

**LEGISLATIVE ASSEMBLY OF SASKATCHEWAN**  
**First Session - Eighteenth Legislature**  
**9th Day**

**Tuesday, November 25, 1975.**

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

On the Orders of the Day.

**WELCOME TO STUDENTS**

**MR. R.N. NELSON (Yorkton):** — Mr. Speaker, it is a great honour for me to introduce to this House two Grade Eight classes, one from Bredenbury; one from Saltcoats and their two teachers, Mr. Farguharson from Saltcoats and Mrs. Thies from Bredenbury, as well as their bus driver, Mr. Ziprick.

It is an honor for me to introduce these students on behalf of the Hon. Mr. Edgar Kaeding, who is away in Rome on a Food and Agricultural Conference. I personally know these teachers very well and I had the privilege of teaching many of their brothers and sisters in the Yorkton Regional High School. So through you, Mr. Speaker, and to this House I hope that these students find their stay in Regina and their visit to the Legislature very interesting and we wish them a safe trip home.

**HON. MEMBERS:** — Hear, hear!

**QUESTIONS**

**UNSECURED CREDITORS OF POTASH COMPANIES**

**MR. E.F.A. MERCHANT (Regina Wascana):** — Mr. Speaker, before the Orders of the Day I should like to direct a question to the Minister of Mineral Resources (Mr. Whelan). I mentioned the other day that one of the failings of the potash legislation is its failure to protect unsecured creditors of companies nationalized. Has the Minister looked into the dangers of small local businessmen going unpaid after nationalization and will the Government be amending the Potash Bill to protect unsecured creditors so that unsecured creditors won't lose out as they did when the Parsons and Whittemore Pulp Mill was cancelled?

**HON. E.C. WHELAN (Minister of Mineral Resources):** — Mr. Speaker, in answer to the Hon. Member I am sure that when the Bill is before the House there will be ample opportunity to take into consideration every aspect of the question that he has just asked.

**MR. MERCHANT:** — A supplementary question, Mr. Speaker. I would be concerned and I suggest to the Minister that he may be concerned that Saskatchewan businessmen now may be jeopardizing themselves and I wonder if the Minister would advertise for Saskatchewan businessmen, indicate to the House that he is prepared to notify Saskatchewan businessmen that extending credit to potash companies which might be nationalized could be dangerous to those local businessmen and that they would then be faced with having to move their unsecured debt into a secured judgment?

I wonder if the Minister would indicate whether they are prepared to advertise and advise people in the potash areas of the danger that they face?

**MR. WHELAN:** — Mr. Speaker, I am sure when the Bill is before the House it will take care of this aspect. In this case I think that the business people under the Bill are able to take care of themselves.

#### **TRANSFERS OF MONEY TO FEDERAL TREASURY**

**MR. R. L. COLLVER (Leader of the Progressive Conservatives):** — I wish to direct a question to the Premier. Had the Premier or his Government made any special deals with the Federal Government to transfer millions of dollars belonging to the people of Saskatchewan over and above the normal to the federal treasury to assist them in meeting their \$6 billion deficit?

**HON. A.E. BLAKENEY (Premier):** — Much as I would like, Mr. Speaker, to offer assistance to the Government at Ottawa in managing their financial affairs, since the governments appear to need it more. But we have made no arrangements to provide funds to the Federal Government at Ottawa to meet their deficit and we are not contemplating any call upon our resources by the Government at Ottawa.

**MR. COLLVER:** — A supplementary question, Mr. Speaker. Is the Premier not aware that due to the capital gains tax and the income tax rules relating to recaptured depreciation, that should the proposed potash legislation be enacted and acted upon, even using the Premier's own figures, that as a result well over \$100 million will be transferred by the Government of Saskatchewan through the companies to the Federal Government thereby making a mockery of the federal-provincial agreement on the special fund accumulation for oil revenues by Saskatchewan for capital investment.

**MR. BLAKENEY:** — Mr. Speaker, I think many Hon. Members will know and I suspect it may include the Hon. Member for Nipawin, that there are many ways to organize and package a sale or a purchase, and it may well be that the purchase or sale which might be contemplated would not necessarily attract the levels of tax which the Hon. Member is suggesting. In any case, a good number of the resource companies involved have other resource enterprises against which they can balance taxes payable. Indeed one of the points which we have complained about on many occasions is that many of the large resource enterprises, notwithstanding very substantial apparent taxable incomes, manage to pay very little tax. I suspect that if we enter into arrangements with these resource companies to purchase their potash that the same results will ensue.

#### **TORONTO LAWYERS CONSULTED RE: BILL 1**

**MR. W.C. THATCHER (Thunder Creek):** — Mr. Speaker, I should like to address a question to the Attorney General, if I may? Were you or your department

advised by a lawyer or lawyers in Toronto drafting Bill 1, The Potash Development Act, 1975? If so, who was he or they? When was he or they first consulted

**HON. R.J. ROMANOW (Attorney General):** — Mr. Speaker, we received as much legal advice as we could both from within the department, and quite frankly, from outside the department. I think the detailed nature of the question that the Hon. Member asked really requires that it be put on the Order Paper for further consideration at that time.

**MR. THATCHER:** — A supplementary, Mr. Speaker. What fees have been paid for such services? Or if the accounts have not been received, what is their estimated cost and are such accounts all that are expected.

**MR. ROMANOW:** — As I say and I don't mean this in any offensive way, but I think all Members would agree with me that that is the type of question which is properly only placed on an Order Paper. When you ask me how much the fees are or what the daily fee rate is, or how much has been paid or hadn't been paid, forgetting about the Potash Bill, generally, that's the type of question that comes on the Order paper. We have answered it in the past before, that's the reason why I said it in the first case. And I would say, with respect, that that type of a question really should be put on the Order Paper for the consideration of the House.

#### **NET PROFIT — INTERCONTINENTAL PACKERS**

**MRS. E.G. EDWARDS (Saskatoon-Sutherland):** — Mr. Speaker, I have a question for the Minister of Industry and Commerce. What is the net profit of the return on capital investment in Intercontinental Packers after the last complete fiscal year since the Government entered the beef processing industry?

**HON. J.R. MESSER (Minister of Industry & Commerce):** — I think, Mr. Speaker, with all due respect to the new Member that that type of question can best be answered, probably only adequately answered, if it is put on the Order Paper.

**MRS. EDWARDS:** — A supplementary question, Mr. Speaker. Will the Minister give assurance to the House and to the people of this province, that he will provide those facts as soon as possible now that the Government is about to enter the biggest government enterprise in Canada? It is important for people to judge the success or failure of the businesses they have entered into over a year ago.

**MR. MESSER:** — Mr. Speaker, I can assure the Member and the Members opposite that the Government will give due consideration to any such questions when they appear on the Order Paper.

**ADDRESS-IN-REPLY**

The Assembly resumed the adjourned debate on the proposed motion by Mr. Koskie (Quill Lakes) for an Address-in-Reply.

**MR. N.H. MacAULEY (Cumberland):** — Mr. Speaker, I want to congratulate you on your appointment as Speaker of the House. I have heard the name of Brockelbank for many years and I am most pleased to see you sitting in that Chair.

Now I want to say how happy I am to be representing the constituency of Cumberland in this House. Today I want to thank the people of Cumberland constituency who elected me to this office. I hope I can do a good job for them.

I want to say a few words in Cree for the first two paragraphs so that the people at home can see what has been said here: (The following was spoken in Cree).

I want to congratulate you on your appointment as Speaker of this House. I have heard the name of Brockelbank for many years and I am most pleased to see you sitting in that Chair.

Now I want to say how happy I am to be representing the constituency of Cumberland in this House. Today I want to thank the people of Cumberland constituency who elected me to this office. I hope I can do a good job for them.

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

**MR. MacAULEY:** — Mr. Speaker, I want to say a few words on what has happened in the last four years in my area. There has been a lot of talk about the Department of Northern Saskatchewan in the last four years. I believe many of the things that have been said are not right. Today, the development and progress shows what has been done for many of the people of the North. I believe the main function of the criticism was to delay the progress and programs of the present Government . . .

**AN HON. MEMBER:** — Right on!

**MR. MacAULEY:** — . . . and to sneer at the Minister of Northern Saskatchewan. However, in spite of all these harassing tactics of the opposition and their followers, it has been proven by the election of two northern Member to the legislature here . . .

**SOME HON. MEMBERS:** — Hear, hear!

**MR. MacAULEY:** — . . . one for Cumberland and one for the Athabasca constituencies, that the Government's policies are accepted by the northern people. I want to go on and explain what has been done for the people of the North that has never been done in the past.

Construction. Although construction in my area is much different than that in the South, because in some of the areas we have to deal with a very short construction period, and the

fact that it is very difficult to transport large quantities of materials due to the necessity, in many cases, of flying the materials in, construction in the North has gone on at a rate never experienced before.

I wish, Mr. Speaker, to point out the following facts in regard to construction projects:

1. Water and sewer. Complete systems have been provided at Weyekwin and Cumberland House, one of the oldest settlements in northern Saskatchewan. A new water and sewer system is being initiated in Sandy Bay and is scheduled for completion in 1975.
2. Public Housing. The Department of Northern Saskatchewan Housing Division provides for maximum northern employment and training. Between 400 and 500 northern residents are currently employed in construction. In the year 1971-72 public housing starts increased by 20 over the 1970 figure, increasing each year until in 1975, 161 new housing starts were made.
3. Airstrips. In the last four years the following progress was made on airstrips in my constituency. Improvements were undertaken at Cumberland House. Upgrading of airstrips will take place in 1976-77 at Kinoosan, Wollaston Lake, Southend, Reindeer Lake, Deschambault, Stanley Mission and Pelican Narrows.

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

**MR. MacAULEY:** — 4. Road Construction Programs: Road construction programs are going ahead and new road construction has been completed on the access road in the new townsites at Southend Reindeer, 3.7 miles Weyekwin to Montreal Lake, four miles Deschambault to Highway 106. New construction is underway or to commence during 1975 as follows: On Highway No. 7 via the Anglo-Rouyn mine site to Stanley Mission; Weyekwin, Weyekwin Lake access road to Highway No. 1. Winter roads are being constructed to Stanley Mission and Kinoosan.

Mr. Speaker, I feel I must mention the improvements taking place in Social Services in northern areas. This is very important as far as northern residents are concerned in that in 1971 there were only three social services offices in the North reporting to two southern centres. Now there are six northern offices reporting to a northern headquarters in La Ronge, this providing more immediate and relevant services.

Because of this, improved child care services have resulted. Before 1971 there were no full-time correction workers. Now there are four probation officers, providing more meaningful and rehabilitative assistance to the courts and offenders, and a probation hostel is nearing completion in La Ronge.

Before 1971 no magistrates or lawyers were resident in the North. Now there are two magistrates and legal aid staff in the North.

Before 1971 there were no programs to deal with alcoholism and now a good alcohol rehabilitation program is in progress.

November 25, 1975

**SOME HON. MEMBERS:** — Hear, hear!

**MR. MacAULEY:** — Before 1971 there was no northern recreation program. Now a recreation program is working with 15 community recreation boards.

Most important of all in the social service area, Mr. Speaker, the fact that in January 1973, there were 1,228 social assistance cases and in December of 1974 only 706. These figures do not include federal welfare cases, and of the 706 cases mentioned 445 were classified as unemployable.

May I say, Mr. Speaker, the Department of Northern Saskatchewan social service programs have been directly affected by increased social, economic and educational opportunities in the North.

Mr. Speaker, some comparative figures on the Health Services Program in the North may be appropriate at this time and I submit the following; I'll read those out here. In 1972 - 33 staff and in 1975 — 65 staff; in 1972 nine public health nurses and in 1975 — 18 public health nurses; in 1972, seven physicians and in 1975 — 12 full time physicians; in 1972 no full time dentists and in 1975, two full time dentists, three dental nurses, which is expected to be increased to four dentists and seven dental nurses by fall, 1975. We have free dental care for northern residents aged three to 16, and dental clinics are being established in larger communities.

**SOME HON. MEMBERS:** — Hear, hear!

**MR. MacAULEY:** — In co-operation with the Northern Municipal Council, DNS is implementing a health education program designed essentially for the North, with a full time health educator working with the northern residents who are to be trained as community health workers.

Education. Northern School Board governs all northern provincial schools with the exception of Uranium City, Creighton, and Ile a la Crosse. As of January 1, 1976 the Board is now composed entirely of northern community representatives with Government employees acting as consultants only. As far as facilities are concerned, five mobile training units have been constructed to take specialized training in communities. A community college has been established in La Ronge. A new gymnasium/auditorium built at Sandy Bay. Major school construction planning is underway at La Ronge and Sandy Bay.

Various actions have made northern training and education more relevant. They include: development of special materials and courses for northern use; an expansion of "teacher aide" programs; teacher training for northern residents; public participation in school boards; adult education committees. The number of adult education courses offered has greatly increased with direct local participation in determining courses required.

School operating grants are as follows: in 1971-72, Creighton had \$150,035 and in 1975, \$296,423.

**SOME HON. MEMBERS:** — Hear, hear!

**MR. MacAULEY:** — In 1971 — Northern School Board 1.8 million — in 1975 \$4 million, with additional amounts under consideration.

Mr. Speaker, I must at this point not fail to mention the Northern Municipal Council which was established by the Department of Northern Saskatchewan, after lengthy consultation processes involving the Metis Society of Saskatchewan, Federation of Saskatchewan Indians and an appointed Northern Advisory Council. The Northern Municipal Council has been successful in greatly increasing northern influence and direction of northern affairs. It provides a degree of local government to all settlements and is supportive to local councils. Its 1974-75 budget was \$850,000 and 1975-76 the budget is \$1.2 million. Added on this was special funding for winter works, summer projects, etc. The Northern Municipal Council, is consulted on capital programs and policy development by DNS.

Numerous new local advisory councils and local community authorities have been elected and have become active in most northern communities. The Northern Municipal Council budget has allowed for greatly increased government grants. Before Northern Municipal Council and DNS operated, organized communities received \$2 annually per capita plus a matching grant for local tax revenue. In 1975-76 the communities will receive \$56 per capita grant.

**SOME HON. MEMBERS:** — Hear, hear!

**MR. MacAULEY:** — Plus a local tax revenue. Northern development, that is, new business ventures, new housing units, is increasing the tax revenue of the settlements.

Economic Development. Mr. Speaker, under the DNS economic development program, great incentive has been provided to northern residents to own and operate their own businesses. The total loans fund established by DNS is \$5 million.

In addition may I mention the following. A Northern Saskatchewan Fisheries study is underway involving northern fishermen in determining best use of fisheries' resources. DNS has initiated federal-provincial meetings to demand improvement in operation of the freshwater fish-marketing corporation. A northern prospectors program and joint DNS and Department of Mineral Resources mineral evaluation program is providing for direct involvement of northerners in mineral exploration. Four training farms continue in operation under DNS.

North Saskatchewan Electric are extending the power grid to Timber Bay, Weyekwin, Pelican Narrows, Sucker River. New generators are being provided at Southend, Wollaston, Kinoosan, Sturgeon Landing. The rates have been reduced to the same as southern Saskatchewan.

Mr. Speaker, my remarks have been quite lengthy, but I have come to the most important part of my report and I hope everyone will bear with me while I talk awhile about the resources. This area, Mr. Speaker, is a very important area of our province, and more important even for northern residents. Our resources of timber, game, wildlife and fish if not properly protected will deteriorate and the Indian people and other northern residents who have made their living from those resources will

no doubt be caused much hardship in years to come if the program is not properly administered. We need more resource people to protect these areas, and we certainly do not at the present time have sufficient staff in the resource branch for this protection to be looked after adequately.

The tourist industry has grown to be one of the big resources in the North and will continue to grow. The two major roads, when completed, will no doubt bring in more people to the North for vacations from the south and from the United States.

We have already experienced difficulties in my area because the former Liberal Government, when negotiating with the pulp companies, did not arrange communication with the northern people or insist upon a full study of the possible implications in the event of pulp mills coming to the North. The trappers and fisherman in northern areas are naturally upset and find those changes very difficult to accept. They are already noticing change in the habits of animals and fish, which are directly affecting their livelihood, and understandably annoyed and worried about these changes. However, I am sure that my Government will do everything possible to help northern people in this regard.

**SOME HON. MEMBERS:** — Hear, hear!

**MR. MacAULEY:** — In my particular area we have also had experience with mines. Anglo-Rouyn Mine operated for something over six years and then decided to discontinue the operation. Today we are left with nothing but a big hole at the end of a very expensive access road. With this in mind I am proud to support the leader of the New Democratic Party and his motion on the potash mines. He has taken a wise step, which should protect our province and hopefully encourage other provinces to take the same steps to protect their resources.

**SOME HON. MEMBERS:** — Hear, hear!

**MR. MacAULEY:** — Earlier last week there was some heckling from the other side of the House when the Member for Regina Lakeview (Mr. Malone) was a little sarcastic and used the word 'expropriation'. I should like to remind him that the Indians of northern Canada are struggling to get their land claims settled and have been doing so for many years.

**SOME HON. MEMBERS:** — Hear, hear!

**MR. MacAULEY:** — If they cannot get these claims settled, who is doing the expropriation? Indians are not rich oil companies and rich potash companies. They are people who have struggle for hundreds of years just to exist in their own country.

**SOME HON. MEMBERS:** — Hear, hear!

**MR. MacAULEY:** — Mr. Speaker, I should like now to urge the opposition to contact their counterparts in Ottawa to speed up settlement of Indian land claims in this province and the rest of Canada.



**SOME HON. MEMBERS:** — Hear, hear!

**MR. MacAULEY:** — However, one thing I do not want to see is the Department of Indian Affairs sending consultants from Ottawa to consult consultants in this province and have nothing materialize from it.

Mr. Speaker, in concluding my remarks, I wish to invite all the Members of the legislature to travel to northern Saskatchewan this coming summer — you will be most welcome. I should like you all to enjoy your province — not only just our guests from the United States.

Mr. Speaker, I understand that I was not on the air when I spoke in Cree. So I will repeat what I said at the beginning so that the people in the North will hear what I had to say.

**SOME HON. MEMBERS:** — Hear, hear!

**MR. MacAULEY:** — (In Cree). Mr. Speaker, I want to congratulate you on your appointment as Speaker of this House. I have heard the name of Brockelbank for many years and I am most pleased to see you sitting in that Chair.

Now I want to say how happy I am to be representing my constituency of Cumberland in this House. Today I want to thank the people of Cumberland constituency who elected me to this office. I hope I can do a good job for them.

**HON. MEMBERS:** — Hear, hear!

**MR. MacAULEY:** — Mr. Speaker, I will be supporting the motion.

**MR. J.L. FARIS (Arm River):** — Mr. Speaker, I should like to begin by saying that it is a great honour to represent the constituency of Arm River in this legislature. Arm River for many years, of course, was represented by Herman Danielson and then by people like Martin Pederson and to continue in the socialist tradition which they began is a great honor.

**SOME HON. MEMBERS:** — Hear, hear!

**MR. FARIS:** — I want to say that there is no one that I would rather follow in this debate than the Member for Cumberland (Mr. MacAuley). He is the first Cree speaking Member to be elected in this Assembly and I am sure that we are all proud of him.

**HON. MEMBERS:** — Hear, hear!

**MR. FARIS:** — I've in the past had an interest and a concern in alcohol policy in this province and I want to continue suggesting to the Government and to our society some of the lines I think should be taken to deal with this problem.

The reports which were just tabled indicate that the people of the province at the retail level now will be spending something like \$150 million a year on alcohol. This will come

**November 25, 1975**

to something like an average expenditure per family of \$500. Studies have indicated that costs to our society are very close to the amount of government profits on alcohol. So we may see a total cost, if you count in accidents, legal costs, criminal costs, medical costs, of something like \$700 a family in Saskatchewan. This is the real cost in economic terms. This, of course is having harmful effects in our society but more than that it is affecting our lifestyle in such a way that we may not be able to put our attention to great social need in our society. I know of no society that can long sustain itself when its members are drugged.

The second impact of this kind of use of alcohol in our society is that we are not spending this kind of money, these resources on supplying the need of people overseas.

The Member for Pelly (Mr. Larson) gave a very excellent address in this House on the needs of world development. When you think that the amount of grain and foodstuffs which are destroyed to produce our society's favourite drug are sufficient to feed anywhere from 20 to 30 million people a year, you can see that this waste in our society spreads around the world.

My concern is not only that we do something to rehabilitate those who have problems in this area, but more that we should get into the area of prevention. The great Japanese Christian leader, Kagawa gave an illustration. He said that when we deal with special problems very often we stress for the rehabilitation side and forget about prevention. He said it is like the situation where there is a very tall mountain and people are climbing up the path along the side of the mountain and a good many of them are falling off at a certain spot, a dangerous cliff. People of compassion say, what will we do about this, this is a very bad situation. So they decide to build a rescue station at the bottom of the cliff. They do that. And the people continue to fall off. They rescue some, they have some success with some, but there is a great deal of suffering that continues. Finally they realize that more and more people are falling off that cliff. So they say, we will have to build a hospital. We will get the people at the bottom of the cliff in the rescue station and rush them to the hospital. So they do that. They build more and more rehabilitation facilities and still they are not able to keep up with those who are damaged. Until finally somebody suggests wouldn't it be a good idea if we were to put a fence along the dangerous part of that path, so the people don't fall off the cliff. There is, of course, a great debate about that.

Some people suggest that if you put a fence up even more people will leap the fence. This, of course, turns out not to be the case. When the fence is put up many lives are saved and much suffering is saved.

I suggest that this parable is one which applies to the recreational use of chemicals in our society. We have done a rather poor job of trying to rehabilitate or pick up the pieces of the people who are damaged by alcohol and other drugs in our society. We are just not very successful.

