

**LEGISLATIVE ASSEMBLY OF SASKATCHEWAN**  
**Third Session — Sixteenth Legislature**  
**7th Day**

**Tuesday, February 24, 1970**

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

**WELCOME TO STUDENTS**

**Mr. Speaker:** — I am happy to welcome the following groups of school children: 63 students from St. Anne's school from the constituency of Regina North East represented by Mr. Smishek under the direction of their school teacher, Mr. Zurowski; 83 students from Imperial school from the constituency of Regina North East again represented by Mr. Smishek under the direction of their teacher, Mr. Jackman; 46 students from Cudworth school from the constituency of Watrous represented by Mr. Schmeiser under the direction of their school teacher, Mr. L. Herman; 60 students from the Al Pickard school from the constituency of Regina North West represented by its Member, Mr. Whelan, under the direction of their teachers, Mr. Bartel and Mrs. Harvey; 39 students from St. John's school, Saskatoon from the constituency of Saskatoon-Riversdale represented by its Member, Mr. Romanow, under the direction of Mr. Breker and Mr. Orosz; 40 students from St. Mary's school, Saskatoon from the constituency of Saskatoon-Riversdale again represented by Mr. Romanow under the direction of Messrs. Oscreny and Breyski. I'm sure all Members of the Legislature will wish to join with me in extending to each and every one of them a very cordial welcome to the Legislature of the Province of Saskatchewan and in expressing the very sincere wish that they will enjoy themselves here and will find their stay educational and interesting and in wishing each and everyone of them a safe trip home.

**Hon. Members:** — Hear, hear!

**QUESTIONS**

**Reports of Starvation in Northwestern Saskatchewan**

**Mr. R. Romanow** (Saskatoon-Riversdale): — Mr. Speaker, before the Orders of the Day, I wonder if I might direct a question to the Minister of Welfare (Mr. MacDonald) — I suppose he anticipated this. The newspaper reports today in The Regina Leader Post, front page, that referring to the recent incidents that have been reported, the four man Federal team found no starvation but confusing welfare policies — they didn't have to go all the way from Ottawa to find confusing policies, we could have told them. But my question to the Minister is: have the findings of the four man delegation of confusing welfare policies been communicated to him and if so, what are those findings?

**Hon. C. P. MacDonald** (Minister of Welfare): — No, there has been no communication from the Federal Government and I would like to state that the only thing that

is confusing is the reports in the press. I would like to state also, Mr. Speaker, that at this time I have had communication from many Métis people in relation to the list of names that were submitted. I am finding that many of the names that were solicited were done by deliberate canvass when members were organized in a committee and went from door to door to ask people if they wanted free flour. I have also found, Mr. Speaker, from other members of the Métis community that many people were solicited by telephone, asking if they wanted free flour. I have also heard from the Métis that people on that list are making between \$300 and \$400 per month. Many of them are on welfare and receiving full welfare entitlement, so that the only conclusion that I have been able to come to is that this is a farce, a hoax and deliberate hypocrisy. The only implication of that list was a request for free flour and I might also suggest that I could find many, many other poor people in Canada, many, many other poor people in Saskatchewan who would also welcome a free bag of flour.

**Some Hon. Members:** — Hear, hear!

**Mr. Romanow:** — A supplementary question if I might, Mr. Speaker. The Minister of Welfare (Mr. MacDonald) might in fact refer to it as a farce and a hoax, but the four man delegation according to the newspaper reports did find cases of absolutely poor housing, lack of feeding and malnutrition. My question to the Hon. Minister is this:

**Mr. Speaker:** — Order, order! Now I want to draw the attention of all Members of the House to the fact that these questions, so-called questions, are becoming more and more protractive. Now the purpose of the question period is to ask a question, the receiver replying thereto. I would ask all Members of the House to make their questions short, snappy, succinct and to the point and I ask that the reply be similarly short, sharp and snappy.

**Mr. Romanow:** — Thank you very much, Mr. Speaker, I am sorry. May I put the question in this way: also according to the newspaper report Dr. Haidasz, who is the parliamentary secretary said that improvements called for improvements within the Welfare Program, would the Minister (Mr. MacDonald) kindly advise the House what improvements Mr. Haidasz recommended for his consideration and what steps his Department has taken?

**Mr. MacDonald:** — First of all I would like to reply to the gentleman that certainly there are indications of housing difficulties in Northwestern Saskatchewan, but I would also like to say that this condition of housing was one that has been there for many years and was created by the Socialists. Mr. Speaker, do you know that in 20 years of Socialist Government that a total contribution of \$1,000, Mr. Speaker, a total contribution of \$1,000, two \$500 grants was given to improve housing in Northwestern Saskatchewan in 20 years under the Socialists.

**Some Hon. Members:** — Hear, hear!

**Mr. Romanow:** — Mr. Speaker, my final question to the Minister is this: in the light of all of the criticism and obvious confusion by the

Minister and his officials and the Government on this problem, will he now undertake an independent inquiry that we the Members of this side are calling for to alleviate the problem?

