supply it at that time, or does not desire to supply it until a later time because of checking a fact, he is quite within his liberty to say that he will answer the question later.

The Assembly adjourned at 5:25 o'clock p.m.