I think then we should turn our minds to the area of prevention. I say our society is greatly in need of a rational strategy to cope with the increasing problems that are associated with the increasing use of mood and mind altering drugs. We need

a national strategy because the present situation is characterized by public ignorance, panic and special pleadings. Present strategies have reflected these characteristics and at best have been useless. And in some cases downright harmful.

Any discussion of drugs or the drug problem inevitably focuses on those chemicals which most respectable members of society see as evil, insidious or downright immoral — drugs such as heroin, LSD, speed and marijuana. Surely when the word drug is spoken do people associate it with aspirin, tobacco, tums or alcohol. A fundamental axiom of pharmacology however, is that the use of the term drug in its widest sense should refer to any substance which can be dangerous. Dangerous, that is, when it is taken by the wrong person, in inappropriate does at the wrong time or in the wrong place.

Our society must devise a strategy that will deal consistently and coherently with the entire spectrum of drugs in our society.

Alcohol, tobacco, barbiturates, glue, speed, marijuana, LSD, heroin, that is today's list of drugs. But modern science can and is producing new substances, new chemicals to produce new experiences, faster than they can be counted.

Unless our society has an overall strategy to deal with all mood or mind altering chemicals we shall probably fail to deal with any one of them.

Already we are at the point of widespread and increasing multi-drug use.

With present policies this can only be predicted to increase. There may be an ebb or flow in the popularity of any drug but in general we are in a period when more people are using more drugs on more occasions, I would support those guidelines for a rational strategy to cope with increasing drug use in our society.

First, we should seek to reduce the use of those substances which are most harmful to the individual and to society. Secondly, we should seek to reduce the use of these substances which lead to the use of other substances which are perhaps more harmful and, thirdly, we should seek to reduce the use of the most widely used substances.

In respect to the first point, reduction of the use of these substances which are most harmful to the individual and/or society, it's very difficult to compare the relative harm that may occur to an individual from the use of various drugs. One expert who attempted such an appraisal said:

An assessment by experts of the relative hazard potentials of these drugs has never been undertaken. This assessment involved a series of complex judgment, often based on incomplete or inadequate information and it is doubtful that experts would uniformly agree on any rank ordering of the drugs, or on any decision making criteria and priorities established for doing so. Nevertheless, I will attempt to make such a judgment based upon such criteria as these drugs' overall potential to:

1. be used repeatedly or compulsively;
2. be taken intravenously;
3. be used in a self-destructive manner;
4. produce physical dependence;
5. impair judgment;
6. predispose to social deterioration;
7. produce irreversible tissue damage and disease; and
8. cause accidental death from overdosage.

Having stated these criteria and the difficulties, he then ranked eight major categories of drugs according to their intrinsic hazard potential to the individual. His ranking from most hazardous to the least hazardous was:

1. glue sniffing
2. speed
3. alcohol
4. nicotine
5. barbiturates
6. heroin
7. LSD
8. marijuana

Other experts might well disagree with this list and recent disturbing research findings especially in regard to marijuana, heroin, alcohol and tobacco might alter this ranking, but nonetheless the significance would remain that the high potential hazard associated with the two most widely used, legally and publicly accepted drugs, alcohol and tobacco, is very great.

Alcohol ranked highly in this researcher's estimation because it has high potentials for psychological and physical dependence, greatly impairs judgment and co-ordination; it's a leading cause of driving accidents, increases aggressiveness and violent behaviour, often produces marked social deterioration, causes irreversible damage to the brain, liver and other body tissues. The withdrawal symptoms, DTs, from alcohol abuse are also often life threatening and very difficult to treat.

Cigarette smoking is listed next because of the high incidence of irreversible damage to lungs, heart and blood vessels and cancer formation accompanying its prolonged use. These hazards greatly reduce the life span and often debilitate the individual long before death.

The intrinsic danger of these substances combined with their widespread use undoubtedly puts the excessive use of alcohol and tobacco in a class by themselves in terms of actual harmfulness to individuals.

In terms of harm to society, alcohol alone undoubtedly leads the way.

For example, one obvious area of concern is the relationship of various drugs to crime. Indeed at various times in history there has been quite a public panic about this. But the public is quite properly concerned that drug users will endanger the rights of others to drug-induced behaviour. The Shafer Committee in the United States surveyed the area of drugs and crime and most commonly used drug, is strongly associated with violent crime and with vehicle accidents. Secondly, barbiturates and amphetamine use are linked with violent crime in studies in

Sweden and Japan. Thirdly, marijuana use, in and of itself, and I'm quoting the report,

... is neither causative or, nor directly associated with crime, either violent or non-violent. In fact, marijuana tends to be under-represented among assaultive offenders, especially when compared with users of alcohol, amphetamines and barbiturates.

And finally, that

... heroin is associated with acquisitive crimes such as burglary and shoplifting, ordinarily committed for the purpose of securing money to support dependence. Assaultive offences are significantly less likely to be committed by opiate users, especially in comparison with users of alcohol, amphetamines and barbiturates.

Shafer reported that in the case of homicide and other assaultive offences, alcohol was used by at least half of the offenders directly prior to the crime. The Kinsey Institute's study of sexual offenders showed that alcohol was reported as a factor in 39 per cent of sexual offences against women and in 67 per cent of sexual crimes against children.

Le Dain reports similar findings stating that of some selected crimes, alcoholics and problem drinkers were involved in 33 per cent of the murders, 39 per cent of attempted murders, 54 per cent of manslaughters, 39 per cent of rapes, 42 per cent of other sexual offences, and 61 per cent of assaults. Quite simply, Le Dain says, of all drugs used medically or non-medically, alcohol has the strongest and most consistent relationship to crime.

Just as a footnote I say observe that during the recent liquor strike in Saskatchewan I contacted the enforcement and hospital officials and they reported a very significant drop in crime and accidents but particularly violent crime during the period of the shortage of alcohol in the province.

The second point then is that we should reduce the use of substances which lead to the use of other substances which are perhaps more harmful.

In the 1960s a great many people were greatly concerned that the use of marijuana would lead young people to use other drugs. A more perceptive view would be that for almost all adolescents, the first psycho tropic used is either alcohol or tobacco.

And I quote from Le Dain again:

When questioned about their early drug use, the majority of non-medical users revealed that their first experience was with alcohol. In the mid-fifties, Stevenson and his associates found that almost all of the British Columbia heroin users they studied had used alcohol prior to opiates and most of them had never tried cannabis. As noted earlier, it was not until the mid-sixties, when cannabis became readily available in western Canada, that heroin users indicated concurrent or prior use of marijuana. Alcohol as the first drug used by heroin addicts, has been reported by a series of researchers,

Henderson, Chambers, Robins, etc., Hawks and his associates discovered that problem drinking predated the use of other drugs among amphetamine users; Whitehead found that alcohol and tobacco use generally precede solvent use; and cannabis-using college students studies by Goode had first used alcohol. Moreover, two extensive surveys, one of a college population and the other high schools, found that alcohol-using students were much more likely to want to try marijuana than were non-drinkers.

We have already observed that it is questionable if there are many substances more intrinsically harmful to the individual or society than alcohol and nicotine. But even if say, marijuana, heroin or speed are considered more harmful, it is very clear that their use is generally preceded by the use of legal drugs. For example, people who do not know how to smoke, to inhale, to be more exact, are not likely to smoke marijuana, it is not surprising that tobacco use precedes marijuana use.

It is also not surprising that most people's first drug experience, the chemical high, is produced by alcohol. New users of alcohol are very unlikely candidates for use of the illegal drugs.

Our society's general widespread use of the legal drugs prepares the way for the use of illegal drugs. I quote Le Dain again:

It is legal use in the form of tobacco, alcohol, sedatives, stimulants, analgesics and a host of over-the-counter remedies that creates the general climate of reliance on drugs to change our mood and remove discomfort. It is this general climate that propagated the notion, overtly and subliminally, that such reliance is not only acceptable but the intelligent course of action when one is troubled by physical or mental discomfort of some kind.

This relationship of legal drug use to illegal use in society is paralleled by the family. There is no doubt that children are influenced, says Le Dain,

By the importance which their parents attribute to drugs and by the example of drug use which their parents give, parents convey more by their conduct than by their words. If parents show that they rely on drugs to relieve discomfort and to change their mood, how can they expect their children not to follow their example? No doubt, there are exceptional cases where children may become so disgusted by the effect of drug use on their parents that they are turned off it for good, but studies show that the children of alcoholics are more likely to become alcoholics themselves, and that the children of parents who make extensive use of prescription and other drugs are at greater risk to drug use than the children of parents who do not.

The third point then is, we must seek to reduce the use of the most widely used substances. The problem in public policy is to distinguish between drug use and drug abuse. Drug abuse is often used to mean, the use of any drug I don't happen to use myself. Most social drinkers, for instance, would not describe taking a drink of alcohol as a form of drug abuse. However, they might very well feel that their son's smoking a joint of

marijuana merited that phrase. Conversely a teenager who smoke the occasional joint might describe his parents' dependence on the moderate intoxication associated with social drinking to be drug abuse.

If it is agreed that a very small dose of most, but not all drugs would not cause apparent harm to most, but not all people, than our society may wish to define the problem as one of drug abuse and not of drug use. That is, we may wish to say only large scale, excessive or harmful use is undesirable. But this distinction ignores the fact that recent research has established that there is a very significant relationship between so-called moderate drug use and heavy drug use. I earlier quoted from Le Dain where he says that the common use sets an atmosphere, which encourages abuse, but he also says this:

There can be no harmful use unless in the first instance there is some use. Moreover, the lines between occasional use, moderate use, and excessive use, or between harmless use and harmful use, are not clearly marked. They are levels of drug use which slide into one another. Finally, the climate of drug use as a whole and the prevailing attitudes towards it are factors which can influence use at various levels. There is a view which holds that the potential for harm, the total incidence of harmful effects, increases as drug use increases generally, and that if we wish to reduce the total incidence of harm we may do so by reducing per capita drug consumption generally.

Unfortunately, the Le Dain report did not expand on this view. Its implication are crucial for public policy and for individuals. For public policy it warns us not to think of drug users and drug abusers as two separate populations. In regard to alcohol, for instance, it has been stated by the Ontario addition research foundation that:

As long as we looked upon alcoholics and social drinkers as two entirely separate groups it was reasonable for us to ignore drinking in general and to concentrate on rehabilitation of alcoholics. But now our studies have shown that these groups are not separate populations, and that as per capita consumption of alcohol increases there is a proportionately higher number of alcoholics. Therefore we have been forced to realize that there is no great hope of reducing the number of alcoholics or of those who drink at levels hazardous to their health without rolling back the overall consumption of alcohol throughout our society.

I would suggest, Mr. Speaker, that for individuals this suggests that the non-recreational use of alcohol or any drug, remains the safest and the wisest course of action. As a father of two sons, that's the advice I will give my children and I believe that any prudent society would give the same advice to their citizens. I believe it is the prudent, rational and compassionate course of action both for societies and individuals to reduce, to discourage the non-medical use of drugs.

I believe that the following points might be part of a national strategy to attempt to reduce and discourage the use of drugs in our society. I think such a strategy should concentrate upon those drugs, alcohol and tobacco, which are

**November 25, 1975**

most available, most widely used and most harmful in our society. The first point is that I believe we should have alcohol and tobacco advertising entirely prohibited, both in the electronic and the print media and through promotion activities.

Secondly, that alcohol and tobacco manufacturers should be entirely taken into public ownership to remove the profit motive and the industry's constant pressures on politicians.

Thirdly, I believe that pricing policies and other means of reducing accountability should be used to reduce the use of those drugs which are legal.

Fourthly, alcohol and tobacco educational campaigns should be carried out in the media, in homes, school and churches. Scientific facts should be stressed. The non-use option should be recommended as the wisest and most prudent course. Minimization of use should be a secondary theme.

Fifth, an alternative approach in teaching living skills should be integrated into the whole education system. Sports, recreation, nutrition, personal growth and family life course involving the entire family should be encouraged to provide life styles which are rewarding in themselves. Life itself should turn people on.

Sixthly, law enforcement, aimed at reducing availability should be increased against the prohibited drugs.

Mr. Speaker, I now want to turn to another subject and that is the matter which was mentioned in this legislature at a very early point, the matter of decorum.

Mr. Speaker, John Diefenbaker believed in parliament. He also believed in debate. He once said in the House of Commons, and I quote:

Strong men have strong opinions. I think one trend in the last 15 or 20 years has been to reduce the standard of debate in parliament by the insistence on the letter of decorum. If we come to the point where every little expression of criticism results in a request for withdrawal, the indeed will parliament cease to maintain the traditions of the days of Sir John A. Macdonald, D'Arcy McGee, Sir Wilfred Laurier and Blake. They spoke strongly.

Mr. Diefenbaker said, "Strong men have strong opinions, they spoke strongly." What kind of men have no opinion? What kind of men speak not at all? One last word from Mr. Diefenbaker. In 1967 he said:

These amateur critics of parliament ought to read the debates of Britain's Parliament. Then they'd begin to understand what harshness and debate means. They formed the idea that parliament is a kind of sewing circle. They don't know anything about parliament. They never will.

Mr. Speaker, let us hope that Mr. Diefenbaker was wrong. Let us hope that the sewing circle opposite will learn.



Mr. Speaker, there are a number of matters which were raised in the debate that concern me. One was raised by the Member for Nipawin (Mr. Collver) when he gave himself permission to speak and that was his opposition to the Provincial Government's suggesting that various groups in our society such as construction workers, nurses and teachers should be allowed to go beyond the federal guidelines. Mr. Speaker, I cannot at all understand that position. I think it is a position which is incredibly unjust to those groups. Why should those groups which do the same work as people in other prairie province get less money than their neighbours in those prairie provinces. That is unfair to these people, but it also has drastic effects for our society. At the present time there is a shortage of construction workers in this province. We had very close to a shortage of teachers in this province. We have had a continuing shortage of nurses in this province. If we hold their wages below the prairie average we can expect as a very practical outcome of that policy that we shall have an increasing shortage of these people, more problems in our society and, in fact, in the long run, probably more inflationary pressures.

Mr. Speaker, I should also like to say how upset I was to hear some of the suggestions made last evening by the Member of Qu'Appelle (Mr. Lane). I had thought at one time he was a possible leadership candidate for the Liberal Party but I see that he has given up that hope. He suggest that what we should do is (if I am correct in this) pay teachers according to how well their students do in school. I think that is an incredible kind of suggestion, in that it would mean that children who have learning difficulties would get very little attention and those students who learn easily would get a lot. If I understood what he said — and I may not have, because it never is all that clear — I think he also suggest that welfare workers should be paid according to how little welfare money they handed out as an incentive to them to reduce the welfare rolls.

Mr. Speaker, I have heard the Conservative Members in this House referred to as an 18th Century group, surely the Liberals then are a 17th Century group. This is the mentality of the workhouse and the poor-house, that is an incredible way to operate a welfare system. It may appeal to a certain bigoted sector of our population but in terms of the kind of relationship it would establish between those who work in the Department of Social Services and their clients, I think is absolutely incredible.

Mr. Speaker, I am also concerned about the way in which the Canadian economy is being controlled in the interests of the wealthy and the powerful. I am concerned that the wage control proposals which have been put before the people of Canada by the Federal Government are part of a design to continue those injustices. Tolstoy described the situation of the rich in relation to the poor as that of a fat man riding on the back of a sickly weak man, saying, I sit on a man's back choking him and making him carry me, and yet assure myself and others that I am very sorry of him and wish to ease his lot by any mean possible, except getting off his back.

Mr. Speaker, the level of corporation profits more than doubled in Canada between 1970 and 1974, they went from \$8 billion to more than \$19 billion. Corporate profits rose by 32 per cent in 1974 on top of a 36 per cent increase in 1973,

**November 25, 1975**

a 21 per cent increase in 1972 and a 16 per cent increase in 1971. In each year those gains have exceeded the rate of growth of the gross national product. This increased share of the gross national product has come at the expense of the working people of Canada. The working people of Canada have had their share of the gross national produce dropped during these years down to less than 70 per cent, the lowest it has been since 1966.

Mr. Speaker, if anyone wants to know who has benefited from inflation in Canada the answer is clear, the rich and the powerful have benefited. From 1971 to 1973 the gross national produce increased 28 per cent, the income of working people increased only 25 per cent, less than the increase in the gross national product. The income of small businesses increased only 16 per cent, they fell even further behind, but the amount of money going to those living off interest went up 33 per cent and corporate profits increased over 64 per cent. Clearly the working people and the small business people have fallen behind because the financial institutions and the giant corporations have taken their share.

It is popularly believed that there is more economic equality in Canada now than there was 20 or 30 years ago. This is not the case. In 1951 the bottom 21 per cent of Canada's population received only 4.4 per cent of the total income, their income which includes welfare payments had dropped in 1971 to 3.6 per cent. However, at this same time the top 20 per cent increased their share from 42.8 per cent in 1951 to 43.3 per cent by 1971.

Mr. Speaker, the facts are this, that the rich have got richer and the poor have got poorer. This is just as true in times of inflation as it is in times of depression. Sometimes we comfort ourselves in the face of these facts by admitting that the gap between rich and poor in our country is widening but that after all the poor too have increased their well-being but only not as much as have the rich. That also is not the case. A recent study shows that in the purchasing power the lowest tenth of income earners in Canada dropped by 41 per cent between 1946 and 1971. This also occurred for the next 20 per cent. The lowest 30 per cent of Canadian income earners are worse off in absolute purchasing power than they were 30 years ago. In 1946 the richest ten per cent of Canadians received 20 times as much income as the poorest ten per cent.

By 1971 this richest ten per cent were receiving 45 times as much. Or to put it another way, in 1946 the richest ten per cent of Canadians received as much income as the poorest 55 per cent of Canadians. By 1971 they received incomes equal to the poorest 64 per cent.

Mr. Speaker, what is being done about economic injustices in Canada? The answer to that question varies a great deal from province to province. In NDP Saskatchewan we have a three per cent unemployment rate. In Conservative Newfoundland they have a 19 per cent unemployment rate. In NDP Saskatchewan we have a minimum wage which will soon be \$2.80, the highest in Canada. In Conservative Newfoundland they have the lowest in Canada, \$2.20. NDP Saskatchewan has a five per cent sales tax, Conservative Newfoundland has just announced a ten per cent sales tax. NDP Saskatchewan has the lowest inflation rate in Canada, Conservative Newfoundland has the highest inflation rate in Canada.

To give you some examples, people in Newfoundland pay 26 cents a gallon more for gasoline, they pay 15 cents a loaf more for bread, they pay 25 cents a quart more for milk, they have no provincial income supplements for senior citizens, they have no housing grants for senior citizens, they have no drug plan, they have no family income plan.

Mr. Speaker, it is very clear that there is a wide variation in what is being done for the low income groups across Canada and the New Democratic Party Governments in the three western provinces are leading the way in seeking equality.

**SOME HON. MEMBERS:** — Hear, hear!

**MR. FARIS:** — Mr. Speaker, at the national level we do not have a New Democratic Party Government and we do not have a Tory Government, we have a Liberal Government, a free enterprise Liberal Government. How are they doing in terms of economic justice? To be fair, they have presided over the greater period of the increasing injustices of the past 30 years. How are they doing recently?

In addition of the increasing inequality of incomes in Canada they have given us an 11 per cent inflation rate and a seven per cent unemployment rate. Now these are not the highest rate in the world. What is the highest rate in the world is Canada's strike rate. Canada share with Italy the distinction of having the worst industrial relations system in the world. Mr. Speaker, the Member for Saskatoon Sutherland (Mrs. Edwards) pointed to Denmark as an example of the failure of socialism. Denmark has recently had a very high inflation rate and a very high unemployment rate, they also have a minority Social Democratic Government with the largest opposition group being the Liberal Party. It is no wonder they have problems.

For a fairer picture of what is happening in Scandinavia we should look at neighboring Norway and Sweden. Let's compare Canada, Sweden and Norway. These three countries' inflation rates are about the same. In fact, in 1974 both Norway and Sweden had lower inflation rates than Canada but the unemployment rates are very different. While Canada regularly goes over seven per cent, Sweden is at two per cent, Norway at one per cent. Mr. Speaker, there is no greater economic waste and inefficiency in any economic system than unemployment.

**SOME HON. MEMBERS:** — Hear, hear!

**MR. FARIS:** — But it is when you look at industrial disputes that the differences are more startling. Canada has over 15 times as many days lost due to strikes as Sweden or Norway and that is on a per worker basis, that's a per capita basis. Why is this? These countries have over 70 per cent of their labor force unionized; Conservative has less than 30 per cent. It could be argued that instead of causing strikes, a strong and mature union movement decreases strikes. But it is generally agreed that the most significant factor is a central annual wage bargaining system. This system sets a group representing all trade unions down opposite a group representing all management. They work out a nation-wide agreement. There are provisions for regional differences, for wage drift, but also these contracts are worked out on the basis of the principle of solidarity. They agree to a narrow range of incomes in their society because they believe

in equality and brotherhood. For example, a central wage agreement in the 1960s gave most workers a 6.5 per cent increase, but it gave textile workers a ten per cent increase and transport workers received a 12 per cent increase. These differences were agreed to by all of the unions and all the industries in Sweden. This agreement avoids the leap-frogging we see in Canada where one union receives ten per cent and the next goes for 20, next goes for 30 and so on. And we to blame the unions for what is happening in Canada? Surely it is the system. Corporations go for all they can get. It is the system. The free enterprise ethic says 'take what you can'. It is the system, the system of negotiating, the system of our society. We must change the system and stop blaming its victims.