**Mr. MacDonald:** — No, Mr. Speaker. I will say that I will have much to say in this House very shortly on this whole problem.

**Some Hon. Members:** — Hear, hear!

**Mr. W. S. Lloyd** (Leader of the Opposition): — Mr. Speaker, a supplementary question, I was wondering; since the original statement about this was made in part by Reverend Father Owen and the Reverend Sister, has the Minister communicated to him that this is all a fraud and a bit of hypocrisy?

**Mr. MacDonald:** — No, Mr. Speaker, I haven't, but I have certainly been in contact with Father Owen and Sister Steuart by telephone and I have sent them both a telegram and they have not replied.

### **Criticism of Marketing System**

**Hon. D. Boldt** (Minister of Highways): — Mr. Speaker, in view of what I said in the House yesterday, I have received numerous phone calls from all sectors of the province complimenting me on my criticism of . . .

**Some Hon. Members:** — Hear, hear!

**Mr. Boldt:** — . . . our marketing — You know I've got all afternoon to make this statement — the criticism that I levelled at the marketing system of Canada and the Wheat Pools. One or two were asking me whether these were my personal opinions or those of the Government. I thought I had made it plain when I said that these were my strong, personal opinions and not necessarily those of the Government.

**Some Hon. Members:** — Hear, hear!

### **QUESTIONS**

#### **Regina Sash & Door Re-opening**

**Mr. E. Whelan** (Regina North West): — Mr. Speaker, I would like to direct a question to the Minister in charge of Industrial Development, the Hon. Premier (Mr. Thatcher). Since Regina Sash and Door which has been operating in this city since 1912 has been slated to close its doors on Saturday, can the Minister advise us if his Department is taking steps to re-open this operation?

**Hon. W. R. Thatcher** (Premier): — They have not approached us in regard to this. If they come to see us we will be glad to take a look at the situation.

## ANNOUNCEMENT

### Monday, March 2 Budget Day

**Hon. D. G. Steuart** (Provincial Treasurer): — Mr. Speaker, I would like to announce that since the Federal Budget will be coming down on Tuesday, March 3rd and we had formally made a decision to bring our Budget down the same day and since our Budget will contain so many wonderful things we don't want to confuse it with the Federal Budget, I wish to announce to the House that I will be bringing my Budget down on Monday, March 2nd.

## 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. A. R. Guy** (Minister of Public Works): — Mr. Speaker, before adjourning the debate yesterday, I had congratulated our new Lieutenant Governor, the mover and seconder of the Throne Speech, and the new Member for Kelvington. I congratulated the Members of the NDP that had been promoted to the front benches and offered my condolences to those that were moved back or did not move at all. Since then I have had one more suggestion made to me that if those who have been moved to the back benches would like to proceed back to the front there is always the opportunity to sit as an independent. I also congratulated Premier Schreyer of Manitoba for considering an increase in the sales tax from five to six per cent, and I congratulated David Cass-Beggs of Manitoba Hydro for urging a 14-1/2 per cent increase in power rates. Two examples of NDP concern for the Manitoba taxpayer!

In reply to the concern of the new Member for Kelvington (Mr. Byers) regarding the Government's Information Services, I reminded him that the former CCF Government had used \$465,000 of the taxpayers' money to print the Commonwealth through a printing company owned by T. C. Douglas, the present Leader of the Opposition, Cabinet Ministers and high-ranking CCF officials. And I see the Member for Redberry (Mr. Michayluk) shaking his finger. I think his only concern is that he didn't get in on this little plum.

**Some Hon. Members:** — Hear, hear!

**Mr. Guy:** — I also said I was shocked to hear the Member for Kelvington was going to vote against the Throne Speech because I reminded him of the promises that he had made in the election campaign to help the farmers, to help the municipality, to support education in this province, to help the taxpayers. Now he says he will vote against assistance to the farmers and to the municipalities. He says he will vote against increased grants to education and the provision of free text books to grade 12. Finally he said he would vote against increasing the homeowner grants, increased food and clothing allowances to our poor and reduced bus fares for the old age pensioners. This is only one

example, Mr. Speaker, of the irresponsible actions of Members opposite in a year that will go down in history as the year of Opposition irresponsibility.

I would like this afternoon to outline some of the examples, some of the other examples of the irresponsibility shown particularly by the Leader of the Opposition (Mr. Lloyd) and his party. As I mentioned last year, I believe it is desirable each year during the Session that the activities of the Opposition parties and the Government should be reviewed, because you know there are policies which our friends opposite have in their platform that for one reason or another they tend to overlook when they make their speeches in this Legislature. But I think it is only fair that the people of Saskatchewan get a complete look at their Opposition, the stand they have taken on issues, and their political activities during the past year. I'm sorry that Mayor Baker, the Member for Regina South East, is not in his seat again today to hear of these irresponsibilities. The NDP held several conventions and national meetings during the last year which have given the people of Saskatchewan a good insight into what to expect as policy, should the NDP ever be returned as the Government of this Province.

