

LEGISLATIVE ASSEMBLY OF SASKATCHEWAN
Third Session - Sixteenth Legislature
4th Day

Thursday, February 19, 1970

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

On the Orders of the Day

WELCOME TO STUDENTS

Mr. Speaker: — I would like to introduce to the Legislature the following groups of school children and others seated in the galleries. From the Al Pickard school, represented by the Member from Regina North West (Mr. Whelan) 30 students under the direction of their teacher, Mrs. Harvey, seated in the east gallery; 36 Air Cadets from Leader, Saskatchewan, from the constituency represented by the Hon. Minister of Natural Resources (Mr. Barrie), under their leader Mr. Clary. In the Speaker's gallery, 23 students from Wisetown elementary school in the constituency of Elrose, represented by Mr. Leith, under the direction of Mrs. K. R. Powell, principal. In the west gallery 15 students from Dieppe school, Regina North West, represented by Mr. Whelan. In the east gallery, 44 students from Briercrest public school in the constituency of Milestone, represented by the Hon. C. P. MacDonald, Minister of Social Welfare, under the direction of Mr. L. E. Smith; 34 students from Hepburn high school from the constituency of Rosthern, represented by the Minister of Highways, Hon. D. Boldt, under the direction of Mr. Kabatoff, their principal. They are in the east gallery; 60 students from Caronport high school in the constituency of Morse, represented by the Hon. Premier (Mr. Thatcher) under the direction of Mr. Hepler. They are in the Speaker's gallery; 25 students from Campbell Collegiate, Regina South, represented by the Minister of Public Health (Mr. Grant), under the direction of Mr. Unger. In the west gallery 11 students from Rouleau school in the constituency of Milestone, represented by the Minister of Social Welfare (Mr. MacDonald).

I am sure that all Members would wish to join with me in extending to each and every one of these students a very warm welcome to our Legislature. I trust that their stay here will be interesting and informative and that they will all enjoy a safe trip home.

Hon. Members: — Hear, hear!

QUESTIONS

Cutback of Employees

Mr. W. G. Davies (Moose Jaw South): — Mr. Speaker, I would like to ask the Government this question: whether 40 or more employees within the Department of Natural Resources either have received or will be receiving their notices shortly, and whether it is true that similar substantial cutbacks in the number of employees are expected shortly in other departments. If these reports are accurate would the Government reconsider such action in view of the contributing damage to an already serious economic situation that has been caused by heavy unemployment in Saskatchewan?

Hon. J. R. Barrie (Minister of Natural Resources): — In reply to the Member for Moose Jaw South, I would like to say that I am not aware of 40 people being dismissed from the Department of Natural Resources. I don't know where he received his information.

ANNOUNCEMENTS

Second Barter Deal for Wheat

Hon. W. R. Thatcher (Premier): — Mr. Speaker, I have a very brief announcement. I wish to announce that the Government of Saskatchewan has concluded the second barter deal, or if some prefer, an exchange deal for wheat.

Some Hon. Members: — Hear, hear!

Mr. Thatcher: — The contract is for the supply of a \$450 thousand betatron for the Saskatoon Cancer Clinic. It involves wheat and has been awarded to Siemens Medical of Canada Limited.

The Siemens company has arranged for the disposition of a quantity of Saskatchewan wheat on the international market with a value equivalent to the cost of the betatron.

The betatron, a high energy radiation device, will permit improved treatment of cancer patients in the province. The betatron is manufactured in West Germany and will be installed at the Saskatoon Cancer Clinic in conjunction with the approved extension to the University Hospital. Our understanding is that Siemens has disposed of the wheat in Japan.

The exchange mechanism has been worked out with the approval of the Canadian Wheat Board. Mr. Speaker, if the law permitted a more direct approach, may I say that in our opinion barter sales could be greatly expedited. The Government is working on a number of other barter proposals, some of them of fairly major significance.

I hope the Legislature and the people of Saskatchewan will accept this sale as tangible evidence that our Government is lending every effort toward resolving the wheat surplus problem.

Hon. Members: — Hear, hear!

Construction Contracts

Hon. A. R. Guy (Minister of Public Works): — Mr. Speaker, before the Orders of the Day I would like to announce to this House the awarding of three construction contracts. These are being awarded at this time to stimulate construction in the province and provide impetus to the Saskatchewan Government's recently announced Make Work Program.

Planning and scheduling of the projects have been stepped up from previously established time-tables in recognition of the need to encourage more employment now and for the rest of the winter rather than later in the summer when more employment

exists.

The contracts are as follows: Bomac Industries Limited of Saskatoon has been awarded a \$98,000 contract for construction of additions to two schools at Pelican Narrows. Ser-Con Contractors Limited of Regina has been awarded a \$69,800 contract for construction of a recreation hall to serve the Duck Mountain Provincial Park area. McNevin Construction Company Limited of Saskatoon has been awarded a \$54,803 contract for the addition of two rooms to the existing 12-room school at Buffalo Narrows. We feel that the construction industry, the architects and the engineers in this province will appreciate the efforts of the Government to speed up our construction program.

Some Hon. Members: — Hear, hear!

ADJOURNED DEBATES

Address-in-Reply

The Assembly resumed the adjourned debate on the proposed motion by Mr. R. Heggie (Hanley) for an Address-in-Reply.

Mr. W. S. Lloyd (Leader of the Opposition): — Mr. Speaker, I am surprised that only the Premier and one Minister got up to make announcements on radio time. I fully expected the Government to be more versatile than that in using up the time.

The Premier has announced what he calls the most recent effort of the Government of Saskatchewan to dispose of some more wheat. I can assure him that we are very interested in the efforts of the Government in this regard. We hope that it is productive. It is common knowledge, however, that there are a number of people who really don't share his opinion that this kind of effort, well-intentioned as it may be, is doing anything other than muddying the waters of selling wheat.

I have in my hand a copy of an editorial from the Western Producer of January 15th which says, "Isn't it about time the Saskatchewan Government quit fooling itself and the public by describing the deal in terms of barter. It is not barter . . ."

Mr. Thatcher: — Are you opposed?

Mr. Lloyd: — "... but rather a clumsily performed swap that will not likely move one single extra bushel of wheat from Saskatchewan or any other province."

Some Hon. Members: — Hear, hear!

Mr. Lloyd: — I am not opposed, Mr. Speaker, to the efforts of the Saskatchewan Government, but I am opposed to this continual attempt to confuse and to mislead the public that it is doing something when it is doing nothing.

Some Hon. Members: — Hear, hear!

Mr. Lloyd: — Mr. Speaker, when I was speaking yesterday I had

mentioned that I was sorry that the Government of Saskatchewan didn't include all of the brief which we presented to it in its submission to the Federal Government a few days ago. I was particularly sorry that it had failed to advance the request, which has been endorsed by major farm organizations of this province, for a supplementary payment on grain which would have injected a couple of hundred million dollars of cash into the Prairie economy. I am glad that it adopted a number of the other proposals. We hope that something will soon be made positive as to what is going to happen there.

I also leading up to the topic of agriculture, Mr. Speaker, had a little bit to say about what is happening to population in Saskatchewan. It may be recalled here that I could quote the Premier's statement when he was Leader of the Opposition, saying that 'population figures are the acid test of growth.' It was possible to use its own statistics to show that in the three years up to 1964 the population increase was 12,000, whereas in the three years up to 1969, the population increase was 1,000. It was further possible to show that as of this time people are leaving the Province of Saskatchewan at the rate of about 1,800 per month. If 'population figures are the acid test of growth,' then that shows what is happening to growth in Saskatchewan using the Government's own method of measurement.

I want to go on, Mr. Speaker, to a more full examination of the problems of agriculture and some of the solutions to those problems as we see them. Let me comment again about something which the Premier said yesterday. He tried to persuade this House that the proposals advanced by the Government of Saskatchewan, if accepted, would bring hundreds of millions of dollars into the pockets of Saskatchewan farmers. Let us know first of all, Mr. Speaker, that not one of those proposals has yet been accepted by the Federal Government. Secondly, if it does accept them, then I suggest that the Premier's statement that this would mean hundreds of millions of dollars is a blatant misinterpretation of even the most optimistic results which could be expected. It is a monstrous magnification of the possible benefit. It is a manufactured attempt to produce a mirage to try to make the Saskatchewan Government look good.

Some Hon. Members: — Hear, hear!

Mr. Lloyd: — At issue in this matter of agriculture, Mr. Speaker, is the social and the economic future of farm life in Saskatchewan. Nothing less than that. At issue also is the social and economic future of the communities which serve farm people and are in turn supported by them. Let me note for the record some evidence of the concern which Saskatchewan people have shown during this last year. It is a concern, which I am sorry to say, the Saskatchewan Government does not reflect in its statements or proposals to Ottawa, it is a concern, I am sorry to say, that the Ottawa Liberal Government has simply shrugged off.

Hon. Members may recall that shortly after the session finished here last year the Farmers Union arranged a meeting in the city of Saskatoon. Some 6,000 farmers, angry farmers, worried farmers, made farmers come there to show their concern. I didn't notice any Liberal MLAs there, I must admit that.

Some Hon. Members: — Hear, hear!

Mr. Lloyd: — I did notice one Liberal MP who came late and wished he could have gone early. After that came a series of meetings with the Agriculture House of Commons Committee, sponsored by the Saskatchewan Wheat Pool. Some 18,000 angry and worried farmers attended those meetings. And thirdly, there was concern expressed when there were large gatherings and demonstrations in Regina and Saskatoon when the Prime Minister visited this province in July of 1969.

The facts on which those concerns were based are now part of the unfortunate history of this province. There was a drop in farm cash income to our farmers of some 20 per cent in 1969, while costs went up and while many of those corporations selling things to the farmers saw their profits increase. There was a drop in rural retail sales according to the Retail Merchants Association of some 15 per cent. There is the special problem of farm machinery dealers — important in themselves and one of the barometers of the farm problems. And finally, there is the increased burden of the highest interest rates in history paid on an increasing amount of farm debt. We learned yesterday, once more to our regret, that the Government's submission to Ottawa hadn't even thought of mentioning this burden of high interest.

Some Hon. Members: — Hear, hear!

Mr. Lloyd: — While there was concern a year ago and during the year, the reasons for concern are greater now, greater now than they were when 24,000 farmers this spring asked for, in their words, "their fair share." The reasons for concern are greater now than they were when thousands of farmers on their tractors faced the Prime Minister at high noon on the streets of Regina and Saskatoon.

While it is one thing to talk about these things in terms of the effect on the total farm community, I want to bring it down to the level of one farmer. The information which I have come to me from a rural municipality just a few days ago. This is a farmer who has a young family, and a large family. He has land and some other assets which, according to the Department of Welfare, are valued at about \$55,000. He has assets but he can't eat them; he can't use them to pay taxes and he can't use them to pay the power bill. He has produced on his farm some 8,000 bushels of grain. Earlier in the year he got a loan from the bank in order to seed and harvest that crop. He took maximum advantage of his cash advance, most of which he had to turn over to the bank in order to meet that loan, and even then it wasn't enough.

Since harvest he has sold the magnificent sum of 400 bushels only. In mid-winter he finds himself in debt to the retail merchant to the extent of \$800; in debt to the bank to the extent of \$500; in debt to the Power Corporation to the extent of \$160. There is his problem. No cash, his credit exhausted, no alternative employment, but a family to feed and clothe and keep warm.

His recourse it seemed to him was to apply for assistance through the Saskatchewan Assistance Plan. When he did so, he was told that, in calculating his income, all of his grain would have to be shown as if it had been sold. As a result he finds

himself with an alleged income of something over \$11,000. Then the Government of Saskatchewan went on to say to him, this is your income and this of course “precluded the granting of assistance to you under the extreme hardship clause.”

The problem, if of course, that the merchant won't take his wheat, the banker won't take his wheat, the Power Corporation won't take his wheat. Now there is “a firm hand at the helm.” This man however is without money, without credit, without alternative employment. He has only overdue debts and grain that he can't sell and a large family to feed, and the kindly munificent Saskatchewan Government says this is not extreme hardship. This paints as good a picture of the Government as you could do on miles and miles of canvas.

Some Hon. Members: — Hear, hear!

Mr. Lloyd: — Mr. Speaker, this is the kind of situation which virtually forces a man to go out and break the law and to attempt disposal of his grain at fire-sale prices just to keep food in front of his family. Now there is one small, dim crack of light for the man. He can still appeal the refusal which he has had up to this time for assistance to keep food before his family. In the meantime, of course, the rural municipality is asked to contribute to the Provincial Government to pay Saskatchewan Assistance Plan benefits which people like that, its residents, can't get any advantage from.

I suggest to you that neither the Speech from the Throne nor any of the submissions which this Government made to the Federal Government in the last few days, nor anything that the Federal Government has said or offered, offers anything whatsoever to that man or that kind of people in that kind of condition.

Mr. Speaker, it is not alone, of course, the denial of decency and the destruction of hope for farm people that need to worry us. It is not alone the further desolation of smaller Saskatchewan communities which we are facing. The farm cash shortage is the major contributor to a dangerously high level of total Saskatchewan unemployment. But it is not just Saskatchewan alone that is affected. It is not just the Saskatchewan economic and social structure that is under attack. What happens to those farm people when they are liquidated off their farms by economic pressure outside of their control? Where can they go? What can they do? Inevitably they must seek employment in the cities – not in Saskatchewan cities because the lineup at the unemployment offices is too long there now – but in other cities in other parts of Canada perhaps. Even there, there are too many people looking for too few jobs. The future design, in Liberal philosophy, is a Canada with more people in fewer larger cities, more people unemployed, underemployed and unsatisfied.

You know, I think we might look at some of the United States experiences in this regard. I think we might look at these particularly because of those who urge that to solve all of our problems we simply have to create ourselves more and more in the image of that country.

Let me refer to a report from the President of the United States National Advisory Commission on Rural Poverty.

That report said this:

The urban riots during 1967 had their roots, in considerable part, in rural poverty. This fact alone makes clear how large a stake the people of this nation have in an attack on rural poverty.

Certainly the economic facts facing Saskatchewan people are harsh. The human facts are cruel. The social facts are threatening. The answer of a Liberal Government in Saskatchewan and a Liberal Government in Ottawa is simply: more of the same, only faster. And with that kind of team there is no hope for a viable agricultural industry, operated by farmers and contributing the maximum from our rich agricultural resources to Saskatchewan, Canada and the world's hungry millions.

Mr. Speaker, farm ownership by farmers is important. The employment of the maximum number of people in effective farm operation is important. The full use of our great food-producing resources is important.

It is quite true, as the Member from Elrose (Mr. Leith) reminded us yesterday, that there are new varieties of grain, better production methods, more skills, more use of fertilizer and chemicals, and that these have made world food production more secure. But population is less today than it was 30 years ago. It is also true that the number of acres of arable land per person in the world is less now than it was 30 years ago, and is steadily decreasing. It is also true that there is food deficiency, particularly protein deficiency, which is a current chronic and consistent problem in many parts of the world. It is also true that the food supplies of developing countries will have to quadruple by the year 2000 to feed their populations. I submit that it is neither civilized nor wise for us to overlook such basic facts of human existence and basic criteria for a peaceful world. And yet the policies of the Federal and Provincial Governments fail to encourage a stable, rewarding life in agriculture. Instead the tendency seems to be, Mr. Speaker, to put almost all of their eggs in the basket of industrial development.

We have incentives for industrial development. We have disincentives for agricultural development. We are being told now by a Minister of the Federal Government, "Don't produce wheat this year." We are being told that there is in effect in Canada a double standard, one for agriculture and one for industry. Look at the Speech from the Throne. Look at the offers to agriculture: loans to farmers to expand livestock operations; loans, the interest rate on which will increase (if I read press reports properly) if the bank increases its interest rate next year; loans which must be paid back. On the other hand, to industry: loans without any interest; loans of which a part will be forgiven as the industry pays them back. We have a double standard at Ottawa and a double standard in Regina with regard to agriculture on one hand and industry on the other.

Some Hon. Members: — Hear, hear!

Mr. Lloyd: — Mr. Speaker, their attitude is that industry is here to stay, that farming as a way of life is on its way out; goodbye farmers, hurry along; let the job be taken over by

corporations operating on a factory basis and you go along and move to the city.

I submit that the Federal and Provincial Liberals are captives of their own convictions. Their conviction is that if they can only make as many opportunities as freely available as possible to industrial corporations we will solve all of our problems. Even in this, they surrender the right to make decisions about it to those who sit in the board rooms of those corporations wherever they are, give them the right to make key decisions about Canadian people and the future of Canada. This they must do because it is their commitment.

Mr. Speaker, I want to say something about the policies which are needed in this country and in this province — some of the long-range policies, as I talked yesterday of some of the immediate policies needed. We need, first of all, production guides which recognize the value of what farmers can grow as a national trading asset of benefit to all of Canada. We need production guides which recognize long-term world food needs. We need production guides which recognize the contribution which satisfying rural life and employment can make to the economic and social structure of Canada.

We need, secondly, trade policies to make it possible for greater purchases by people who buy or who would want to buy what we can produce. You know we have accepted large sales to Russia and to China. We accepted the sales as a matter of right. We have done practically nothing to go out and develop the kind of trade policies which would solidify or expand or extend those things.

Thirdly, we need policies of Government guarantees, Government guarantees to buy specified amounts of produce and to buy these specified amounts at prices which will make farming viable, which will encourage people to make it a lifetime work and to make possible diversification and other adjustments within the farm industry. What is happening today, Mr. Speaker, with regard to diversification is that the farmer is being urged to do so in the face of excessive costs, ruinous debt burden in many cases, and the farmer is carrying the unfair risk all himself. The Government ought to carry some of this responsibility.

We also need laws to prevent the extension of non-farm corporate ownership to larger areas of farm activity. We need laws to establish minimum prices for grain sold within the Province of Saskatchewan. The Provincial Government can act on this. It can act to establish minimum prices for grain sold within the province. And we need laws to fully protect the farmer and others against foreclosure and any other punitive action when the farmer, through no fault of his own, is unable to pay his debts.

We need, Mr. Speaker, a Provincial Government which will support orderly marketing, not attack it as we had happen here yesterday. We need a Provincial Government which will cooperate with, not interfere with, the Government of Canada when it starts to enforce the necessary laws to have orderly marketing. We need a Provincial Government which will once again give some leadership when transportation services are threatened in this province as they are threatened right now. And we need a Provincial Government which will aggressively and adequately

urge meaningful and definite solutions on the Government of Canada.

Mr. Speaker, all in all, we need that combination of imagination and realism and respect for Saskatchewan that sees a real potential in Saskatchewan agriculture, that sees a real contribution, which people fully engaged in and properly rewarded by agriculture can make to a healthy economy and the social structure of Saskatchewan and Canada.

I realize that to do that we are going to have to have government action beyond the direct farm front. And as a result we are going to have to have government action to control prices, and consequently profits, of those companies whose income comes from selling to farmers the inputs of their production. We are going to have to have governments prepared to go nose to nose with corporations like the farm implement manufacturers and say, "You've harvested this field too long and got back from it too much more than you seeded." We need a government that is prepared to give some assistance to Canadian Cooperative Implements and small locally owned manufacturing companies to provide alternative sources of farm supplies. We need governments which are going to remove some of the waste and exploitation in the food handling industry in order to get more of the consumer's dollar back to the farmer.

Admittedly there is going to be some conflict with corporate interests. Admittedly it is going to mean a greater commitment of public intervention and initiative and ownership. But, Mr. Speaker, it is either that or it is death to farm opportunity and related opportunity as we have seen it build and develop this province and this nation. To delay only makes the matter worse.

May I just add something more, Mr. Speaker, about what else must be done if we are going to solve our agricultural problems, because the problems of agriculture have to be looked at against the backdrop of our total society. We have already seen how the result of Liberals at Ottawa and Regina applying their philosophy has meant fewer farmers owning their own farms and has meant fewer people enjoying productive and satisfying lives in Saskatchewan's villages, towns and cities. The main reasons for this, I suggest, is that farming is too often looked at by the so-called experts in terms of the narrowest economic definition – a definition which doesn't contain any human or social equation. And as a result the farmer gets over and over again the advice that all he has to do is to become more efficient.

You know, there is a deep and growing conviction in the countryside that the Liberal god of market-place economics is not only cold, harsh and ruthless – it is dangerous and it is wrong. This Liberal doctrine enshrines the Gross National Product as the be-all and end-all of our lives. This doctrine says that the main purpose of consumption is not to add satisfaction to people's lives. It says rather, consume more so that we can produce more. It says waste more so that we will consume more, so that we can produce more. The value of a product is measured not so much by its usefulness, but by how fast it moves dollars around the table. And the quicker the product wears out or becomes obsolescent the higher the value.

Above all, Mr. Speaker, that handmaiden of Liberal

doctrine – high pressure advertising – “helps make good things happen” or so we are told on television. When you translate that into plain English, it says advertising creates wants we didn’t know we had, to persuade us to buy many things we don’t need, for prices we can’t afford, in order to achieve an illusory result.

Some Hon. Members: — Hear, hear!

Mr. Lloyd: — Mr. Speaker, in the context of all of that, we have a right to be suspicious of Ottawa and Regina Liberals when they or their economic experts tell us that the only salvation for farmers is to move off their farms and to seek jobs in our delightful, welcoming cities outside of Saskatchewan. Now one of the most recent comments that have come out of the bowels at Ottawa has been this:

We have 430,000 farmers in Canada now; the present rate of attrition will bring this to 300,000 by 1980; but it is economically desirable if this could be reduced even further to 150,000.

Now I would like to know whether the Minister of Agriculture (Mr. McFarlane) and the Premier accept this kind of direction, this kind of future which has come to us out of the bowels of the Liberal Government at Ottawa.

Mr. Speaker, it is time, I submit, that the people of Saskatchewan stand up on their hind legs, face their governments, and the corporate industrial structure and say: “Whoa! We’re not going to stand quietly by while you sentence our farm life and our rural communities to death. We demand that you consider our costs and our benefits. We’ll fight every inch of the way to keep our farms and preserve a way of life we value highly, and which can make in the future, as it has in the past, a great social and economic contribution to Canada.”

Some Hon. Members: — Hear, hear!

Mr. Lloyd: — Let me turn to a second one of Saskatchewan’s major problems, that of unemployment. As I said yesterday, you search the Speech from the Throne and you will not find the word ‘employment’ or ‘unemployment’ mentioned. Yet let’s look again at the evidence of what the situation is and has been in Saskatchewan. According to the Star Phoenix of October 24th:

The number of unemployed people in Northern Saskatchewan last month increased by 34 per cent over September, 1968.

That was back in September, an increase of 34 per cent. The headline in the North Battleford News Optimist in December said this: “almost 1,100 people unemployed in City.” The Leader Post on January 7th said:

In the last month, the number of unemployed persons in Regina has increased by almost 60 per cent . . . There has also been an increase in unemployment in comparison with the situation last year.

Mr. Speaker, the Star Phoenix on January 28th of this year

summed it up by referring to the September-October Prairie Manpower Review and there it said: "The number of unemployed rose by 120 per cent compared to the same period the year before! Not only that, Mr. Speaker, but the number of people employed had decreased by 12,000 as compared to the year before. Increase in unemployment of 120 per cent; decrease in employment, 12,000 people.

And, Mr. Speaker, the unemployment rate would have been much larger if the Premier and his colleagues hadn't found one way of curing it, and that was by encouraging people to leave the province at the rate of some 1,800 per month during this last year. That Liberal promise of 80,000 new jobs is proven to be more deceitful as each year's evidence rolls in.

But, Mr. Speaker, again we should note the similarity of the approach of the Federal and Provincial Liberal Governments. You know, Federal and Provincial Liberal Governments may pillow fight in public, but under the sheet they've got the same kind of ideas. For example, you will recall the Prime Minister's pre-Christmas greetings which he broadcast to Canada as he left for the South Seas. At that time he was prepared to put increasing numbers of unemployed people, even up to six per cent, in the front line of the fight against inflation. Well, he has achieved his army of six per cent unemployed in the battle of inflation, but even though he has, inflation like Ole Man River just keeps on rolling along.

Secondly, notice that meanwhile back on the Saskatchewan range the Saskatchewan Liberal Government beat the Prime Minister to the draw — it beat him to the draw by at least one year. Provincial Liberals act, Mr. Speaker; they just don't talk, they act. They didn't wait for the Federal Government to set a target for unemployment, they created their own target and achieved it.

Some Hon. Members: — Hear, hear!

Mr. Lloyd: — Let's look at it, some of the records going back to over a year ago. It can be found in the Public Accounts tabled in this House for 1968-69. You will find there a continued and consistent record of this Government voting money for useful and job-creating projects but not spending the money. For example, look at this. Of the capital voted for technical education extensions, over \$350,000, 17 per cent, was not spent. That meant fewer jobs. Of the money voted for urban renewal grants, \$46,000, 50 per cent, was not spent. That meant fewer jobs. Of the money voted for the Municipal Winter Works program, \$300,000, 40 per cent, was not spent and that meant fewer jobs. And of the money voted for various housing projects, \$1.7 million, 57 per cent, was not spent and that meant fewer jobs and fewer houses. The Saskatchewan Government began destroying jobs in 1968 and before. Saskatchewan Liberals act, they don't just talk about unemployment; they plan and execute its creation. They beat the Prime Minister at his own game of deliberately creating unemployment.

Let's come a little closer to this date, the Budget discussions in this Legislature in February of 1969. Now you will recall the warning of my colleague, the Member from Regina Centre, the financial critic (Mr. Blakeney), about the Budget.

He pointed out to the Government that, when it was cutting back on its investment in a number of projects, it was inevitably going to increase unemployment as a result. He pointed out that this was particularly unfortunate because private industry had also decided to reduce its investment in things that create jobs in this province.

In the month of May, my colleague, the Member from Regina North East (Mr. Smishek) wrote a letter to the Premier. He had made a survey in the city of Regina. This survey showed that in the construction trades from 10 to 30 per cent, depending on the trade, were unemployed. He urged the Premier to do something about it and suggested some things he could do. The Premier wrote back and said he would give it careful consideration. Well again the Liberals acted. They acted and a few months later they destroyed more jobs by cutting out some more construction.

Unbelievable as it seems now, Mr. Speaker, in September the Provincial Treasurer (Mr. Steuart) announced that school and university construction would be checked, that almost \$1 million would be cut back in other public works. The Provincial Treasurer at that time said he had some surplus. Our question then and now was and is: why not spend it? There was serious unemployment. As I have just referred to, the unemployment in the northern part of the province was 34 per cent more than it had been the year before and the Provincial Treasurer said, "I've got my surpluses to keep me warm."

It is a mystery to me why the Provincial Treasurer gets pleasure out of sitting around fiddling with his surpluses while people walk the street looking for non-existent work. It was plain in September, when this Government was cutting back on projects which would have given work, that the situation was going to get worse. The farm crisis would have more impact. It was plain that more people would use up unemployment insurance benefits and times would be tougher for them. There would be fewer goods purchased come winter. There would be fewer bills paid. There would be more small businesses forced out of existence. And the Provincial Treasurer sat in his counting house and fiddled with his surpluses and let men go without work.

In January, Mr. Speaker, we presented to the Government our brief entitled "It's Time to Act." We made a number of proposals about unemployment. One was to urge the Provincial and the Federal Governments to remove the restraints imposed on job-creating projects; we urged them to undertake a crash program of training people. Finally, in February, just a few days ago, someone told the Premier and the Provincial Treasurer about unemployment and now, at this late date, they have promised in the press some added expenditure, some time in the future, some of which won't produce any jobs until next fall, and we don't know what any of it is going to be as yet.

You know, Mr. Speaker, there is in existence, or there used to be in existence, something called a funeral horse. The Provincial Government's performance about providing employment is like that of a funeral horse. You, Sir, I am sure will know what a funeral horse is. A funeral horse is one that is trained to trot magnificently while actually moving at a speed slower than a walk. And that is the performance of this Government with regard to unemployment.

Some Hon. Members: — Hear, hear!

Mr. Lloyd: — As we begin the 1970s we get some more help from that benevolent Liberal Government at Ottawa in its announcement of public works spending. Spending in Saskatchewan by the Federal Public Works Department is the lowest in Canada except for tiny Prince Edward Island, a province with a population less than our capital city. Spending in Saskatchewan by Federal Public Works is actually cut this year more than in any other province. The drop from last year in all of Canada was 11 per cent, the drop in Saskatchewan was 28 per cent — 2 1/2 times as big a cut as across the rest of Canada. Mr. Speaker, this is surely dramatic proof of the failure of the Government that sits opposite to make Saskatchewan needs known in Ottawa. After all, why should the Federal Government act any differently? The Provincial Government cut the program last September, it cut the program last February. Come January, December, it had done nothing about it itself. This was a pure and straight invitation for the Federal Government to say: Saskatchewan doesn't need any. One can imagine the Prime Minister saying, "You know that boy Thatcher of mine in Regina has got a hard, heavy hand on the helm. He knows a good business thing, he's not doing anything about it. Why in the world should the Federal Government do anything about it?"

Some Hon. Members: — Hear, hear!

Mr. Lloyd: — It is quite clear, Mr. Speaker, that this combination of Liberal Government in Ottawa, plus Liberal Government in Regina, is a losing combination so far as Saskatchewan is concerned. The Prime Minister of Canada has put the farmers of Saskatchewan and the unemployed of Saskatchewan in the front line of his fight against inflation, and he is willing to fight inflation with the support of the Saskatchewan Government to the last drop of our economic blood. In spite of all of this, the Throne Speech doesn't even use the word 'employment' or 'unemployment'.

Mr. Speaker, I submit that the procedure or the tactics of the Provincial Government is extremely transparent. Its policy is this: allow conditions to get worse, even help them to get worse. And then we'll do a little bit, and a little bit will look like more because conditions are so bad. Well maybe, Mr. Premier, we are going to get that election after all this year, maybe we are. But if we do, let's believe this: Saskatchewan will not forget this funeral-horse performance of the Liberal Government, this horse that has been trained to trot so magnificently while actually moving at a speed slower than a walk. Saskatchewan people will not forget the months and months without work. They will not forget the sales that are down, more people out of work because of that, businesses closed or moving to other provinces. Saskatchewan will not forget the people forced to leave this province. Saskatchewan will not forget the decreased standard of living which this Government has forced on many people so that its performance might look better after awhile. Mr. Speaker, the Saskatchewan people won't forget it even though in a desperate bid to get re-elected the Government will promise more once again, even though members of the Liberal party will strut the public stage, admiring its artificial peacock-like tail of its colorful promises of 80,000 more new jobs.

Some Hon. Members: — Hear, hear!

Mr. Lloyd: — Mr. Speaker, we need some action. Surely the Government has by this time some stockpile of projects ready to go. It claims to have money surpluses. The unemployed are everywhere. The question is: why wait? The Premier says he is going to announce some projects one of these days. Why not announce them today? Mr. Premier, why not announce them tomorrow, big ones, needed ones, fast ones? We need to get people back to work. Mr. Speaker, let's put the funeral horse in the barn and get out a modern vehicle. Let the Government call a conference of municipal officials, and of labor people, and of farm people, and of business people. Let that conference pool its ideas as to public and private projects which will put people back to work.

Some Hon. Members: — Hear, hear!

Mr. Lloyd: — Mr. Speaker, let's not have this funeral horse just continue to plod on for one day longer than necessary. You know, Mr. Speaker, there is a current movie showing called, "They Shoot Horses, Don't They?" and I suggest that the Premier ought to have a look at that in connection with this kind of action.

Now I want to turn, Mr. Speaker, to the third of the very major difficulties facing the people of this province, and that is education. I referred yesterday to the attack of the Saskatchewan Liberal Government on the quality of education in Saskatchewan. You know it has got to the point that when people talk about education in Saskatchewan now, they don't talk about the three Rs. Instead they talk about the five Cs which have come out of the Liberal Government. And the five Cs of education today are conflict, contradiction, confusion, concern and crisis.

Could we use, as an example, the division system of grouping students, which was experimented with in various parts of this province for several years? It was introduced as a general policy in 1964. It has been endorsed by teachers and by trustees. It was endorsed again in the Gathercole-Nicks Report of not many months ago. This was one part of a program designed to bring more flexibility, less rigidity, in student promotion. It was designed to bring more freedom of choice and satisfying, motivating experience to the student. It was designed to provide more emphasis on individual instruction and more opportunity determined by individual student choice. It was designed to bring more freedom for the individual student and the individual school in planning a program that was appropriate to the needs and satisfaction of the students of that community. These are good quality-producing objectives. Yet the actions of this Government are in conflict with, and in contradiction to, those objectives.

May I just give two of the major conflicts. One is the centralization of decision-making which has taken place. The programs and the hopes and the plans which used to be developed on the spot by teachers and trustees are all subject to veto and destruction now by a central agency of the Government. Decisions by people have been replaced with decisions of a Government-owned computer.

The second example of conflict and contradiction lies in the repressive and regressive orders of the Government that the

artificially-developed, externally-imposed teacher-pupil ratio is the supreme god whose discipline must be obeyed.

You know, Mr. Speaker, not content with conflicting and contradictory ideas, the Government used its administrative genius to confuse the situation even further. Last summer and fall, over the province, I met school boards who said, "Look, we've just agreed with our teachers as to employment next fall, and here we get orders from the Department which, if we accept them, will release some thousand teachers throughout the province. What are we going to do with the teachers whom we said we'll hire?" Fortunately because of pressures the Minister (Mr. McIsaac) finally woke up to the fact that there was a problem and I think this order was changed.

But even yet, Mr. Speaker, we don't really know what the formula is. Sometimes it is talked about as an average of 25 students per classroom, with some allowance for technical studies. Sometimes it is talked about as two more per classroom. I submit that even the Minister is confused. I submit that the Minister himself doesn't really know what the situation is within the Province of Saskatchewan.

Boards are only now finding out how many teachers or what kind of teachers they are going to be allowed to employ. They are only now finding out what courses they are going to have to rearrange or discontinue or what teachers they are going to have to dismiss. One thing they do know is that much of the planning they have done and many of the programs they have had for years are going to have to go out the window because of the orders of this Government.

Teachers are confused and concerned about whether their position will be there next fall when school opens, or what they will be required to do at that time. School boards are confused and concerned about how to decide which teachers to let go and which courses to discontinue.

Confusion and conflict, Mr. Speaker. May I bring some evidence from some of the people on the spot. I want to quote, for example, the comments of Mr. Bill Manning who is Chairman of one of the Saskatoon School Boards. He put it to a group of teachers and others this way:

Acceptance of the department quota would be a deterioration of educational standards, while trying to maintain all staff would invite the department's disapproval.

There is the dilemma: to do what the Department says is to decrease standards, and not to do so means "we are in trouble with the Government of Saskatchewan." He went on to describe the effect here as being "a serious blow to morale for teachers." He described the effect of "cutting subject offerings in schools, discharging teachers, reducing the effectiveness of small classes for slow learners and generally lessening the quality of education." The Premier has a different term for that. He calls it cutting off the fat.

As an additional comment on this may I read just a few lines from a letter to the Minister (a copy which I received) from a Home and School Association. It says:

We'd like to express our concern about actions taken by

your Department is regard to the budget review.

We fail to see how a cut of this magnitude can mean anything but a cut in the program. We are concerned about the apparent low priority that education has with your Government. We feel this does not reflect the thinking of the people.

Some Hon. Members: — Hear, hear!

Mr. Lloyd: — In addition to school boards and teachers being concerned, Mr. Speaker, there is special confusion which has been retained for students in the senior years at the College of Education. Their concern is: “Is there any place for those of us improving our qualifications in the Province of Saskatchewan?”

There are students and teachers right at this moment who are debating the question of whether to go on and improve their qualifications because they, thinking they know what the Department thinks and the Government thinks, feel if they improve their qualifications their chances of getting a job become just that much less.

Mr. Speaker, there are other examples of contradiction and conflict which have produced this concern and crisis. Let me just read just one more quotation. This one from another Saskatoon trustee, Mrs. Bater. She said:

They (that is the Department) have spent four months and hundreds of dollars analyzing our budget. They said they would send us the recommendations ahead of time and they didn't. They talk continually about two-way discussion and it never was that. To me they are planning our program and that's not local control.

Some Hon. Members: — Hear, hear!

Mr. Lloyd: — Mr. Speaker, you can talk with students, with parents, with trustees, with teachers, with taxpayers and the concern about the crisis in education is uppermost. But while there is confusion about education there is no confusion in their minds about one matter. They have decided that education is too important to be left in the hands of a Government with a computer for a heart, a dollar bill for a conscience and a clenched hand and the foot poised to kick for its administrative tools.

Some Hon. Members: — Hear, hear!

Mr. Lloyd: — Mr. Speaker, nothing short of a new government will cure all of that.

Some Hon. Members: — Hear, hear!

Hon. D. G. Steuart (Provincial Treasurer): — Oh, you're in a mean mood!

Mr. Lloyd: — Now the Provincial Treasurer is coming to life. He's evidently decided he's fiddled with his surpluses enough for today and he's come back into the House for a little while.

Some Hon. Members: — Hear, hear!

Mr. Lloyd: — Well, there are many inevitable effects of this rigid, externally-imposed, student-teacher ratio. It is inevitable that there will be more pupils per classroom. And some boards tell me there will be up to 30 and 35 and 40 in order to get the necessary average.

It is inevitable that there will be fewer choices for students. There will be a more narrowly conceived and academic program.

It is evident there will be fewer teachers in activities which enrich and which encourage creativity and which supplement the straight academic requirements. And I am speaking of those areas which allow for greater freedom of personal enlightenment and satisfaction such as art and music and guidance and library.

There are many classes, particularly those of the kind I have just talked about, which will be taught by teachers less well qualified. Certainly there is going to be less experimentation and innovation and there is going to be more of a strait jacket and performance by the book. There is going to be less quality in education.

The impact of all of these is also inevitable. Here again the Liberal Government has turned its priorities upside down, and the inverseness of its priorities is exceeded only by the perverseness of those who set them. The impact is this. It imposes the greatest handicap on those who ought to get more benefits, because, Mr. Speaker, this imposes the greatest handicap on rural students and those in small communities. It imposes the greatest handicap on students whose objective after grade 12 is other than university. It imposes the greatest handicap on those youngsters who have some learning handicap because they are going to get less individual attention. It imposes a handicap on the youngsters with special interests. The school system which has done the most to build up quality in education gets the worst kicking around from the Government of Saskatchewan.

Some Hon. Members: — Hear, hear!

Mr. Lloyd: — One point I want to grant and that is this. In any given year it may save some money. It will save some money at the expense of quality of education. It will save money at the expense of equality of opportunity for education. The danger of saving money in that way is that you never stop paying for it.

Mr. Speaker, I want to make a proposal with regard to the Government as to what it can do even at this late date. It's a suggestion as to what I think any government in this Province is going to have to do in the future. And that is that this Legislature and the Saskatchewan Government and the people of Saskatchewan are going to have to implement a vastly increased way of assisting the operation of schools from the revenues of the Province and the revenues of the Federal Government. And I invite the designation of a program which in two or three years time will provide at least 65 per cent of the school costs in grants from the senior governments and which

at the end of five years' time will provide at least 75 per cent of the cost in grants from those two governments. I think nothing less than this is going to redistribute and to lower the property tax level, as I suggest any government has to do in this Province in the very near future.

Some Hon. Members: — Hear, hear!

Mr. Lloyd: — But, Mr. Speaker, I don't believe that this is going to happen until the present Liberal Government is placed by Saskatchewan voters in its rightful place. Its rightful place is alongside where the Liberal party is in British Columbia, in Alberta and in Manitoba.

Some Hon. Members: — Hear, hear!

Mr. Lloyd: — I want, Mr. Speaker, to examine for awhile the Liberals' promise, as contrasted to their action, on the tax front. Here we let the record speak or shall I say we let the record shout. I go back to read again from a statement by the Premier when he was Leader of the Opposition in the Throne Speech Debate of 1964. Here is what he had to say about taxes:

Mr. Speaker, I assure the House and the people of Saskatchewan that one of our primary, consistent and determined purposes will be major tax reduction. One, (he went on), we will reduce the five per cent sales tax immediately to four per cent and in our first four years of office we will endeavor to get it back to three per cent.

Some Hon. Members: — Hear, hear!

Mr. Lloyd: — Two, we will increase the list of goods exempt from sales tax to include such items as clothing and shoes which are after all necessities of life.

Some Hon. Members: — Hear, hear!

Mr. Lloyd: — And four (we'll finish up on a kindly note for them):

we will permit farmers to use purple gas in their farm trucks.

Never in the history of Canadian governments have so many promises been busted so quickly, so loudly and so rudely.

Some Hon. Members: — Hear, hear!

Mr. Lloyd: — Let's look at the record. Let's look at the record. Sales tax down, yes, when? Before the 1967 election and afterwards right up. More exemptions? Yup, off turkey saddles and a few things like that but on to soaps and detergents and a lot of other things.

Some Hon. Members: — Hear, hear!

Mr. Lloyd: — And not off clothing and shoes even yet. Probably they aren't necessities of life or perhaps it's because people can't afford to buy them anymore under the Liberals.

Some Hon. Members: — Hear, hear!

Mr. Lloyd: — After the election in 1967 we had new sales tax on many services – telephones, hotel and meals and a higher rate on everything. This is the Government that was going to get us back to three per cent on everything. “We will find some method of reducing property taxes.” And if there is anything that will produce a belly laugh in the people of Saskatchewan it's that one.

Purple gas in farm trucks before the election, yes, after the election a new tax on farm fuel.

Some Hon. Members: — Hear, hear!

An Hon. Member: — Sock it to 'em, sock it to 'em!

Mr. Lloyd: — Let us look at what has actually happened about Provincial taxation per capita. From the 1963 Budget to the 1969 Budget, Provincial taxes per capita increased by 84 per cent. That means they increased by \$109 for every man, woman and child. This is the Government that was going to reduce taxes. So that if you had a man and his wife and two children, that's four times \$109, that's a \$436-per-family increase in Provincial taxes. These are the taxes paid by people. They don't include revenue from resources. Nor do they include a lot of other charges which people have to pay and which this Government imposed. For example, this \$436 for the family of four, doesn't include the deterrent fees for doctor's care and hospital care and physiotherapist visits, and you know that's another \$30 on the average for a family of four. They don't include the increased cost of automobile licences in some cases. They don't include the increased drivers' licences, particularly for the young people. They don't include the increased cost of university fees, which have gone up four times in the last six years. They don't include the increased technical school fees which have gone up twice in the last two years. They don't include increased grazing lease charges. They don't include increased charges for older people in homes. They don't include the increased charges for students writing grade 12 examinations. They don't include the new tax imposed by taking \$4 or \$5 million of revenue from the Power Corporation. They don't include increased telephone charges and they don't include a lot of other things too numerous to mention on which this Government has increased the cost.

But that's just, Mr. Speaker, the taxes imposed by the Provincial Government. Let's take a look at municipal or property taxes. It was for these that the Liberals saved their biggest and their saltiest tears.

You remember they said: “We will find a way” to reduce. Let's go to the reports of the Department of Municipal Affairs which are available for us up to 1967-68. We find there that the property tax increase per capita in the three years before

1964 averaged \$15. An increase of about \$5 per year. The Liberals said at that time that was an astronomical increase, it was an oppressive and crushing burden. But in the three years from 1964 to 1967 the average increase was about \$12 per year, an increase at the rate about 2 1/2 times as fast as it had been under the previous Government.

This Government says, you know, "We will find a way." And it is still looking for the way. In 1968 property taxes went up again. In 1969 property taxes went up again and in 1970, though we can't see, we certainly have reason to fear. Lower taxation in Saskatchewan under the Liberals, Mr. Speaker, for whom? Not for the Provincial taxpayer, not for the municipal taxpayer and more, of course, has been added by the Federal Liberals. Clearly, Mr. Speaker, Liberal times are high-tax times for people.

Some Hon. Members: — Hear, hear!

Mr. Lloyd: — Mr. Speaker, in just a minute or two, because of what I've said and a lot more that could be said if I had more time. I'm going to move a Resolution which I'll now table, seconded by my seatmate, the Member for Regina Centre (Mr. Blakeney). The Resolution will be that, by leave of the Assembly, we add these words to the motion:

but this Assembly, acutely aware of the critical cash situation facing Saskatchewan farmers and the disappearance of job opportunities for working people, denounces the Government for its failure to halt this disastrous economic setback and calls for immediate and decisive steps to provide cash for farmers and jobs for the unemployed.

Some Hon. Members: — Hear, hear!

Mr. Lloyd: — Let me just summarize, Mr. Speaker, the main reasons why it seems to us on this side of the House that this amendment should be supported.

There is much that, as I said a minute ago, I haven't had time to touch on. There's a mess that this Province has brought our potash industry into, Mr. Speaker. It's not good enough for it to say, as the Minister now says, "The industry is sick," and it's all the fault of the companies. This Government pushed potash companies pell-mell into the situation which it now says has created chaos and confusion in the industry. Much could be said and will be said by some of my colleagues about the destruction of many of our health programs and the threat to the structure of our hospital and medical care insurance because of what this Government has done.

Some Hon. Members: — Hear, hear!

Mr. Lloyd: — But even leaving out such critical areas as these, there is, I submit, one significant and inescapable fact which emerges. That fact is that a Liberal Government at Ottawa and a Liberal Government in Regina are an unhealthy and disastrous combination for Saskatchewan.

Some Hon. Members: — Hear, hear!

Mr. Lloyd: — The abject failure of this combination is proven by every possible measuring device. Look at the loss of population. Look at the drop in farm income. Look at the increases in cost of living. Look at the loss of employment opportunities. Look at what has happened or hasn't happened in resources development. Look at the tremendous increases in taxation. Look in a dozen different ways and the statement comes through loud and clear that a Liberal Government in Ottawa and in Regina is an unhealthy and disastrous combination for Saskatchewan.

Some Hon. Members: — Hear, hear!

Mr. Lloyd: — Before my honorable friends opposite decide how they are going to vote on this amendment, let me ask them a series of questions about which they know the answers.

Where have all the jobs gone? Down. Where have all the taxes gone? Up. Where have all the people gone? Away. Where has the percentage of budget to agriculture gone? Down. Where has the drug program gone? Forgotten. Where have health programs gone? Well the costs have gone up or over to municipalities and individuals; the benefits have gone down. Where has Provincial assistance to students gone? Down absolutely and down relatively according to the costs. Where has farm and home security gone? Down. Where have the Batten Commission recommendations to protect consumers gone? On the shelf under the dust. Where has pollution gone? It increases every time the Provincial Treasurer (Mr. Steuart) opens his mouth in this House.

Some Hon. Members: — Hear, hear!

Mr. Lloyd: — Where have the Liberal promises of yesterday gone? Those bold, bright strokes which were to be the new Saskatchewan? Mr. Speaker, the Liberal promises are deflated and devalued so much that they are no longer even listed on the stock exchange of public believability.

Some Hon. Members: — Hear, hear!

Mr. Lloyd: — Mr. Speaker, I've stated some of the philosophy and some of the action that are needed to get Saskatchewan going again. My colleagues will add to the evidence and add to the proposals in this debate and in the series of resolutions later on during the Session. In the final analysis again, there is one inescapable fact, that is, that Liberals at Ottawa and Liberals in Regina are an unhealthy, unfortunate combination for Saskatchewan.

Some Hon. Members: — Hear, hear!

Mr. Lloyd: — May I say on behalf of those of us on this side of the Legislature we have confidence in Saskatchewan people, we have confidence in our Province. This is the place in which we hope our families will find satisfaction in the years to come. This Province of ours, Saskatchewan, has made some striking contributions in the past. It's made striking contributions in production for agriculture and non-agriculture. It has made striking contribution not only by way of increasing production but by way of diversifying production. We have made

striking contributions to the whole field of social ideas in this country and have helped to move this country towards a more humanitarian society.

Some Hon. Members: — Hear, hear!

Mr. Lloyd: — We've had our effect, Mr. Speaker, our influence, with regard to economic thinking. The Saskatchewan people would like to see our Province restored to its role of sensitive leadership in Canadian society and to do this Saskatchewan must have, first of all, a new government. That being done, there'll be a real, joyous homecoming for many people in Saskatchewan in 1971.

Some Hon. Members: — Hear, hear!

Mr. Lloyd: — Mr. Speaker, I ask for leave to move the amendment at this point.

The debate continues on the motion and the amendment concurrently.

Hon. W. R. Thatcher (Premier): — It was rather interesting to note that, one week ago when the Throne Speech was read, some of the Socialist Members rushed from this Chamber and told the press, "There's going to be an election." I think those comments speak rather well for the constructive Throne Speech that we are now debating.

Some Hon. Members: — Hear, hear!

Mr. Thatcher: — It was rather interesting to note that some of the press had similar ideas. Here is what the Prince Albert Herald said:

An Hon. Member: — They are independent.

Mr. Thatcher: —

If we are to draw conclusions from Thursday's Throne Speech opening, the Third Session of the 16th Saskatchewan Legislature, it is that the Provincial Liberal Government might well be laying the groundwork of an election.

Some Hon. Members: — Hear, hear!

Mr. Thatcher: — When the Socialists learned about some of the legislation in this Speech, it isn't any wonder that they were concerned. For example the proposed increase in the homeowner grant. Do they dare vote against it?

Some Hon. Members: — Hear, hear!

Mr. Thatcher: — Free textbooks for grade 12. Do they dare vote against that reform? Increased grants for education. Do they dare vote against them?

An Hon. Member: — No, no!

Mr. Thatcher: — Assistance to police forces in municipalities. Have they the courage to vote against that measure? Industrial incentives for smaller Saskatchewan communities. Will they vote against such a Bill? Higher pensions for civil servants. Will they oppose that Act? Increased financial assistance to those on social welfare.

Some Hon. Members: — Hear, hear!

Mr. Thatcher: — When the Leader of the Opposition (Mr. Lloyd) finds out how much, he is going to be surprised, because there will go some of his today's speech. Day centers, will they vote against them? Reduced bus fares for old age pensioners. Let's see them vote against those regulations. The coming of age for young people. Do they dare vote against that Bill? And there are a host of other measures.

An Hon. Member: — Give us the big ones!

Mr. Thatcher: — And so no wonder when the Socialists learned of the legislation in this Throne Speech, they wondered if an election was coming.

An Hon. Member: — Is it?

Mr. Thatcher: — Mr. Speaker, we listened to the Leader of the Opposition (Mr. Lloyd) yesterday and again today deliver a lengthy tirade which was almost completely destructive. As I recall it, not one suggestion was made to help the farmers.

Some Hon. Members: — Hear, hear!

Mr. Thatcher: — Not one suggestion was made to help the unemployed.

Some Hon. Members: — Hear, hear!

Mr. Thatcher: — Not one suggestion was made to help the economy.

An Hon. Member: — Just give them money!

Mr. Thatcher: — Hardly a constructive thought.

Some Hon. Members: — Hear, hear!

Mr. Thatcher: — Mr. Speaker, as I say again, I am going to make a little wager, they may talk against this Throne Speech but when the chips are down . . .

Some Hon. Members: — Hear, hear!

Mr. Thatcher: — . . . when the chips are down, they'll vote for almost every piece of legislation in it.

Some Hon. Members: — Hear, hear!

Mr. Thatcher: — My hon. friend complained about unemployment in Saskatchewan. Yes, the Government regrets that because of the wheat crisis, there is some unemployment.

An Hon. Member: — Yes, there is.

Mr. Thatcher: — But I do remind this House and the people of Saskatchewan today that since 1964 under a Liberal Government, there has been far less unemployment annually than there was in the 20 years under the Socialists.

Some Hon. Members: — Hear, hear!

Mr. Thatcher: — And I remind you also, Sir, that the unemployment in Saskatchewan even this last year with the wheat crisis, has been consistently less than in the great majority of provinces of Canada.

Some Hon. Members: — Hear, hear!

Mr. Thatcher: — We are aware of the unemployment and we have measures to propose as the Session proceeds to deal with it. Yesterday the Leader of the Opposition (Mr. Lloyd) gloated a bit about the results of the Kelvington by-election. I suppose we can't blame him, because he has waited a good many years for an election win.

Some Hon. Members: — Hear, hear!

Mr. Thatcher: — On behalf of the Government I want to welcome the Member for Kelvington (Mr. Byers) and I am sure he will make a contribution to the deliberations of this House. Naturally we did our best to defeat him. The Liberal vote actually went up about 170, if I recall the facts.

Some Hon. Members: — Hear, hear!

Mr. Thatcher: — The wheat difficulties did prove insurmountable. However, in case the Leader of the Opposition (Mr. Lloyd) might become smug or the Member for Regina Centre (Mr. Blakeney), I want to remind him that the batting average is still pretty bad. I want to recall to him this afternoon of Liberal by-election wins — Turtleford, Weyburn, Prince Albert. Then I want to remind him of the Liberal general election in 1964. Hanley was an NDP win. Then I want to recall to my hon. friends the Liberal election wins in Moosomin, then in Bengough, then another general election in 1968. So, I say to the Hon. Leader of the Opposition, it has been a long drought for the Socialists . . .

Some Hon. Members: — Hear, hear!

Mr. Thatcher: — . . . since my hon. friend became Leader. Therefore, I don't as I say object to him gloating a little bit. We can only hope that the Kelvington win coming as it did after such a long string of defeats will save the Leader of the Opposition

in his own party.

Some Hon. Members: — Hear, hear!

Mr. Thatcher: — As the old saying goes, “Every cloud has a silver lining.”

Some Hon. Members: — Hear, hear!

Mr. Thatcher: — This afternoon during his remarks, the Leader of the Opposition was very critical of the Government’s treatment of agriculture. Yet I would point out that in past months the Member for Biggar (Mr. Lloyd) and his colleagues have come up with no real answers to a very real crisis. Anyone can pose problems, even the Socialists. But it is infinitely more difficult to come up with solutions. We on this side would be the first to admit that the wheat crisis is most serious. The world export market has been plagued with surpluses and with delivery quotas that are almost impossible. This fact has strained our economy. And yet I know of no easy solution. I know of no magic formula to solve the grain marketing problem. I contend today that the Provincial Government has done everything in its power to help the farmer in his present difficulties. If a real solution to the farm crisis is to be found, surely it must be on a Federal basis, because international trade is a Federal responsibility. Even the Leader of the Opposition (Mr. Lloyd) has admitted such a fact frequently. An example is the Star Phoenix of last January 12, Mr. Lloyd, the Leader of the NDP said and I quote:

Saskatchewan should not delude itself. Selling wheat can only be done adequately by the Federal Government through the Canadian Wheat Board.

May I say, Mr. Speaker, that this Government has done everything in its power to impress upon Ottawa the need for more vigorous action. The Leader of the Opposition has accused us this afternoon of fighting a sham battle. I think he accused us of waging a pillow fight with the Federal Government over farm policies. Mr. Speaker, we will fight with anyone, even the Federal Government, if we think them wrong. If the Hon. Leader of the Opposition had taken time out to come to the Conference last Monday or Tuesday he would have been aware of that fact.

Some Hon. Members: — Hear, hear!

Mr. Thatcher: — After all, Mr. Speaker, the Leader of the Opposition and his colleagues have been claiming that they should be added to these delegations. So a month ago, we invited the Member for Biggar (Mr. Lloyd) to participate in this very important Conference, because the wheat crisis was being discussed at our request. The Leader of the Opposition, who professes to be so interested in the farmer, didn’t even bother to join the Saskatchewan delegation. What kind of sincere and genuine interest does that attitude represent? I would point out as I did yesterday to the Leader of the Opposition that his colleagues from the Manitoba NDP were present. As far as Western farmers were concerned, they might as well have stayed home.

Some Hon. Members: — Hear, hear!

Mr. Thatcher: — It was very interesting to note how different was the viewpoint and the recommendations of the Manitoba NDP Government, from the suggestions of the Socialists in Saskatchewan who are in opposition. Now the Socialists claim — I think there is a Resolution on the order paper already — that there should be an immediate cash injection made to the farmers of Saskatchewan by the Federal Government.

Some Hon. Members: — Hear, hear!

Mr. Thatcher: — So what is new? Many months ago our Government began asking Ottawa for a cash injection. And at the recent Federal-Provincial Conference we made three major proposals: first, cash payments on farm-stored grain; secondly, a two-price system for wheat; and third, a substantial acreage payment for land taken out of wheat production and diverted to forage. And we have to admit the cost of those proposals would be several hundred million dollars. We have done our best to persuade Ottawa that such injections are needed. No one could do more. It is very interesting as I say that there is a Resolution on the order paper having to do with cash injections. Who has it been moved by? The Hon. Member for Tisdale.

An Hon. Member: — Kelsey.

Mr. Thatcher: — Oh, Kesley, I'm sorry. It was not long ago that the Socialists had a convention in Saskatoon, July 11, 1969. The matter of cash payments was raised in the agricultural committee. And where was the Member for Kelsey (Mr. Messer) on this point of view, on this issue? I quote:

Mr. Messer opposed the resolution calling for immediate cash payment of \$5 an acre to a maximum of \$2,000 to help the farmer.

Some Hon. Members: — Hear, hear!

Mr. Thatcher: — I don't know whether that proves the sincerity of the Hon. Member or not. But certainly it is very strange that he should oppose a resolution a few months ago and then move the same one in this Legislature.

Some Hon. Members: — Hear, hear!

Mr. Thatcher: — Mr. Speaker, what would the Socialists do about the grain crisis if they were in the Saskatchewan Government benches? The Saskatchewan NDP have their thoughts on the matter. I have a clipping in my hand from the Moose Jaw Times Herald, Monday, January 20:

Saskatchewan Young NDP Members Sunday voted to press for nationalization of the farm lands in Canada.

Some Hon. Members: — Hear, hear!

Mr. Thatcher: — It is bad enough to have those young kooks move such a motion. However I didn't think the senior members would be

quite so nutty, but I was wrong. On July 11, the Star Phoenix says:

A resolution aimed at public ownership of farm land as a basic plank was passed Thursday by an agricultural panel at the Saskatchewan NDP Convention.

Some Hon. Members: — Hear, hear!

Mr. Thatcher: — In other words, Mr. Speaker, the Socialists' answer to the farm crisis is "Take the farmer's land away from him. Nationalize it!"

Some Hon. Members: — Hear, hear!

Mr. Thatcher: — Small wonder the Socialists can't get very much farm support. Down through the years, Mr. Speaker, the NDP always had a difficult time with the farm vote because farmers basically are not Socialists, particularly in Canada. Many rural residents feel that the NDP is dominated by the trade union movement. Those unions have often and frequently taken positions which are most harmful to Canadian farmers. The Socialists claim that the interests of the farmer and the laborer are the same. Was it in the interest of the farmer when the seamen tied up all the shipping on the Great Lakes? Was it in the interest of the farmer when the union workers closed down elevator terminals? Was it in the interest of the farmer when the longshoremen tied up the port facilities? Was it in the interest of the farmer when the railroad workers closed down the railroads? I ask the farmers of Saskatchewan, Mr. Speaker, when have any Members of the NDP tried to prevent these crippling strikes? When have they made an attempt to bring about a quick settlement? When have they tried to point out to their labor friends that this behavior threatened the farmers' well-being? I think it is timely today to remind my honorable friends opposite once again of that story in the Toronto Star Weekly about Tommy Douglas. According to that story, at one of the NDP conventions, Walter Young, a member of the NDP executive was quoted as saying:

To hell with the farmers, they are the declining force anyway.

That's the CCF-NDP national executive member.

Some Hon. Members: — Hear, hear!

Mr. Thatcher: — I remember that in the old days, little Tommy Douglas had a favorite saying. He said, "He who pays the piper calls the tune." Certainly today the NDP is being financed in the main by the labor unions. So if Tommy is right, labor is calling the tune.

Mr. Speaker, when you add it all up today, the NDP have failed to come up with one solitary practical solution, not one new idea to solve the farm crisis. The Liberals on the other hand have introduced various programs of diversification. I am going to talk about them tomorrow briefly. These measures all have been helpful in getting our agricultural economy on its feet again.

May I refer very briefly to something the Leader of the Opposition said this afternoon. He was talking about problems in some of our hospitals. Some Hon. Members opposite have been very critical from time to time the last few months, about the way that we settled the hospital strikes in Estevan and in Prince Albert. The Leader of the Opposition (Mr. Lloyd) has complained about the wage increases which we gave the hospital employees. For example, on December 8, according to The Leader Post he stated: "It is unthinkable that we should ask employees earning an average of \$1.50 per hour to subsidize the hospital plan." How different are the words of the Member for Biggar (Mr. Lloyd) in opposition, to what they were when he was in government. Then he could have done something about wages. If the hospital workers of Saskatchewan today are underpaid, surely much of the responsibility can be placed at the doors of the former Socialist Government . . .

Some Hon. Members: — Hear, hear!

Mr. Thatcher: — . . . because in all their years of office, the Socialists gave increases which were generally inconsequential. I was given that information by Mr. Qualey, the head of the union. So, I phoned Mr. Grant the other day and I said, "Let me see some of the grants that have been given recently. Give me the increases that were given the last four or five years of Socialist Government before 1964 and then give me the wage percentage increases since that time." I think the House would be very interested in the figures which Mr. Grant gave me. In 1960 the raises given by the Socialists, 0; in 1961, 3.8 per cent; 1962, 5.6 per cent; 1963, 2.6 per cent; 1964, 4.6 per cent and then the Liberals took office. What were the wage increases? 1965, 4.7 per cent; 1966, 9.1 per cent; 1967, 5.6 per cent; 1968, 7.8 per cent. Every year without exception the increases given by the Liberals were greater than those given by my crying friends of the Socialists prior to 1964.

Some Hon. Members: — Hear, hear!

Mr. Thatcher: — Mr. Speaker, we have never suggested that our hospital employees were overpaid. But, because of the wheat crisis this year, we felt that all the farmers of Saskatchewan should be expected to pay for civil servant, for Crown corporation employees or for hospital employees, was a maximum of 6 per cent. We have felt obliged to stick with that formula. But I can tell my hon. friends opposite that, when economic conditions permit, we will endeavor to give our hospital employees a larger percentage increase.

My hon. friend, the Leader of the Opposition, this afternoon talked a lot about education. He sought to indicate that this Government has been very harsh with our teachers, with our trustees, with students and so on. Of course talk is cheap when you are in the Opposition. How much did the Socialists give our entire education system their last year in office? — \$57 million; this year we are giving education \$121 million or more than double.

Some Hon. Members: — Hear, hear!

Mr. Thatcher: — I was rather surprised at

some of the things the Leader of the Opposition (Mr. Lloyd) suggested today. Why, he indicated the problems of the teacher, the problems of education would all disappear, if we could ever get a Socialist Government back into power. How are the Socialists in Great Britain dealing with their teachers? How are they treating them over there? Last spring the teachers accepted a two-year contract for a salary increase amounting to three and one-half per cent over two years – three and one-half per cent. It was so bad that the teachers decided to go on a nation-wide strike. Mr. Wilson and his Labour Government agreed to give them another \$200. I have an article from The Leader Post, January 1970, by a Dave Humphry from London. It says this and I quote:

British teachers are poorly paid both by Canadian standards and in relation to other jobs here. The basic scale is from \$2,200 for a teacher with three years' training to \$4,100 maximum after 14 years.

That is the manner in which the Socialists handle the teachers in Great Britain. And as if that weren't enough, perhaps the House would be interested in the way they treat their nurses. A student nurse in Britain now earns \$1,000 a year. And they are threatening to strike to try and obtain \$1,350. That's the way the Socialists operate and I don't think it is a very good way.

Some Hon. Members: — Hear, hear!

Mr. Thatcher: — There is another matter that I would like to discuss very briefly, Mr. Speaker, — taxation. The Leader of the Opposition has complained about Provincial taxation. I want to say that if there is one field in which we are proud it is the financial record of this Government . . .

Some Hon. Members: — Hear, hear!

Mr. Thatcher: — . . . because since taking office in 1964, this Government has consistently balanced its budget. We are probably the only Government in all Canada with the possible exception of British Columbia which has done that. We have balanced our budget despite huge new demands for expenditures in the field of health, education and the University. And in the process because we have been prudent we have saved our taxpayers tens of millions of dollars in interest charges.

Some Hon. Members: — Hear, hear!

Mr. Thatcher: — Now I remind the hon. friends opposite that we have done this despite our loss of equalization payments, which used to amount to \$35 million per year. Once in a while when we want to compare what is going on around us we look at Saskatchewan's sales tax. Compare our rate to the fact that two other provinces today have an eight per cent sales tax, three other provinces have a seven per cent sales tax. For several years the Provincial Treasurer has been endeavoring to restrain expenditures, so that the tax line could be held. It hasn't been an easy job. It has meant exercising a rigid control on the spending of people's money. The Leader of the Opposition and his colleagues have repeatedly claimed that we

should have reduced taxes. Yet in every speech the Socialists make, they suggest projects that would cost hundreds of millions of dollars. They say we should have cash grants for farmers. They say we should have higher salaries for teachers, civil servants and so on. They want huge expenditures for public works. They want more schools, more hospitals, more university buildings. They want expanded health services. They want new winter works programs. Now, my hon. friends can't have it both ways. Governments can't print money. If we on the one hand are to provide more services, of course we must have more revenue. When the Opposition criticize our taxation rates, I challenge them to tell us what services they want curtailed. What services do they want curtailed? Well, I said earlier in my remarks that our Manitoba Socialist friends certainly act quite differently than the way our Socialist friends opposite talk. Back in the election campaign in Manitoba, not very long ago, Mr. Schreyer, the NDP Leader, was complaining bitterly about hospitalization and medicare taxes in that province. He said the rates were too high. He repeatedly promised that the Manitoba taxpayer would be relieved of that very onerous burden. Now how did the Socialists act once they took office? Oh, they did reduce the head tax. It went down to \$99.60 a head per family — \$49.80 for a single person. In other words after the huge Socialist reduction it is still 40 per cent higher than it is in Saskatchewan under the Liberals.

Some Hon. Members: — Hear, hear!

Mr. Thatcher: — But that's only part of the story. They immediately went in and announced that they were going to increase personal income taxes savagely — six per cent for all the citizens of Manitoba. Then in addition they raised the corporation tax by two per cent. In other words the Manitoba Socialists, the Manitoba NDP, the Manitoba cousins of my hon. friends opposite, announced \$28 million in tax increases the first week that they met in the Legislature.

Some Hon. Members: — Hear, hear!

Mr. Thatcher: — So after the way their Manitoba cousins acted, I don't think we should hear very much more about tax reductions, Mr. Speaker. I don't think the Liberal Government in this province has very much to learn from my Socialist friends as far as taxation and finances are concerned, because it is self-evident, Mr. Speaker, that in every Socialist country in the world, whether it is Great Britain or Sweden or Russia or Czechoslovakia or East Germany, the countries behind the Iron Curtain, there are high taxes and those taxes have hindered progress. The Socialist philosophy has always been to tear down the successful, discourage private initiative, incentives. Most Canadians don't want that philosophy here. Mr. Speaker, I move adjournment of the debate.

Some Hon. Members: — Hear, hear!

Debate adjourned.

The Assembly adjourned at 4:30 o'clock p.m.