**SOME HON. MEMBERS:** — Hear, hear!

**MR. FARIS:** — Mr. Speaker, Pierre Trudeau and the corporate wealth he represents are sitting on the backs of the working people of Canada, the farmers, the small businessmen, choking them and making them carry him, meanwhile assuring himself and others that he is very sorry for them and wishes to ease their lot by any means, except getting off their backs.

Mr. Speaker, this country is receiving no leadership to distribute fairly the wealth in the most resource rich nation on the face of the earth; no leadership to life up the condition of the poor, the weak, the rejected and the fatherless; no leadership to bring the fruits of industrial peace, full employment and prosperity to every home in our land. Instead we are being led in the same aimless circles of despair that we grew to expect from MacKenzie King 30 years ago. Is MacKenzie King dead or sitting in the Government in Ottawa and in the opposition in Saskatchewan? F. R. Scott said it well:

How shall we speak of Canada,  
MacKenzie King dead?  
The mother's boy in the lonely room  
with his dog, his medium and his ruins?  
He blunted us.  
We had no shape.  
Because he never took side,  
And no sides  
Because he never allowed them to take shape.  
He skilfully avoided what was wrong  
Without saying what was right,  
And never let his on the one hand  
Know what his on the other hand was doing.  
The height of his ambition  
Was to pile a parliamentary committee on a Royal Commission,  
To have 'conscription if necessary,  
But not necessarily conscription'.  
To let parliament decide — Later.  
Postpone, postpone, abstain.  
Only one threat was certain.  
After World War I,  
business as usual.  
After World War II,  
Orderly decontrol.  
Always he led us back to where we were before.  
He seemed to be in the centre  
Because he had no centre.

No vision  
To pierce the smoke-screen of his politics.  
Truly he will be remembered  
Wherever men honor ingenuity  
Ambiguity, inactivity, and political longevity.

**SOME HON. MEMBERS:** — Hear, hear!

**MR. FARIS:** —

Let us raise up a temple,  
To the cult of mediocrity,  
Do nothing by halves  
Which can be done by quarters.

Mr. Speaker, I intend to support the motion supporting the Speech from the Throne not because it deals with all the problems, but because it attempts to deal with some of the problems of our society.

Certainly the amendments put forward by the opposition do nothing but support the present inequalities and injustices of our society. I will be supporting the motion.

**SOME HON. MEMBERS:** — Hear, hear!

**MR. W.C. THATCHER (Thunder Creek):** — Mr. Speaker, I am certain a freshman MLA finds his maiden speech in these Chambers a very difficult and frightening experience. I find standing here and address you, Mr. Speaker, and the institution you represent a most sobering and humbling experience. I am most honored to be the first representative of the new constituency of Thunder Creek and sincerely hope to play some role in a contributory fashion.

At this time, allow me to congratulate you, Mr. Speaker, on your election to your high office. We wish you well. Like my father, I find this side of the House most distasteful, however, he wasn't here all that long and I am confident that we won't be either.

**SOME HON. MEMBERS:** — Hear, hear!

**MR. THATCHER:** — I should like to congratulate the newly elected MLA for Regina centre, on behalf of his home Caron area. One of the old timers at Caron the other day was telling me that Ned and I are the eighth and ninth MLAs since 1905 with direct association with the Caron area. This is not particularly significant until one stops to consider the small size of the community and the vast areas in which it has always been included. I should like to add my personal congratulations to the Member for his elevation to the Cabinet and assure him that his home area wishes him well.

The election campaign of 1975 did leave me with some very definite observations and conclusions. The foremost was that the theory of representation by population is fair only up to a point, after which it becomes quite unfair. It is an indisputable fact that there has been a shifting of our population from rural to urban area over a period of many years. The people may have shifted. However the dependency of the economy of its agricultural base has not changed. As one who makes his living

from agriculture, I am angry at the loss of rural representation in Saskatchewan.

**SOME HON. MEMBERS:** — Hear, hear!

**MR. THATCHER:** — And at the manner in which rural constituencies have been greatly enlarged to give an overbearing preponderance to the cities of Regina and Saskatoon. Dividing the constituencies into population of roughly 15,000 may look good on paper; as does the theory of representation by population, but in a province as unique as Saskatchewan, it is not unfair to our rural people. It is in rural Saskatchewan that the real bills in this province in terms of productivity are paid. Granted, our dependence on our agricultural base has been overshadowed recently by the bonanza in the resource field. However, I don't believe that anyone seriously believes that this will continue indefinitely. Over the long haul there is no question that this province will go up or down with agriculture. I think it is fair to say that if all segments of society had kept pace with agriculture in terms of productivity there would be no such thing as inflation in this country. In this time when productivity must become the name of the game, agricultural decisions must be made by agricultural people, not urbanites prostituting it for their petty political purposes. This Government has already gone too far in eroding rural electoral power to where representation by population is rapidly becoming a dictatorship of the urbanites.

It is always interesting to speculate on how history will view a government's four year performance. In the case of this Government, you had access to unprecedented revenues. The province enjoyed a bonanza in the grain trade, record prices in the cattle industry for three-quarters of your term, unbelievable revenues from the resource industries and record intake from normal taxation channels. This Government had access to opportunities that no Provincial Government since 1905 has enjoyed. History will judge you on what you did with those opportunities. I believe that the judgment of history will be harsh. Because history will ask the basic question — what did you accomplish with the opportunity when it presented itself? And the answer will reverberate back, that you squandered it, you pilfered it, you wasted it, and in short — you blew it.

**SOME HON. MEMBERS:** — Hear, hear!

**MR. THATCHER:** — You blew it because you chose to use this opportunity to increase the power of the state, to increase the size of government, to stifle productivity and increase the dependency of people on the state. You did all this under the guise of a New Deal for People. And the most incredible part, perhaps the most tragic part, is that almost 39 per cent of them believed that garbage.

However, Mr. Speaker, we are now into a brand new legislature with a few new names and faces. And we hardly got our seats warmed up when suddenly we were off on a brand new orgy of socialist spending. Certainly our friends opposite are not bashful. It used to be said — what's a million or two. This Government says — what's a billion or two. If it wasn't so horrifying, it would be funny. It is horrifying because they talked this way in Great Britain some 25 or 30 years ago. And

the socialist government there went on a drunken spending spree such as what is now underway in this province. Today Great Britain is stripped naked of economic pride and hope. Her state controlled industries lie in a morass of technological bungling, inefficiency and deplorable productivity. The entire country can be held up for ransom by any one of a few union leaders who happen to take the whim to do so.

Is Great Britain the model that our friends opposite envision as the prototype for the future Saskatchewan? It mystifies me as to how they can continually rationalize that their planning will succeed where similar socialist planning all over the world has failed. Unquestionably, they have some great things going for them. First of all, they have made it socially acceptable for one to be a parasite on society in this province — better known as a bum. The number of people who take great pride in not working for a living is increasing in leaps and bounds. Under the guidance of the Minister of Labor (Mr. Snyder) and his far reaching changes in the labor code, productivity in this province's labor force has diminished at a disgusting rate. Even more disgusting is the fact that the Minister of Labour takes great pride in such. Under his standards mediocrity is the norm and don't step out of line by attempting to excel on the job. After all, the high producing worker will expose the poor quality worker so we all know that the good worker must be brought to hell in order to protect this poor, poor, low quality worker. I have usually differed with the philosophy of the former Minister of Agriculture but at the same time respected him because I thought he was his own man. However, since his demotion to the junior post of Industry and Minister in charge of the Saskatchewan Power Corporation, his actions at the Poplar River Project have shown conclusively that he is not his own man. Like his seatmate, the Minister of Labour, he is a puppet dangling on a string, pulled by an unseen union business manager.

**MR. THATCHER:** — When it comes to spending money for bizarre purposes, this NDP Government is strictly major league with any government anywhere, past or present. They are even in the same league with our Federal Government if that is possible. But it is their logic for spending that is so incredible. I watched an interview with the Premier on television shortly after his earth-shaking address on the provincial network. He made the statement that spending on a special asset was not inflationary. I believe, if memory serves me correctly, he used the example of a bridge. Building that bridge, he said, was not in any way inflationary. Is he serious in suggesting that the massive spending in Government construction the past four years has not been inflationary in the construction industry? The construction industry has not been able to handle the work both private and government. Because they could not handle the building binge, absurdly high tenders have been submitted by contractors in the hopes they will not get some jobs. It has been common for some tenders to have only one bidder and almost commonplace for contractors to be begged to submit a tender of any sort so there will be some appearance of competition for the job.

Coupled with that, the Government tells the construction industry how much they should pay their men, after of course receiving their orders from the union business managers. And the Premier suggests that this isn't inflationary. Mr. Speaker,

if this is the logic of this Government you had better put up that daily prayer of yours, because this province is going to need all the help available from the divine.

**SOME HON. MEMBERS:** — Hear, hear!

**MR. THATCHER:** — Mr. Speaker, in the interview with the Premier that I referred to earlier, he made two points in his justification as the proposed legislation that I find, to say the least, hollow. He suggested that government ownership of the potash industry would create a large number of technocrats with the expertise and knowledge of potash right here in Saskatchewan rather than having them based in Denver, Houston, Atlanta, etc. By having them right here in Saskatchewan, he suggested, will bring untold benefits to the industry and this province. Coming so soon after the dinner hour, the top technical people of Saskatchewan Power Corporation must have just about thrown up. Because here is a Crown corporation that has been successful in building up a top core of technical people. And they didn't do it overnight either. One of their people worked his way up through the ranks to the top job. It is on the public record what you did to him. But isn't it interesting that none of them top technical people at SPC will now apply for that top job. This would tell most people something, but not our friends opposite. It is noteworthy that both gentlemen fired by the junior Minister had no problem landing top jobs in the private sector in Calgary. In short, Mr. Speaker, even if this Government had these kinds of people from the potash industry available this Government would not know how to use them

**SOME HON. MEMBERS:** — Hear, hear!

**MR. THATCHER:** — Mr. Speaker, the Premier speaks glowingly about good business deals, self liquidating debts, etc. From such descriptions one could almost conclude that we were hearing from a Desmarais, a Bronfman, or a Molson. For some reason, the name Blakeney does not register as being prominent in the fields of business. This in no way infers that he is not an excellent lawyer or a clever politician. But as a businessman, I do not think I am being presumptuous in suggest that he is out of his element.

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

**MR. THATCHER:** — Frankly, Mr. Speaker, as far as business acumen is concerned the list is pretty short on the other side of the House. The Members opposite who have any experience in meeting a payroll, a bank payment or interest payment are not very numerous, to day the very least. Yet like socialists all over the world, when the opportunity of spending several billion dollars of someone else's money arises, they are suddenly experts in the field of business.

Some years ago, after graduating from college with a couple of degrees after my name, I returned to the family operation and proceeded to revolutionize and change everything. Finally in exasperation, my father said to me, "It doesn't take any brains to spend money. Any idiot can do that. It is quite something else to make it." I can already see several of your scoffing over there. And the Member for Moose Jaw North (Mr. Skoberg)



how true that statement is. He tried the business field for a few months and upon finding out what that side of the fence was like, he scurried back to the other side of the fence in a hurry.

Mr. Speaker, I will have considerably more to say on the subject when debate on the potash Bill commences. In the meantime it is a pleasure to join 62 per cent of the Saskatchewan electorate and vote against this Government.

**SOME HON. MEMBERS:** — Hear, hear!

**HON. E.L. TCHORZEWSKI (Minister of Education):** — Mr. Speaker, let me first of all say that it is a privilege to rise in this House at this time as a Member representing the constituency of Humboldt.

I want also to say that it was an honour that I felt to be able to be associated also on this side of the House with the Member for Cumberland (Mr. MacAuley) who spoke to us for a brief while in the Cree language. I say that for a lot of reasons besides the fact that Cree was spoken in this House I think for the first time every, this afternoon. I say it because his remarks here this afternoon reinforced the fact that in this province we have many languages that are spoken. We have many people who have come here from many places in the world as well as the people who were first here when the people from Europe came. And that fact has made this province as it has made this country, a far richer place in which to live and I do hope that it will continue to grow in that way.

Mr. Speaker, it is always a pleasure and an honour to take part in the Throne Speech debate. In taking part in this debate which will conclude tonight is particularly an honor for me because this Throne Speech will go down in history as announcing one of the most outstanding initiatives ever taken by any government in Canada.

**SOME HON. MEMBERS:** — Hear, hear!

**MR. TCHORZEWSKI:** — This Government clearly stated in the past election campaign that when re-elected we would continue to act to see that Saskatchewan people get the greatest possible benefit from their resources. We said that this may well involve new approaches to public ownership. But all approaches will be measured by the test what will give to Saskatchewan people the greatest overall benefits in the decades ahead. Benefits in revenue, in industrial development and job opportunities, in conservation of scarce resources, in the ability of Saskatchewan people to have a greater control over their own destiny.

In years to come in the short run and as future generations benefit from the actions of this Government on this commitment, no doubt Liberals and Conservatives will acclaim the action taken by this NDP Government just as they now acclaim things such as medicare, automobile accident insurance, Farmstart and many other programs that they once criticized, trying to destroy and reject them as being outlandish socialist programs. But the record will be there, Mr. Speaker, and the words of those who speak in this debate will be recorded and history will explain that this province grew and prospered and continued to lead this country because of our positive actions to assure that our

resources are developed for the maximum benefit of our people.

Now we just heard, Mr. Speaker, some comments made by the new Member for the constituency of Thunder Creek (Mr. Thatcher) and I thought it was somewhat interesting listening to that Member. It was interesting because a few days ago we also heard in some way similar comments from the Member for Nipawin (Mr. Collver). It seemed to me that the Member for Thunder Creek might be much more comfortable if he moved over to his left one row of seats because obviously the thinking is much the same.

The Member for Thunder Creek spoke about unprecedented revenues that we have had in Saskatchewan in the last several years, and that is true. There have been unprecedented revenues for a lot of reasons, because of increased buoyancy in agriculture, but also because of the kind of direction that this Government has taken with regard to the resources of this province, so that finally the people of Saskatchewan are getting a better share of those resources that they own and have a right to have. The Member for Thunder Creek talked about how history will judge what we have done. I, for one, as a Member of this Government, as I know all of my colleagues are prepared to wait for that judgement because we know what it will be. He talked about squandering and pilfering and wasting. Well, having said what he has said, Mr. Speaker, there is no doubt that he must be saying that money spent, this unprecedented revenue that the province has been getting, this revenue spent on dental care, on hearing aid programs, on support for our rural communities, on support for agricultural programs such as Farmstart and crop insurance ( and as a farm representative I wish he were here to hear this), on such programs as Medicare, he claims that is squandered and pilfering and wasting of the resources of this province. Well on that, Mr. Speaker, I am prepared to be judged by history, and what he has said, I think he ought to be prepared to be judged by history as well.

**SOME HON. MEMBERS:** — Hear, hear!

**MR. TCHORZEWSKI:** — Mr. Speaker, to give money for programs that benefit people and create greater equality and opportunity for everyone in society, to the Members opposite, appears to be squandering and pilfering. In fact, when funds are provided and programs are developed to help people, they call it welfare. But when funds are given in the form of grants to vast multinational corporations, they call it grants. I once heard someone say about two weekends ago, that maybe it's time that we reversed the two.

**MR. LANE:** — That was Barrett!

**MR. TCHORZEWSKI:** — That's right, it was Premier Barrett and he was right.

Now, Mr. Speaker, the Member for Thunder Creek also spoke about the demands by the Government on the construction industry. Is he saying by that that government or any government at this time should not be pursuing the route of building increased numbers of public housing units for people on low income and our senior citizens throughout the province? Is he saying by that that we should stop building roads and that we shouldn't build

a bridge in Saskatoon as one of the Members from there was suggesting we should do? Is that what he is saying, Mr. Speaker? I don't know. Maybe in the process of other debates in this House he will clarify that position. I want to suggest to him that one of the reasons why we have had to increase the amount of construction on such things as public housing is because during the years of Liberal Government that type of construction came to a standstill. Not only is there a need to meet the demand but there is also great need to catch up for the neglect that there was around during that time.

**SOME HON. MEMBERS:** — Hear, hear!

**MR. TCHORZEWSKI:** — Mr. Speaker, I wish at this time to congratulate you on your position of Speaker. I have known you for a number of years and I know that you will continue the traditions of the institution that you represent by being Speaker. I know that the job which you have is not an easy one, but I'm confident, as is everyone in this House, who has gotten to know you so well, that you will handle it as well as anybody has every handled it in the past or will in the future.

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

**MR. TCHORZEWSKI:** — I also want to commend and congratulate the mover and the seconder of the Throne Speech, the Member for Quill Lakes (Mr. Koskie) and the Member for Melfort (Mr. Vickar). Both of their constituencies border on mine and it's an honor and a pleasure to be associated with those colleagues of mine. I think that the words which they said and speeches which they delivered in this House indicate very clearly why their constituents had the confidence in them to elect them to this legislature and no doubt will continue to do so time after time.

I also want to congratulate all of the new Members of this legislature. I can't do it as well as the Member for Regina Centre (Mr. Shillington) did yesterday and in the way that he did it. I think that the point which he made is probably a very valid one, but I do want to congratulate all of the new Members on being elected. It's a great responsibility that one has by being elected in this Assembly, and I look forward to hearing the contributions that all of those Members make from time to time. I particularly want to congratulate (and I see one of them is here) the two lady Members who have been elected to this Assembly. I don't want, at this time, to say a great deal about that, except to say, 'it's about time'. I think certainly we would prefer that we had the lady Members on this side of the House, but I want to say that if society is really serious about the issue on the status of women, then it should be reflected even in a very high decision-making body such as Parliament and our legislatures throughout Canada.

**SOME HON. MEMBERS:** — Hear, hear!

**MR. TCHORZEWSKI:** — Mr. Speaker, some comments have been made in the proceedings of this debate on the first major contribution to this House by the Leader of the Conservative Party.

When I sat here and listened to the words of wisdom that he had for us, I was tempted to make notes very quickly and

November 25, 1975

speaking at great length when I got up to speak in this debate about the comments that the Member for Nipawin had for us, and the advice which he had. But I guess maybe it's fortunate that I enter this debate in the very latter part of it because I have had time to contemplate and think about the things that I might have said five or six days ago. I have come to the conclusion that really spending a great deal of time commenting on the comments of the Member for Nipawin would be lending more credibility and giving more merit than he or the things that he had to say really deserved.

I just want to say, Mr. Speaker, that people who live in glass houses should not throw stones.

Already I see that the Members opposite who had been so very carefully instructed not to thump their desks, have been doing so very enthusiastically lately. Breaking of the rules and slumping in their desks, they should be more careful.

It's interesting, Mr. Speaker, that in this debate only the Leader of the Progressive Conservative Party and second, the Member for Rosetown (Mr. Bailey) spoke from the Tory benches. And I have to wonder, Mr. Speaker, and I'm sure that the public in Saskatchewan is going to have to wonder — is the Member for Nipawin afraid of what his Members will say? We have to ask ourselves, how long will those Members, those other five, remain seated in this Chamber and allow themselves to be muzzled by their leader? I hope not very long. If I were to offer any advice or suggestion, Mr. Speaker, I should have to say to those Members — don't be misled, because your constituents elected you to this House.

**SOME HON. MEMBERS:** — Hear, hear!

**MR. TCHORZEWSKI:** — They elected you because they had confidence in your ability to represent them. Because they had that confidence and gave you their support, you have a responsibility to represent them outside and inside this legislature. Now seven constituencies, Mr. Speaker, must have become very disappointed and concerned about hearing the Member for Nipawin that they don't deserve enough attention from their MLAs to even be mentioned in this House. I'm sure that those people continue to wait for a contribution to this debate, in this legislature, from five of those Members opposite.

Mr. Speaker, let me put on record that I'm proud to talk about the people from the communities which I represent in this Legislature as an MLA.

**SOME HON. MEMBERS:** — Hear, hear!

**MR. TCHORZEWSKI:** — I have done it since 1971 and I shall continue to do it as long as I'm a Member of this House.

**SOME HON. MEMBERS:** — Hear, hear!

**MR. TCHORZEWSKI:** — The last election I was again given the honor to represent Humboldt constituency as a Member of this Government and for that I am grateful and extend to my constituency my thanks for their confidence and their support.

Humboldt constituency has changed considerably since my election in 1971. Most of the area that used to be the Watrous constituency now makes up the Humboldt seat, and I've gotten to know the people in Colonsay and Viscount, Young and Zelma and Watrous, Guernsey and Plunket and Bruno, Carmel and Peterson and Meacham and I look forward to serving them for the next three and a half or four years.

**SOME HON. MEMBERS:** — Hear, hear!

**MR. TCHORZEWSKI:** — For the information of the Member for Qu'Appelle (Mr. Lane) those boundary changes were made by an Independent Electoral Boundaries Commission. He should be reminded that the last year the gerrymander of constituencies took place prior to 1971, engineered by the Leader of the Opposition (Mr. Steuart) and supported by the Member for Qu'Appelle who was then executive assistant to the then Attorney General, and we can only assume he may even have assisted in that disgraceful attack on the parliamentary democratic process.

It was somewhat ironic, Mr. Speaker, and even in a strange but painful way, humorous, to hear him last night speak of gerrymandering in this debate. He needs to be reminded that with the Independent Electoral Boundaries Commission established by this Government the unprincipled mutilation of democratic representation that the Members opposite inflicted on Saskatchewan has been removed like a cancerous growth, the virus has gone and the sickness is no more.

**SOME HON. MEMBERS:** — Hear, hear!

**MR. TCHORZEWSKI:** — Now, Mr. Speaker, as the Minister in charge of the Department of Culture and Youth I would just like to make a very few comments on some activities in that department.

The Department of Culture and Youth was established in 1972 and given the responsibility for providing cultural, recreation and social time opportunities for the residents of Saskatchewan. Since that time a wide variety of programs has been initiated and expanded by this Government in the areas of recreation, cultural, multi-cultural, artistic and sports programs. During the past year a number of very significant accomplishments have been made and I should like to draw your attention to a few of them.

The Saskatchewan Multi-cultural Act was passed by this House in the last session and under the provisions of this Act a Multi-cultural advisory council has been established and is providing useful input to the Government on the development of Multi-cultural programs in the province. We anticipate continued significant progress in this area over the next few years. Our multi-cultural heritage has been given a new life in Saskatchewan and will continue to enrich the lives of all Saskatchewan people.

During the month of August of this year the first Western Canada Summer Games were held in the city of Regina. The province of Saskatchewan is proud to have been the host of these games and commends the organizing committee for its efforts and its work.

**SOME HON. MEMBERS:** — Hear, hear!

November 25, 1975

**MR. TCHORZEWSKI:** — More than 2,000 volunteers under the very capable direction of President Dick Rendick were the real force that made the games go and one lasting legacy of games like these is the continued involvement of volunteers in community sport and recreation programs.

I should also like to extend my thanks to the department staff whose hard work, dedication and contributions, even beyond the call of duty, were a major factor in the games' success.

The games themselves were an outstanding success with all four western provinces sending their top athletes to compete in the 25 different sports events. A number of Canadian and Saskatchewan Native records were set and the games have proven an event that will long be remembered in Saskatchewan sports history.

The city of Regina and the province of Saskatchewan were also winners at the games, with the construction of an Olympic class swimming pool, a 400-metre all-weather track and the completion of a marina on Wascana Lake. These new facilities along with the equipment obtained to operate the various sports events, will permit Regina and Saskatchewan to encourage and promote the development of a variety of sports activities for years to come.

Other program initiatives by the Government that I might mention are the development of coaching certification programs to assist amateur and volunteer coaches to better understand and perform their coaching duties. We anticipate that this program will have a long-term benefit for the young athletes and volunteer coaches at the grassroots level.

There has also been created a financial assistance program for those agencies operating or developing programs for the handicapped. This program is the first step towards meeting the special needs of individuals who require specialized types of recreation programs.

Mr. Speaker, the progress made since the establishment of the department has been significant and we anticipate that further development in the maturity of the programs offered will take place over the next few years in order that every resident of Saskatchewan will have a variety of opportunities to participate in recreation and cultural activities.

Now, Mr. Speaker, turning to another subject. Recently I was given the honor of taking on the responsibilities of the Department of Education and Continuing Education.

**SOME HON. MEMBERS:** — Hear, hear!

**MR. TCHORZEWSKI:** — At this time I want to make some comments relating to those departments.

Notwithstanding the unfounded claims made by the Hon. Member representing Saskatoon Lakeview (Mr. Penner), the policies of this Government with respect to education have been progressive and well received by the citizens of Saskatchewan.

**SOME HON. MEMBERS:** — Hear, hear!

**MR. TCHORZEWSKI:** — In fact, these policies have restored Saskatchewan to a position of educational leadership second to none in Canada. The new education climate developed over the past four years is one in which the major partners in this important enterprise can now work together in a spirit of harmony and mutual respect. In great contrast to the previous period of controversy, confrontation, confusion and despair. This new outlook, this new attitude, this new deal didn't just happen, it is the direct outcome of the positive policies and achievements of this Government and we can consider just these examples.

First of all, in the area of teachers' contract bargaining legislation, our bargaining legislation has achieved its major objective of restoring faith in the process of collective bargaining. Furthermore there is no doubt that the new bargaining procedures will result in improved conditions of employment for teachers, and that the teaching profession will become more attractive, a necessary prerequisite for quality education in schools.

Secondly, school finance. The principals of unconditional grants to school districts has enabled school boards to improve their program offerings in accordance with local priorities, in contrast to the former regulatory role of the Department of Education, and I need mention only one example — that is the imposition of the 25 to 1 pupil/teacher ratios.

Now with the grants to schools and property improvement grant representing a local provincial contribution amounting to some 75 per cent of the school costs in 1975, the priority that this Government is giving to education should be evident. Equally significant are the changes that have been made in the distribution of school grants. A sparsity factor and an enrolment decline factor for school units has been included in the formula, to ensure a more equitable funding for the rural areas. Greatly increased support for services for the handicapped pupils has been provided. Grants for private high schools shows significant increases. Substantial additional grants support for rural conveyance has been provided. And in addition for the first time in our history, conveyance grants are now paid for certain types of transportation in urban districts.

Mr. Speaker, it is essential always to have public participation in policy development. Since 1971 opportunities have been provided for public input into the development of education policies. In the fall of 1973, approximately 3,500 people participated in a series of regional conferences organized by the Department of Education to provide an opportunity for public discussion of a number of issues and choices related to the delivery of educational services in Saskatchewan. And to enable the Department of Education to identify those issues it required follow-up public discussions. As a follow-up to the 1973 fall conferences further opportunities were provided during the fall of 1974 to encourage public participation in the formulation of recommendations for the improvement of the pre-service preparation of teachers in Saskatchewan. This public input will form the foundation for new policy on teacher education which I will be announcing in the very near future.

This approach to policy formulation has gone a long way in restoring public confidence with respect to education in Saskatchewan. Gone are the days of Liberal decrees and restrictions at a 25 - 1 pupil/teacher ratio.

**SOME HON. MEMBERS:** — Hear, hear!

**MR. TCHORZEWSKI:** — I could spend considerable time in reviewing other significant achievements since 1971. But a few are such as improving educational opportunities for children of Indian ancestry, implementing new and needed curriculum thrusts in consumer education, agricultural education, environmental studies, outdoor education, physical education and kindergarten education. An improved superannuation plan for teachers. Improvements in school facilities and particularly rural Saskatchewan and bursary awards to upgrade the qualifications of teachers in specialized fields.

Another aspect is the review of school legislation with the view to consolidating and updating. The School Law Review Committee is hard at work examining the 17 statutes administered by the Department of Education and advising on the consolidation of these statutes. This committee will present its interim report in the very near future and will give some indication of the main features of its recommendations. I look forward to these recommendations and introducing as soon as possible a bill that will bring out legislation up to date and in line with current educational realities.

In another important area, Mr. Speaker, I believe that it is fair to say that the single most important factor in the quality of educational process is the teacher. Fall conferences represent a good deal of concern about the inability of the system to respond effectively to either outstanding teachers or to poor teachers, both at the teacher training level and at the school level. This problem has been approached from two points of view. First, the Board of Teacher Education consisting of representatives from the Saskatchewan School Trustees Association, the Saskatchewan Teachers' Federation, both universities and the Department of Education have done a good deal of research into more effective teacher training programs. The Education Council also put a good deal of work into consultations with teachers and students on the matter. The matter of increasing the minimal training requirements is under serious consideration and I can see a great deal of merit in it.

Whether any changes are made or not in length of program the number one issue has emerged as increased field experience at all levels in the training program. More obvious are periods in various schools plus short practice teaching periods need to be included in the early stages. This needs to be followed up by longer practice teaching opportunities and a full semester of internship in the final year.

The other aspect of ensuring quality in the teaching professions is a hard look at the teacher tenure legislation. There is a general consensus that the existing tenure legislation is inadequate leaving teachers feeling exposed to unjustified dismissals, boards feeling hamstrung and the public feeling that the system protects the incompetent.

It is the position of this Government that no member of any recognized profession should be subject to dismissal without good cause being demonstrated. And by the same token if good cause can be demonstrated boards should be able to release a teacher without fear of a judgment in the courts which puts them in jeopardy. In any tenure legislation there is need for



a set of administrative routine to be followed in dismissals, in resignations and grievances. Also there should be defined grounds for justifying dismissal and resignation; and an appeal process where either party may challenge the evidence on which dismissal or resignation is based.

Consideration is taking place with the Saskatchewan School Trustees Association and the Saskatchewan Teachers' Federation on this matter. It is my hope that I shall be able to introduce legislation to the legislature some time during this Session.

Mr. Speaker, I am sure that when the history of education in Saskatchewan during the period '71 to '75 is formally recorded, it will be reviewed as a period of recovery, a period of renewal and recognition of remarkable growth and not content to rest on past laurels. New and additional significant developments may be expected during this time of office. Among these may I mention the following: SaskMedia will soon become operational acquiring producing and distributing instructional resource materials to support enriched educational programs both formal and informal. Special financial incentives should enable school boards to implement language programs to meet the aspirations of our many ethnic groups. As mentioned earlier a new program of teacher education and certification is under development.

Further decentralization of Department of Education services will occur with a view to providing better service to the people of Saskatchewan and to enable the Department of Education to be more sensitive to the view of those whom it serves.

Mr. Speaker, since 1971, gone are the confrontations and the bitterness. In their place a new emphasis on working together, to improve the quality of education. But as we continue in the important work it is essential to keep in mind that in the process of education society as a whole has a responsibility. And the role of the family, the church and the community must remain a very important part.

**SOME HON. MEMBERS:** — Hear, hear!

**MR. TCHORZEWSKI:** — Mr. Speaker, if I may turn to an area in the Throne Speech which is of some major importance to all of us, the people of Saskatchewan, as it is to the people of this country, inflation.

Inflation has been a serious problem in Canada over the past few years. It has severely reduce the purchasing power of low and fixed income Canadians. It has eaten away at the real value of personal savings. It has created a set of false values based on rising expectations. At the same time the Canadian economy has suffered from high unemployment, throwing people out of work and sacrificing the real income gains that could help reduce poverty in this country.

Our Government has repeatedly urged the Federal Government to introduce selective price controls on major commodities, such as steel, fertilizer, cement and so on. On Thanksgiving Day the Federal Government introduced a system of price and wage guidelines which apply to all sectors. The Government of Canada will enforce the controls on the federal public sector,

**November 25, 1975**

on large private firms and on construction firms. The Federal Government has asked the provinces to apply the guidelines to the provincial public sector, to rents and to professional fees. The Government of Saskatchewan has responded positively to the Federal Government's call for a concerted attack on inflation, but it has insisted that a program of restraints must be comprehensive and as fair and equitable as possible for all groups in society. It has clearly stated that the present federal proposals do not meet these tests and that changes must be made. But while awaiting further response from the Federal Government, this province has taken action on several fronts. We have announced a comprehensive rent control program which will limit rent increases in future years to the amount of increased costs and which will apply retroactively to protect tenants who have had unjustified rent increases during the past year.

Government capital projects will be deferred. And to assist those at the bottom of the income scale, there will be an increase in the minimum wage to \$2.80 on January 1st of 1976.

Inflation is too serious a problem for responsible governments to ignore, Mr. Speaker. But income controls cannot be acceptable if prices are not firmly controlled and if all forms of income are not controlled. Without strongly enforced price controls and controls on rents, dividends, and professional fees, then income wage controls would be unfair, unworkable and unacceptable.

The Government of Saskatchewan has urged the Federal Government to make its anti-inflation program fair and workable so that inflationary pressures can be contained.

With respect to salaries, the Federal Government has asked provinces to restrict salary increases to eight per cent to cover inflation, and two per cent to cover actual increase in productivity, and two per cent to cover catch up in places where that is necessary. Because for various reasons some employee groups have fallen behind in the stream of things it is my view that the two per cent for catch up will in some cases not be enough. I believe that the teaching profession is one of those groups.

We have the responsibility to see that the teacher salaries are fair in relation to other professional groups. It is also true that teacher salaries for Saskatchewan are behind both Alberta and Manitoba. If salaries are not kept competitive we may have a serious teacher supply shortage at some time in the future. While the federal guidelines allow for the maintenance of historical relationships, it is not clear how those relationships will be define. But what is clear is that we need to be able to continue to attract good teachers to this province.

Mr. Speaker, I opened my remarks earlier with a comment on our Government's initiative in obtaining for the people of Saskatchewan, effective control through ownership of the potash industry in Saskatchewan. In closing my remarks today I want to do as I began.

As we move into the final quarter of the 20th Century, two broad issues above all face the people of Saskatchewan. First, how do we develop our province and build upon our solid agricultural base, realize our industrial potential and at the

same time preserve the unique values of the Saskatchewan style of life. And second, who is to call the shots and reap the rewards from our rich store of resources? The vast large multinational corporations or the owners of those resources, the people of Saskatchewan?

These issues, Mr. Speaker, are bound together. There is not second chance with non-renewable resources such as oil and potash. And if Saskatchewan people are to have a chance to shape their own future, then it is vital that the owner's share of these scarce resources provide the capital and the springboard for the people to develop their province in their own way. The present situation where the citizens of Saskatchewan, owners of the potash, are being told by a handful of corporations that we have no claim to the benefits from our own resources is intolerable. Not only have these corporations withheld their taxes, they challenge the very right of the province to pass a law to collect it.

The people of Saskatchewan do not approve of this corporate behaviour. The people are tired of being told that outside developers are doing them a favor by coming here to exploit our potash. And people are looking for leadership, they are looking for someone who will stand up to these international corporations and they have found that leadership in this Government.

**SOME HON. MEMBERS:** — Hear, hear!

**MR. TCHORZEWSKI:** — Mr. Speaker, a great deal has been said about this issue and I should like to show how actions of even the former Liberal Government help to show the wisdom of the actions undertaken by this Government, even though they were at that time too blind to see it and today are afraid to admit it. From the moment that Saskatchewan decided to develop the potash in the 1950s Government have played a decisive role in regulating the industry and on at least one occasion, saving the industry from self-destruction. All along we have failed to heed the obvious message in these events that our potash industry should be run as one industry.

I should like to talk for a moment about prorationing because I think it is a good example of how the province through its Government really has to run the industry. The only question is whether the province runs the potash industry directly or indirectly. Obviously the direct method makes more sense and that is why we are moving to guarantee effective control through ownership.

Prorationing was a policy whereby the Government set production levels for each mine and also set a minimum price for selling potash. Nobody questions that prorationing saved the Saskatchewan potash industry from financial disaster. I believe that prorationing was introduced even by a Liberal Provincial Government, Mr. Speaker, if my memory serves me correctly. It also seems to me that the potash companies helped to develop the prorationing policy and when there was a change of Government in 1971, they asked that the new Government keep it going.

The point I want to make is that it took government action to stabilize the industry at a critical period of its development. You could call it government interference, if you like, but neither the industry nor the previous Government was using

such words then. It seems ironic that prorating became a political and a legal issue. Even more strange that the federal Liberals expressed no opposition to the policy when Liberals were in power provincially and when it suited the big companies to have prorating.

Now the former Attorney General for Saskatchewan from 1964 to 1971, Mr. Darrel Heald, publicly stated a year ago that he understood that the prorating system was within the jurisdiction of the province. And that any objections of the Federal Government and I quote, "Had been dealt with." Mr. Heald, also said and I think that this is very significant that prorating was introduced, and again I quote:

. . . because of the desire to help the potash industry to preserve the natural resource by ensuring the potash companies had the financial resources to mine the resource properly.

Because the Federal Government and the potash companies are opposing an orderly development of the potash industry and holding up expansion, this is just one more good reason for the people of Saskatchewan to acquire a controlling interest in the mines, place management of the industry under a Crown corporation and achieve proper development by a direct and on a saleable route.

Prorating worked at that time. Prorating is not necessary today, but it showed the wisdom, even the inevitability of having to treat our potash industry as one industry that we are going to get good management over a long period, efficient production and we are going to hold or expand our share of markets.

Mr. Speaker, in order to take effective control of our potash industry we must raise some hundreds of millions of dollars. This is a large amount of money, so one needs to ask how do we propose to find it? To begin with the credit of the province of Saskatchewan is as good as that of Ontario. It is better than nearly every other province in Canada. All of this is due to the management of the provincial governments since World War II, when our credit rating was nearly nil.

In short our reputation is well known and well respected and that is half the battle. Now although the potash industry has been subject to the boom and bust cycles in the past and it might be again, there is no question that its long-term future is bright and the world must have fertilizer and we have a lot of it. Right now the demand is high and the price is climbing. There is little question that the potash industry in Saskatchewan is a sound investment with relatively low long-term risk.

Investing in potash is something similar to buying a quarter-section of land, Mr. Speaker. You assess what the land will produce and schedule your payments accordingly. The land grows grain and the grain sales meet the payments. It is a self-liquidating debt. On the books of the province the assets balance the debt and in the end the people own both the potash and the means of producing it. One point should be made very clear. Entry into the potash industry will be a financial venture that on the whole will be separate and independent from the regular flow of money through the provincial budget. It will be a self-liquidating debt and is not likely to create a

burden for taxpayers. And both the purchase and the payout are to be separate from any tax funds of the province. Loans will be repaid from income generated by the industry itself. Income taxes should not be affected, government programs in operation should not be affected.

While potash companies are being purchased and paid for it is unlikely that new money will be available from the mines for general revenues but once the mines are bought and we hold clear title, profits will no longer flow out to corporate shareholders in the United States and in Europe, they will stay right here and build up to the credit of the million citizens of the province of Saskatchewan.

Mr. Speaker, in closing I just want to say again that what is happening during this Session will prove to be of overwhelming benefit to the people of Saskatchewan. An such will be the case that even the Tories and the Liberals in the future will admit that it was a wise move and in fact will try to claim some credit for it, no doubt. In light of that, Mr. Speaker, I can do no other but wholeheartedly support the main motion.

**SOME HON. MEMBERS:** — Hear, hear!

**MR. W.H. STODALKA (Maple Creek):** — Mr. Speaker, I should like to congratulate the Member for Humboldt (Mr. Tchorzewski) on his ability to distort. I sat here too and listened to the speech from the Hon. Member for Thunder Creek (Mr. Thatcher) and somehow he and I got a completely different interpretation of that speech. I just can't understand when somebody thinks the Government should eliminate the squandering and the wasting of money that this automatically means that there is going to be a reduction in the number of houses that are built in Saskatchewan. Somehow this insinuation seemed to come from that particular Member for Humboldt.

I should also like to congratulate all the Ministers who are asked questions, they have a great ability to stick handle. In the four questions that were asked this afternoon, I don't know if we received one specific answer. I also enjoyed listening to the Member for Humboldt. I watched him on the time piece up there and he spent about ten minutes out of 45 on education, I just hope that this isn't the priority that he is going to give to education in the future.

**SOME HON. MEMBERS:** — Hear, hear!

**MR. STODALKA:** — In listening to his presentation I just wonder if the Hon. Member for Last Mountain (Mr. MacMurchy) former Minister of Education, hadn't written that particular portion on education. For too many years I have been attending education meetings and heard that the policy about teacher training was going to be announced, that legislation was going to be brought down combining all the legislative acts in Saskatchewan into one. That there were going to be some changes in teacher tenure legislation. I think there are a couple of other Members here in this House who attended those particular meetings and can verify what I have said. Mr. Speaker, we need action not words. We have hard this so many, many times.

On this my first occasion to address this Assembly, I should

**November 25, 1975**

like to congratulate you on your appointment as Speaker. In contrast to what was said earlier about protocol and procedures in this Assembly, I should like to compliment you on the manner in which you have conducted this debate until this time. From my initial observations I am sure you will continue to serve with the dignity and decorum that tradition has established in the distinguished office of Speaker.

At this time I would be remiss in my duty if I did not thank the constituents of Maple Creek for the opportunity to serve as their elected representative in this Assembly.

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

**MR. STODALKA:** — My only hope is that I should be able to serve in a manner that justifies the confidence that they have bestowed on me.

Mr. Speaker, as a Liberal I am proud to represent a constituency that has elected Liberal Members to this legislature for 50 of the past 58 years.

**SOME HON. MEMBERS:** — Hear, hear!

**MR. STODALKA:** — Mr. Speaker, only twice in those 58 years, in 1944 and in 1971 has Maple Creek failed to send a Liberal Member to this Assembly. As the ninth Member to represent the constituency since the province was established in 1905, I hope that I shall be able to approach the type of representation given by some of my noted predecessors. I wish particularly to mention the last Liberal Member who represented that constituency, Mr. Alex Cameron, father of the Hon. Member for Regina South (Mr. Cameron) who represented the constituency continuously from 1948 to 1971 in which time he won six elections and served a total of 23 years. I have entered the Assembly realizing the difficulty I will have in attempting to provide the high calibre of representation he gave Maple Creek. I am not only proud of being his Liberal successor but I am also proud of being his nephew.

**SOME HON. MEMBERS:** — Hear, hear!

**MR. STODALKA:** — I haven't got this in my speech but there is one thing I should like you to know. We used to have a ball team in a small town that we have out there and we used to have the Hon. Member for Regina, Mr. Les Benjamin as part of our ball team. Somehow we missed the Hon. Member for Regina, he got away from us. Mind you we defeated him in a couple of elections out there before he got here to Regina.

Mr. Speaker, as I listen to other Members describe their constituency I began to really realize what a great constituency I have. As I sat down and began to itemize all the great things we have in Maple Creek, it just got too lengthy and I thought I would have to ignore it for the time being.

We will go on to another topic in the speech that I should like to make note of and that is as a new Member it was with a degree of skepticism that I entered this Assembly. Preconceived opinions that I had of this Assembly were not flattering but after the limited exposure of the last week I am happy to report

that my anxiety has been abated. Mr. Speaker, in my opinion it is obvious that the participants of the debate have spent many hours in preparation and that they have delivered their contributions with conviction.

**SOME HON. MEMBERS:** — Hear, hear!

**MR. STODALKA:** — Mr. Speaker, knowing the Hon. Member for Rosetown (Mr. Bailey) quite well, I was utterly amazed that he was able to stay quite as long as he did. I am indeed envious of the debating skills also of a number of the participants in this debate. And, Mr. Speaker, I recognize the fact that three is interaction in this Assembly that is probably unpalatable to some, but on the whole, it is my opinion that this interaction serves a useful function and harms no one. It is no shame for a man of strong convictions to become emotionally involved. I see wit and humour as effective mechanism to relieve the tensions that sometimes arise in this Assembly.

I was amazed that some of the Members opposite have not been referring to activities of Saskatchewan's last Conservative Government, the Anderson Government. After all great portions of their speeches are devoted to reminding Members on our side of the House as to what the Liberals did in 1964 to 1971. I make no apologies for the actions of that Government. But cannot the Hon. Members opposite recognize that two elections have passed since that time? Economic conditions have changed dramatically and in fact that 87 per cent of the Members of the present Liberal caucus were not even in the legislature, let alone part of that Government. Are you people over there so bankrupt of ideas that you must keep referring to things that are no longer applicable?

**SOME HON. MEMBERS:** — Hear, hear!

**MR. STODALKA:** — Every one in this Assembly has recognized that there are serious problems confronting us as a province and a nation. Yet the Members opposite continually keep referring to the irrelevant activities of the past. Mr. Speaker, I can do like the Hon. Member for Regina Rosemont (Mr. Allen) and tell all of you how badly off I was under the previous CCF administration. I could tell you how in the 1950s I received \$106 a month teaching school, right here in the city of Regina. And \$50 of that grand sum went to a wonderful landlady. That left me with \$56 a month, to provide transportation to work, clothe myself, continue my education, court my girlfriend, save for a home and pay my hospitalization tax.

**SOME HON. MEMBERS:** — Hear, hear!

**MR. STODALKA:** — I could also tell you how I as a ten-year-old boy attended my first political meeting and heard the Hon. T.C. Douglas promise that if elected how he would eliminate the two per cent education tax. We all know that he left us with a five per cent tax. That is what I was a little worried about last year when the election was going on in Saskatchewan with that Conservative promise of eliminating that five per cent tax, it might have brought us eight or ten or whatever it was.

Mr. Speaker, the issues of today are certainly more important to this Assembly and to the people of Saskatchewan.

What about the future? Certainly time is needed to discuss policy that will affect our province's future. I plead with the Hon. Members opposite to use the resources that they have available in a positive way. Why not become men of vision and foresight and quite wasting the Assembly's time as well as yours reciting irrelevant history.

**SOME HON. MEMBERS:** — Hear, hear!

**MR. STODALKA:** — Mr. Speaker, I should like to make a few comments on senior citizens' homes. Within the constituency of Maple Creek a new citizens' home in Leader was recently opened and another is under construction in Gull Lake. A new, 24 one-bedroom complex for senior citizens is about to be constructed in Maple Creek. And on behalf of the constituents I should like to thank all governments, federal, provincial and local for the support. Certainly the facilities are going to be appreciate and also put to good use. But in consultations that I have had with the trustees and administrators of nursing homes I became aware of a problem that needs government attention.

Nursing homes, I was informed accepted guests based on a quota of Levels I and II and III guests. Level I and II guests require a small amount of supervisory and personal care each day. The care increased dramatically in Levels III and IV. Facilities for Levels I, II and III are often available in small town but Level IV facilities are not available. Many guests enter the home as Level I and Level II guests but ultimately they end up being classified as Level III and sometimes even Level IV. Once a guest reaches the stage where Level IV care is required that person is supposed to leave the home and be admitted into another institution, a Level IV institution. This is where the problem really develops.

Guests are reluctant to leave the home that they have come to know. They are even more reluctant to leave the area in which they have resided for many, many years and go to a distant city. Relatives of the guests are often extremely difficult to negotiate with when suggestions are made to move their parents or relatives. The staff of the homes become over burdened with the increased load because of the extra amount of care required and the Level III and IV guests. The board and examining doctors are under extreme pressure not to have the classification changed. It truly creates a very difficult situation.

In most of these small towns I am sure you can find small hospitals originally constructed to have 40 or 50 patients. They are now rated by the Department of Health for grant purposes usually as 20 to 30 patient hospitals. Here we have the facilities and the space necessary to keep the patients right here in their own home area. Why can't this apparent space in these hospitals be converted to take care of these Level IV guests?

Mr. Speaker, I see this as a much more humane way to treat our senior citizens. Suggesting that hospital boards designate a limited number of beds for these people is not a solution, but hospitals are already exceeding the number of patients recognized for financial assistance and they cannot afford the designate beds for Level IV usage.

If Members of the Government proclaim they are a humane government, if they are, why don't they use a humane approach?



I should like to direct a few comments made about Cypress Hills Park. Mr. Speaker, on November 14, the Department of Tourism and Renewable Resources issued a news release concerning the Cypress Hills Provincial Park. The reason for that news release I suspect is contained in the following passage taken directly from the news release:

To date there has been a degree of controversy respecting Cypress Hills. Our department must do whatever possible to obtain as much input as possible to ensure that the decisions which are made in the future will reflect the most reasonable and publicly accepted position.

Mr. Speaker, a very notable objective with which I agree. But they key expression in that expressions is 'in the future'. The controversy which the department has recognized has no one to blame but themselves. It was their high-handed and dictatorial approach that precipitated the controversy in the first place.

**SOME HON. MEMBERS:** — Hear, hear!

**MR. STODALKA:** — Officials of the Department of Tourism and Renewable Resources attending cottage owners' meetings in the past previously indicated that no major decisions will be made without consultation with the public at large. But this never did happen Since that time the Department has made a decision to build a new store in a location far removed from the existing store, a location that will have a drastic effect on the park in its usage. This is a decision that is extremely unpopular. Cottage owners were told at a public meeting just last year that an independent firm, the Lombard North Group of Calgary had been hired by the department to develop a master plan for Cypress Hills. They were also told there would be an opportunity for public input before important decisions were made. Relocating the store, Mr. Speaker, was an important decision but there was no consultation.

The department argues that the report was delayed and they say they were forced to make an early decision because their own medical health officer condemned the building that houses the present store and present café. Yes, Mr. Speaker, the Government had allowed things to deteriorate to such an extent that their own medical health officer was forced to publicly condemn the facilities.

This did not happen all of a sudden. Pressure from the Department of Health had prevailed for some time. But because of the inactivity of the Government the medical health officer had to go to the media to get action. Imagine, Mr. Speaker, the situation became so unbearable that one of the Government's own employees took the risk of going to the public.

Mr. Speaker, the department's news release indicates the public will have a chance to analyze a proposed master plan before presenting briefs at public meetings. A questionnaire in management and development guidelines is going to be publicly distributed. Even though this program of action is late I want to commend the Government for initiating it. But, Mr. Speaker, as I read the news release a little further I began to wonder just what impact the public will have in that final decision making. Again, I should like to quote from that same release. It says:

An alternate development scheme has been suggested to allow for two areas separating passive and recreation areas.

It further states:

A cafe is being built in the lake area, east of the swimming pool and a store will be constructed in the recreation complex in keeping with the proposed plan.

My point here is, that the department initially suggests there is a development scheme to provide a passive and recreation area. Now this is what it suggests, and then in the next breath it indicates that a store is being built in the recreation area of the proposed plan. First they suggest they are going to have a plan or there is a plan that might exist, the next step they tell you that the plan already is being carried out.

Mr. Speaker, to me, and the people living in that particular area, there is a lot of concern in this particular park and we do want to become involved. We do feel that the park is for people in Saskatchewan and the rest of Canada and the United States to enjoy the park, which we know is fragile. We hope that we can become involved in the decisions and we will, in the area, co-operate as much as we can to improve the facilities.

**SOME HON. MEMBERS:** — Hear, hear!

**MR. STODALKA:** — I should like to move then to a few remarks on oil and natural gas.

Mr. Speaker, the constituency of Maple Creek is blessed with oil and natural gas deposits and these two products have brought a considerable degree of economic development to our area over the years; development that has not only been of financial benefit, but also many jobs. If it were not for this development, many of the people presently living in the area would not be living there. But, as the Member for Regina North West, the Minister of Natural Resources (Mr. Whelan) knows, that all is not rosy in the oil business. There are two problems that I should like to refer to.

The first is the type of crude oil that we have. Mr. Speaker, it is a heavy crude which contains sulphur and because of its nature it is not refineable in Canada and has to be exported to the United States. As the Minister is undoubtedly aware quotas on oil to the United States and the price and the poor quality of crude can have a dramatic effect on the volume that is exported. At last report the field was operating at far below capacity. I believe it was somewhere around 30 per cent. Mr. Speaker, I would urge the Minister to do all he can in his power when negotiating with federal authorities to make sure that the price is competitive and the export quotas will not be too stringent.

The second problem I should like to refer to is that of exploration and development. It is most disheartening, Mr. Speaker, to observe what is presently happening in our area. Mr. Speaker, on the Alberta side of the border large numbers of gas wells are being drilled. Compression stations are being built and pipelines are being laid. In contrast, Mr. Speaker, on our side of the border very little, if anything has happened

in the last four years. Mr. Speaker, I would invite the Minister of Mineral Resources to tour the area and just see for himself. It is indeed alarming.

Now your recent announcements regarding changes to royalty rates and incentives for exploration indicated that the Government has finally realized they made a mistake. But, Mr. Speaker, how do you expect investment when your policies do not approach those that are offered in Alberta?

Now, I should appreciate the Hon. Member for Regina North West just telling this Assembly what it is he thinks that we have here in Saskatchewan that will attract capital when they can get a better deal elsewhere? Just what is it, what is it we've got?

**SOME HON. MEMBERS:** — Hear, hear!

**MR. STODALKA:** — Mr. Speaker, it just does not add up. Who in their right mind would invest in a province which gives the poorer of two deals, and also which has a record of nationalizing industries when they begin to prosper?

Finally, I'm amazed at the Minister of Mineral Resources, the Regina North West Member. Last week he changed regulations in his department to try to attract investment in the oil industry. And what did he do here yesterday? He spent a great portion of his speech yesterday telling us what villains these corporations were and how they rob the people. Mr. Minister, do you really feel you are acting in a responsible fashion?

**SOME HON. MEMBERS:** — Hear, hear!

**MR. STODALKA:** — Finally, I should like to make a few remarks about the Government's anti-inflation program, if they have one.

The Throne Speech and remarks made by the Government before and since that time have indicated that's before the Throne Speech have indicated that the province is willing to co-operate in an attack on inflation. But look at the Government's record. Six weeks have passed since the federal program was announced and what have they done? Besides acting very quickly to point out weaknesses in the federal program what measurable actions have they taken here at home in the province of Saskatchewan.

Well, number one, they told us they are going to have rent controls; and number two, they said they are going to raise the minimum wage.

Mr. Speaker, these are the only two positive defined actions taken by this Government to this date. And they are not in effect yet. Look at some of the other measures mentioned in the Throne Speech. The Government says first of all it is going to severely restrain its programs on public works and will be holding the number of positions in the public service at, or close, to the 1975 level. Statements such as the aforementioned can easily be used as window dressing. What do statements like 'severely restrained' mean, and 'close' means, like that other one I keep hearing 'fair'? Fair deal. Mr. Speaker, have we seen an example of a slowdown in public works to this date?

November 25, 1975

Look at the two administrative building that are presently being constructed. If the Government is as serious as they say, tell us what projects are going to be delayed or cancelled.

**SOME HON. MEMBERS:** — Hear, hear!

**MR. STODALKA:** — Then the Government states it is going to keep its number of public positions at, or close, to the 1975 level. Mr. Speaker, words like 'close' mean little. Why use such ambiguous statements? Why not be objective and tell us precisely what that number is going to be so we can see whether or not they are going to be held, or going to be close.

Finally, what is the Government's position regarding wage controls? The Throne Speech recognizes that there are some groups to whom the guidelines do not apply . . . public employees, teachers, nurses, construction workers among them and I agree. Again, Mr. Speaker, do you note the negative approach in identifying the groups to whom the guidelines do not apply?

The Federal Government had the intestinal fortitude to identify groups to whom their guidelines should apply. Where are yours? Why the negative approach? Why say, these are the ones they don't apply to? That's an easy way out. Why not name the ones that they do apply to?

**SOME HON. MEMBERS:** — Hear, hear!

**MR. STODALKA:** — Mr. Speaker, it is about time you answered the question, or your Government answered the question as to what groups in Saskatchewan, other than those covered by the federal guidelines, to whom their guidelines are going to apply. It is about time this Government takes some responsible action and makes its position known and makes the position known now.

**SOME HON. MEMBERS:** — Hear, hear!

**MR. STODALKA:** — Mr. Speaker, I have not addressed myself to the nationalization of the potash industry, as I presume that this opportunity is going to come at a later date. But, Mr. Speaker, I am sure that you are certainly aware that I will be voting against the Motion.

**SOME HON. MEMBERS:** — Hear, hear!

**MR. P.P. MOSTOWAY (Saskatoon Centre):** — Mr. Speaker, I am delighted to have this opportunity to reply to this historic Throne Speech. I am delighted because of its monumental significance in that it clearly indicates that this Government, truly a people's government, has once again produced another first. It indicates that in expressing the will of the citizens of this province, it intends to take bold and imaginative steps now to provide for continuing future benefits for Saskatchewan.

**SOME HON. MEMBERS:** — Hear, hear!

**MR. MOSTOWAY:** — It indicates that Saskatchewan people will control

their own destiny insofar as certain natural resources are concerned.

Mr. Speaker, only a bold and courageous Government such as this one could take such action, and I predict then, in ten to 20 years, opposition Members who now so willingly defend giant octopus-like corporations, will be telling their grandchildren that it was really their idea.

**SOME HON. MEMBERS:** — Hear, hear!

**MR. MOSTOWAY:** — Before I go on, Mr. Speaker, I should like to congratulate you on your appointment as Speaker of this August Assembly. I know you will bring honor, dignity, and the Brockelbankian touch to the high office you now hold. As well, I wish to congratulate all newly-elected Members of this House, recently appointed Cabinet Members and the mover and seconder of the Throne Speech.

**SOME HON. MEMBERS:** — Hear, hear!

**MR. MOSTOWAY:** — Mr. Speaker, I want at this time to make a few comments in regard to what the Hon. Member for Thunder Creek said just a little while ago. I agree with him that there has been an erosion of rural electoral power, and I say it was really a shame the way the Liberal Government in previous years gerrymander and pulled off their election. But it backfired on them in 1971. But I want to bring to the attention of this House once again that it was the Liberal Government who found themselves in a bind, and found that they had to pass retroactive legislation in order to correct some of the evils that they had perpetrated on the public insofar as gerrymandering was concerned. I want to tell the Hon. Member for Thunder Creek I found him to be extremely surly, sour and snarly. Maybe that's in the tradition, I don't know. I want to tell him when he referred to 'bums on welfare' that not all Members are born with silver spoons in their mouths. There are some people who are not brought up in comfortable environments, and I should like the Hon. Member to sleep on that for tonight. And, if after thinking it over, you want to come clean and make a confession, we certainly will accept it on this side of the House.

**MR. LANE:** — Wes Robbins was born . . .

**MR. MOSTOWAY:** — Does the Hon. Member want the attention of Wes Robbins?

**MR. LANE:** — Wes Robbins was born with a silver spoon in his mouth.

**MR. MOSTOWAY:** — I can tell you one thing; it was a heck of a lot smaller than the spoon that will fit in your mouth.

**SOME HON. MEMBERS:** — Hear, hear!

**MR. MOSTOWAY:** — Mr. Speaker, during the last election campaign I made a special effort to keep track of the cost of election promises made by some Members opposite. My calculations at one time seemed to indicate that these same promises would have cost the province well over \$1 billion yearly with at least one half of

this amount going back to what these same Members opposite seem to feel are the poor little corporations. And did the citizens of this province believe opposition Members? Apparently they did not when one considers the political makeup of this House today. The people certainly spoke and spoke wisely.

**AN HON. MEMBER:** — Who . . .

**MR. MOSTOWAY:** — I'm sorry but I am not in the mood to listen to your gibberish at this time, Mr. Hon. Member.

Mr. Speaker, the other day one of the Members opposite seemed to imply that Saskatoon was not getting its fair share as compared to Regina. Well, I don't want to make comparisons but I do want to mention just a few of the things Saskatoon has either received or will receive in the near future. A tremendous increase in school grants over the past number of years, Mr. Speaker, and there isn't a Member opposite who can deny that. Two million dollars of Provincial Government money towards the cost of a sports complex in Saskatoon. Grants towards the cost of a new police station. Expansion of the University Campus relative to the hospital. A new engineering building, a new Provincial Government building, the site never having been objected to by city council. The Hon. Member laughs. I don't recall city council ever objecting to the site. I am under the impression that they were in complete agreement. Increased transit and police grants. And other assistance that I know indicates this Government does not play favourites.

**MR. STODALKA:** — Ho, ho!

**MR. MOSTOWAY:** — The Hon. Member seems to say ho, ho! May I ask you what the trouble is? If it is Roloids you need, we can certainly rustle some up.

But this does not mean, Mr. Speaker, that I should not like to see certain changes, because I would. I should like to see more decentralization of government agencies and services to the one true hub of Saskatchewan, and everyone know that is Saskatoon. To my way of thinking, decentralization of such services would save the taxpayers of this province millions of dollars, and it would provide services not now available to many because of long distances that sometimes now have to be travelled. Mr. Speaker, I mention this business of decentralization because I know that this Government has the capacity to do something about it. It has done so on this very point, and I am sure that it will do more.

Mr. Speaker, probably the greatest point of interest in the last election in Saskatoon Centre was in regard to housing. I don't believe I have to tell this House that the housing situation in this province is critical. I believe it is critical for a number of reasons.

One reason is the high employment rate in this province, thanks to this Government's bold and imaginative policies. Another is the absolutely ridiculous mortgage rates now being charged by friends of Members opposite. Another is the failure of all levels of — I am noticing Members opposite and to my right smiling; now I wonder, Mr. Speaker, if this is allowed — Government to put a stop to outrageous land development policies

which have made million for some speculators and/or contractors in our cities and town at the expense of those who would wish to become homeowners.

**MR. LANE:** — Name one.

**MR. MOSTOWAY:** — Do you want some names, Hon. Member? We can certainly — it seems to me that Lane Industries just might be one.

**SOME HON. MEMBERS:** — Hear, hear!

**MR. MOSTOWAY:** — Gary Lane Industries. Mr. Speaker, I am not one to say land development and house construction at any cost which is what we have really been allowing. I am not one who thinks all levels of government should stand idly by when the price of houses has doubled or even tripled in the last few years. But I am one, Mr. Speaker, who advocates that speculation, gouging, the use of inferior materials, and just general browbeating should be stopped, and it can be stopped by government getting into house building. I say that this move would be welcomed by many because it would appear that even though profits from house building and related areas are very great, greater profits can be garnered from the construction of office space.

Mr. Speaker, it would appear that private enterprise cannot or will not meet the demand for housing. Therefore, a valid case can be made for government getting into this field. And, if it did, the increase in the number of housing units would, no doubt, to some degree, force down the exorbitant prices now being asked for and received.

And while I'm on the topic of housing, Mr. Speaker, I want to say a few words on the absolutely ridiculous situation that exists insofar as the renting of suites and apartments is concerned. Numerous cases have been brought to my attention where rents have increased by as much as 100 per cent over the past year. And some of the reasons given to tenants for these rent increases are absolutely incredible. Some gouging landlords seem to delight in blaming increases on maintenance costs. Well, Mr. Speaker, I know of no large apartment maintenance personnel who have even come close to a 25 per cent increase in salary in the past year. Some of these same landlords have blamed the recent increase in the price of gas for which they can thank the last Liberal junta when they so willingly sent our gas deposits in Alberta to foreign interests. But, Mr. Speaker, in no way can 100 per cent rent increases be blamed on this.

Other large landlords have blamed a rise in municipal taxes for rent increases. Now it is true municipal taxes have increased, but in no way should they cause rent increases of up to 100 per cent. One landlord told me quite bluntly that it was all the fault of the Human Rights Commission. When I asked him how, he muttered something under his breath which I would be the last person in this House to repeat.

**AN HON. MEMBER:** — Good.

**MR. MOSTOWAY:** — I am glad the Hon. Member wants a clean House.

Mr. Speaker, at this time, I should like to read a letter

November 25, 1975

from a constituent of mine, and even though the grammar may not be 100 per cent correct, I am sure it will convey the gist of what I mean. It has an address on it but I didn't put it on here to protect the constituent.

Dear Sir: Being Ottawa has passed wage, price, rent controls, I now your Government of Saskatchewan will put them (rent) control into effect or roll them back. It seems they (the landlords) are hurrying to get them up high before it does happen. Our case they have gone up in two stages, 15 per cent, 20 per cent.

I remind you I am quoting from this letter.

Now they are going up 40 per cent on November 1. Reasons given on all cases, overhead, taxes, gas, service charges. We all know that increases in taxes, gas only happens once a year, not three times, besides for overhead it's a joke as they have not spent one dime on this place in ten years. It's so bad for the want of paint that you have to have the lights on to see across the room in daylight, and the rest is all run down.

Just like the Liberal Party opposite. I'm not quoting from the letter. I want you to take note of that.

This service calls are another rip-off for them to shove on to the tenant the high cost of outside help, instead of janitor who could do the same work. This way they kill two birds with one stone, save a suite that the janitor would use and do not have to pay him. How it's going to work this winter when the snow piles up is to be seen, as you do not wait hours and days for some to clean steps and walks in apartments.

Please do not mention my name or address as they would throw us out for sure.

**SOME HON. MEMBERS:** — Agreed.

**MR. MOSTOWAY:** — Well, I certainly agree that if I mentioned the name in here that you fellows would probably do that.

Many thanks for what you can do for us who are on fixed income and taking the hardest beating of most of the people. Remain.

And I did not put the name down there so that the constituent would be protected.

**MR. LANE:** — Is that one of the . . .

**MR. MOSTOWAY:** — It is one of my better letters.

Further on this topic of concern, Mr. Speaker, I had occasion, on behalf of five constituents in one apartment block in Saskatoon, to write a letter to one agency which handled the block for the owner. At any rate I politely asked the agency if it might not consider giving its tenants some specific reasons for its rent increases instead of always using the generalities, "Due to tremendous increases in costs." Well, Mr. Speaker, to



my surprise, about a month later, I received a reply from the owner who, I thought, did not appreciate my letter. At any rate, I got no satisfaction from him, but I did get a sharp rebuke from him for not listening to the said plight of large apartment owners. Consequently, I informed the owner I would be delighted to hear his point of view. Mr. Speaker, that was quite some time ago, and to date I have not heard from him.

The obvious conclusion from all this, Mr. Speaker, is that rents must be controlled, retroactively, and with an appeal mechanism so as to not penalize the many just landlords of this province.

Mr. Speaker, some Members opposite and certain organizations in this province, claim that this government's proposed legislation to ensure control of the potash industry by the people of this province is immoral. Now I ask you, Mr. Speaker, by whose standards is this move immoral? Well, I decided to do a little checking, and so I turned to the Bible to find out whether such a move might be immoral or not. I notice the Hon. Member laughs when I mention the Bible. If you want to laugh at the Bible, well, I say that rests with you.

Mr. Speaker, try as I did, I could nowhere find anything to back up these charges. But what I did find in the good Book made me thoroughly convinced that not to act as this government proposes to act would be immoral. I say this because nowhere could I find passages that claim that God-given resources should be the monopolies of certain individuals or groups of individuals.

Mr. Speaker, from the passages that I read, I am convinced that natural resources were put on this earth for all to use and enjoy, and no howling by Members opposite or by organizations who fought medicare tooth and nail can alter that fact.

**SOME HON. MEMBERS:** — Hear, hear!

**MR. MOSTOWAY:** — In fact, Mr. Speaker, when Members opposite or certain organizations wail and scream, I know that this government is on the right track. I say on the track because in a recent survey that I conducted personally — all kinds of survey are being done these days — and I thought I would jump on the gravy train too, I found that many citizens of this province were wondering just how much this government could take from these runaway corporations.

In fact, Mr. Speaker, many of these same citizens asked me how those potash corporations could thwart government wishes in a manner that would almost certainly bring prison or jail terms to private citizens were they to try the same thing.

**MR. LANE:** — Has anyone asked . . .

**MR. MOSTOWAY:** — Well, I remind Hon. Members that the Federal Government has on numerous occasions seen fit to have people taken into court and the courts imprison people for evading certain taxes. You gentlemen can't read the newspapers, so be it.

Mr. Speaker, in refusing to pay legitimate taxes, in refusing to co-operate with government, and in soliciting assistance from the Trudeau regime, to embarrass this government,

I know that these same corporations have proved that they do not have the best interests of the people of this province at heart. Mr. Speaker, I know that in the immediate past these same potash corporations have been using every trick in the book to hoodwink the government. I believe that many of these potash companies have been packing their inventories in the hope that they could distort their true profit picture. I believe this because I have talked to people who are sure that corporation heads have come from a sunnier clime and ordered administrative personnel here to distort in the manner that I have just mentioned.

Mr. Speaker, effective control through ownership of our potash industry will do more than keep the profits in this province. Just as important, it will make Saskatchewan the headquarters of the second largest potash operation in the world. For years Saskatchewan has been called a branch plant economy. Our early pioneers were sent out to colonize the West and provide a market for eastern goods. Freight rates made it cheaper to ship our produce elsewhere for processing and with every box car of product we exported jobs at the expense of our own young people. The evidence of the branch plant economy is all around us. When you go to a lumber yard or a hardware store and order something in, where does it come from? Look at the labels in the boxes and the crates. They read offices in Montreal, Toronto, Winnipeg, Vancouver. How many times does the label say, head office, Saskatchewan?

Well, once in a while you will see an organization with Saskatchewan offices — Interprovincial Pipe and Steel, Regina; Federated Co-operatives and Intercontinental Packers of Saskatoon; Co-operative Insurances Services of Regina. There are a few others, and they are all headquartered here, because they are either a co-operative, organized by Saskatchewan people to serve themselves, or they are companies established and maintained here because of action or participation by an NDP government.

**SOME HON. MEMBERS:** — Hear, hear!

**MR. MOSTOWAY:** — The history of Saskatchewan shows clearly that if we want to make something of this province, we have to do it ourselves.

In 1975 we have decided to make something out of our potash industry. Effectively, we are going to bring all or most of the head offices from New York, Chicago, Toronto and other centres. From now on when you deal in potash you will have to come to Saskatchewan.

**MR. MALONE:** — Or Russia!

**MR. MOSTOWAY:** — Well, the Hon. Member suggests that people go to Russia. If this is what you are going to suggest, fine. I say people should come to Saskatchewan, not to Russia! But if you have certain dealings with Russia, so be it! I am sure that your constituents would find it very interesting to know that you may have secret dealings with Russia.

As I was saying, before I was so rudely interrupted, Mr. Speaker, from now on when you deal about potash you will have to come to Saskatchewan. If I may be so bold as to add, preferably to beautiful Saskatoon!

The Potash Corporation of Saskatchewan will employ over 450 people in its head office, 450 jobs! Not hewers of wood and drawers of water but managers here to serve, rather than to exploit. These are not a new level of bureaucrats who didn't exist before, these jobs exist now, but they aren't in Saskatchewan. Well, I say the potash belongs to the people of Saskatchewan, and the people who manage the industry should work for the people of Saskatchewan. I say they should be located in Saskatchewan, making profits for Saskatchewan people, doing business in our stores and adding to our economy, instead of siphoning off dollars to the East and out of Canada. It will be Saskatchewan people making the decisions, Mr. Speaker, doing the jobs and getting the benefits. Now that's what Headquarters Saskatchewan means! Hundreds of job brought home, top managers, top engineers, and top decision makers. For that reason alone, I say the investment is worth it, for it is an investment in our future and the future of our children.

**SOME HON. MEMBERS:** — Hear, hear!

**MR. MOSTOWAY:** — I should like to spend a few minutes, Mr. Speaker, on another area and this is inflation. I am not one who puts very much faith in the wage controls imposed by the Federal Government because I believe that it really puts no restrictions on those individuals, companies and jurisdiction that traditionally have a way of getting what they want. I say this because I believe it is a well-known fact that the day after Mr. Trudeau announced his plan of controls many supermarkets in Saskatoon had their employees marking up prices after closing time.

Now I ask you, Mr. Speaker, how can this sort of nonsense be justified? Can excellent profits on land speculation and house building be justified during a period of inflation when the risks are practically nil? Can oil companies be allowed the privilege of exclusion from these controls? Mr. Speaker, the list of inequities from these hastily contrived controls could go on and on, but suffice it to say that they prove one major point and that is that the working people of this country, our senior citizens and the economically and socially disadvantage will bear the heavy brunt of their effect.

While I am on this topic, Mr. Speaker, permit me to express my pleasure to this government on its intention to exempt from the Federal Government's wage controls such citizen groups as teacher, nurses, and I am quoting one of the Members opposite, "... and hopefully others who are only now just beginning to catch up with their counterparts in other parts of Canada."

Mr. Speaker, over the past few years I have consistently praised the good work done by the government's Department of Consumer Affairs. I believe this department has done much to assist and protect the citizens of Saskatchewan. What I should like to suggest at this point, Mr. Speaker, is that this same department — which now has a different Minister — consider some sort of program whereby there could be more protection to the consumer insofar as automobile repair work is concerned. I suggest this because I believe that in many cases there is a ripoff on car repairs and associated work done.

**MR. LANE:** — Who are you talking about, SGIO?

**MR. MOSTOWAY:** — I don't know what you are talking about, Mr. Hon. Member. If you spoke up like a man, I could understand you!

While I am on this topic, Mr. Speaker, permit me to express my pleasure to this government on its intention or possible intention to do something in this area.

Mr. Speaker, I am well aware that the Premier has asked all Members of this House to exercise a certain degree of restraint insofar as asking for new programs or the extension of old ones. However, I feel compelled to mention one area where I believe there should be an extension and that is in regard to this government's drug plan which I know all Members will agree is a smashing success. Mr. Speaker, I feel there could be much merit in the inclusion of prescription vitamins in this plan. I say this because I know for a fact that quite a number of citizens will swear to the fact they have been made healthy or normalized through the use of prescription vitamins. I venture to say that numerous school teachers will attest to this in relation to certain of their students. Many others now live normal lives through the use of these vitamins. I say it is time we took a long hard look at the inclusion of these vitamins in the plan.

Mr. Speaker, I could mention many things which I am sure the people of Saskatoon Centre would appreciate from this imaginative government. I know that parking facilities at Kelsey Institute are needed, and I have no doubt that action in this regard will soon be taken. I know that many in Saskatoon are anxiously awaiting greater river bank development that, I presume, should involved all three levels of government. I now that many wish more development at the Black Strap recreational area just south of Saskatoon. As far as our senior citizens are concerned, I know that many appreciate the Provincial Government supplement paid to them, but by the same token, they are looking forward to increases in light of Ottawa's refusal to act in this area.

**SOME HON. MEMBERS:** — Hear, hear!

**MR. MOSTOWAY:** — As well, Mr. Speaker, many are looking forward to grants being paid to renters in much the same manner as property owners now enjoy.

Mr. Speaker, I should like to go back and refer to my constituency very briefly. I want to thank the good citizens of Saskatoon Centre for having expressed at least a degree of confidence in me during the last election. As for the elections itself, in Saskatoon Centre, it was cleanly fought, so I thought, by all four candidates.

**MR. STEUART:** — There's the truth!

**MR. MOSTOWAY:** — Well, Mr. Speaker, if it is the truth, I certainly would not want to hold it back from opposition Members.

Mr. Speaker, Saskatoon Centre is a unique constituency. In one sense it is probably the most urban of any constituency, it has the largest number of voters, well over 12,000, and it has the largest number of family units.

Mr. Speaker, it has been a pleasure for me to participate in this debate.

**SOME HON. MEMBERS:** — Hear, hear!

**MR. MOSTOWAY:** — Thank you for backing up what I have just said. In all sincerity I have found it extremely pleasurable because the Throne Speech strives for people's rights as opposed to corporate privilege, as advocated by Members opposite. I will be anxiously awaiting to see whether opposition Members vote for people or corporations when the vote comes.

Mr. Speaker, I believe you can easily ascertain that I will be supporting the Motion.

**SOME HON. MEMBERS:** — Hear, hear!

**MR. S.J. CAMERON (Regina South):** — It is obviously, Mr. Speaker, a great night to begin. I notice the level of enthusiasm in the House is a little greater than usual. I am not sure whether we owe that to the Member for Saskatoon Centre (Mr. Mostoway) or to the toasts to the great speeches given by the Member for Maple Creek (Mr. Stodalka) and the Member for Morse (Mr. Wiebe).

**SOME HON. MEMBERS:** — Hear, hear!

**MR. CAMERON:** — I begin, Mr. Speaker, by congratulating you on your elevation to the position of Speaker and add on behalf at least of the official opposition that we have been suitably impressed to date with the manner in which you have discharged our obligations as Speaker.

The debate thus far, Mr. Speaker, has had many references by Members to their constituencies and I wondered in hearing those many references what I might say about my own. As you know, we have neither fish, nor lake, nor timber, nor mine; indeed we don't even grow a single bushel of grain. I suppose, Mr. Speaker, you might say I represent the poor. I am proud to represent them none-the-less! What we lack in other resources we make up for in resources of mind and self-reliance and enterprise . . .

**SOME HON. MEMBERS:** — Hear, hear!

**MR. CAMERON:** — . . . and I may say in judgment and in wisdom for a full 50 per cent voted Liberal.

**SOME HON. MEMBERS:** — Hear, hear!

**MR. CAMERON:** — I have some interesting constituents, former Ministers Kim Thorson, Alex Taylor, present Minister Neil Byers. I wonder if there is a message there for the Minister of the Environment. We have a tendency to retrain people, Sir, where we come from. I am pleased to say too, Mr. Speaker, that I have a constituent of mine the Member for Indian Head-Wolseley (Mr. MacDonald). I am particularly proud of him.

**SOME HON. MEMBERS:** — Hear, hear!

November 25, 1975

**MR. CAMERON:** — What pleases me particularly, Mr. Speaker, is that he adds some seven MacDonalds to the voters' list.

**SOME HON. MEMBERS:** — Hear, hear!

**MR. CAMERON:** — The Hon. Member for Arm River (Mr. Faris) this afternoon made some references to John Diefenbaker. I want to make a reference to him too. He said on entering Parliament he spent his first six months wondering how he ever got elected to such a great institution. He said he spent his second six months wondering how any of the other Members got elected.

Apparently, Mr. Speaker, the Leader of the Right Hon. Gentleman's party in Saskatchewan is a quicker learner, because what took John Diefenbaker his second six months in Parliament to learn, apparent the Member for Nipawin learned in his first six days.

**SOME HON. MEMBERS:** — Hear, hear!

**MR. CAMERON:** — He spoke, Mr. Speaker, of the serious and sombre times that faced the province and he talked about his first serious communication from the government. I think he said it was a visit from the Attorney General to talk about MLAs' indemnities. That brought to mind the first communication that we received from the Conservative caucus and I'm going to refer to it. A letter, Province of Saskatchewan, Legislative Assembly. As Members know it was a matter of grave import. It said, is there anyone interested in getting an MLAs' hockey team together?

**SOME HON. MEMBERS:** — Hear, hear!

**MR. CAMERON:** — I guess I shouldn't have been surprised at that, Mr. Speaker, it follows that you may have to look elsewhere to form a hockey team, if you have only a coach and six right-wingers.

**SOME HON. MEMBERS:** — Hear, hear!

**MR. CAMERON:** — Mr. Speaker, those of us who are new to the House have witnessed one of the most significant Throne Speeches in a very long time. Significant, I think, for the enormous and unwarranted risk that it has set for the people of Saskatchewan. The announcement that the government intends to nationalize all of part of the potash industry carries with it tremendous implications for the future of this province. Financial risk alone is enormous. We face a veritable constitutional mine field ahead of us. We shall have grave problems in the future enticing substantial investment to our province.

Mr. Speaker, the size and the power of the government swells in its wake. The people are gravely concerned, much confused and indeed not a little frightened.

**SOME HON. MEMBERS:** — Hear, hear!

**MR. CAMERON:** — What they ask, Mr. Speaker, is why? Why is it necessary

to take this drastic gamble? And some are ashamed. Ashamed because only a short time ago we invited to our province the very people we now seek to drive from it. Surely, Mr. Speaker, our government should not do what we ourselves would not. None of us individually would be so callous in our personal relations with others as one day to invite, on a solemn assurance of welcome, only to turn around the next and breach that assurance and drive them from our province.

**SOME HON. MEMBERS:** — Hear, hear!

**MR. CAMERON:** — Mr. Speaker, it's interesting to note that all that has changed since the day we invited them is that they've been successful.

Premier Ross Thatcher used to say, he never knew a socialist who could handle success. I think he may have been right. There is an old saying and I want the Premier to pay special attention to this, because I think he may find in it some relevance to the way in which his government has been behaving. The old saying is that, 'many people share in the labors but not in the spoils.' I think that may have some relevance. The old saying stems from a story about a lion who used to prefer to hunt alone, but now and then would invited the other beasts of the forest to hunt with him. Now on one such occasion he killed a deer. The lion stood over the deer and he said, now beasts it is time to divide the spoils. I demand that it be quartered. Now, he said, the first quarter goes to me as King of the beasts. The second is mine as arbiter. The third quarter is due me for my part in the chase and as for the fourth quarter let him who dares take it from me. I as the Premier if that doesn't sound familiar.

**SOME HON. MEMBERS:** — Hear, hear!

**MR. CAMERON:** — Mr. Speaker, the move by your Government to nationalize the potash industry, amounts to a clear unequivocal confession of failure. I don't know that there has ever been a government in Canada that has combined as passionate a lust for power with such incurable impotence in its exercise.

**SOME HON. MEMBERS:** — Hear, hear!

**MR. CAMERON:** — One of the delegates at your convention is reported to have said to great applause, it's time we had a good fight, we haven't had one for some time. That, Mr. Speaker, is the complete antithesis of what good government is all about.

**SOME HON. MEMBERS:** — Hear, hear!

**MR. CAMERON:** — It isn't the function of government to provide confusion and fear and conflict, but stability and trust and confidence. People are asking, what have you done to this valuable Saskatchewan industry, the potash industry.

You say that you are not getting expansion and clearly you aren't. The question is why? If you look back the answer becomes reasonably clear. You said first to the industry that if you expand we will take half of your expansion, then you said to the industry we will tax your reserves and tax them heavily,

**November 25, 1975**

to the extent the potash industry's claim of 80 to 90 per cent. Well, I ask you how can you expect expansion when you take 50 per cent off the top and as to the remainder, you say you want 80 per cent? Take a farmer, if he wants to expand his operation he looks at buying another half-section, one of the Hon. Members earlier in the day made a similar reference, the government says, yes expand, buy the additional half-section, but when you do we will take 80 per cent. Now, no farmer in his right mind would buy a deal like that. Then Hon. Members wonder why there is no expansion.

If you combine, Mr. Speaker, three elements, a fair tax system, a healthy market demand and a good level of price, expansion surely follows. Now two of these elements are already present. The market demand is strong and prices are high, but still there is no expansion. Obviously, therefore, the first element is missing, that you have introduced a tax system which is repressive.

No enterprise, not even the great Saskatchewan Elysium, foreseen by the Premier, can you have both your cake and eat it too.

**SOME HON. MEMBERS:** — Hear, hear!

**MR. CAMERON:** — Of course, that's the very thing that you seem to be trying to do.

Mr. Speaker, in the last three years, I say to the Government, that they have got themselves into an enormous tax mess, a tax box. First, you pressed your luck in extending a very delicately balanced prorationing scheme until you brought in tumbling down. Second, you insisted on having half of any future expansion. Third, you devised a reserves tax system which is of questionable validity to begin with, and then taxed under it to the point where you destroyed incentives. Fourth, you insisted upon collecting taxes under a questionable reserves tax system, knowing that three or four years from now you run the risk of having to repay some four or five hundred million dollars in taxes. If that happened and I appreciate the enormity of the risk involved to the government, you would bring this province to its financial knees for decades. With these moves you have create an enormous mess in this industry.

What baffles me, Mr. Speaker, is that you have done it with a Premier who whatever qualities of leadership he may lack, does not lack superior qualities of mind. I can only conclude that you have allowed prejudice and pique to overcome sound reason and judgment.

**SOME HON. MEMBERS:** — Hear, hear!

**MR. CAMERON:** — Now, having boxed yourself into the corner that you have, and created this mess, you have one of two avenues of exit. The first is to back off and start again in a more reasoned and reasonable way. If that requires an admission that you made some mistakes, then we say for the sake of the future of this province, admit them and begin again.

**SOME HON. MEMBERS:** — Hear, hear!



**MR. CAMERON:** — Bigger men before you have had to admit mistakes.

The second avenue out of the mess you have crated and apparently this is the one you have chosen, is to nationalize the industry. But the problem with the latter course that you have chosen is that it may very well bring even a bigger mess than that which you are in, with its enormous financial risks, its constitutional ramifications, its risks about further development of the province and its inevitable mushrooming in the size of the Government.

The sensible thing to do is to sit down with the Federal Government and the industry and as reasonable men work out a solution to bring expansion to this valuable industry and provide the maximum possible benefit to the people.

**SOME HON. MEMBERS:** — Hear, hear!

**MR. CAMERON:** — One that does not require us to mortgage the future of this province. Unless you do that and now persist in your present course, we could become what one of the Members opposite referred to earlier in the day, as a new Newfoundland. Because of the enormity of the risk involved and the confusion of the people in this issue, and they are very confused, we are suggesting to you, Mr. Premier, that you pause for six months. The potash isn't going to g away; it will be there until the year, 4000. In the meantime you establish a commission of six members, to be chaired by the Chief Justice of Saskatchewan, to have the following membership, one conversant with the production and marketing of potash, one a financial expert, one a constitutional authority, and two members from the general public.

**SOME HON. MEMBERS:** — Hear, hear!

**MR. CAMERON:** — That you empower this Commission to hold a series of public hearings across the province to assess the risks and the course that you are setting. It would give people the opportunity to listen to the submissions of the potash companies, by the government and indeed would give the people themselves some voice and to understand better the atrocious course that you are asking them to take.

The commission would report back to the Assembly or to the Government within six months in respect to its findings on three questions. The first is, what are the immediate financial and constitutional risks involved in the course you have set us on? The second is, is the risk of loss in the event of failure of this enterprise disproportionate to the benefit in the event of success? In other words is the huge gamble you ask us to take really worth the gamble? Three is, what other alternatives are there to the drastic step that you are proposing we take?

We have public hearings these days on a whole array of government proposals, but none anywhere near approaching the magnitude of the one that's now before us.

**SOME HON. MEMBERS:** — Hear, hear!

**MR. CAMERON:** — And I say if we can do that with regard to routine government decisions surely we can do it with the biggest one to come before us in some time.

The potash question, Mr. Speaker, dominates the Throne Speech. But since we will all have the opportunity on second reading of the Bill to inquire further into it, I want to pass on to other areas of the Throne Speech.

As to the Government's intentions on the war against inflation we remain largely in the dark, except to the extent that the Government proposes rent control, a move which we endorse.

To this point the Government has been strangely inconsistent, saying on the one hand, we will join the battle and then on the other, we'll not commit our full troops. So we wait. I notice the Throne Speech had reference to health and the Prescription Drug Act and the Mental Health Act, but precious little else.

I thought, Mr. Speaker, when I heard those references to health, of the ad campaign that the Department of Public Health has been conducting for some while. You know the one to which I refer, about communicable disease. It says in big bold letters, INFORMATION. It says this disease can strike anyone and sometimes does. My wife's in the gallery, you know, what's she to think about that, Mr. Speaker. It says don't take chances, if you have suspicions contact your nearest clinic immediately. Then I noticed there was another ad right beside it which invited us to Share The United Way.

I want, Mr. Speaker, to turn briefly to the Attorney General's Department. I am pleased to see that amendments will be introduced to improve the magistrates' courts and I'll have more to say on that subject when the legislation comes before us.

Certainly he will find in us a willingness to support the Government in improving the administration of justice in the province.

**SOME HON. MEMBERS:** — Hear, hear!

**MR. CAMERON:** — What we require is support for more effective police work, additional judges of the magistrates' courts, one or two chief judges, support staff in the courts which could be drawn from other areas of the civil service. Most of all we need a renewed commitment to effective administration of justice in this province. We are now experiencing lengthy delays between arrest and trial every day in the courts. Delays as long as six to eight months and in some instances indeed a year. We say, Mr. Speaker, this is totally unacceptable.

**SOME HON. MEMBERS:** — Hear, hear!

**MR. CAMERON:** — Mr. Speaker, in the last six months the Government has hired from time to time 49 lawyers in Saskatchewan in private practice to serve as part time judges. We say too that this is not an acceptable practice. I appreciate the reasons for it, but I say to the Attorney General that we ought to move as quickly as we can away from it.

These lawyers are one day appearing in the courts as advocates only to appear the next day in the same courts as judges and that is contrary to the high standards of justice that we should be attempting to have.

**SOME HON. MEMBERS:** — Hear, hear!

**MR. CAMERON:** — Mr. Speaker, six months ago the official opposition began on a regular basis to ask the government a series of questions when we weren't in session. The Premier dismissed that practice as gimmicky.

On September 25th I asked the Attorney General four questions about the courts and related subjects. On October 29th the Attorney General replied with a six page letter answering these questions, and it's a very good letter and I want to commend the Attorney General and I say that his attitude in this respect is enormously better than the Premier's.

**SOME HON. MEMBERS:** — Hear, hear!

**MR. CAMERON:** — Mr. Speaker, these last several days I have often thought of an observations made by Alexander Pope. Lest it begin to apply to me I will conclude. He wrote?

Words are like leaves  
And where they most abound  
Much fruit of sense beneath is rarely found.

I will not support the motion.

**SOME HON. MEMBERS:** — Hear, hear!

**MR. H.H. ROLFES (Minister of Social Services):** — Mr. Speaker, most people in this Assembly direct their first words of congratulations to you, but my first words of thanks go to the Leader of the Opposition, because it was a little over a year ago that he personally interfered with the Liberal nomination of Buena Vista and I think that decision that he made at that time, resulted in me being back here in the legislature.

**SOME HON. MEMBERS:** — Hear, hear!

**MR. PENNER:** — . . .inaudible . . .

**MR. ROLFES:** — So can you, Sir, and if you move over a little further to the left I think you will be in territory which is not totally unfamiliar to you, sir.

**SOME HON. MEMBERS:** — Hear, hear!

**MR. ROLFES:** — Mr. Speaker, I certainly want to add my words of congratulation to you on being appointed as Speaker in this House. I know it will be a very difficult job to perform, but I know you personally and I know you will carry it out with integrity and honesty and to the best of your ability.

**SOME HON. MEMBERS:** — Hear, hear!

**MR. ROLFES:** — My congratulations also, Mr. Speaker, go to the mover, the Member for Quill Lakes (Mr. Koskie) and the seconder, the Member for Melfort (Mr. Vickar) for the excellent way in which they participated in the Throne Speech.

Mr. Speaker, before I get into the main part of my speech, I want to take this opportunity to thank the people of Buena Vista. It is a new constituency, it is certainly not a very political constituency and for that I am thankful. Those people don't approach you because of your politics, they approach you as an individual, as a person whom they can trust and people whom I hope I can be frank with and trust at the same time. To me this is much more meaningful than to have to always be on guard as to whom you are talking to because of their politics and therefore, can't give them a straight answer.

Yes, I would think that you should know having served so long in one before. Times have changed and we have also different people in the Executive Council at this time. It operated differently, it is not a one man Cabinet. I found out in the first two weeks, it is comprised of 18 or 19 thinking people, this I much appreciate.

Mr. Speaker, I welcome this opportunity to participate in the Throne Speech. The legislation proposed in the Speech from the Throne is momentous indeed. I can think of no greater personal satisfaction than to play a role in the establishing a new direction for this province's resources policy. The proposed legislation on potash is a watershed, marking a division between the past when insecurity of production and expansion were ever present and the future when the people of Saskatchewan will reap the benefits of a sound, common-sense approach to resource utilization. I am totally committed to such a new direction.

Mr. Speaker, over the past few days much has been said about the resources of this province. To some extent I am concerned with the attempt of the Members opposite to particularize this concept. This is the key distinction between the NDP and those sitting opposite — whereas the NDP maintains a consistent, long-range philosophy, the Liberal and Conservative Members opposite stray from one minor issue to another in an unrelated fashion — it's a hit and run approach — it's an approach which the people of Saskatchewan have rejected in the past and will continue to do so in the future.

Resources, Mr. Speaker, means the total complement — it includes people, services, natural goods, along with industry and manufacturing. The most critical of this array of resources is people. I should like to direct your thoughts for a few minutes to the human resource field.

The harsh effects of inflation are well known to all of us. What we are witnessing today is the destructive effects of an unsupervised and reckless economic system, one which has not essential relationship to, nor regard for, the needs of people.

We cannot expect to ride out inflation on the backs of the poor and the disadvantaged. I totally, totally disagree with the Member for Nipawin when he says that these people must forego any increases in order that we can fight inflation. Let me

tell the Member for Nipawin that a few years ago, not even that long ago, I saw ads on the Saskatoon television advertising weekend rates at the Bessborough Hotel for \$14 a day, today those charges are \$21 a day, at 50 per cent increase over the last 16 months or two years. These people didn't wait, they weren't prepared to fight inflation. Maybe, Mr. Speaker, when the Member of Consumer Affairs is bringing in rent controls he should have some clause in there which will roll back rates even on commercial hotels.

**SOME HON. MEMBERS:** — Hear, hear!

**MR. ROLFES:** — Let's give them eight per cent, Mr. Speaker, a year. In that case some of the hotels wouldn't get an increase for six or seven years.

As I said before, Mr. Speaker, I am not prepared to fight inflation on the backs of the poor. It is only too apparent that for a good number of people in our society poverty has become a way of life — an ugly subculture in Canadian society. We have only to reflect on recent press reports of the incidents and situations in the downtown core areas of our own cities in Saskatchewan to remind us of this fact. This should be unacceptable to us all — any change will only occur on the basis of joint responsibility.

Mr. Speaker, from ministers in charge of the Department of Social Services, and I make no distinction here as far as parties are concerned, clearly pointed out that there is only one common factor shared by all of the poor — and that is that they lack money. It follows, therefore, that if we are serious about preventing poverty, all of us must accept the principle of income redistribution. I want to emphasize that this is not accomplished by providing more window-dressing.

Some people, and I can think of a few Members opposite, would have us believe that there is really nothing wrong with our present so-called 'capitalist' or free enterprise system. Such people continue to maintain this despite the obvious shortcomings which we have witnessed over the past few years.

But I don't accept this — our New Democratic Government doesn't accept this — and neither, Mr. Speaker, do the people of Saskatchewan.

Canada's social security system as it exists today is a chaotic accumulation of good intentions gone out of whack. I suggest to you, Mr. Speaker, and to the Members of this House, that this is not so much a result of what programs have been operated, but rather a result of what programs have been omitted. Problems exist today not because of action — but rather because of inaction.

Since 1971 the Government of Saskatchewan has urged the Federal Government to establish tangible programs in the area of income security. My predecessors in Social services fought for a major restructuring of Canada's social and income security programs — generally to no avail. Mr. Speaker, this government will continue to press other provinces and the Federal Government to implement a single-tiered income security system — one which ensures for all a basic income; an income level which is above the poverty line and one which relates to community standards.

Fortunately the Government of Saskatchewan took decisive action in the areas of income and social security. For the benefit of those across the floor I will review some of this progress.

Mr. Speaker, the people of Saskatchewan demanded a better deal in terms of health services, particularly for the sick and the aged. They wanted a removal of deterrent fees, they wanted an expansion of health services and they got it. Since 1971 the Government removed those deterrent fees and medical premiums, implemented the Hearing Aid Program, implemented the Denticare Program provided aids for independent living for the handicapped and most recently provided a Prescription Drug Program. These are benefits which the people of Saskatchewan enjoy because of the foresight of this government. Nowhere else on this continent will one find such a varied and effective array of essential services.

Let me Mr. Speaker, turn for a moment to the Family Income Plan. Through the leadership of the Government the people of Saskatchewan became aware that social security programs had a basic flaw, that is they were leaving out the working poor. In response, Saskatchewan introduced a Family Income Plan. The Family Income Plan recognizes that you cannot expect people to work for less than current public assistance levels. When the Family Income Plan was introduced by the former Minister Alex Taylor in 1974 he emphasized that a review would occur after one year. This year the Department of Social Services is planning to improve the Family Income Plan through a new auditing procedure and through reconsideration of benefit levels. In this respect eligibility for the Family Income Plan will be changed with respect to some self-employed individuals. These changes will more realistically assure the public that the Family Income Plan is available to families with low incomes and this assurance will come about through a more realistic determination of income. At the present time approximately 19,000 families are in receipt of Family Income Plan benefits. This amounts to approximately \$1,777,000 per month. This program goes a long way to assist low income families in maintaining an adequate lifestyle for themselves and their children. Let me say also, Mr. Speaker, at this time that we know that this program has had some difficulties. But that shouldn't mean that we throw out the whole program. Let's re-examine it. Let's take out those things that permit people to abuse the program and better it for those working poor.

I want to turn for a moment to CORE Services. Mr. Speaker, the people of Saskatchewan became aware that through our various programs and services and perhaps unintentionally, we were ostracizing and isolating the mentally and physically handicapped. The people of Saskatchewan demanded a change. In response the Government of Saskatchewan established CORE Services Administration. Through CORE Services the Provincial Government committed itself to humanizing the lives of the disadvantaged. In this respect a community-based approach in the provision of programs and services has been instituted. Aside from new and expanded services, CORE has worked toward the co-ordination of those services provided by the Department of Health, Education and Social Services for the betterment of the mentally and physically handicapped. Mr. Speaker, since its implementation CORE Services has been well received by both handicapped groups themselves and groups working with the handicapped.

I must admit that much of the credit for the success of CORE Services can be directly attributed to community groups and organizations who have been sensitive to the needs of other members of their community. Mr. Speaker, I can assure you that this will continue and will be a priority in my term of office.

Some criticism, Mr. Speaker, has been directed at our programs to senior citizens. I wish to make a few comments in that regard.

First of all, let me direct the Member for Saskatoon-Sutherland (Mrs. Edwards) to Hansard, a speech that I made last year on senior citizens and compare the contributions to senior citizens under an NDP government in the last four years and those made by the former government. For her edification I will go through some of these now.

Mr. Speaker, the elderly people of Saskatchewan along with those groups who are concerned about services to the elderly felt that some changes had to be made. In recognition of this and in co-operation with the senior citizens of Saskatchewan the Government of Saskatchewan responded. Since 1971 the Saskatchewan government has built and/or approved 2,032 nursing beds, for Levels I, II and III. Since 1971 the Government of Saskatchewan has introduced a subsidy program for residents and guests. This compares to nothing in 1971. In 1971 no money whatsoever was appropriated for community services for the elderly. Today over \$4 million is available. During our first term in office a Senior Citizens' Home Repair Program was introduced. In 1975 this program amounted to \$4.6 million. In 1971, there was nothing. In 1971 the Home Owner Grants for senior citizens amounted to \$1 million. This year the Property Improvement Grants equalled \$4 million. This year \$100,000 was appropriated for the establishment of a Senior Citizen's Provincial Council. Furthermore in light of inflation and Federal Government inaction the provincial NDP government introduced the Senior Citizens' Benefits Program. In October of 1975 approximately 38,000 senior citizens received benefits for a total of about \$610,000 in that month alone. Mr. Speaker, the tally for these comparative figures is as follows. For 1971 approximately one-half million dollars. For 1975/76 approximately \$49,300,000. This is factual, concrete evidence of this government's commitment to provide tangible services to the elderly citizens of Saskatchewan.

**SOME HON. MEMBERS:** — Hear, hear!

**MR. ROLFES:** — As I mentioned previously the Provincial Government also implemented the Hearing Aid Program, the SAIL Program, the Prescription Drug Program and Home Care Services throughout the province. Furthermore we established a Senior Citizen's Commission. This body nurtured leadership and helped the elderly citizens of this province to frame appropriate government action. The result was the establishment of the provincial Senior Citizens' Council and a special branch for senior citizens within the Department of Social Services. Both of these will provide critical assistance to our senior citizens so that they may better set their priorities and the services necessary therein. With regard to Saskatchewan's older adults, they can look forward to a greater input into services and programs which affect their affairs. In the months ahead the Provincial Senior

Citizens' Council will be working with other senior citizens throughout Saskatchewan in order to establish local Senior Citizen Councils. Such councils will have direct input into social policy for older adults in their own communities. Such future action will complement local projects and services which have come into existence since 1971. Today there are just under 300 community-based projects for senior citizens in existence. This compares with 21 projects which were in existence in June of 1971. Credit for these programs undoubtedly must go to the local groups and people involved, however leadership from the New Democratic Government of Saskatchewan has been essential in this regard.

Mr. Speaker, the record of this Government in providing meaningful social services is indeed impressive. Unfortunately the Members opposite have consistently displayed their ability to confuse the facts. Therefore, in one last ditch attempt to help them understand, I will review some of the facts.

The Saskatchewan Assistance Plan appears to be one of the major areas in which they totally misunderstand. From my recollection of various incidents and advertisements in a recent election campaign there is much need for education. Mr. Speaker, as an example, I have before me an advertisement which one of the Liberal Members used during their recent election campaign. The advertisement states, and I quote:

That welfare in Saskatchewan has tripled in the last four years.

**SOME HON. MEMBERS:** — Hear, hear!

**MR. ROLFES:** — The advertisement goes on to state erroneous figures in comparing expenditures from 1971 to 1975. The advertisement then stated, and I quote further:

A Liberal candidate feels that we must reduce welfare abuse.

Mr. Speaker, I should like to present some of the facts. I don't disagree with the Member that welfare abuse must be eradicated. But I think it is incumbent upon that Member if he knows of abuse to report those abuses to the authorities. Then, and then only can we act. The Department of Social Services' total budget for 1975-76 is \$137,347,780. Of this total amount the sub-vote for Saskatchewan Assistance Plan, and this is the one that they constantly criticize, is \$54,600,000, or 39.75 per cent of the total. In comparison the 1971-72 budget, which was the last budget prepared by the Liberal government, had a total Saskatchewan Assistance Plan expenditure of \$41,336,598, or 71 per cent of the total budget. Seventy-one per cent compared to 39 per cent on the Saskatchewan Assistance Plan (of the total budget). Mr. Speaker, it is obvious that the facts do not support the allegation.

**SOME HON. MEMBERS:** — Hear, hear!

**MR. ROLFES:** — This advertisement is totally derogatory. There is little doubt that it was purposely designed to mislead and to play upon prejudices which unfortunately exist in our society. The approach of certain individuals (and it's a sad indictment)



has been to seek political advantage by harassing the poor and discrediting the needy. Such an approach is a despicable game. However, even if one agrees to use such a deplorable technique, the figures simply don't back up the allegations. In 1971 the Liberals spent 71 per cent of the Department's budget on what they called 'welfare.' Today, only 39.75 per cent of the total budget is spent for the same purpose. Mr. Speaker, this is a shameful demonstration of their social irresponsibility. It is noteworthy that 60 per cent, or approximately \$77 million of this department's budget for this fiscal year is for non-SAP programs, i.e. for programs like nursing homes, adoptions, corrections, assisting youth in conflict with the law, etc.

Certainly the budget costs for the Saskatchewan Assistance Plan have increased since 1971. The budget has increased, but the Government of Saskatchewan has no intention of denying this. The increase has been approximately \$12,763,000 or about 10 per cent. Since 1971 two things have occurred in regard to social assistance. First, the total number of people in receipt of public assistance has declined substantially; and secondly, benefit levels have been raised in accordance with actual increases in the cost of living. Let me give you a few specific examples. With regard to the level of benefits let's use a family of four, two parents and two children. Of course, I will not include rental or utility costs since actual rates were provided both in 1975 and 1971. In 1971 this family of four (and please note) in 1971 this family of four had a maximum entitlement of \$149.10. This year their maximum entitlement is \$290. This is an increase of just under 100 per cent in just four and a half years.

With regard to these increases some people may say that this is inflationary. As I said before, Mr. Speaker, I am not prepared to fight inflation on the backs of the poor and neither is the NDP government.

**SOME HON. MEMBERS:** — Hear, hear!

**MR. ROLFES:** — With regard to the reduced number of people in receipt of public assistance there has been a substantial decline. At the end of 1971, the last year for which the Liberal Government was responsible for programs and services to the people of Saskatchewan, there were approximately 58,500 people on the Saskatchewan Assistance Plan payroll.

**MR. LANE:** — Taylor said 52.

**MR. ROLFES:** — I said, approximately, if you will open your ears and listen.

In September, 1975, three and one-half years later, this number was reduced to approximately 36,500. This is a decrease of about 22,000 people.

**SOME HON. MEMBERS:** — Hear, hear!

**MR. ROLFES:** — These individuals are now working and serving as members of their community. Perhaps of more importance is the fact that this verifies, despite what some Members opposite say, that employable people, who through no fault of their own end up

in need of public assistance, are only too willing to work if given the chance.

The breakdown for the current caseload for the Department of Social Services is as follows. I think this is worthy to note again: 58.9 per cent of all persons receiving assistance in September of 1975 were either senior citizens or handicapped people; 21.7 per cent were single parent families, and of the remaining amount only about 3.9 per cent are considered to be fully employable. Mr. Speaker, on the basis of these facts and figures it is utter nonsense to suggest that there is any rip-off whatsoever. Obviously there are a few abuses, there are a few in every system, but I suggest that it is totally irresponsible for any Member to suggest otherwise to the people of Saskatchewan.

Mr. Speaker, the results which I have just referred to testify to the success, not only of Saskatchewan's economy, but also of those programs offered by the Department of Social Services and to the competence and hard work of the staff members of the Department of Social Services.

One of the new program directions of the Department of Social Services has been in the area of employment creation programs. In this respect the Employment Support Program, the Work Preparation Centres and the Work Activity Programs, along with the work incentives of the Family Income Plan have gone a long way toward providing jobs for thousands of people in this province.

Take the Employment Support Program, for example. In the last two and one-half years since the program started it has provided funding to client and community organizations so that they could engage in a wide range of activities which involved actual work situations. Since the introduction of the Employment Support Program 27,160 man weeks of employment have been created. During this same period of time, 1,325 positions have been available and 1,526 people utilized these positions. The Employment Support Program results in an actual saving to the Provincial Government of approximately \$40 per month for each worker. This means a total saving to the province of over \$265,000.

Of more importance, obviously, are the social benefits and these, of course, are immeasurable. Self-confidence, integrity, self-respect are attitudes which are seldom obtained while an individual is in a state of complete dependency. The Employment Support Program in Saskatchewan and our other job creation efforts, are indeed a major success story. Since the inception of the Employment Support Program, only about 19 per cent of those involved have returned at one time or another to the Saskatchewan Assistance Plan and in these cases most of them returned for health reasons, family reasons or simply due to the fact that there were not suitable employment opportunities in their own local community. Mr. Speaker, it is obvious that subsidized employment is better than subsidized unemployment.

Mr. Speaker, as Minister of Social Services I welcome some of the Federal Government's attempts to arrest spiralling inflation. Unfortunately their program is far short of being adequate. Common sense tells us all that food, shelter and heat are critical essentials, yet the federal plan takes none of these into account. While the price of basic food commodities

has increased anywhere from five to 30 per cent in the last couple of months. Ottawa is standing idly by. The indifference is totally unacceptable and as in the past, this government will be using its total resources to impress upon Ottawa the need for vital price controls. In this respect Saskatchewan's policy of monitoring price increases throughout the province should be of considerable assistance to low income people.

Mr. Speaker, I also welcome the initiatives in the Throne Speech in the areas of housing and rent controls. The increase in serviced lots, the expansion in provincial housing assistance programs and the encouragement of the co-op housing ventures will greatly assist in reducing the extreme housing shortage. In addition, I welcome the proposed increase in the minimum wage. This will be well received by many of those who are working on a very low income and trying to contend with the extreme burdens of inflation. Along this line the Department of Social Services has been reviewing its Saskatchewan Assistance Plan benefits and in the near future increased rates will be forthcoming.

Mr. Speaker, since the Members opposite have already indicated, through their spokesman, the Member for Wilkie (Miss Clifford) that she would like to have benefits increased for those who are worthy of receiving benefits, I know that we will receive wholehearted support from the Members opposite when I make that announcement.

**SOME HON. MEMBERS:** — Hear, hear!

**MR. ROLFES:** — Another major responsibility of the Department of Social Services is the area of corrections. In this field several unique and meaningful programs have been pioneered during the NDP government's first term in office. I should like to draw your attention to the Fine Option Program, the Probation Program and the Community Work Training Program.

The Fine Option Program provides an alternative to jail for those people who are unable to pay fines. Instead of a jail sentence the program allows for fines to be worked off through community projects. This program has met with considerable success. Since the program began in January of 1975, 473 persons participated and worked off fines equal to \$27,380 or equivalent to 6,000 jail days. The benefits of this program are twofold. First the program offers a more humane approach to persons who are sentenced to fines and it also removes an unnecessary cost for the taxpayer.

Community corrections services have been expanded in the last four years of this Government. The probation officer staff has been doubled and now includes persons of Native ancestry. In addition, five community training residences have been opened in various centres providing services to approximately 1,000 people.

As a result of the increased community correctional services the demand on institutions has remained relatively constant. Comparative statistics from September 30, 1975 to the 1971-72 year offer us evidence as to the success of the programs available. In 1971-72 there were 2,595 people on probation in Saskatchewan. In September of 1975 this had been reduced to 2,097 people. In 1971-72 there was a total of 5,528 people in Saskatchewan's correctional centres. Let me repeat that — 5,528

people. In September of 1975 this had been reduced to 2,677.

**SOME HON. MEMBERS:** — Hear, hear!

**MR. ROLFES:** — Mr. Speaker, you and the Members of this House may also be aware of the department's most recent initiative in the area of corrections. Public hearings are now being held in 14 Saskatchewan centres, including Indian reserves and correctional institutions so as to obtain the public's views on the future development of corrections services in this province. This is but another example of this government's effort to involve the public in the future development of social policies for the people of Saskatchewan.

Another program of the Department of Social Services is day care. Today, residents of Saskatchewan who are in need of child care services can utilize either day care centres or family day care services. Mr. Speaker, the day care program is providing an important additional resource to these families in need of child care services. The following facts bear this out. On all children subsidized under the day care program 87 per cent were from single parent families. In addition, of all children being subsidized 73 per cent of them came from families with an income of \$7,000 or less. A further figure which is of interest is that 78 per cent of all children were using day care services because their parents were working. Another 19 per cent of all parents were attending educational or training classes. These figures speak for themselves and emphasize the importance of this program to families and children in Saskatchewan.

Mr. Speaker, over the next few years it is my intention to emphasize preventive services. I am speaking of the prevention of family breakdown, slums, battered children, malnutrition, alcoholism, drug abuse and the problems faced by our Indian and Metis citizens.

I hesitate to remind this House of the urgency of some of these situations. I am not so naive, Mr. Speaker, to think that I will be able to solve all of these problems, or that this government will, but I think we must at least make an attempt to try and find some solutions. These problems demand our attention, they are screaming for resolution. My department and this government are committed to addressing ourselves to these difficulties. The time is long past when the people of Saskatchewan can view these events neutrally. There is no escape from the value choices we face, no longer can we view the area of social policy as a closed and separate system of welfare for a particular group within our society. Mr. Speaker, I am talking about an essential re-ordering of our social priorities and responsibilities.

Toward these ends the Department of Social Services will be giving particular emphasis to new approaches within existing problems. For example, the provision of family counselling services throughout the province of Saskatchewan is an important preventive resource. In the months ahead staff of the Department of Social Services will be giving this their foremost attention.

Another area which will be receiving additional attention is the issue of decentralization of government services. Decentralization obviously means greater access to services by

the public. But decentralization also means more than this. It means real and first-hand input and participation by the public at the local level so that services and programs available in their communities are relevant to the needs and requirements which exist.

Tied in with the matter of decentralization is that of co-ordination of services. Mr. Speaker, this is an area which will be receiving considerable attention.

Over the past few years CORE Services Administration has provided some important leadership in this area. What CORE has done in the area of services for the mentally retarded deserves full credit. Dr. Graham Clarkson, a noted consultant in the field of health services and mental retardation, spoke at a recent national conference in Calgary. He stated that Saskatchewan is the only province in the Dominion that has taken definite steps to resolve the dilemmas facing the handicapped through the formation of CORE Services Administration and the provision of effective community based services.

Mr. Speaker, if we talk seriously about prevention of the social problems we now face, then we have to reconsider what we mean by community programs, ways and means have to be found so that communities will be encouraged to accept responsibility for the delivery of services to their fellow community members. Obviously this will mean community agencies with real decision making authority, community bodies which will be involved in the most optimum planning of services for their fellow man. Obviously it will mean that some services would be different from one town to another, but this is in fact what reality requires. The people of this province have a long history of involvement in decisions which affect them. The people of this province have demonstrated through existing community structures, voluntary agencies and other associations that they are prepared and willing to take on this responsibility.

Mr. Speaker, we must stress local services in addition to income security, rehabilitation instead of relief, and training for useful work instead of prolonged dependency. Our objective is to prevent or reduce dependency and to encourage self-care and self-support in order to maintain family life at a standard where it is adequate. The provision of appropriate human resources to help people and families in trouble to better cope with their problems is what this is all about.

In fact, this is what the New Democratic Government is all about, Mr. Speaker.

Mr. Speaker, I was proud to be able to participate in this debate. I am also very proud of the programs that the Throne Speech provides for us for the future. Therefore, in my conclusion, I am sure you can deduce that I will support the Motion.

**SOME HON. MEMBERS:** — Hear, hear!

**MR. C.P. MacDONALD (Indian Head-Wolseley):** — Mr. Speaker, I certainly enjoyed the Minister of Social Services' (Mr. Rolfes) dialogue, attempting to justify the tens of millions of dollars of increased welfare expenditures in Saskatchewan. Unfortunately, what he did fail to tell the Members of this House, that all he really did was transfer the

November 25, 1975

Saskatchewan Assistance Plan to three different areas of government expenditure. First of all, he transferred them to the Family Income Plan which is the biggest scandal of any welfare program in the Dominion of Canada. There are more abuses, more illegitimate claims, more people with assets, more people receiving the Family Income payments that they do not deserve than any other welfare program in the Dominion of Canada.

**SOME HON. MEMBERS:** — Hear, hear!

**MR. MacDONALD:** — The second thing they did, Mr. Speaker, they transferred all the recipients in northern Saskatchewan to the Department of Northern Saskatchewan

**MR. STEUART:** — Then they hired most of them!

**MR. MacDONALD:** — . . . that's right, then they hired most of them.

The third thing they did, they took all the senior citizens in Saskatchewan who are receiving grants and Saskatchewan Assistance Plan to enable them to help payments in nursing homes and gave them a direct subsidy, and all they did was to transfer the payments from one pocket to the other.

Let's not kid ourselves, Mr. Speaker, this Government over there has spent more on welfare than any government in the Dominion of Canada.

**SOME HON. MEMBERS:** — Hear, hear!

**MR. MacDONALD:** — It is kind of interesting, Mr. Speaker, to hear the Minister stand up make an apology for the Premier and the Government for ignoring the senior citizens in the Throne Speech. To give that recitation of Alex Taylor's that we have listened to so often, about the senior citizens, when just two or three day ago, a whole delegation was in Regina telling this government they had failed in their responsibility to senior citizens, that they failed in their obligation to keep up with inflation. Your apology will not be accepted by the senior citizens, when the one group in the province of Saskatchewan who turn around and receive the benefits of inflation have been completely ignored.

In a few moments you, sir, are going to stand on your feet and ask us to vote for a Speech from the Throne that asks the Members of this Legislature to vote for a \$2 billion gamble. A \$2 billion gamble! A government sitting across the way which have neither the economic sense, the economic understanding nor the economic appreciate of the complications of the decision that they are asking us to make here tonight.

**SOME HON. MEMBERS:** — Hear, hear!

**MR. MacDONALD:** — Each one, Mr. Speaker, has stood on his feet from the Premier down and mouthed socialist gobbledygook and mother move and refused to provide any rational information to Members of this House, to the public or to the Members of the Press. They have asked us to vote and to act like river-boat gamblers. Surely, Mr. Speaker, in a decision of the magnitude that this

Government is presenting in this Throne Speech they have an obligation and a very serious obligation to put their case, to be honest with the public, to quit deception, to present the facts and outline their position. This, Mr. Speaker, they have failed to do beyond comprehension. If you can imagine, the Minister, the Provincial Secretary standing on his feet — he is an intelligent man, he normally gives a fair speech (if I reread that speech I would be ashamed) — on the verge of seizing an industry worth \$2 billion and not even have the courage to stand up and discuss it before the public.

**SOME HON. MEMBERS:** — Hear, hear!

**MR. MacDONALD:** — Mr. Speaker, the Government, the Press and the Progressive Conservative Party have failed in their responsibility to inform the public of the province of Saskatchewan of the magnitude of what they are doing. The Members across there have stood up like puppets, Mr. Speaker, Member after Member and asked us to vote for a policy that will destroy the public confidence and jeopardize the economic future of this province for years to come.

Surely we have the right as Members of opposition, surely the public of Saskatchewan have the right to demand that the government stand up here and point out the complications of the legislation before us. I watched a television interview last night, or the night before, where the cameras interviewed ten or 12 people and only one or two had had the opportunity to realize what was going on in this legislature at this time and at this moment. Is this not the responsibility of Members of the opposition as well as the government to ensure that everybody in the province of Saskatchewan is informed? Instead of that, what are they doing?

The Attorney General is attempting to ram down our throats a bill that will confiscate, expropriate \$2 billion worth of private industry in the Province of Saskatchewan.

**SOME HON. MEMBERS:** — Hear, hear!

**MR. MacDONALD:** — Mr. Speaker, I wonder if the Press realize that this is the second occasion. We watched the Premier and the Attorney General do this a couple of years ago, with another Bill, called Bill 42. We watched exactly the same pattern, a fall session, a session where the Premier announced would be the specific purpose of laying legislation on the table, adjourning the House, giving the public two or three months to review it, to respond, to study, to give Members of the opposition the opportunity to put their case across to the public. Instead of that, the Attorney General, tomorrow afternoon will attempt to ram that Bill through this House before anyone in the Province of Saskatchewan understands it, including the Press, the Conservatives and even Members of this opposition and even the Government.

Mr. Speaker, we watched the ramifications the last time they put forth this performance, we watched the ramifications of Bill 42. What happened, Mr. Speaker, it destroyed the economic viability of the oil industry in the private sector in the province of Saskatchewan. Community after community turned around and lost local Saskatchewan citizens and private

businessmen. We watched technical people who had developed a skill and an expertise to contribute to our economy and to this province who were forced to leave this province, at a time when Canada and the world was suffering an energy crisis. That government and Bill 42 destroyed for the next five or ten years the opportunity for the private sector to explore and develop the potentials beneath our soil in the oil industry.

Now, Mr. Speaker, the Attorney General, the Premier and that Government come in here and ask us to do the same thing, ram that Bill down our throats, to turn around and pass it in two or three days, before even the potash companies, before the public of Saskatchewan have had an opportunity to understand it. I say to the Press, it is their responsibility to see that this does not happen. Potash has been here for thousands of years and it will be here for thousands of years in the future. The taxes are paid, there is no rush, absolutely no rush at all and you know it. You can leave that Bill on the table, you can give the opportunity for public education and discussion. Not only that, give the public an opportunity to find out if the Premier is telling the truth. That's the important thing. Up until this time, he has not levelled with the public of Saskatchewan, he hasn't levelled with the people and he hasn't levelled with the Members of this House.

**MR. MESSER:** — That's a serious accusation!

**MR. MacDONALD:** — It is! Already this afternoon, members of the potash industry were in providing information to the Premier. What has he got to hide? Why is he trying to jam this Bill down our throats? Is it because they know if the public have an understanding of what is going on that they will reject the NDP policy.

Mr. Speaker, I want to say that I don't think there is any Member in this House who enjoys the exchange of ideas and enjoys the public debate as I do. Mr. Speaker, I have never stood in this House, I have never had less respect for this Assembly, this Government, and for the position that I hold than I do right now, when I watch the actions of that Government in trying to ram this Bill down the public's throats and down the throat of this Legislature.

Mr. Speaker, I have watched this Bill with a certain degree of foreboding. For the province that I was born and raised in I have a genuine concern that the Government is betraying the very trust by which they were elected in June. A spirit of anger and frustration that a group of men, because of narrow doctrinaire policy, individual greed and a hatred of the free-enterprise system would turn around and present a bill of this kind. A sense of regret also that this decision may well affect and jeopardize the future of the people of this province for years to come.

I want to say a word to the Conservatives to my left. Mr. Speaker, if there has been anything in this House that has been a disappointment to me, it has been the performance of that seven Members over there. The Progressive Conservative Party in this country has a great tradition, a tradition of presenting the alternative, the alternative to socialism, government control and government ownership. They have always presented the viewpoint that free-enterprise is the method of the development of this country.



Mr. Speaker, they have remained silent! It reminds me of the saying about “Nero fiddling while Rome burned”. The Conservatives remain silent while free-enterprise is burned in the province of Saskatchewan. The Leader of the Conservative Party has an opportunity to stand up in this House and for one hour tell the people of Saskatchewan, the principles that he advocates and what his party stands for in this moment of crisis. He took 20 minutes and then let that Marxist from Yorkton (Mr. Nelson) stand up and preach that gobbledygook to the province of Saskatchewan for the rest of the 40 minutes. I am not sure if their silence is not tacit approval. I am not sure. I am going to assure you and tell my Conservative friends, that in this Assembly you don’t command respect, you earn it. The way you earn respect is by performance. You have not performed.

I will also tell you, you don’t stand up in this House and tell us how diligent and hard working they are, you demonstrate it. You demonstrate it in here. I should like to suggest you compare it to the job that has been done by those young Members here. Rarely, Mr. Speaker, have I seen a group of young people come into this legislature and do the job that they have done. I’ll tell the Conservatives, they will be run out of this House unless they stand up and fight for what they believe.

**SOME HON. MEMBERS:** — Hear, hear!

**MR. MacDONALD:** — I am going to tell the NDP that they are going to run them right out of this legislature in 1979. Mr. Speaker, I haven’t got very long, but I want to take a very few moments . . . I want to hope that you will set aside that Bill tomorrow. I want to make it very clear what the position of the Liberal caucus is.

1. This is a bad business deal, that you are attempting to ram through this House, so that you can hide it from the people of Saskatchewan.

2. We oppose the principle of government ownership and control in management of the very social and economic fabric of our life.

**SOME HON. MEMBERS:** — Hear, hear!

**MR. MacDONALD:** — Mr. Speaker, is this a good financial deal, that’s the basic question? Mr. Speaker, the NDP mouthed platitudes, “the people own the resources, the resources should be for the benefit of the people.” Mr. Speaker, that is not the subject of this debate and they know it. The subject of this debate is: how can the benefits of our resources be transferred to the people? Is it: (1) by private ownership, then by taxation policies and management? Or is it by (2) government ownership, confiscation and expropriation? That is the subject of this debate.

How do those benefits get to the people? Mr. Speaker, let me ask you what fool, what fool over there, would buy a farm in Esterhazy when he can sit in Regina in a comfortable house, never see the farm, never spend a five cent piece on the asset, never buy the machinery, never pay for the seed or the chemicals or the fertilizer, never pay for the labor and receive 80 per cent of the profit while sitting in Regina? What fool would buy

November 25, 1975

a business in the city of Saskatoon and he doesn't even know where it exists, he pays no rent, no power, no light, he pays for no staff, he pay for none of the materials for sale and he received 80 per cent of the profit? The only fools in the Dominion of Canada who would act like that are the fools that are in office, Mr. Speaker, and it is those people who have never invested a ten cent piece in their life. The only gamble they have ever had is a two-bit poker game.

The potash industry claims that pre tax funds or after tax fund, that 80 to 81 per cent go to Canadian Government taxes. The Premier says I don't believe it but the potash company has volunteered to put an independent commissioner to take their books, assess them and report to the public. I challenge the Premier, who says I don't agree with independent commissioners. When you turn around and do what you are doing with the potash industry, I say let's have an independent commissioner stand up and find out if the Premier is telling the truth or the potash industry. Why does he refuse to let an independent arbitrator assess whether or not 75 or 85 per cent is paid in taxes?

What is the present situation, Mr. Speaker? Before the Government does anything without any investment and any risk, the people of Saskatchewan are receiving approximately \$140 million from the potash industry; \$120 million in provincial taxes approximately, plus their share of the federal corporate tax. One hundred and forty million dollars with no risk, no expertise, no gamble, nothing. Mr. Speaker, no industry in the Dominion of Canada is taxed to the extent that the potash industry is. None. Would the Minister of Mineral Resources in his old insurance business give 80 per cent of his profits to the Government? Would Jack Messer, the Minister of Industry and Commerce turn around and give 80 per cent of his profits from his farm to the Government? Mr. Speaker, no, no government has ever taxed any industry or any group of people who have come to the Dominion of Canada, not even in the banana republics, no one, Mr. Speaker. Then, Mr. Speaker, the Premier stands up on is feet and he challenges the Liberals and the Leader of the Opposition. He makes to statements and I quote: he dismisses the Leader of the Opposition's financial statement as meaningless. A potash mine which produces 1.2 million tons of KCL which has a present value of \$225 million, or almost \$200 per ton of capacity, this must be regarded as too high a figure. 2. Similarly his calculations of sales prices was too low. Once again the Premier is playing with the truth. The Leader of the Opposition said the production was 1.2 million. The capacity of that mine is 1.5. And I challenge the government to present on the table of this House the feasibility study for Bredenbury, then we will find out if it is \$150 per ton of production, or \$200. Whether a mine today is worth \$225 million or not.

Then he turns around and he says the selling price is too low. I am not sure if the Premier is up-to-date. The selling price of potash has gone to \$70 per K<sub>2</sub>O or \$42 which is 60 per cent of production in the mine. The Premier knows that and he knows it as clearly as does the Minister of Mineral Resources. Mr. Speaker, the people of Saskatchewan are benefiting \$140 million a year form this industry. Now the government will purchase this at approximately \$2 billion at fair prices if the market value has not changed.

What an Act, one clause says it will be fair market value and then the Attorney General and his legal friends have

enumerated five or six or seven clauses to show that it won't be fair market value. Mr. Speaker, there is no guarantee of expertise, no guarantee of market. The Premier knows that from July to October in 1975 compared to July to October in 1974 the potash markets have diminished by 20 per cent. He knows, for example, in Russia which has the biggest and richest potash deposits in the world will crack the United States market one million tons in 1978 with a deal with Occidental. He knows that European markets for potash for the first time is now in Brazil. He also knows that the Japanese are looking at the Thai deposit for development. There is no guarantee, Mr. Speaker. He also knows the price is dropping, the future of this industry is not as bright and rosy. Every speaker stands on his feet and talks about those dirty Americans, those foreign capitalists.

Where are you going to get the money to buy those mines? The Canadian bond market will never stand it. You know you have to go to foreign sources and if you borrow \$2 billion or \$1.5 billion, there will be \$150 or \$100 million going below the border, far more than the potash industry is making today.

**SOME HON. MEMBERS:** — Hear, hear!

**MR. MacDONALD:** — What excuse do they use, Mr. Speaker? They use the excuse of legality. Why, the potash people are taking us to court? I suggest to you that the constitution of this country is not to protect the Provincial Government; it is to protect the citizens. Individual or corporate, they have the freedom and the right.

He talks about expansion What Member over on that side of the House would expand any industry? What Member on this side or anyone in Saskatchewan? Six per cent return on their investment, they haven't even retired their debt. They can't even pay their interest or depreciation. I say that the Premier deliberately designed the reserve tax to prevent expansion. He knew that the implications of that tax would destroy any opportunities for the Saskatchewan potash industry to expand in Saskatchewan. He knew the result, Mr. Speaker, of providing only a six per cent return on their investment before the original debt and capital investment was paid back, before any returns to their shareholders. One of the potash companies in Saskatchewan has been here 20 years and over that 20 years they still haven't shown a profit, when it is amortized over that 20 years. Then they turn around and ask the people of Saskatchewan to support a Throne Speech that projects that kind of a bill. I say, Mr. Speaker, it is dishonest, it is deceitful. The government has a responsibility not to proceed with the second reading of the Bill for the next three months. And I say, Mr. Speaker, if they fail in that responsibility they are abrogating the very responsibility they were elected for. And I challenge that government because I am going to tell you this opposition is going to fight, fight that legislation so that the people of this province will know what kind of jeopardy, instead of \$140 million a year to build roads and hospitals and schools, they will have nothing. It will be paid out of the individual taxpayer's pocket.

Mr. Speaker, as you can presume I am not going to vote for the Throne Speech.

**SOME HON. MEMBERS:** — Hear, hear!

November 25, 1975

The question being put on the Motion, it was agreed to on the following recorded division:

YEAS — 29

Blakeney	Mostoway	Tchorzewski
Pepper	Larson	Matsalla
Bowerman	Whelan	Skoberg
Romanow	Dyck	Nelson (Yorkton)
Messer	McNeill	Allen
Snyder	MacAuley	Allen
Byers	Feschuk	Koskie
Baker	Shillington	Johnson
Faris	Rolfes	Thompson
Robbins	Cowley	Banda

NAYS — 21

Steuart	Edwards	Collver
Stodalka	Nelson (Assiniboia- Gravelbourg)	Larter
Lane	Clifford	Bailey
Wiebe	Merchant	Berntson
Malone	McMillan	Ham
MacDonald	Thatcher	Katzman
Penner		Birkbeck
Cameron		

**HON. R.J. ROMANOW (Attorney General):** — Mr. Speaker, I move, seconded by the Hon. the Premier (Mr. Blakeney):

That the said Address be engrossed and presented to His Honour the Lieutenant-Governor by such Members of the Assembly as are of the Executive Council.

Motion agreed to.

The Assembly adjourned at 9:10 o'clock p.m.