We have also had the opportunity to view the actions of the NDP Government which has been in office in Manitoba for the past nine months. You will recall that last year the NDP spent part of their summer in anti-American demonstrations which ended with the burning of the American flag, for which we had to apologize to the American Government on behalf of our Province. This year, while their anti-Americanism did not decrease, their anti-Canadianism increased, and we found our NDP friends, aided and abetted by their satellite organization, the Saskatchewan Farmers' Union, driving tractors up and down the highways of Saskatchewan, obstructing local and tourist traffic. From this unlawful pursuit, however, they took time out to insult our Prime Minister by throwing wheat in his face and carrying distasteful, crude and vulgar signs during his visit to Saskatchewan. As the Minister of Highways (Mr. Boldt) pointed out yesterday, once again we were placed in the position of having to apologize to the Prime Minister and to the Canadian people for the intolerable actions of the Saskatchewan Opposition party. The tractor demonstration and the attack on the Prime Minister, which were jointly organized by the Farmers' Union, the NDP and the University New Left, were a disgusting demonstration and this is not the view of the Government alone. One had only to read the hundreds of letters that appeared in newspapers across Canada, condemning this action, to know that Canadians expect all groups to have respect for our Prime Minister, whether they agree with his policy or not. Unfortunately the image of every Saskatchewan citizen was tarnished by this irreprehensible action by the groups involved. One can only wonder, Mr. Speaker, how many more times we will be forced to apologize to our Canadian and American friends for the unprecedented and reprehensible actions of the Opposition party in this province.

It was with a sigh of relief that most people in Saskatchewan saw the end of the Saskatchewan Farmers' Union during the past year. I didn't think that the Leader of the Opposition would have to leave this soon but I guess his conscience is worrying him more perhaps than I had anticipated.

**Some Hon. Members:** — Hear, hear!

**Mr. Guy:** — Hopefully, the National Organization, which replaced the Farmers' Union, will expect more rational behavior befitting a farm organization than was ever shown by the Saskatchewan Farmers' Union while it existed. In Saskatchewan, the Farmers' Union had deteriorated to become nothing more than the pawns of the NDP. When the Leader of the Opposition made a statement on Sunday at his constituency picnic, the next day it became the official policy of the Saskatchewan Farmers' Union. On Friday when the Saskatchewan Farmers' Union made a declaration against the Government, it became the official line of the NDP party over the weekend. This liaison with one political party ended the contribution this organization could have made to our province.

The 1969 Annual Convention of the NDP held in July, proved to be significant from the point of view of future policy of that party. You will recall a year ago when Members of the Government asked the Opposition to state definitely whether or not they were in favor of the nationalization of land, they hedged by blaming the New Democratic Youth Movement for the passing of that resolution. But they can no longer hide behind the New Democratic Youth, for, at their convention last summer, the concept of state ownership of farm land was passed by the agriculture panel and by the general session.

**Some Hon. Members:** — Hear, hear!

**Mr. Guy:** — However, after its passing by the general session, some of the provincial farm MLAs led by the agricultural critic, the MLA for Kelsey (Mr. Messer) became scared. They were successful in bringing the resolution back for a second time, when the Member for Kelsey pointed out that it would be most harmful politically, should the NDP pass that resolution for the state ownership of farm land at this time. And as a result of their arguments, based on political fears, rather than any change of heart, on the second vote, the resolution was defeated by a very small majority. So it is obvious to all of us that in order to protect their political skins, they are prepared to soft pedal this plank in their platform. Hardly an approach a responsible party would take, and one that I am sure the farmers of Saskatchewan will not overlook in the coming election. The fact is, socialization of land is NDP policy and would become legislation should they form the Government. It was interesting to note that all trade union members were strongly in favor of farm nationalization. As the NDP becomes more and more labor dominated, the voice of the farm members becomes more of a voice in the wilderness, so any hope this policy will be revised is not a realistic one.

The second significant convention held by the NDP during the past year was the National Convention held in Winnipeg last October. The main point of interest, from Saskatchewan's viewpoint, was the position taken by Saskatchewan delegates in regard to the Watkins Report and the role of foreign capital for development of our natural resources. As you are aware, the Watkins proposals are violently anti-American and extremely far left and radical in its recommendations. Although the report was finally turned down by the Convention, largely due to the urging of Premier Schreyer who claimed his Government would be endangered by its passing, one cannot help but be alarmed at the large following this manifesto had in the NDP party. Most

significant to Saskatchewan, I suggest, was the fact that the Leader of the Opposition, the MLA from Regina North East (Mr. Smishek), and more than half of the Saskatchewan delegation supported the Watkins Report and its extreme left position. Mr. Speaker, with the tremendous development of our natural resources that has occurred since we became the Government, it is obvious to all of us that this development would soon stop under a political party led by a man who supported the Watkins proposals, with its violent opposition to the import of foreign capital for the development of these resources.

The Leader of the Opposition's view in this regard were made known again when he supported the White Paper on Taxation and its proposals to eliminate the incentives to the mining and oil industry. This can have nothing but a harmful effect on the development of Saskatchewan's resources. Yet, knowing this, the Leader of the Opposition and the party that he represents, are prepared to see resource development come to a standstill. Surely, at a time when we are only beginning to develop our potential, a position such as taken by Members opposite cannot and will not be tolerated by the people of Saskatchewan.

It was interesting to note that at the same time as the Saskatchewan contingent and others were expressing themselves so strongly in opposition to American capital and our American friends, the Finance Minister of Manitoba was packing up his suitcase and moving to the United States to try and promote some Manitoba bonds. However, the effects of Socialism and its anti-American stand were not lost among the investors of the financial world of the United States. It is true Manitoba was able to sell their bond issue, but according to the investment industry, as reported in the Winnipeg Free Press, the Socialist Government in Manitoba had cost them money and the only question was how much.

The consensus of industry sources was that Manitoba, as the only Socialist Government in North America, cost about one quarter of a percentage point on the interest rate. This is not surprising to us in Saskatchewan as we are well aware of the effect of a Socialist Government on the investment climate and atmosphere of this province.

It was also significant to note at the NDP National Convention, that, while the anti-Americanism was aimed at capital, investment and industry, it did not extend to the labor movement. In fact, they bent over backwards to attract support, both financial and political, from the largest unions in the United States, and I might say, with some success. During the convention, the women of the NDP made a strong representation for additional seats on the National Council. I believe they asked to have their representation increased from five to fifteen. And in view of the NDPs' stated position on civil rights and equal opportunity for women, no one would deny that this was a logical request. But what happened? The convention, with the majority of men, turned down this legitimate resolution from the women of the convention and, in place of giving the women a greater say in the National Council, they gave it to the labor movement instead. Without them asking, a resolution was passed unanimously, to give the 12 largest unions in North America automatic seats on the National Council of the NDP. This, of course, includes the United Steel Workers, the United Auto Workers, the International Woodworkers of America, among others that will automatically be given representation on the

National Council of the NDP. This move must have caused some despair among the women, and the farmers, and the small businessmen, who support the democratic principles on which the NDP are supposedly based. To those of us in Saskatchewan, it means a complete sell-out of the NDP to the international unions of North America and the world, and certainly a move that is not in the best interest of a mixed agricultural and small industry province.

Future direction of the NDP was quite adequately expressed by Donald MacDonald, president of the Canadian Labour Congress, in his address to the convention, when he said it was inconceivable to him that the NDP could ever come to power without the support of the Canadian trade unions, and that in his view the NDP should be a party that organized labor should be able to call their own. The farmers and businessmen in Saskatchewan say they are welcome to the NDP.

Perhaps the most significant meeting held during the year, from Saskatchewan's point of view, was the meeting of the National Council of the NDP which was held several weeks ago, under the new President, Mr. Allan Blakeney of Saskatchewan. This National Council of the NDP, as you are all aware, is the real governing body and voice for this party. And I am sorry that the Hon. Member that is now president of this party is again today not in the House. I suggest that it was significant to Saskatchewan for two reasons.

First of all, it showed that the Watkins Report was not dead. Unanimously, Professor Watkins was added to a committee to map out future NDP policy. No matter what the NDP say, or what Premier Schreyer is trying to tell the people of Manitoba, the Watkins Manifesto, with its far left radicalism, will continue to become more a part of the NDP policy than ever before. Under the influence of Professor Watkins and Opposition Leader Lloyd, the NDP is becoming a party of radicals, dissidents, revolutionaries, anarchists, and all those not welcome in other political parties who support a philosophy found wanting throughout the world.

Now the second and most significant reason why the Saskatchewan people should be interested in this meeting, was that according to all press reports, – and I checked the Eastern papers and the Western papers – no mention was made of Western agriculture. This was the first meeting since 12 U.S. labor unions were given direct representation on the National Council and this was the first meeting that Western farm problems were not discussed. I suggest that this is more than a coincidence. What is most disconcerting, of course, is that the president of the Council comes from Saskatchewan. Does he have no concern for our farmers? Or did he make an effort to have our problems discussed only to be voted down by the 12 labor unions of the United States? We would like to know.

It becomes obvious to us in the Government that the speeches that are being made in the small towns, in Ottawa, in this Legislature, and the newspaper releases by the Federal and Provincial Members of the NDP, are purely window dressing for their own political expediency. It appears the NDP has no interest whatsoever in the farmer, because the National Council had a glorious opportunity to draft a policy on behalf of the whole party at the highest level and present it to the Federal Government, and they blew it. Not one work or resolution passed



regarding the farm situation! Surely this lays open for all to see the true face of the NDP and its members toward Western agriculture and a position that will not be overlooked by Saskatchewan people. I suggest that it is significant also that immediately after the meeting of the National Council of the NDP, the longshoremen on the West Coast rejected their offer and went on strike, thus halting the shipment of grain, once again showing the great concern of labor and its unions for the Western farmer.

We have all seen the number of releases and public meetings which the NDP has supposedly held where they have discussed the farm problems in Western Canada. In all these cases, the usual cry has been that the Provincial Government has not done enough. So I was interested a few weeks ago to see the Leader of the Opposition was a guest on the Lorne Harasen 'Contact' show one evening – and I'm sorry that the Leader of the Opposition is still out of his seat – I thought, here is the opportunity for the Leader of the Opposition to state exactly what he thought the Provincial Government should do and what the NDP would do if they were the government of the day. But again the Leader of the Opposition struck out. The first question that Lorne Harasen asked on this program was, "What do you think the Provincial Government should be doing to assist the farmers?" I listened with bated breath, here in front of the television audience of Saskatchewan, the Leader of the Opposition (Mr. Lloyd) had the opportunity to state boldly and positively what his party would do and what our Government should do. And in view of his criticism over the past months one would have expected a devastating statement of policy. Do you know what he said?

**An Hon. Member:** — What?

**Mr. Guy:** — I know that you'll find it hard to believe but he said, after he mumbled a couple of times,

First of all I think the Provincial Government should make greater representation to Ottawa.

So after months of talk and noise from the Saskatchewan Leader of the Opposition (Mr. Lloyd), when he was finally placed on the spot, we find he had no solution to the farm problem but cry to Ottawa. And there's nothing new about that.

From the very first of his program he openly admitted that the farm crisis in Western Canada is primarily a Federal responsibility. It is not the responsibility and not caused by the Provincial Liberal Government as he and his underlings like to say when they get out in the country.

He had no other answer. He had no Provincial policy. He had no Federal policy. In short he had no policy at all and he proved it to the whole television audience of Saskatchewan. Thank heavens, Mr. Speaker, the Saskatchewan Liberal Government has done more than that. Because the movement and sale of grain are primarily a Federal responsibility we have made strong representations to Ottawa. It is true that we have fought with it on occasions on the handling of grain and the operations of the Wheat Board. It is true that delegations have been going back and forth for more than a year and it is true that we have applied continuous pressure on Ottawa. But we have done more than cry to Ottawa. We have presented it with a concrete

11-point program which if implemented would go a long way to alleviating our current situation. We have a Federal policy.

**An Hon. Member:** — What is your policy?

**Mr. Guy:** — At the same time we have accepted the responsibility that we should have a Provincial policy as well. As the Premier outlined in his Throne Speech the other day, and as I am sure the Minister of Agriculture (Mr. McFarlane) will do before the Debate is through, your Government has taken positive and definite action.

It will stand out clearly that this action taken far surpasses any ideas that the Opposition might have in this period of economic difficulty for our Western agriculture.

The other day the Leader of the Opposition (Mr. Lloyd) had the nerve to suggest that we had included in our brief to the Federal-Provincial Conference some NDP proposals. If they were indeed NDP proposals, what we would like to know and the people of Saskatchewan would like to know is why in heaven's name haven't the Leader of the Opposition and his Deputy (Mr. Blakeney) used them before this. Why didn't the Deputy Leader use them at the National Council Meeting of his party in Toronto? The truth is they have no proposals. They've never had any proposals and they never will have any proposals.

The Leader of the Opposition kept talking very heatedly the other day – it appears his boiling point is very low at this Session of the Legislature – about the “acid test”. I suppose there is no better authority in Canada on the subject of acid than our NDP friends opposite.

**Some Hon. Members:** — Hear, hear!

**Mr. Guy:** — According to a report from Toronto, the secretary of the Ontario Young New Democratic party was highly critical of an executive member of his party who supplied drugs to youth delegates attending a Provincial NDP council meeting. He also criticized his group for drunkenness and vandalism which had them thrown out of every labor temple throughout the province.

Finally the Leader of the Opposition – who is still not in his seat – said he was surprised that the Premier was happy after the Federal-Provincial Conference, rather he should have been dismayed. But it appears from the headlines in the papers across Canada that all the Premiers went home happy from the Federal-Provincial Conference. The Winnipeg Free Press, however, quoted Premier Schreyer as only being “half-happy” as he said the Conference had only been a “modest” success.

**An Hon. Member:** — Ross stole the show!

**Mr. Guy:** — And one cannot be surprised that Schreyer took that attitude because Ross did steal the show! Of all the Premiers in Canada nobody came to this Conference better prepared than the Premier of Saskatchewan (Mr. Thatcher).

**Some Hon. Members:** — Hear, hear!

**Mr. Guy:** — Because, as I say, you only get out of a conference what you put into it.

**Some Hon. Members:** — Hear, hear!

**Mr. Guy:** — Our Premier was happy because due to his efforts alone wheat had been placed on the agenda and our delegation had made strong recommendations on wheat, inflation and pollution. Premier Schreyer on the other hand had no agricultural proposals to make, and no desire to combat either inflation or pollution. In other words he was probably no less happy than the people of Manitoba were by his performance.

In spite of the heads of 11 Governments of all political faiths stating that the Conference had been successful, the NDP Opposition Leader in Saskatchewan (Mr. Lloyd) is deliberately trying to destroy the efforts of these dedicated and concerned statesmen. Another irresponsible position taken by the Saskatchewan NDP at a time when responsibility is required!

The Premier in his speech the other day outlined the problems of over-supply in our potash industry and the steps his Government took to bring order to a sick industry. If any one act of statesmanship should be commended by the people of Saskatchewan it was Premier Thatcher's one-man fight to bring an international industry into some semblance of order. And he did it. Receiving a cold shoulder from Ottawa, he and our Minister of Mineral Resources (Mr. Cameron) could have said, "This is a Federal problem of trade" and sat and watched the jobs and revenues disappear. This was the action the Leader of the Opposition recommended when he said: "Oh, leave it to Ottawa, let it set up a marketing board."

But our Premier was not content to sit idly by. He took on the industrial giants of the world in the United States of America, France and Germany and he won.

**Some Hon. Members:** — Hear, hear!

**Mr. Guy:** — And he gained their respect and their thanks in so doing. What were our NDP Opposition doing while this was going on? They were sneaking out to meetings in the country spreading misrepresentations and falsehoods. They said we were trying to increase profits for our American friends, as if selling potash at \$12 a ton when costs of production were \$19 a ton, is a profit. Of course the Socialists have always had an arithmetic system of their own. In every way they belittled and downgraded our efforts. They hoped we would fail for their own political expediency.

Mr. Speaker, let me review in closing the contribution that the NDP have made to solving the problems facing the province during the past year.

First of all they deliberately misrepresented to the people of the province the role of the Provincial Government in the moving and selling of grain.

Second, they have opposed every Provincial action we have taken within our jurisdiction to alleviate the farm problem.

Third, they refused to support and even worse tried to destroy our efforts to bring stability to our potash industry.

Fourth, they have absolutely refused to admit that the escalating health and education costs from the taxpayers' view must be slowed down.

Fifth, they have offered no solution and no willingness to cooperate in the fight against inflation.

Sixth, they have supported the proposals in the White Paper on taxation that will destroy our oil and mining industry and our small business.

And finally, when offered a chance to support our Province at Ottawa in the fight against inflation and our wheat crisis, they refused. The Leader of the Opposition (Mr. Lloyd) refused to provide a united front on behalf of the people of this province. And they have done everything possible to downgrade the efforts of those that tried.

Surely, Mr. Speaker, the people of Saskatchewan deserve a better Opposition than that. Your Government has never tried to deny the fact that these are difficult times for our province due to the over-supply of our basic resources. But we feel and think the people of Saskatchewan feel that it is in times like these that we need the constructive efforts of all political parties. But it appears that the NDP prefer to spread doom and gloom, to criticize and destroy and hopefully to drag Saskatchewan down economically, socially and politically, so that their party can rise from the ruins they would like to create in their insatiable lust for power.

I am sure the good people of our province will not permit this. Surely we agree that in times like these, political parties and members should put the welfare of the people they represent above political expediency and through positive suggestions and constructive criticism, build a better province for all.

I will support the resolution but not the amendment.

**Some Hon. Members:** — Hear, hear!

**Mr. W. A. Forsyth** (Saskatoon Nutana South): — Mr. Speaker, on entering this Debate I want first of all to congratulate the Government on the contents of the Throne Speech. It is a realistic and it is a reassuring document for a province which has been dealt a severe blow and the near collapse of its principal industry. It makes no glib and irresponsible promises such as those that come from the mouths of the Opposition. It does offer a practical program of help for thousands of our citizens, and it does so in the complete confidence that it can carry out its program. There is no good reason for gloom or doom at this time. But now I believe that we are finding the wisdom of sound financing. I believe the people of Saskatchewan are recognizing the wisdom of sound financing by putting the brakes on expenditures on open-ended programs. It is becoming more evident every day that this Government is now in a position to take action because of the husbandry which it has shown in the past.

I would also like to congratulate the mover and the seconder of the Speech. Both of these Members have displayed a most intelligent approach to some of the basic problems which are facing our communities.

Mr. Speaker, I would like to draw the attention of the Members to this treatise on mountain building which has been distributed on the desks of Members by my deskmate, the mountain builder from the constituency of Saskatoon City Park-University, (Mr. Charlebois).

**Some Hon. Members:** — Hear, hear!

**Mr. Forsyth:** — This is indeed a memorable day and I am sure that most Members are aware of it. It is now just 348 days before the opening of the Winter Games in Saskatoon.

**Some Hon. Members:** — Hear, hear!

**Mr. Forsyth:** — And I hope that you will come and see my deskmate to get early reservations.

Since this Debate is traditionally a time for general discussion I would ask the indulgence of the House while I make a few remarks on one of the problems which I think is of great interest and of great concern to many people and it should be a concern to all of us today. I am speaking about the essential need for increasing environmental controls, better known as the fight against pollution.

Every once in a while the human race is faced with a challenge so terrifying that our social organizations are shaken to their very foundations. In our times we have two such challenges; first, the dramatic confrontation with the consequences of the uncontrolled release of atomic power, and second, the quiet but nonetheless serious confrontation with the fact that we are reaching a point of no return in our fight to prevent the pollution of our environment.

Since the time that I originally decided to use this topic there has been a veritable flood of publicity on pollution with articles in the press, magazines, and numerous public meetings have been held on the subject. The ecologists, those men who have devoted their lives to the study of environment, have suddenly found an audience and they have emerged from the quiet of academic life to be sought after as speakers, interviewees and panellists. In other words concern about pollution has become the “in thing”.

In fact one of the dangers in the present concentration on environment problems is that the cause may suffer from over-exposure. As Mr. Lorne Harasen said on his TV spot last Friday evening, talk about pollution is in danger of becoming a fad, a passing fancy, a safe topic like motherhood.

Let me assure Members of the House, Mr. Speaker, that I do not regard pollution as a safe topic. If we in Saskatchewan, in Canada and in North America, are going to do our share in fighting this scourge we will have to be prepared to put our money where our mouths are. We will face possible restrictions in the quantity of the affluence which we enjoy in order to save

the quality of our lives. As legislators we will have to lend our support to some unpopular political decisions. Above all we will be called upon to show real leadership in asking for sacrifices from our fellow citizens.

Without pretending to possess any expertise on the subject let me try to state the problem which is facing us. It is estimated that in 1800 there were fewer than one billion people on this earth. At present there are about 3-1/2 billion and by the year 2000 it is estimated that our world population will be 7 billion. If our present rate of increase continues, the child of a child born today will be struggling for living space, or dying space, with 2,000 other human beings on every square mile of inhabitable land in this world.

There is grave doubt that the earth can feed more than 6 or 7 billion people, and under present practices there is doubt that there will be enough oxygen for them to breathe. This is not scare talk, Mr. Speaker. It comes from a cold-blooded analysis of our world-wide population patterns, and it does make one wonder about the ultimate wisdom of telling our farmers that they should not grow wheat this year. What would have happened to Joseph's Brethren had Pharoah's ministers offered similar advice in biblical times?

Let's take a look at air pollution for a moment. Unfortunately in some areas of this continent one can do so in a most literal fashion. What we as a human race are doing is burning up hydrocarbons which have been laid down over millions of years. These hydrocarbons are in the form of coal, oil and natural gas and when we burn them we use vast amounts of atmospheric oxygen. By so doing we return to the atmosphere large quantities of carbon dioxide, nitrogen oxides and sulphur oxides. It is estimated that the United States alone contributes over 140 million tons of this type of pollution every year and more than half of it comes from motor vehicles and aircraft.

Plant life has the unique ability through a process known as photosynthesis to remove carbon dioxide from the air, combining it with water to produce hydrocarbons for the nourishment of animals, plus oxygen for them to breathe. This is essentially the cycle by which life came to be on this earth. Man is messing it up by discharging increased amounts of carbon dioxide while decreasing the amount of oxygen-producing plant life through such things as deforestation, strip mining, and asphaltting huge areas for urban development.

What is the record of our industrial age in its handling of water? Many of the great rivers of the United States and Eastern Canada are reported to be little more than open sewers. Biologists are labelling Lake Erie as a dead lake because of the industrial and domestic wastes which have been poured into it. Increasing consternation is being caused by the discharge of oil into our coastal waters. There are indications that disastrous changes are occurring in the marine life of those waters which overlie our continental shelf.

The list of potential pollution and pollutants is almost endless. I could go on to speculate on theories that we may be causing our environment to overheat so that the polar ice caps eventually melt, causing our ocean levels to rise and submerge our coastal cities. An opposing theory is that, if we becloud the atmosphere sufficiently, we will lower the incidence of the

sun's rays to the point where a temperature drop will cause another ice age to be upon us or upon our descendants. Apparently we can take our choice by swimming or going into deep freeze.

What I have tried to do is point out the seriousness of our problems on a global or at least on a continental basis. If there is any area of human concern in which we cannot afford to be isolationists it's that of environmental control. Smog in the San Bernardino Valley may seem of little importance to sunny Saskatchewan but we really can't afford to think that way.

Up to this point I have said that pollution is a bad thing and like sin we should be against it. Now let me modify my stand just a bit. If pollution is defined as a potentially dangerous change in environment then even nature is not free from blame. The eruption of a volcano with the resultant distribution of ash into the atmosphere, the destruction of forest cover through fires caused by lightning, the creation of alkali sloughs so common on our Prairies, these are acts of pollution. What we can and we must do is determine how much pollution we can add as human beings. We must determine the limits of pollution which our environment can tolerate and set ourselves to the task of maintaining these limits.

For instance the waters of most rivers have a remarkable ability to revitalize themselves. A stream will accept a certain amount of industrial or human waste without impairment of its function. The Hon. Joe Greene said, in moving second reading of the Federal Bill to provide for management of our water resources, and I quote:

Waste disposal is not necessarily an illegitimate use of water. It does not necessarily interfere with other uses for water, because, if our waterways are not overloaded, they can purify themselves. It is only when the natural ability of water to cleanse itself is surpassed that we find this use of water interfering with other uses of that precious resource.

The current issue of the University of Saskatchewan News describes a study of the pollution potential of the South Saskatchewan River which is being conducted by the Department of Civil Engineering on just this basis, not to determine whether the River is being polluted, because every body of water is polluted in one respect or another, but to determine what pollution we can live with.

Sometimes we must be prepared to accept calculated risks as far as pollution is concerned. Many of the uses to which we have put DDT have been questionable and even frivolous, but who is to say that its employment by a United Nations agency to control malaria-carrying mosquitoes in underdeveloped areas of the world has not been a benefit for mankind?

What I'm really asking is that the Government of Saskatchewan take cognisance of all aspects of every problem before engaging in precipitous action. The fact that the Saskatchewan Water Resources Commission is in active existence means that we have an agency ready and willing to work within the framework of a national water policy. It is unfortunate that other provinces are not so fortunate. However, I won't belabor this point because I'm sure the Minister in charge will have more to say about it later in the Session.

One thing which does concern me is that programs which have a vital bearing on the quality of our environment exist in virtual isolation in a number of our Government departments. Public Health, Public Works, Agriculture, Municipal Affairs, Natural Resources, Education, Mineral Resources, and Highways, are departments which immediately come to mind in this regard. And I am suggesting that we take a very close look at a coordinating body, a small but well-equipped staff of people, who can coordinate our programs. Through an intensified program of education we must prepare every citizen, private and corporate, for the price he will be called upon to pay for these programs through taxation, direct charges, and certain curtailments of traditional freedoms. We must continue to give leadership through our own Legislature.

Mr. Speaker, anything less than complete dedication on our part to the correction of past errors and the prevention of future crimes against our environment represents a betrayal of the birthright of succeeding generations of mankind.

I am certain in my belief that this Government will display such dedication and therefore I will vote for the motion to adopt the Address-in-Reply.

**Some Hon. Members:** — Hear, hear!

**Mr. M. Kwasnica** (Cutknife): — Mr. Speaker, in listening to the comments of the Minister of Public Works (Mr. Guy) just a few minutes ago I couldn't help but notice and think to myself that the Premier (Mr. Thatcher) has chosen an excellent man as Minister of Public Works in charge of pollution because I have never heard so much garbage in this House before.

**Some Hon. Members:** — Hear, hear!

**Mr. Kwasnica:** — And I would like to apologize to the people of Saskatchewan for that absolute, nonsensical speech that he gave.

**Some Hon. Members:** — Hear, hear!

**Mr. Kwasnica:** — Mr. Speaker, first of all I would like to thank the people of Kelvington constituency for electing Neil Byers as MLA to help bolster our strength in this House . . .

**Some Hon. Members:** — Hear, hear!

**Mr. Kwasnica:** — . . . and for bringing the total number of New Democrats now to 25. I am confident that this victory in Kelvington is proof positive that we will win in Saskatchewan whenever the Government feels fit to call the next election.

**Some Hon. Members:** — Hear, hear!

**Mr. Kwasnica:** — In looking at the Throne Speech presented to us on February 12th, Mr. Speaker, I was very disappointed to see an absolute lack of a philosophy in the Department of Education. The philosophy of this Government is certainly not quality education. If this Government was concerned with the quality of



education it would not have increased the student-teacher ratio by two per classroom. This increase will hurt our students desperately. What will happen will be larger classes in the basic essential subjects such as English and History which are so absolutely necessary for reaching a basic understanding of humanity. Of course it could be that the Minister of Education (Mr. McIsaac) doesn't want the people of Saskatchewan to be able to read with understanding and have a questioning mind, which is so necessary to our democratic way of life.

So this new ratio means that the basic subjects will now have 35 to 40 students in their classes, and there won't be much time for a student to express his views in class. He will not get the much needed individual attention by the teacher. Instead, learning will become a more and more mechanical, assembly-line type of experience of little relevance to the needs of our students today.

**An Hon. Member:** — What about the teachers?

**Mr. Kwasnica:** — Secondly, this increased ratio will cause many classrooms to include several grades together. This is a return to the system which is completely outdated today. But as usual this Government continues with its backwoods approach to education. In my own constituency what is happening to the schools in Hillmond? In Marshall? In Marsden? Or Lashburn or Neilburg? The Lloydminster School Unit has been told to cut 14 teachers out of 85. Four teachers at Marsden, 2 at Neilburg, where one classroom will be shut down and the Principal will now have to teach full-time, and the services of their librarian will be cut off.

**An Hon. Member:** — New Saskatchewan!

**Mr. Kwasnica:** — The other towns like Hillmond and Marshall and Lashburn and Maidstone are asked to cut back by one or two teachers each. And the key question is, Mr. Speaker: which teachers will they let go?

**Hon. D. G. Steuart** (Provincial Treasurer): — You!

**Mr. Kwasnica:** — Which classrooms will be closed?

**Mr. Steuart:** — