

**LEGISLATIVE ASSEMBLY OF SASKATCHEWAN**  
**Third Session - Sixteenth Legislature**  
**5th Day**

**Friday, February 20, 1970**

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

**WELCOME TO STUDENTS**

**Mr. Speaker:** — I wish on behalf of all the Members of the Legislature to introduce the following groups of school children seated in the galleries: 45 students from the Kelliher high school, in the Touchwood constituency, represented by Mr. Meakes, under the direction of their teacher, Miss Sweatman; 22 students from the Bateman school in the constituency of Gravelbourg, represented by the Hon. Minister of Labour (Mr. Coderre), in the west gallery; 20 students from St. Chad's Girls school from Regina South East constituency, represented by Mr. Baker, under the direction of Mrs. MacKenzie, in the east gallery.

I am sure that all Members will wish to join with me in extending to each and every one of these students a very warm welcome to the Legislature and a very sincere wish that their stay will be enjoyable and informative and that they will all have a safe trip home.

**Hon. Members:** — Hear, hear!

**QUESTIONS**

**Statement by Warren Carragata**

**Mr. E. Whelan** (Regina North West): — Mr. Speaker, I would like to direct a question to the Hon. Premier. In a news story in The Leader Post dated February 12, 1970, you stated that you had instructed the Attorney General (Mr. Heald) to study the transcript of a television program in reference to a statement by one Warren Carragata. This study, so the news story indicates, is to be undertaken because of a rumor that has cast suspicion on Members of the Treasury benches and on members of their families. Since this is a most undesirable situation, can the Hon. Premier advise this House on the steps that have been taken, the finding by the Attorney General and the action that has been contemplated as a result of the rumor attributed to Mr. Carragata, who I am advised is president of the Young Liberal party on the Regina Campus.

**Hon. D. V. Heald** (Attorney General): — Mr. Speaker, the Hon. Member no doubt saw the apology which Mr. Carragata had published in the press. The law officers of my Department are studying the transcript of the original statement and also the transcript of the apology. A decision will be taken in due course. The denial, of course, is quite clear. The denial was made by the Premier on behalf of himself and the Members of the Government. We are studying Mr. Carragata's statement which was a retraction and such action as will be necessary in the circumstances will be taken in due course.

**Mr. Whelan:** — I wonder if I might ask the Attorney General a supplementary question. Since this type of rumor is bound to arise partly because of the Government's refusal to provide the House with the audited financial statements of firms such as Woodland Enterprises Limited and the Saskatchewan Pulpwood Limited, is the Premier now prepared to table these audited statements in order to put a stop to this type of rumor that is emanating from the Liberal party?

**Hon. D. G. Steuart** (Provincial Treasurer): — Mr. Speaker, I don't think you could get their mind up out of the gutter even if we tabled the whole thing.

**Mr. Speaker:** — When Members rise to ask questions, I draw their attention to the fact that they should ask the question and not give a statement about what they presume to be facts. The question, therefore, is out of order.

### **STATEMENT ON INDIAN AND MÉTIS**

**Hon. C. P. MacDonald** (Minister of Welfare): — Mr. Speaker, I would like to make a short statement this afternoon. Reports emanating from the House of Commons yesterday indicated that there were 879 Indian and Métis families starving in Saskatchewan. This report was a result of a proposal made by Dr. Howard Adams to the Saskatchewan Farmers Union to ask the Canadian Wheat Board to permit farmers to contribute wheat to be converted to flour for needy Indian and Métis families in Saskatchewan.

In a letter to Bert Cadieu MP for Meadow Lake and in a statement to the press, Howard Adams, Father John Owen, Sister Ray Steuart, claimed 879 families were facing starvation in Saskatchewan. This is a gross misrepresentation of the truth. What was a simple request for participation in a program of free flour has turned into a claim of starvation by Dr. Adams and his co-authors.

The Métis Society solicited the names of the families through the newspaper, The New Breed. They asked them to apply for free flour. They asked people on welfare, people on low incomes, anyone to write to them if they wanted flour through the proposed program. I have contacted our regional officers and no workers received reports of starvation. No one in this condition has applied for assistance. I have asked our workers to check the communities in their areas to see if the situation exists. I requested the names of the 879 families from Father Owen and Sister Steuart in order to investigate the need of the families referred to. I was refused. I have written Dr. Adams requesting this information. Up to this point I have had no communication with Dr. Adams or the Métis Society indicating this situation does exist.

I do not question the merit of the proposed program, nor do I question the fact that thousands of Canadians on the poverty line or below would welcome flour contributed by farmers in Saskatchewan. However, I do challenge the complete and utter lack of responsibility of Dr. Adams in charging starvation. By his irresponsible actions and deliberate misrepresentation he

has distorted an excellent proposal to help the poor in Saskatchewan.

The Government of Saskatchewan is making major efforts to improve the lot of Indian and Métis people in this province. The people of Saskatchewan are sympathetic to their problem. This places a grave responsibility on their leaders to act in a responsible manner.

**Some Hon. Members:** — Hear, hear!

## **QUESTIONS**

### **Establishment of Sawmill in Prince Albert**

**Mr. W. J. Berezowsky** (Prince Albert East-Cumberland): — Mr. Speaker, I have been getting some very sad reports from my constituency which claims that tens of hundreds of thousands of first class white spruce timber is lying rotting on the ground. I recall that sometime back there was a statement made that a sawmill was negotiated for. Therefore I would like to ask the Government a question. What success has it had so far in the past year of getting a sawmill established in Prince Albert in order to make use of this very valuable timber that has cost us considerable money?

**Hon. W. R. Thatcher** (Premier): — We are working on it. I imagine we will be more successful than the Socialists. After all we obtained a pulpmill when the Socialists failed.

### **Report of the Provincial Auditor**

**Mr. E. I. Wood** (Swift Current): — Mr. Speaker, last Friday the Hon. Attorney General (Mr. Heald) referred to the report of the Provincial Auditor for the fiscal year ending March 31, 1969, as tabled, to the Select Standing Committee on Public Accounts and Printing. We have not as yet received this statement. I was wondering if the Hon. Attorney General can tell us when we might receive this as we would like to get on with the business of this Committee as soon as possible.

**Mr. Heald:** — Mr. Speaker, I am surprised that the Hon. Member has not received it and I will certainly look into it.

### **Sawmill at Big River**

**Mr. W. S. Lloyd** (Leader of the Opposition): — Mr. Speaker, I would like to ask the Premier or the Minister of Natural Resources (Mr. Barrie) if any move has been made to replace the sawmill at Big River and if there is any hope of that being replaced in order to restore that community to its former status.

**Mr. Thatcher:** — We are working on a major complex for that part of the province. I admit, very frankly, that we have been working on it for two years. But we hope that one of these days we are going to have a complex. If we get it, Big River will be

included. Until we have a decision, we are hesitant to go ahead on our own.

**Mr. Berezowsky:** — Mr. Speaker, what in the meantime is going to happen to the hundreds of thousands of this oversized timber? Let it rot?

**Mr. Thatcher:** — Well, when the CCF were in power, the whole of Northern Saskatchewan was rotting. At least we are using a good . . .

**Some Hon. Members:** — Hear, hear!

**Mr. Lloyd:** — Mr. Speaker, the difference now is that the whole of Saskatchewan is undergoing some rot in line with what the Premier is saying.

**Some Hon. Members:** — Hear, hear!

### **Investigation on Indian and Métis**

**Mr. Lloyd:** — I wanted however, Mr. Speaker, to direct a further question to the Minister of Welfare (Mr. MacDonald). In view of the very serious nature of the charge that has been made and in view of the fact that the Government of Canada has recognized it as worthwhile investigating, as I understand that they have sent an investigating team to the Province of Saskatchewan, is he having his Department take part in this investigation so that we can make sure that people are not in need when this need could be met?

**Mr. MacDonald:** — Yes, we spent the morning meeting with the officials, the two Members of Parliament from the Government. We have cooperated with them in arranging for meetings in northern communities and in their stay in Saskatchewan. We have also instructed all of our workers to investigate all the communities in their areas to see if any of these reports are true.

**Mr. Lloyd:** — Mr. Speaker, a further question along this line to the Government. My understanding of the situation is that the committee of Dr. Adams, Father Owen and Rev. Sister Steuart were in touch with the Hon. Otto Lang on or about January 24 and their request to him was that he facilitate this transfer, making it possible for the wheat that the farmers were willing to donate to get to the people who needed it without being charged against their quota. My question to the Government is: has it made any representations to Mr. Lang asking this move to be facilitated without it being charged against the miserably low quota which the farmers have?

**Mr. Thatcher:** — No.

**Mr. Lloyd:** — A supplementary question. Is it the intention of the Government to make any representation? I know that the Government is sensitive about radio time and this is welcome compared to the change of view of yesterday.

**Mr. Thatcher:** — Mr. Speaker, we had three MPs in our office this morning from Ottawa. We suggested to them that we would be very happy if they wanted to change the Wheat Board arrangement. But as the Minister has indicated today, to our knowledge there is no one in that northern area who cannot get on social aid if he applies, provided that there is no employment available.

### **Released Prisoners and Mental Patients**

**Mr. G. R. Bowerman** (Shellbrook): — Mr. Speaker, I would like to ask one short question. Have the Minister of Social Welfare (Mr. MacDonald) and the Minister of Health (Mr. Grant) done anything recently in view of some of the recent tragedies concerning released prisoners and former mental patients and some of the tragedies that have occurred in the past year?

**Mr. MacDonald:** — The Minister of Health is not in the House. I have no knowledge of his business.

**Mr. Thatcher:** — I would invite the Member to direct that question tomorrow or Monday.

**Mr. Bowerman:** — Sorry, Mr. Speaker, I didn't notice that the Minister was not in his seat.

### **ADJOURNED DEBATES**

#### **Address-in-Reply**

The Assembly resumed the adjourned debate on the proposed motion of Mr. Heggie (Hanley), and the amendment thereto by Mr. Lloyd (Leader of the Opposition).

**Hon. W. R. Thatcher** (Premier): — Mr. Speaker, yesterday I spent some time discussing Provincial measures to cope with unemployment and with the agricultural crisis. Today, of course, I would like to commence my remarks by congratulating the mover and the seconder to the Speech from the Throne. I can't promise them that we will immediately move them to the front benches as did the Leader of the Opposition (Mr. Lloyd) in some cases. But they certainly did a fine job.

Mr. Speaker, I have always suggested in this House that there is nothing wrong with socialism except that it will not work.

**Some Hon. Members:** — Hear, hear!

**Mr. Thatcher:** — This morning I heard another definition from one of the Federal Members of Parliament which I thought was rather appropriate. I would like to pass it on to Hon. Members. "Socialism is an excellent theory. But the only places where it will work are in heaven where they don't need it, or in Hades where they already have it."

**Some Hon. Members:** — Hear, hear!

**Mr. Thatcher:** — I knew that my Hon. friends would enjoy that.

Now, Mr. Speaker, for the first few minutes of my time this afternoon, I propose to use the Throne Speech to discuss a subject which has caused many of our citizens increasing concern. I refer to what sometimes has been called ‘Western Alienation’>

Sixty-five years ago the Province of Saskatchewan was created to become, with its neighbor Alberta, one of the key areas of this nation. Since that time many things have happened. An empty wilderness has been populated; thousands of farms have been created and transformed into one of the bread baskets of this world; forests have been developed; new resources have been discovered.

I believe our people feel that Saskatchewan and the West have made a massive contribution to the mind and muscle of the Canadian fact. And yet Westerners, and I am not speaking politically, generally are convinced that they have been short-changed economically by Confederation. They believe that national policies such as the tariff structure have systematically exploited Prairie resources for the benefit of the East. Our people have been disturbed by the West’s obvious inability to influence the political and financial decisions of the nation. They feel, as Canada enters the 1970s, that too many decisions affecting the Prairie destiny are made in Ottawa, Toronto or Montreal.

Westerners are convinced that time and again, in the past, their vital interests have been ignored by our Federal Parliament. They fear that far too often today Parliament is preoccupied with the problems of Quebec at the West’s expense.

Recently complaints of this nature have reached a new crescendo on the Prairies. A deep and dangerous change has begun to emerge in the attitudes of Prairie people. There have been a few – fortunately only a few – who have advocated separatism. But almost all our citizens seek economic redress from Ottawa, not in some minor detail, but in a fundamental shift of the nation’s policies. Let me emphasize that I do not believe Western Canadians are asking for any handouts or for any charity. All the West asks is fair treatment, an opportunity to do business on equal terms with the East. I suggest that in the interest of national unity the time has come when our Federal Parliament must thoroughly examine and heed this widespread discontent.

For several years we have been talking about a new Constitution. Westerners will support reform in this field. But in the process we want Ottawa not to be merely concerned about Quebec’s problems and Ontario’s problems. If or when the terms of Confederation are re-negotiated, we ask that Western Canada be given more equitable treatment. If Ottawa and the East ignore our complaints and demands, I believe that the bonds of Confederation could be strained and frayed.

What are some of the complaints of Western Canada? A few years ago they used to ask: what does Quebec want? Today people in the East ask me: what does the West want? The first and most bitter complaint certainly has to do with Ottawa’s treatment of Western agriculture. This does not mean to say that Ottawa

has ignored the problems of the wheat producer. Nor does it mean to say that there is any easy answer or magic formula which could end farm difficulties. But solutions have been lacking and the farmers' plight has gone from bad to worse. Despite the development of our many new resources on the Prairies, agriculture is still the main foundation of our economy.

Since the war our farmers have been caught in a cost-price squeeze so desperate that thousands have been obliged to abandon their farms. Month by month countless others find themselves in a similar situation. This, of course, in turn seriously affects the towns and villages of the Prairies, which without exception are feeling the effects of agricultural recession. And so I say the Prairie farmer is bitter. Rightly or wrongly he blames Ottawa for much of the misguidance and discriminatory policies that put him in his present position.

Our people know that every other wheat producing nation of the world offers price supports on grain to its farmers. In France today the price of wheat is \$2.95; Netherlands — \$3.19; West Germany — \$3.07; Japan — \$4.56; India — \$2.59; Canada, today No. 2 Northern wheat is about \$1.28. Our farmers know that in other countries, when there is a grain war it is the Treasury which bears the cost. In Canada, on the other hand, it is almost solely the farmer. He is given virtually no protection from cut-throat world competition. Our farmers are incensed when they compare their own declining income, with the returns of other segments of our economy.

Since the war, annually throughout Canada, there has been a consistent upward trend in prices, wages and incomes. Year after year sharp wage increases have been demanded and given to virtually every union handling the farmer's grain, whether it is the longshoremens, the railroaders, the Maritime unions, the dockworkers, or the elevator operators. Is it any wonder that our farmers become somewhat cynical, when they compare their own treatment with the treatment given to the trade unions? For years Westerners have asked for the two-price system. Adoption of that policy need not cost the Federal Treasury one cent. Rather it could be financed by an increase in the price of bread of 1 1/2 or 2 cents a loaf. Yet year after year Parliament has turned this request down. Our farmers have watched the price of machinery double since the war. They have watched the price of land more than triple. Yet in the same period the price of wheat has dropped by 25 per cent. So I say, there is probably no other group in our economy which is caught in such a devastating way by inflation as the farmer. It can be rightly said that in this regard he is in a class by himself.

Westerners find it almost incredible that at a time when the Prairie farmer is virtually fighting for survival, the Federal Government spends so much time talking about the Constitution, bilingualism and so on. It is small wonder that some farmers are beginning to ask: what has Confederation really done for me?

At the recent Federal-Provincial Conference the Government of Saskatchewan made a series of suggestions to alleviate the crisis. I can only express the hope that Ottawa will pay some attention to our proposals.

The second major irritant in Western Canada, I think, continues to be the National Tariff Policy. The policy was

established in 1879 by Sir John A. MacDonald. It was designed to protect Canada's infant industries. On an average, because of that tariff policy, most Western Canadians see their cost of living increase by about 25 per cent. Today despite all the recent Gatt negotiations, and all the other tariff conferences Canada still remains one of the most highly protected nations in the world, and largely at the expense of Western Canadians. On the other hand, Western Canada is a producer of great natural wealth including wheat, potash, forest products, oil and so on. These products are given no protective tariff. They must be sold at competitive prices in the world market.

Most Westerners will agree with the statement which Premier Harry Strom of Alberta made a few months ago. He said, "We see the logic of protecting infant industries, but some of the infants are 80 years of age, and we are tired of paying their pensions."

**Some Hon. Members:** — Hear, hear!

**Mr. Thatcher:** — In Winnipeg recently, economists put the cost of the tariff at \$687 per Canadian family. To the Westerner that figure is part of the cost of Confederation, and he is becoming increasingly unwilling to pay such a huge levy.

The present oil situation in Canada seems to be rather typical of the economic discrimination against the West. Much of our Western oil must be sold in the United States, and there are stiff quotas. Soon the quotas, I fear, will be even more severe. We have repeatedly asked to be allowed into the Montreal and Maritime market. Ottawa has refused because they said such action would put the price of oil up one cent to Eastern consumers. In other words, in our existing Confederation there appears to be one set of economic rules for the East, and another for the West. I don't think Westerners are prepared to see this situation continue indefinitely.

We are not an economic colony, simply to be developed in the interests of the East. Nor are we willing to see our development curtailed by Eastern restrictions against foreign investment and trade. This was the kind of economic thinking that led to the American Revolution back in the days of George III. Let there be no mistake in Parliament. If or when a new Constitution is formulated, Westerners will ask and insist on negotiating better tariff terms.

I turn now to another area of rank discrimination — freight rates. For years our two railroads, the CPR and the CNR, have taken advantage of the lack of water competition and trucking competition, to charge Western Canadians substantially higher freight rates than they charge the people of Central Canada. Time and again the railroads have exploited our natural resources, overcharged our shippers, and refused to pay a reasonable share of their tax load. Now this Government has at no time endeavored to make the railroads a political whipping boy. However, a series of events has taken place lately which make us wonder if the CPR and CNR are simply two more companies, dominated by Eastern Canada, which are impervious to the interests of the West.

Why in this Confederation should we pay freight rates higher than those paid by Central Canadians? The way the



railroads are treating our resource industries is little short of scandalous.

Permit me to mention the Prince Albert pulp mill. We now have a huge industry in the North employing hundreds of people at top wages. Our Treasury is enriched by hundreds of thousands of dollars each year from stumpage and taxes. Now, what have the railroads done to help? From the beginning they have refused to give us freight rates similar to those existing in Ontario, Quebec or British Columbia. Why should our pulp mill in Prince Albert pay about 30 per cent more in freight rates to haul pulp a thousand miles than a mill does in British Columbia or Ontario? The treatment of the potash industry has been equally shocking. We have the highest grade of potash in the world. Because we are in the heart of a great continent, those companies are at the mercy of the railroads where freight rates are concerned. They have exploited that situation to the full. Repeatedly the potash companies, repeatedly our Government, have asked for more reasonable rates but generally to no avail.

A year ago IMC of Esterhazy asked the Government for permission to truck potash 120 miles across the border. By so doing they were able to get a rate of \$5 per ton below the Canadian rate. I might say in passing that they are paying for the use of our highways. Now Hon. Members are well aware of the problems of the potash industry. This industry is also fighting for its survival. Yet at such a moment the railroads chose not to lower potash rates but to increase them. So I say, Mr. Speaker, there has been a good deal of talk in recent years of Western alienation. I want to tell the railroads that their uncompromising refusal to give the Prairies competitive rates with other parts of Canada is contributing to national disunity. I have invited the Prime Minister and I invite him again today, to examine the freight rate structure in Western Canada with the same attention he has given the Province of Quebec. Westerners want no better freight rates than other parts of Canada, but we do want the same rates. We are tired of being treated as second rate citizens in this regard.

Over the years it has concerned the West that the head offices of most of the large Canadian companies are situated in Toronto or Montreal. The head offices of 19 out of 20 of the largest corporations in the nation are located in Central Canada. The implement companies, the packing houses, the flour mills, the steel companies and so on. And I point out to you, Mr. Speaker, that not one of Canada's chartered banks has its head office in the three Prairie Provinces. Most of the trust companies, most of the insurance companies, all have their head offices down East. Westerners feel that many of these huge corporations make a good deal of their profits on the Prairies and yet have their head offices in the East. There are many serious effects of this situation.

Company earnings that are drawn from all parts of the nation are used at the site of the head office to pay administrative staff. The result is a disproportionate spending in Central Canada of resources that were collected on the Prairies. It is a never-ending chain reaction. Servicing firms spring up where the head offices are located. The end result is to draw people from all parts of the nation and thus tends to concentrate population in Central Canada.

Today much of the savings, as I say which are deposited in the West, are loaned out in the Central Provinces. In other

words an additional cause of Western alienation is the fact that, while a large portion of our national wealth is in the West, the financial decision-making processes are almost entirely in the East. And when Westerners, when this Government a short time ago endeavored to obtain a bank for the Prairies, every obstacle was put in the way and finally the effort collapsed. Provincial governments are prevented by Federal law from participating in the banking business even as shareholders. I say, Why? Many of the major banks of Canada, Mr. Speaker, refuse even to appoint a national director from the Province of Saskatchewan. So little apparently is their interest in this Province.

Now I want to say a word about Designated Area legislation. I said yesterday that we felt Federal legislation was good as far as it went. Unfortunately two-thirds of Saskatchewan is not designated. We note, with major concern, that so far 85 per cent of the funds that are used in the Designated Area legislation are going to Quebec and the Maritimes. No one will deny that those areas need new industries. But surely in an effort to promote economic stability, far more attention should be paid to secondary industries in the West, to broaden our economic base.

Our people have been concerned that Ottawa has been closing up one military base after another in our province and on the Prairies. Today in Saskatchewan with five per cent of the population we have 1.73 per cent of Canada's military personnel. Why at this crucial period could Parliament not make a more conscious effort to locate additional military personnel in the Prairie area?

Yesterday I mentioned Federal public works. We were appalled last week to learn that this year Saskatchewan will only receive 1.3 per cent of the \$286 million in Federal public works spending. We have asked that this be changed and I believe it will be changed. But surely such figures are discriminatory toward Western Canada.

Now I turn finally to another subject, which in my opinion vitally affects every citizen of our Province and particularly the West. As if the current complex of discrimination were not enough, the Government of Canada proposes to inflict upon us a new tax system, calculated to damage our enterprise, smother our incentive, conscript our capital and restrict our economic growth. The document known as the "White Paper" could well be the last straw on the camel's back. We all know that so far this is still only a position paper. I hope it will remain a position paper. Let me admit at once that there are some provisions of the White Paper which are good, which are desirable. Anyone would be pleased that exemptions for the lower income groups are to be modestly increased. But our Government has serious reservations about many other aspects of the proposals. The document as presently drawn up seems to us to be of the Robin Hood variety. The White Paper suggests substantially increased taxation on those in the middle income group, on small businesses, on farmers, on co-ops and upon resource industries. As we see it, the capital gains tax, which will be at a higher rate than in the United States, could seriously curtail investment in our province. But Saskatchewan as far as our Government is concerned takes particular exception to the provisions which would greatly reduce incentives to the mining and oil industries, just at a time when such development is beginning

to take place in a meaningful way in this province. We saw the great mining industry of Quebec and Ontario built with these incentives. Now that we might make some progress in that field we don't want to see those incentives removed.

**Some Hon. Members:** — Hear, hear!

**Mr. Thatcher:** — A very small portion of the White Paper may represent tax reform. But as I see it, most of the paper is simply a proposal to raise more revenue through an entirely new form of taxation — a tax on assets. If in addition to our other long-standing economic grievances, the West is called upon to assume a new and heavy burden of taxation then we may see more resolutions like the one passed by the Saskatchewan Wheat Pool several months ago advocating a study of Separatism. I believe if that White Paper goes through Canada could become another England, a country where initiative is discouraged and progress impeded. And so I say our Government will do all it can to vigorously protest this White Paper in the months ahead, because we believe, Mr. Speaker, that the adoption of the White Paper in its present form would be a disaster to Western Canada.

These then, Mr. Speaker, are some of the grievances of Western Canada. As I said, there are feelings today of frustration, dissatisfaction and unrest. It has been said by some Westerners that within the existing structure of Confederation there can be no justice for the Prairies, that they must find it elsewhere. I do not share that view. I regard separatism, whether it appears in Quebec or any other region, as suicidal lunacy, because in that direction lies the ruin of a nation, which has given its inhabitants one of the highest living standards in the world, and more important a life of their own, precious beyond the measurement of money.

**Some Hon. Members:** — Hear, hear!

**Mr. Thatcher:** — But fully conscious of my responsibility as Premier of Saskatchewan, I again must tell the Canadian Parliament and Government that the nation's unity is endangered in the West as well as in Quebec. And I must say that lacking a change of mind and policy at Ottawa, the Western situation could finally escape the control of reasonable men. Let us be very clear. The West as I know it demands no special treatment, no pity, no charity. It asks only for equality and a chance to pursue its natural opportunities, its growth, and its chosen way of living, without unnatural burdens imposed by others to the injury and peril of the grand Canadian experiment.

**Some Hon. Members:** — Hear, hear!

**Mr. Thatcher:** — To that experiment with all its mighty success in the past, and all its brave hopes for the future, the Government of Saskatchewan remains dedicated. But it would be no service to Canada, it would be a serious disservice, if we in the West kept silent and brooded secretly on our grievances, instead of presenting them openly and honestly for the judgment of our fellow countrymen. Therefore, I say, let us speak out and appeal to the Canadian people's sense of justice, which over the years has never failed to remove injustice once it was demonstrated and understood. Canada, I am sure, will listen if our voice is

reasonable and our case is sound. Most Westerners, indeed almost all Westerners, want Canada to survive, but we want it to survive under new and different economic rules. There are inequities to be righted. There are urgent agricultural problems to be solved. There is the matter of Federal favoritism to Central Canada to be ended. We want freight rate treatment in Saskatchewan which is similar to that given elsewhere. There is the question of straightening out Ottawa's priorities. We want more say in the West in the Canadian decision-making. So I say, in the interest of national unity, we do call upon Ottawa to redress our grievances. It is to these dangers that I have addressed myself today, not in anger, nor in bitterness and certainly not with any threat or menace. I repeat, Westerners want only equal opportunity in a strong and united Canada.

**Some Hon. Members:** — Hear, hear!

**Mr. Thatcher:** — And now, Mr. Speaker, may I turn for a moment this afternoon to the wheat crisis. I pointed out yesterday in the debate that so far we had seen no solution forthcoming from the Socialist benches. The only suggestion we had seen was the resolution passed by the Young NDP calling for socialization of all land in Saskatchewan, and a resolution passed by the agricultural committee of the NDP Convention again calling for the socializing of land. I don't think many farmers in this Province will be very keen about the socialization of land.

As we study this economic crisis, Mr. Speaker, it is frustrating. It is frustrating because it is caused by surpluses and not by scarcity. There is a surplus of wheat. We have a glut of potash. There is more oil than we can sell. We have an overabundance of lumber and uranium. And these have, of course, caused economic problems in our province which are acute and far-reaching. It has placed some employment opportunities in jeopardy. But it continues to be the belief of the Government that these setbacks are temporary, that the long-term economic future of our province continues to be bright.

Hon. Members know that our wheat farmers face the most serious problems they have had since the '30s. And it is increasingly obvious that there are no pat answers or easy solutions. I don't think there is much point in trying to find a scapegoat. It seems apparent that marketing difficulties for grain will be with us at least for the foreseeable future. At the moment we still have about 1.3 billion bushels of wheat on hand. As I say, our difficulties have permeated down through retailers, wholesalers and manufacturers.

Recently there have been a few bright spots. Barley and rapeseed sales have been encouraging. The Russian sale and the Chinese sale were very, very fine efforts. The Canadian Wheat Board has claimed that the situation will improve materially in the next few months. I talked to Mr. MacNamara in Winnipeg about a week ago, and he told me that he fully expects that sales of wheat this year will reach 400 million bushels of export trade. If that is so, the figure is 100 million more than a year ago. He tells us that barley sales will be away up, and he tells us that the sale of grain on the domestic market will be much improved. We all hope that those optimistic predictions are correct. However, there is little doubt that even if Mr. MacNamara is right, we shall have wheat problems for a lengthy period ahead.

I don't need to remind this Legislature that international trade is a Federal matter. As I pointed out in the Legislature yesterday, even the Leader of the Opposition (Mr. Lloyd) in one or two speeches said that, and I quote him:

Selling wheat can only be done adequately by the Federal Government through the Canadian Wheat Board.

I hope he'll make that statement at a few NDP meetings out around the province in the months ahead.

**An Hon. Member:** — I'm sure he will!

**Mr. Thatcher:** — Thus farmers have to look to Ottawa for any major action in the selling of grain. But that doesn't mean to say that our Government is content to sit idly by and leave the disposal of wheat completely to Ottawa. We have tried to take a number of steps that would supplement Federal action. For example we have done our best to encourage straight barter deals. We know that barter is an archaic way of trading. We know it isn't the final answer. We found the Wheat Board and the Federal Government unenthusiastic. Maybe some of their fears are justified but we don't think so. As we have tried to make these barter deals, we have run into roadblocks. We've had many frustrations. We've had unbelievable difficulties. But in the first two deals that we concluded we think that we have gained experience. And we believe that we have no alternative but to endeavor to make other barter sales. Thus we are negotiating additional deals which we hope will be meaningful. I admit at once that, unless we can get cooperation from Ottawa and the Wheat Board, some of our efforts may not be productive. But I say that, if we are given that kind of cooperation, only if we are given cooperation, the Saskatchewan Government could barter 25 million bushels this year.

**Some Hon. Members:** — Hear, hear!

**Mr. Thatcher:** — In passing I emphasize again that barter is no solution to the wheat crisis. But I hope the exercise will indicate even to my hon. friends opposite that at least the Government is sincerely trying.

Mr. Speaker, our Government has constantly since taking office advocated greater diversification into livestock. We are trying to give leadership in that field. Most agricultural experts believe that next year our farmers should plant more durum wheat, more flax, more coarse grains. I was somewhat sorry to see the advice of the Minister in charge of the Wheat Board that farmers shouldn't grow wheat this year. What on earth does he expect them to grow out here — pineapples, or grapefruit, or apples, or avocados? I don't know. And I am sure most Eastern Members of Parliament should realize that fact. Our soil and our climate will only permit us to grow certain crops. I don't suggest that going into livestock is a final solution either. There is no way that livestock can eat their way through mountains of surplus grain. However, I do think it would help. The need for this kind of shift is illustrated by looking at prices, because, as I said earlier, prices for wheat are down about 25 per cent as compared to prices at the end of the War. Yet the price for cattle has nearly tripled since the War, and hogs are 70 per cent higher. There

are some who say that if too many go into livestock there may be a collapse in cattle prices. Well of course there is a danger, but I remind the Legislature and the people of Saskatchewan that our province still has only 2 per cent of the cattle population of North America. A rapid expansion in this province should only have a minimal effect. Today the great American market is at our back door. Surely there is something wrong with our economy when last year we brought in more red meat from the United States than we sold to them. That just doesn't make sense. So authorities whether on this side of the border or in the country to the south of us tell us that the demand for livestock products will rise substantially.

Mr. Speaker, there have been a number of factors inhibiting our livestock production, apart from the relatively high prices of wheat a few years ago. There has been a shortage of grazing land, winter fodder, water, veterinary services and there has frequently been a lack of finances. That is why this Government has taken a number of steps to help the farmer get into livestock production.

We've greatly increased the capacity of our community pastures. We've commenced five new sheep pastures. We have persuaded farmers with cash incentives to get into forage crops. We are sharply increasing irrigation potential, not only at the South Saskatchewan River but also with small projects. We are improving veterinarian services. The main step which the Government is taking during the crisis is to help farmers financially to get into livestock. We have done that as far as hogs are concerned in the Northern ARDA areas by participating on a fifty-fifty basis with the Federal Government in building swine buildings. SEDCO has been loaning fairly substantial sums of money to farmers who want to go into cattle feeding or hog feeding. More farmers should use SEDCO. As the current Throne Speech indicates, we recently commenced a program which will guarantee bank loans made by farmers for the purpose of breeding stock up to \$6,000. The Bill will shortly be introduced into the Legislature. And I think it is a good Bill. It subsidizes the interest rate. No payments have to be made for the first two years. Certainly it has been well accepted. I might tell the House that up to February 1st – and all the figures aren't in yet – 2800 loans have been made to farmers for that purpose. The value of these loans is up to almost \$10 million.

**Some Hon. Members:** — Hear, hear!

**Mr. Thatcher:** — So we hope that these regulations will be of major help in permitting farmers to get into livestock in the quickest possible time. Maybe next spring we will make it apply also to feeder cattle.

I point out that we have helped the Wheat Pool with a similar program. SEDCO has loaned them \$3.5 million so that they can provide their members with loans to get into feeder cattle.

Livestock diversification seems to be proceeding in a most gratifying manner. If there is a silver lining to the current grain glut it is that fact. Cattle and sheep numbers are up quite substantially from a year ago, sheep, I believe, 5 per cent, cattle about 8. Hogs, however, are up over 40 per cent. Thus I urge Saskatchewan farmers to continue their efforts in this field.

Mr. Speaker, our farmers have surmounted countless problems in the past, and I am convinced that they will surmount their present difficulties. Drought in China, in Russia, Australia or elsewhere could change the wheat picture very rapidly. I only hope that we shall not have drought in Canada. Sooner or later our farmers are going to be very happy that their granaries are filled to capacity.

**Some Hon. Members:** — Hear, hear!

**Mr. Thatcher:** — The long-term picture for agriculture is still bright indeed in a hungry world.

I want to turn for a moment now to potash. Saskatchewan has half the known reserves in the world. Last year we produced 3.5 million tons valued at \$70 million. However, the Canadian, indeed the North American potash industry, healthy and progressive several years ago, has transformed itself into an industry that is confused, disillusioned and critically ill. Our potash mines are suffering from the self-inflicted wounds of overproduction, chaotic pricing and a virulent competitive situation. In the past 12 months we watched potash prices drop from \$21.50 a ton to \$12.50. The primary industry vital to Saskatchewan had seemingly brought itself to its own knees. Major layoffs at some companies seemed imminent and, to make matters infinitely more serious, American officials blamed Canadian companies for dumping potash south of the border. They claimed that low-priced Canadian imports were ruining the New Mexico industry. The Government of the United States as a result threatened punitive measures against our potash exports to that country. A number of Saskatchewan potash corporations were threatened with heavy anti-dumping fines. In addition a Bill was introduced into the American Senate which might have imposed a 40 per cent tariff. I visited Washington and discussed this with some American Senators and Congressmen. In no uncertain terms they had a message. It went something like this:

Our potash industry, primarily in New Mexico, is being ruined by cheap Canadian imports. Either Canada must act to end this situation or we will.

Since 70 per cent of all our potash goes to the United States it was important to this Province that some action be taken. We suggested to Ottawa that maybe it would like to move. There didn't seem to be much interest. We were afraid, if we waited for the Federal authorities in Ottawa and Washington to get together, it might take several years. Some of our industries might by that time have disappeared, and so we called an emergency meeting of the nine potash companies doing business in Saskatchewan. We discussed the problem at length and I ask my friend, the Hon. Leader of the Opposition (Mr. Lloyd), and his colleagues to listen to this one statement. All companies unanimously went on record as to the need for some action to end the marketing chaos. Because of the United States anti-trust laws the American companies indicated that they couldn't do anything themselves. So in assessing the situation we came to a number of conclusions.

First, that unless the marketing chaos was ended and some kind of order restored several companies faced bankruptcy. Of course we didn't want to see that happen, but in all honesty our main concern was not the corporations. Our chief concern

was the fact that there were 3,000 jobs in the industry and 12,000 indirectly and many of those jobs were in jeopardy.

We were also concerned by the fact that huge sums of royalties and tax revenue would be denied the people of Saskatchewan. Thus in the face of these extreme difficulties, the because of the lack of action by the potash producers, or the senior governments, the Provincial Administration with some reluctance decided it must take action. Effective January 1st the Minister of Mineral Resources (Mr. Cameron) introduced some far-reaching amendments.

In essence the new regulations provided the following: first, that all mines were subject to strict prorationing; second, that all producers of potash in Saskatchewan were obliged to obtain disposal licences if they wished to export; third, a minimum price of \$18.75 (United States funds) per ton has been set for all potash produced in Saskatchewan. A Potash Conservation Board was created to supervise the implementation of these potash regulations. That Board will determine the productive capacity of each potash mine and the proportionate share of production which will be allowed in each mine.

Now we are well aware, Mr. Speaker, that there could be some kinks in the legislation. We realize that where prices are concerned we are in a grey area. We know that Ottawa is not exactly enthusiastic about some of the regulations we have introduced. It is possible although not probable that mines in the United States might endeavor to undercut the fixed Saskatchewan price. They might use our price as an economic umbrella to increase their own production. Those were dangers that had to be faced.

As Hon. Members know, most of the American mines are in New Mexico. Thus our first step obviously, if our own regulations were to work, was to secure the cooperation of New Mexico. Accordingly, four members of our Cabinet and several officials travelled to that state last autumn to discuss with Governor Cargo and his colleagues problems of mutual interest. We also talked to several of the New Mexico potash companies. We have received voluntary assurances from those mines that they will not take advantage of our regulations to increase production in that state. We have also received assurances from Governor Cargo that he will do his best to ensure the cooperation of the New Mexico companies in this regard.

Mr. Speaker, we next went to Germany to discuss the same problem with the German and French industry. The discussions were most cordial, and we expect full cooperation from the Germans and the French. The same took place in Israel when we sat down with the Minister of Trade and Commerce. Israel produces potash from the Dead Sea. They have agreed also that they will restrict production in the coming year. Another large producer of potash is Spain. Recently two of their officials came out to Regina to meet with us, and they have offered cooperation. This leaves only two major producers in the world, Russia and the East Germans. When we were in Frankfurt, the Germans undertook to go to Russia and to East Germany, to see whether or not they would be interested in working along with us in restoring order to the industry. We have not heard yet of the results. We cannot be certain whether they will be cooperative or not.



Mr. Speaker, I would be the first to admit that potash problems will probably be with us for at least several years. There are some who say that if prices go up, consumption will be discouraged. History has never shown this viewpoint to be factual.

I would like to tell Hon. Members about the attitude of the largest consumer in the United States toward our legislation. I refer to Central Farmers Fertilizer Company. It is a cooperative and by far the largest purchaser of potash in America. At its quarterly meeting last November 14th in Tampa, Florida, the Board of Directors issued a statement, and I quote a single paragraph:

Central Farmers concurs with Premier Thatcher that strong measures are required to put the North American potash industry back on a sound operating basis, and that failure to take action could have a disastrous effect on the industry.

I emphasize again . . .

**Some Hon. Members:** — Hear, hear!

**Mr. Thatcher:** — . . . that this statement was issued by a consumer of potash and a cooperative consumer, not a producer.

Now I indicated that we had to take some drastic action at the first of the year. Shortly after Christmas, IMC the potash company in Esterhazy laid off about 100 people. The Leader of the Opposition (Mr. Lloyd) and my hon. friends opposite immediately began making speeches. Why, they said, those regulations have meant that 100 people have lost their jobs. They tried to make political capital from one end of the province to the other. I have in my hands, Mr. Speaker, a letter from Mr. Nelson C. White, President of IMC in Chicago. I believe this letter should be put on the record in view of those statements made by the Socialists.

Dear Mr. Thatcher:

I am disturbed by Mr. Lloyd's remarks on January 9th on potash policy for two reasons, first, because he made what I consider an unfair attack on my company and, second, used the same distorted information to attack your Potash Conservation Program.

His statement was grossly unfair in implying that IMC gave no consideration to seniority, severance pay, dependents, or assistance in finding new employment for those men involved in the lay-offs. As Mr. Lindberg told Mr. Steuart, we carefully considered all pertinent factors in making the painful decisions involved in letting good men go, did follow seniority and severance pay policies, did find other employment for some and are continuing to help all others who wish us to do so. Of the 99 people involved, there are only 35 for whom we are still seeking opportunities to accept or reject.

And that was about a month ago.

More important, had it not been for the announcement by your Government that it would take action to avert

disaster to the Canadian potash industry, effects on employment both at IMC and other mines would have been far more severe. Had the program not been initiated, IMC may well have had to take far more drastic action (such as shutting down entirely one of its two mines) to minimize the steadily increasing drain on our resources which was passing the point of toleration.

Therefore, we strongly support your Government in its effort to provide a sound base for the potash industry to make maximum efficient use of the resources, both mineral and human, of the province. We believe the current program can provide that base.

**Some Hon. Members:** — Hear, hear!

**Mr. Thatcher:** — Mr. Speaker, if we are to solve the problems of this ailing industry . . .

**Mr. Speaker:** — Table the letter.

**Mr. Thatcher:** — Yes. . . . If we are to solve the problems of this ailing industry, we will have to have frequent consultations. We are confident that the new regulations will provide an initial and important step toward sorting out the problems. Throughout our deliberations we have consulted the industry frequently and often. Although there are some differences in detail, the main principles set out by the plan are generally acceptable. Moreover, we have assured the industry that we will meet with them periodically to correct any inequities if any should arise.

Despite what our Socialist critics have had to say, the Government has been guided in its action by its deep concern for the well-being of the thousands of workers involved. It has been guided by its determination to end the wastage of an irreplaceable natural resource belonging to our people. The minimum price, which is just above the breakeven point, and the orderly marketing procedures are designed to assure a fair return through royalties to the people of Saskatchewan. We think that by 1972 or 1973 potash demand will again catch up to supply, and that the industry may once again begin a program of expansion. The long-term outlook for this great resource continues to be bright.

Now, Mr. Speaker, I would like to hurry on to certain emergency measures which this Government contemplates taking to stimulate employment. We know that the construction industry has been particularly hard hit over the last six months. Not only has the industry been adversely affected by the farm crisis, but it has been laid low by the highest interest rates in the history of Canada. Those interest rates have sometimes reached 10 and 11 per cent. The rates have caused municipal governments, school boards, private industry and homebuilders, all to postpone major projects, and there has been unemployment as a result. As indicated in the Throne Speech, the Provincial Government is going to try to prime the pump. We are proposing such action, even if it does mean deficit financing, though I hope it will not. As the Hon. Members know, this Government believes in balanced budgets in normal times, but we think at this moment a case can be made for not having a balanced budget. How do we propose to help? First of all, the Municipal Loan

and Development Fund has been activated. During the current calendar year municipal governments and school boards and so on will be loaned money to finance capital projects at the prime Saskatchewan rate, plus a small nominal carrying charge. The Throne Speech indicated that we are going to try and speed up housing. We have several programs in this field. The \$500 grant for winter housing is only one of a number. We don't know how much that program will cost. We are putting \$500,000 in the Budget, but we hope the sum required will be many times that amount. We are speeding up industrial incentives. Apart from persuading Ottawa to do a little more, the Throne Speech indicates that we have a new Bill, under which we will make industrial grants to those areas which are not covered by Federal legislation. We are quite sure that before the Bill is up Ottawa will have included Regina and Saskatoon in the Federal legislation. Otherwise we may be obliged to include those cities.

**Some Hon. Members:** — Hear, hear!

**Mr. Thatcher:** — May I now say a word about our own public works. I said a moment ago that we want Ottawa to give us a crash public works program of about \$20 million. I hope that one of these days it is going to agree. Certainly our reception at the recent Federal-Provincial Conference was excellent. But what about Provincial public works? We have had all our departments and agencies working for several months to see what public works could be taken off the shelf. I want to emphasize that the projects I mention this afternoon are projects in addition to the ordinary Public Works budget.

First of all there will be a capital injection in the Department of Agriculture of \$1 million. Incidentally before I begin the details, may I emphasize that the total is \$20 million. That \$20 million will generate another \$15 million due to expenditures by municipalities or school boards and so on. I repeat, in Agriculture \$1 million, of this about \$600,000 will go to commence on the West Side Irrigation Project. Another \$400,000 will be for additional Indian farms that had not been contemplated in the original Budget. The Government has decided to allocate an additional \$1 million for school building grants. This added expenditure of \$1 million should generate spending of \$3.5 million in total, when Federal and local government spending are taken into account.

Highways will be spending another \$1.6 million on two major bridges. One will be located at Leader. The other will be announced by the Minister of Highways (Mr. Boldt) later this Session.

As far as housing is concerned, we are putting another \$765,000 to provide homes for our native people, either rental homes or for building homes.

Municipal Road Assistance, we are allocating an extra \$1.3 million to our rural municipalities above what was in the original grant.

An additional grant of \$350,000 will be placed to extend the park at Lake Diefenbaker. We shall also have a winter program in certain other Provincial Parks.

The Department of Public Works is placing immediately an additional \$4 million in its budget. May I mention some of the

projects included in that \$4 million, I shall not detail the smaller projects, but only some of the major ones. A \$1.3 million Highway building in the city of Moose Jaw; \$650,000 will be spent this year. Renovations to the School for the Deaf at Saskatoon about \$700,000. Renovations to the Court House at Yorkton and the provision of a recreation hall at Duck Mountain Provincial Park, \$165,000. Renovations to the Saskatchewan Hospital at North Battleford, additional \$345,000. Extra renovations to the Legislative Building, \$250,000. Improvements to the Saskatchewan Hospital at Weyburn to provide for a geriatric center, extra again \$300,000. A Liquor Board warehouse in Regina, \$150,000. These are the major projects of the Hon. Minister for Public Works (Mr. Guy). There are others.

So far as the utilities are concerned, may I say to the House that Telephones will be spending \$1.3 million immediately in extra capital projects. I won't go into the details this afternoon. The Power Corporation has been asked to step up its capital program by \$6 million, which will bring the total this year to \$40 million. Again I won't go into details, although Hon. Members will have them tomorrow. We will be bringing gas to an extra 16 communities that are not in the present Budget.

As far as Welfare is concerned, another \$180,000. One major project will be the extension of Pioneer Village in Regina, at a total estimated cost of \$2.5 million; \$100,000 will be made available immediately. Other Special Care and Sheltered Workshop projects will be undertaken at an approximate cost of \$500,000.

The University of Saskatchewan will be given \$1 million extra over and above its original total.

Winter housing as I said a moment ago, \$500,000. Designated Area \$1 million. Now when you add all this up, Mr. Speaker, there is about \$20 million.

We know that these crash programs are urgently needed. If they should prove inadequate, the Government will again in about 60 or 90 days review the situation. If we feel that additional capital projects are needed, we will take them off the shelf. In the meantime we are going to start the architects, the draftsmen, and the engineers in preparing new projects.

As far as Regina is concerned I believe it is the intention of the Minister of Health (Mr. Grant) to proceed with the massive hospital here in Regina, sometime within a very few months.

Mr. Speaker, these past few months have been difficult ones for the people of Saskatchewan. However, as I said earlier, our people have overcome economic obstacles in the past. I am sure they will again. Let us never forget, when we become a little critical, that our living standards are still infinitely higher than those of people in most parts of the world. Let us never forget how fortunate we are, when we compare the lot of Canadians to the famine, war, and starvation which exist in many other parts of the world. Saskatchewan in the next decade I am absolutely convinced will see unlimited development. Our problems as I say aren't caused by poverty, but by surpluses and wealth. Sooner or later a needy world

will want these products. Saskatchewan basically is one of the rich areas of Canada and North America. When many of the people of Saskatchewan listen to some of the promises of the Socialists, let us compare the mess in Socialist England with what we have here in Saskatchewan. Then we will thank God that we haven't got a Socialist Government.

**Some Hon. Members:** — Hear, hear!

**Mr. Thatcher:** — I shall not support the amendment, Mr. Speaker.

**Mr. D. G. MacLennan** (Last Mountain): — Mr. Speaker, I would like at this time to congratulate his Honour the Lieutenant Governor on his recent appointment. I wish him and his wife a most successful term of office.

The former Lieutenant Governor Mr. Hanbidge brought a true and real meaning of the position to the people of Saskatchewan and in my opinion became one of Saskatchewan's most beloved men in public office. I wish him a most enjoyable retirement.

**Some Hon. Members:** — Hear, hear!

**Mr. MacLennan:** — I would like to congratulate the mover and the seconder, the Members for Hanley and Elrose on their presentations, in moving and seconding the Address-in-Reply to the Speech from the Throne.

With somewhat mixed feelings I welcome the new Member from Kelvington (Mr. Byers). I know that he as most Members that have ever sat in this House, will certainly enjoy his stay. It is not necessary for me, Mr. Speaker, to congratulate him on his election, as I had done so on the evening of his election in his own committee room. For some odd reason I happened to be up there at that time. I regret to say, Mr. Speaker, that I in a way subsidized some of the Member from Saskatoon Mayfair's campaign expenses in that election. It was almost a new experience for me after having participated in Liberal victories in Turtleford, Weyburn, Prince Albert, Bengough, Moosomin by-elections, and the deferred election in Athabasca of 1960.

In last year's Debate, Mr. Speaker, on the Speech from the Throne, the Member from Regina North West (Mr. Whelan) opened his remarks with concern about the seating arrangement of some of the Members of this side of the House. He seemed to expect that one or two of them might move their seats to different locations in the House. Well looking around we look very normal and everybody is in the proper place, but it is quite apparent that he was once again wrong and that he should have been concerned about the seating arrangement on that side of the House.

**Some Hon. Members:** — Hear, hear!

**Mr. MacLennan:** — In the great Socialist leap forward according to Chairman Woodrow, the Regina North West Member along with his two fellow travellers from Regina, the Member from North East (Mr. Smishek) and our friend the Mayor, the Member for Regina South East (Mr. Baker) displayed as much forward progress as we could expect from them. I did not expect, Mr. Speaker, the Mayor of

Regina to move ahead into the Front Benches, for he is known to move only sideways, dodging issue after issue.

**Some Hon. Members:** — Hear, hear!

**Mr. MacLennan:** — The Mayor has a great deal of difficulty in moving, Mr. Speaker. Last year he wanted to move his office and city hall into a new office building, but his own council would not let him do it. His next plan was to move city council chambers into a structure suspended directly over Eleventh Avenue. This plan did not materialize and he is still where he was. He is nevertheless, Mr. Speaker, a most determined fellow. He and his council after hours upon hours of talk and talk and after having studies upon studies made by group after group, have finally decided on a new site for his city hall. Low and behold it turns out to be the same site that a council over 20 years ago picked. The Mayor's most ambitious plans for a move was two years ago, when he offered to move into Tommy Douglas's job in Ottawa. This move was stymied not by any nasty Liberals or Tories, but by his own colleagues, who were somewhat less than enthusiastic about the Mayor's suggested move.

Mr. Speaker, I suggest to the Mayor that as his Leader will not move him and the National NDP do not want to see him move down there, the people of Regina, Mr. Speaker, have good cause to move him and will give him a move, one that he will not enjoy.

**Some Hon. Members:** — Hear, hear!

**Mr. MacLennan:** — You never know, Henry, you never know!

Mr. Speaker, Western alienation has been referred to by many in the past few months. This Government has I think done a tremendous job of pointing out to Ottawa the case for the Westerners. I urge this Government and this Legislature to do everything in their power to protest to the Federal authorities the Canadian Radio and Television Commission statement of policy regarding the use of microwave to bring in through cables American television programs. This policy conceived by a group that is made up of Easterners in the great majority is discriminating and insulting to the West. The policy is antiquated and incredible when one thinks of the millions upon millions of dollars that have been spent on communication satellites to bring in live television from each continent and country in the world. Communication through television has made people think internationally and not nationally. Television has enabled man to watch man exist or live in space and on the moon. This CRTC policy, incredible as it is, prohibits us from viewing programs from our next door neighbor and ally. At the present time about 60 per cent of Canadians have access to American television, 40 per cent of us because of our geographical location are unable to do so. The great majority of those Canadians who can watch American television live in Eastern Canada. This policy says it is alright if you live in Toronto to watch American television, but not alright if you live in Regina. It is alright if you live in Montreal, but not alright if you live in Saskatoon. It is not alright if you live in Calgary or Edmonton, but it is alright if you live in Hamilton or Windsor. This policy is an insult to over 95 per cent of the people who live on the Prairies. This double standard policy, this isolationist policy should not be tolerated in

Saskatchewan or in any province in the West.

**Some Hon. Members:** — Hear, hear!

**Mr. MacLennan:** — The Western provinces acting together could each in their own boundaries pick up American television signals and distribute these signals through micro wave and cable into the homes of the viewers that want them. If this were done, Mr. Speaker, would the CRTC insist that the Federal Government try and use jamming devices to destroy these signals? Would then the Federal Government do this in Eastern Canada as well as in the West? I think not. It would not dare! The political consequences would be too severe.

There are many questions to be asked why the CRTC would advocate such a policy and why would the Federal Government implement such a policy. Is it because they are acting under the influence of the CBC or the private network CTV, or under the applied pressure of some private station owners? Are they acting under the advice or influence of some anti-English group in the Province of Quebec, who fear further non-French influence in that Province? Is the CRTC in some way anti-American? Are the 60 per cent of the people of Canada that have access to American television more sophisticated than the other 40 per cent who have no access to this television? Has something harmful come over the people who have watched or been exposed to American television and they do not want this to happen to us? Is this a secret policy of the Federal Government hidden behind and implemented through one of its own agencies? Finally, Mr. Speaker, I ask, does the Federal Government give a damn what the consequences of this ill-begot, and as I have said before, antiquated, discriminatory and double-standard policy mean to thousands upon thousands of people in Western Canada.

I may ask also, Mr. Speaker, why our New Democratic Members of Parliament from Regina and from Saskatoon are not expressing vigorous opposition to this policy. Is it because the NDP are anti-American? I can ask many questions, but, Mr. Speaker, I believe that each Member of this House should do what he can in the parties that they belong to urge that this discrimination end. Mr. Speaker, the Federal Government has changed the Criminal Code to permit the provinces to allow lotteries. The Government of this Province has indicated in the press that it has no intention of operating a Provincial Lottery at this time. I personally regret this decision, as I think it is an easy way to raise hundreds of thousands of dollars annually in a painless fashion. If it is possible I urge this Government to bring in legislation under which municipalities could be allowed to exercise the Province's right to run lotteries. This would have to be done because the Federal Justice Department has stated that municipalities cannot be considered charitable organizations for the purpose of operating lotteries. I think also that the Provincial Government should spell out to the municipalities the projects that monies gained on lotteries could be spent on, projects such as hospital improvements, non-commercial recreational and sports facilities, cultural grants, and land for parks, only to name a few. These lotteries would of course be run only under the strict supervision of the proper government authorities. The arguments in favor of lotteries have been expressed often by many people in the past and I have no intention of going into them at the present time.

Mr. Speaker, we have witnessed two unfortunate hospital strikes in the province in recent months. These strikes were eventually settled because of a piece of legislation introduced in this Legislature by the present Government. We see now, Mr. Speaker, that some labor unions in cooperation with their agents in politics, the NDP, are trying once again to urge the Government to strike this legislation from the books.

Several years ago the people of Saskatchewan watched with apprehension and concern as some employees of the Saskatchewan Power Corporation went out on strike. This Government took immediate action and passed the legislation that I have mentioned. The great majority of the people of Saskatchewan were at that time overjoyed with the decisiveness of the Government's action.

We have in Saskatchewan a crisis in our grain industry. Farmers have watched in the past on several occasions longshoremen and other unions place their industry in further jeopardy by calling strikes at crucial times in the movement of our grains for export. The Members opposite, Mr. Speaker, as the political agents of the unions went into hiding at such times. They, I suspect, are a little embarrassed at such times because their obvious conflict of interest is showing. Their "Friend of the Farmer" slogan is proven once again to be as false and misleading as those Members opposite who advocate it.

To protect our farmers, Mr. Speaker, the Federal Government should introduce a bill similar to our Essential Services Act or similar to British Columbia's Bill 33. The unions, Mr. Speaker, refuse to acknowledge that high wage demands by them contribute to inflation. The Federal Government is attempting to fight inflation. It is asking the Provinces to help them fight inflation. I suggest, Mr. Speaker, the Federal Government by bringing in legislation similar to what I have been referring to would help combat inflation as well as guarantee to our farmers that when we have export markets to fill we can and will fill them. The NDP, the subsidized mouth piece of the unions, will of course come out strong in opposition to such legislation. This would of course place them on the side of the unions and in opposition to the farmers. Would they stand with the majority of Canada's farmers or would they stand with the trade unions? It would be even more interesting to see whether rural Members opposite would be standing or would they try to fence-sit. The Federal Government, if it wanted to know where the public would stand on such an issue, should look to British Columbia.

Premier Bennett and his Government passed such legislation. He had an election six months ago, and what happened? He was given a tremendous vote of confidence and his Government was returned with a huge majority. The NDP on the other hand, his strongest political opponents, lost 25 per cent of their seats that they had held in the previous Legislature. In that province the issue in that election was clearly put by the Premier of British Columbia, when he said time and time again during the election campaign that a Socialist party controlled by the unions would do untold harm to the buoyant provincial economy of British Columbia. He placed the issue clearly to the people of British Columbia. He said it often and the people of British Columbia understood and they agreed.

The Speech from the Throne, Mr. Speaker, indicates once again that this Government is totally aware of the economic situation in Saskatchewan and that it is prepared to take



realistic steps to make life for the people of our province a better and a more productive one. This Government continues to recognize the plight of our Indian-Métis people. The Speech from the Throne notes the progress that has been made in improving the over-all position of these people since the Government has started working with them in 1964. Everyone in Saskatchewan and in Canada agrees that a great many problems still face these people and must be overcome. The Indian Task Force set up by this Government is to be commended for its actions involving job placements and the establishment of a native industry to work in conjunction with the steel mill here in Regina. The actions of this Government on problems facing these people are giving new hope along with encouragement to all the people of Indian ancestry in Saskatchewan.

Mr. Speaker, as the Member for the constituency of Last Mountain I was pleased to see in the Speech from the Throne that the highway and road construction program will again demand a high priority. This gives me hope that the Minister of Highways (Mr. Boldt) will see fit to start the reconstruction of No. 6 Highway north from Regina to Southey. I also ask the Minister to oil No. 15 west from 20 to at least No. 2. If this piece of road is oiled, Mr. Speaker, it will mean every last inch of highway in the constituency of Last Mountain will be dust free and with a hard surface.

Mr. Speaker, in the past six years two new special care homes have been built in my constituency, and one new hospital was opened in Lanigan in August. There is still need for a special care home in the community of Lanigan as well as improved and extended facilities to the home in Southey and I urge the Government to give these matters their urgent consideration.

Mr. Speaker, the Saskatchewan Power Corporation has done a rather commendable job in bringing natural gas to some communities in Saskatchewan. I am told its policy in distributing natural gas has been to do so where it is economically favorable for it to do so. I have also been informed that a policy formulated under this Government made it possible for many of the communities that would not have had natural gas under any former policy to have this service now. This is very good, but I think that the Saskatchewan Power Corporation policy should be now changed or broadened to include a faster development of this service. In particular I urge the Power Corporation to bring natural gas to the communities along No. 20 Highway, Drake, Lockwood, Nokomis and Govan and those communities along No. 15 Highway, Semans, Raymore and Quinton.

Mr. Speaker, on Wednesday of this week the Leader of the Opposition (Mr. Lloyd) said in so many words that the hand on the helm of the ship of state is driving us upon the rocks. He was referring to the Premier and the manner in which he was guiding the policies of the Government. I would like to point out, Mr. Speaker, some of the consequences his party felt when the Leader of the Opposition was at the helm of this Province. It was indeed a rocky voyage he took his party on as a result of his Government's policies. They started hitting the rocks in the Weyburn by-election which they lost. Then came the Prince Albert one with more disastrous results for the great Socialist skipper. This was followed with the 1964 general election when the Socialist ship was sunk. That was some voyage that man took them on. He lost five of his officers when the ship was sunk and one more jumped ship just before it was sunk.

He lost ten of his crew on the same voyage. The NDP, Mr. Speaker, built him a new ship and into battle he goes again. He has success in his first battle in Hanley, but then for the coral and the rocks he goes. He loses the battle in Moosomin and then Bengough. He then leads his ship into another major engagement, the general election of 1967. Mr. Speaker, the voyage has been so rough it forces his first mate, the former Member for Kelsey to go ashore. This engagement, Mr. Speaker, saw him lose his second ship costing him a loss of 35 members of his crew.

The story goes on, Mr. Speaker, they built him yet another ship and it is the same story. He wins his first skirmish and then starts to drift off course and will strike rocks once again. The present voyage started smooth enough, but it is obvious it is on the same old course. It is so rough now that give of his most experienced crew members are leaving his ship before battle is engaged. I am sure, Mr. Speaker, that the people of Saskatchewan will once again indicate that they will not go aboard the Socialist ship to be driven upon the rocks. They will do this, Mr. Speaker, because there is another ship with another captain available, a solid ship with a competent captain, a ship that they trust, captained by a man they know is keeping them away from the rocks despite the squall we are in now.

The Speech from the Throne indicates, Mr. Speaker, that this Government headed by the Member from Morse (Mr. Thatcher) is the most progressive Government in Canada today.

**Some Hon. Members:** — Hear, hear!

**Mr. MacLennan:** — The Premier last summer announced it was the intention of this Government to help move some grain through a barter system of trade. He received some initial words of praise from many people. The Opposition Leader (Mr. Lloyd) and the President of the Farmers Union both praised the Premier. The Opposition Leader said, according to the Saskatoon Star Phoenix of August 23rd, that “Federal Action to support Premier Thatcher’s proposal to barter wheat for Japanese goods was urged today by W. S. Lloyd.” An article in The Regina Leader Post of August 21 says,

Roy Atkinson of Saskatoon, President of the National Farmers Union, Wednesday praised Premier Thatcher’s suggestion to explore the possibility of bartering wheat for Japanese goods.

This Government and its leader helped several hundred farm parents who have sons and daughters attending university, by allowing some students to pay part of their tuition fees with grain. This Government in the past year took even further action to help the grain farmers when it rebated the five per cent sales tax on grain storage facilities that had to be built for the 1969 crop. Several thousand farmers were helped by this program.

As the Throne Speech indicates, Mr. Speaker, this Government took even further action to help the farmer when it guaranteed bank loans with subsidized interest rates to farmers wishing to establish livestock herds. Hundreds of Saskatchewan farmers, Mr. Speaker, have participated in this program. The Premier has been a man of action on all fronts of the economic

picture in Saskatchewan. The people of Saskatchewan are well aware of this. Allow me, Mr. Speaker, to quote from an editorial in the North Battleford News Optimist, dated October 24, 1969:

He also kept the Saskatchewan economy rolling along with balanced budgets in a period that few governments in Canada had the kind of courage that such economics demanded. If Ross Thatcher looked his toughest when he took on education and hospital officials to keep their budgets in line, he looked his best last week as he began his campaign to beef up the province's sagging economy.

In one great swoop he set potash prices to stop an imminent collapse of that key industry, and then in a second burst of energy announced that his Government would subsidize interest and guarantee loans for farmers wanting to establish or expand livestock operations.

The Premier's announcement was immediately welcomed by farm people, this province's key to real prosperity. It was also noticed in Alberta where the President of the Alberta Farm Union said the Alberta Government would have to follow the same path if her farmers were to compete.

The editorial goes on, Mr. Speaker, to say:

At this midway point Thatcher's image as a doer is picking up momentum. The province needs constructive leadership of this kind if we are to continue to progress in the immediate future. The Premier's capacity for constructive economic goals now seems as energetic as his attacks on the spiraling cost of government.

Mr. Speaker, it is obvious that I will vote against the amendment and support the motion.

**Some Hon. Members:** — Hear, hear!

**Mr. G. T. Snyder** (Moose Jaw North): — Mr. Speaker, my first words must be to commend the mover and seconder of the Address-in-Reply for their efforts in the debate thus far. I thought they delivered their addresses in a calm and precise manner, in a well-modulated tone and with a degree of caution too, I thought. There was an element of uncertainty that I believe demonstrates a lack of confidence that this Government has in itself.

This, I believe, is my eleventh session in this Legislature and during that time I have never seen such a desolate and such a down-cast group as the group opposite during the contribution made by the mover and the seconder of the Address-in-Reply on Wednesday, last.

**Some Hon. Members:** — Hear, hear!

**Mr. Snyder:** — Liberals opposite, Mr. Speaker, showed neither emotion nor enthusiasm. They missed their cues and when they did applaud it was a timid and half-hearted effort. This Government, Mr. Speaker, is out of steam and is in the process of living out its final moments.

The Premier today took it upon himself to recount the problems of the West and he charged discrimination with respect to freight rates. He drew attention to the fact that infant Canadian industries had remained protected behind the tariff wall for 100 years to the detriment of the West. He claimed that we in the West had been short-changed in the Federal Public Works project, etc., etc., etc. Well, Mr. Speaker, I believe Members will recall that Liberals have been singing this same tune, they have been making this same speech for seven or eight decades in this country. It is significant, Mr. Speaker, that this country has had a Liberal Government in Ottawa for the greater part of our 102 odd years since Confederation. These Liberal Governments, Mr. Speaker, have consistently failed to acknowledge our most pressing needs in Saskatchewan and elsewhere. This deaf ear, Mr. Speaker, that Ottawa turns to Saskatchewan has been even more evident since the election of this Liberal Government opposite in 1964.

**Some Hon. Members:** — Hear, hear!

**Mr. Snyder:** — Never, Mr. Speaker, never in Saskatchewan have we had a Government which was so completely ignored by Ottawa. Never have we seen our Treasury officials and our Provincial Treasurer (Mr. Steuart) go to Ottawa and come home with their pockets empty and the seats out of their pants from the Dominion-Provincial Tax-Sharing Conference, Mr. Speaker, in the way that this Government has. The fact of the matter is, Mr. Speaker, is that this Government doesn't have the ear of the Ottawa Government and it is little wonder, Mr. Speaker, when the Premier uses Ottawa for a whipping boy at every opportunity. The Premier's name in Ottawa, Mr. Speaker, is a dirty word and his constant attack upon his blood brothers in Ottawa has produced hostility between the Government at Ottawa and the Saskatchewan Liberals here to the point where Saskatchewan's voice is no longer heard.

I think, Mr. Speaker, that the Premier established a rather unenviable record for attacking Ottawa at one moment and then crying to Ottawa for assistance in the next breath. It is rather incredible, Mr. Speaker, that during the period of time when the party opposite sat on these benches and when any representation was made by our Government to Ottawa that the favorite phrase of the Premier was, "There they are crying to Ottawa." We have never been confronted, Mr. Speaker, with a spectacle of so much evidence of crying to Ottawa as we have from the Government opposite. Governments expect to be criticized from time to time, but the irresponsible attack on Ottawa by the Premier to divert attention from the sorry mess that he has created here can hardly be expected to engender confidence, goodwill or sympathy from Ottawa. Being bitten by your own dog, Mr. Speaker, is something less than a pleasant and tolerable experience.

**Some Hon. Members:** — Hear, hear!

**Mr. Snyder:** — Well, Mr. Speaker, I suppose I am almost duty bound to make some mention of the contribution made by the Member from Last Mountain (Mr. MacLennan) who just took his seat. I think really that it requires little more than passing notice. Once again in his typical fashion he attempted to realize some political advantage by his attempts to drive a wedge between two very vital and two very important sectors of our economy. This

is a definite and desperate attempt to preserve that very slim majority that he holds in Last Mountain. What is it, 35 or 37 votes? I just want to take this opportunity to wish him farewell at any time the Government chooses to call an election.

I am extremely pleased, Mr. Speaker, to have this opportunity to make my contribution to this Debate during the early stages. This Legislature meets at a time in Saskatchewan's history when great numbers of our people are experiencing serious financial difficulties and severe economic problems. Some of these problems are related to the agricultural situation, while others are man-made which can be attributed directly to inappropriate policy decisions made by this Government, or to a complete absence of action by Government to deal with the pressing needs of Saskatchewan people. This vacuum in government is increasingly evident as we debate a document at this time — a Throne Speech which glosses over the critical problems which this Government has chosen to ignore during its six years in office. The Throne Speech, I think, Mr. Speaker, was significant, contrary to the remarks made by the Premier today, that not one word was mentioned in connection with the growing problems of unemployment, the mass exodus of people from the province, the need for improved and expanded health services, and the serious problems of agriculture for which the Government has taken only a few faltering and timid steps.

Saskatchewan voters, I think, Mr. Speaker, are becoming increasingly concerned with this Government's order of priorities, and the lack of attention to programs which have been widely accepted by the vast majority of Saskatchewan people. We have seated with us, on this side of the House, tangible and concrete evidence that this Government is on a different wave length than the great majority of Saskatchewan people, and I want to join at this time with others in welcoming the newest Member of this House, the Member for Kelvington (Mr. Byers).

**Some Hon. Members:** — Hear, hear!

**Mr. Snyder:** — If my tabulations are correct, Mr. Speaker, I believe almost all of the backbenchers opposite, plus the Premier, plus most of his Ministers entered the fray in Kelvington in an effort to make the loss there appear somewhat more respectable. Liberals had conceded their chances of winning that by-election long before the election day was announced. In spite of the frantic efforts of every available Liberal who had the courage to be identified, including a number of well-known civil servants, the Liberals lost by a margin of over 500 votes. Had it not been for the personal popularity of the Liberal candidate, the loss in that constituency would have been by a much wider margin.

It struck me, Mr. Speaker, that the most outstanding feature of that by-election was the frantic effort of Provincial Liberals to divorce themselves from their blood brothers in Ottawa. Without exception, Provincial Liberals attempted to place the entire burden of responsibility for the sorry economic state in which we find ourselves upon the shoulders of the Trudeau Government. Even after the dust of battle had settled, they were still claiming that the loss was as a result of failures, errors and omissions by that Federal Government. The irony of it all would tend to be somewhat amusing, Mr. Speaker, if the results of this internal battle in the Liberal family

were not so tragic and so devastating for the people of Saskatchewan. Why, Mr. Speaker, only a year prior to the Kelvington election, we were involved in a Federal general election. At that time you will recall, Mr. Speaker, Premier Thatcher and his Provincial colleagues were ordered to play no part in that Federal election, because the stench of deterrent charges on the sick, the smell of increased property taxes, and the stink of \$35 million of new Provincial taxes, the tax on purple gas, still pervaded the nostrils of the Saskatchewan voter.

**Some Hon. Members:** — Hear, hear!

**Mr. Snyder:** — What a difference a few years make, Mr. Speaker. Only a few years ago, with a Conservative Government in Ottawa, a CCF Government here, Saskatchewan Liberals were free to damn governments at all levels, and assume no responsibility for their actions. Today, Mr. Speaker, we are reaping the rewards of having elected a Federal Government with little or no feeling or concern for the West, and we are burdened with a Provincial Administration that ran out of steam and lost its will to govern just as soon as their inherited financial reserves were depleted.

Kelvington voters voted against Liberals, Mr. Speaker. As time passes, it becomes increasingly difficult to distinguish one from the other. In opposition, they are the champions and the heroes of the underprivileged. In office they are paralyzed and inoperative, with their time occupied by attempts to find others to accuse, instead of addressing themselves to the problems of the day. Kelvington voters knew that this wasn't a Federal by-election, Mr. Speaker. The Premier invited the voters to give their answer with respect to Provincial issues and this they did, Mr. Speaker, loud and clear. The constituents with whom I spoke in Kelvington, Mr. Speaker, and I spent some days there, were agreed upon a number of basic matters. This Liberal Administration has been deceitful in dealing with Saskatchewan people. This Thatcher Government, Mr. Speaker, provided \$8 million in tax relief in the form of a Homeowner Grant just prior to the 1967 general election, only to have the Provincial Treasurer (Mr. Steuart) devastate the taxpaying public with \$35 million in new taxes in his first post-election budget on March 1, 1968.

I don't believe, Mr. Speaker, that Barnum was accurate in his assessment that there is one born every minute. I think that Saskatchewan voters are the most politically mature and responsible people in the whole of this country, and for this reason I believe that the people of Saskatchewan are waiting patiently to render a decision to this Government, in the same way as they expressed themselves in Kelvington last summer.

**Some Hon. Members:** — Hear, hear!

**Mr. Snyder:** — I believe Members of this House will recall the reference made by the Premier during his contribution to both the 1968 and 1969 Throne Speech Debates, to the somewhat unsatisfactory conditions in Great Britain which he took some pains to blame on the Socialist Government there. He failed at that time to take into account a whole host of factors which have contributed to the difficult times which that country has been facing for some time. It dates back prior to the election of a Labour Government to the sins and indiscretions of a

Conservative Administration. These were difficult circumstances that were faced by the government of that day and required some harsh and perhaps unpopular measures. Again this year the Premier seemed so devoid of good subject matter that he again crossed the Atlantic and related the problems in Britain, instead of addressing himself to critical problems in Saskatchewan. Perhaps the Premier has overlooked the account in the Bank of Nova Scotia's Monthly Review for May of 1969, entitled, "Britain's Uphill Recovery." If he saw the article I think it should have some meaning for him. The article among other things points out that Britain has shown an encouraging recovery in a number of fields. It explains that there has been a decided improvement in her balance of trade arrangements, with exports up 18 per cent as opposed to an increase of only eight per cent in imports. The article indicates that from mid-1967 to mid-1968 the national output of the country in real terms rose by four per cent. It goes on further to show that in the four years from 1964-68 personal income rose in value by 30 per cent, and private capital investment showed an encouraging increase of better than five per cent. Another significant and encouraging factor is that the average unemployment rate over the past two years has been held to a low of 2.4 per cent or about a third of the unemployed figure to be found in Saskatchewan today, Mr. Speaker. I have no doubt that the Premier is aware of these facts, but of course any mention of any encouraging development in Britain at this time would serve no particular political purpose for him and for this reason he finds these matters unworthy of his attention. Instead he attempts to divert attention from the areas of responsibility where he and his colleagues have failed so miserably. I am sure, Mr. Speaker, that Saskatchewan people would prefer that the Premier would devote himself to our problems and let Harold Wilson and the British people find their own solutions without the Premier's wise counsel.

While I am on my feet today, Mr. Speaker, I want to say just a few words in connection with the problem of unemployment which continues to be an increasing consideration in Saskatchewan. The fact that Saskatchewan's rate in the past has not been as extreme as in some other provinces is certainly no reason for complacency, Mr. Speaker. For those people who are without work and without the purchasing power that employment provides, the situation for them is equally as critical as when the unemployment figure is at a much higher level. The Throne Speech glosses over the entire problem without so much as a word in this connection. As the Minister of Labour (Mr. Coderre) is aware, figures which are used to calculate Saskatchewan's unemployed can be misleading. It is known that the labor force figures include all self-employed people. It is also a fact that Saskatchewan has a larger number of those who fall into that self-employed category because of the large number of farm households in the province. Saskatchewan has approximately 16,000 more farm families than Alberta and about 46,000 more than the Province of Manitoba. Quite clearly then, Mr. Speaker, the number of unemployed as a percentage of the total labor force is made to appear more respectable because of the high number of farm households. In spite of this, Mr. Speaker, the Dominion Bureau of Statistics showed Saskatchewan with an unemployed figure of 4.7 per cent while Alberta and Manitoba stood at 3.3 per cent — considerably lower than Saskatchewan's. For many years Saskatchewan's unemployment rate was the lowest on the Prairies but that's no longer the case with the Dominion Bureau of Statistics showing 16,000 people unemployed this past December and if only the farm labor force is used, our unemployment

figure would have been 6.3 per cent which is even more than double the percentage which is recognized in some quarters as the tolerable limit. I have on my desk today a circular which has just arrived; it is a special table from the Dominion Bureau of Statistics which updates the whole unemployment picture in Saskatchewan with the tabulations being made on January 17, 1970. It shows unemployment in January in Saskatchewan on the basis of DBS figures the same as I had suggested earlier, including all of the farm families, at 5.5 per cent. It indicates that there are 18,000 people at the present time out of work in the Province of Saskatchewan. If the farm labor force of 85,000 was deducted from the total, then it would mean that the 18,000 unemployed calculated on the remainder would show a picture of unemployment in Saskatchewan which is the highest that we have seen within our memory set at some 7.5 per cent. This is a figure which is reaching rather staggering proportions, Mr. Speaker. The Dominion Bureau of Statistics with its stated percentage of 5.5 per cent, that I have suggested is inaccurate for the reasons that I have mentioned, is still the highest on the Prairies. By contrast Manitoba has a rate of only 4.4 per cent and Alberta's unemployed at a figure of 4.2 per cent. I think, Mr. Speaker, that lagging opportunities for employment have had a very decided influence in the exodus of over 6,000 people from the province during the last 12 months. If these people had remained in Saskatchewan there is no question but that the unemployment figure would have assumed staggering proportions, if you add another 5,000 people to those presently unemployed. Even with this exodus, Mr. Speaker, Canada Manpower reported in the February 6 issue of *The Leader Post* that the number of unemployed males was 25 per cent higher than at the end of December and almost 50 per cent higher than at the end of January, 1969. The article claims that a large portion of the increase was accounted for in the building trades with the construction industry in a stagnant state, with the value of construction down significantly in 1969. Other discouraging figures indicate that gas-well construction was down by 67 per cent in 1969, the value of mine construction declined by 69 per cent in 1969 compared to 1968. One might properly ask, Mr. Speaker, what in the name of providence has happened to this so-called New Saskatchewan that was supposed to emerge with the election of a free enterprise Liberal Government and where oh where, Mr. Speaker, are those 80,000 jobs which were to appear by some magic during their first four years of Liberal rule?

**Some Hon. Members:** — Hear, hear!

**Mr. Snyder:** — Mr. Speaker, a number of these developments were predictable with the Government being aware of the slack that was developing, with a small number of housing starts, with the completion of potash construction projects and with the completion of the pulp mill. With this situation developing it seemed that the Government was prepared to accept the fact that unemployment was going to increase and took no positive measures to combat the problem. It wasn't until January or early February that the Premier made a public announcement that his Government was proposing to initiate a number of public works projects to stimulate the economy and take up the slack in the jobless field. I wrote the Premier at that time. I expressed my approval and I suggested that consideration be given to the long-delayed Provincial office building in Moose Jaw. It will be remembered that my colleague from Moose Jaw when he was Minister of Public Works arranged for the purchase of the property at the proposed site which still sits vacant except



for its use as a parking lot. The wheels were in motion for the construction of this much needed building, Mr. Speaker. It has now been delayed six years. I hope that the Premier or the Minister of Public Works will give this matter consideration. I want to acknowledge the announcement that a building is to be constructed in Moose Jaw to house the Department of Agriculture and the Department of Highways at some time in the future as well as a planned extension to the Peacock high school. But I do want to draw to the attention of the Government that according to the Premier, much of the arrangement for these public works projects has merely begun and they will serve no actual purpose in alleviating a very serious unemployment problem that faces over 18,000 Saskatchewan people today.

Additionally, Mr. Speaker, I would hope that the Government, when it is attempting to stimulate a sagging economy in the construction industry in particular, would pay particular emphasis to accommodation for our senior citizen population. We have a subsidized pioneer lodge in my constituency which is a blissful haven and a refuge for a large number of our most deserving people. The February 6 announcement in the Regina Leader Post makes mention of a non-repayable \$26,000 construction grant to be made to the Ina Grafton Gage Home in Moose Jaw for renovations. The announcement was somewhat misleading in that the renovations are complete, the guests are presently enjoying their new surroundings, while the release left the impression that renovations were to take place at some time in the future as an employment-creating project, and this job was in effect completed at this time. The kind of accommodation provided at the Ina Grafton Gage Home and at the Pioneer Lodge is a credit to the community, Mr. Speaker, and a credit to those who make it possible for the elderly to live out their declining years in comfort and dignity. This kind of construction along with additional subsidized housing units to provide for the needs for low-income groups presents a most worthy undertaking that this Government could initiate. If action along these lines is taken in some meaningful way this Government can expect the support and recommendation of those of us who sit on this side of the House.

A great deal more could be said, Mr. Speaker, about this very important subject but I merely want to suggest, before I go on to another matter briefly, that the position of the Prime Minister of Canada, the position that he has assumed in suggesting that an unemployment rate of six per cent or more would be tolerated in his so-called war on inflation will not be accepted by Canadian people as a rational or a reasonable method of dealing with that problem.

**Some Hon. Members:** — Hear, hear!

**Mr. Snyder:** — Unemployment must be regarded, Mr. Speaker, as a social ill and governments at all levels must recognize their responsibility in seeing to it that unemployment is eliminated as completely as it is humanly possible to do so.

Mr. Speaker, before I ask for leave to adjourn the debate today, I want to make brief reference to the opportunity that was provided for me by the Saskatchewan branch of the Commonwealth Parliamentary Association to attend the CPA course at Westminster, Northern Ireland and the Isle of Man during April and May of last year. I have a written report which I'll be filing with you prior to the annual meeting, but in the meantime

I want to express my appreciation for what I think must be regarded as a rather rare opportunity to participate in that annual course. When it became known in my constituency that I was to attend, one of the leading Liberal ladies in Moose Jaw expressed a great deal of interest in the matter of how the choice of delegates had been arrived at. She concluded to me that in all likelihood I had been chosen because I probably needed a course in parliamentary procedure worse than any other Member in the House. I agreed with her of course and I reminded her that the Minister of Education (Mr. McIsaac) and the Deputy Speaker of the Legislature (Mr. Howes) had been so honored previous to me.

**Some Hon. Members:** — Hear, hear!

**Mr. Snyder:** — The entire course, Mr. Speaker, was one which I regarded as a valuable and memorable experience. Of the 25 delegates, two Federal Members of Parliament from Ottawa — one Conservative and one Liberal — and the Speaker for Botswana and I made up the part of the course that would properly be described I suppose as the Caucasian group, while the remainder were African or Asian. I believe one of the most satisfying features of the course was the deep and genuine friendship which emerged as a result of this encounter between Commonwealth members of different color, race and religious conviction. The two weeks that we spent at Westminster involved numerous lectures with eminently well qualified people offering the benefit of their knowledge. Among these was the former Conservative Prime Minister, Sir Alec Douglas Home and a number of others that will be recognized by Members of this House. We had the opportunity to see the Mother Parliament in session on a number of occasions including the question period. We also witnessed the House of Lords in action. It may be that my choice of words is perhaps inappropriate in describing the Upper Chamber as being in action when in reality it may be perhaps too energetic a figure of speech.

I believe, Mr. Speaker, there can be no doubt about the benefits that accrue to all those who participate. The experience is one which I'm certain is especially valuable to the so-called newly emerging nations who have only received their independence in recent years and have a limited understanding of British parliamentary democracy which we the older members of the Commonwealth have grown to admire and respect. For example, Mr. Speaker, I understand that Tanzania, which sent two delegates to the course, decided shortly after receiving her independence that an opposition made the functioning of Parliament somewhat tedious and awkward and as a result one of their first official acts as a new government was to outlaw the political party which opposed the government. In subsequent elections . . .

**Some Hon. Members:** — Hear, hear!

**Mr. Snyder:** — Don't get any ideas. In subsequent elections all candidates were members of the governing party. Western Samoa which also sent a delegate has stringent qualifications for all those who seek election to Parliament, and it is a requirement that any candidate who stands for office must spring from a titled family. A large number of the Asian and African delegates expressed surprise that the British Government should see fit to allow opposition and the press to publicly criticize the actions of the Administration. In total, Mr. Speaker, I am convinced

that these delegates to that conference will return to their native land with a deeper understanding and deeper appreciation of the principles which the vast majority of Canadians guard jealously. This fact alone provides reasonable argument for our continuing participation. Even with a vigorous schedule, free time on the weekends allowed me to visit Scotland and fly on another weekend to Switzerland and to motor into Northern Italy. Without exception the officers of the CPA were invaluable in assisting in travel arrangements or helping in any other possible way.

Members who were in this Chamber prior to 1967 will remember Mr. Kenneth Bradshaw who exchanged positions with our Clerk, Mr. Koester during the, I believe it was, the 1966 Session. I had the opportunity to have dinner with him and he asked me to send his very best wishes to all of the Saskatchewan Members with whom he had been acquainted during his stay in our province.

There is much more, Mr. Speaker, that I might add with respect to the kindness and hospitality of those who looked after our needs in Northern Ireland, England and on the Isle of Man and made the visit memorable and rewarding. I think most of all it is a matter of very deep satisfaction to discover that, no matter where you travel, to be a Canadian is to have many doors open to you and it is extremely gratifying to find, Mr. Speaker, also that Canadian credentials no matter where you travel are in good order and are well respected wherever you may be.

**Some Hon. Members:** — Hear, hear!

**Mr. Snyder:** — I want to say again how much I valued the opportunity to take part in that course and encourage the continuing participation by the Saskatchewan branch.

Mr. Speaker, I have some additional remarks which I hope to make tomorrow, accordingly I beg leave to adjourn the debate.

**Some Hon. Members:** — Hear, hear!

Debate adjourned.

The Assembly adjourned at 4:50 o'clock p.m.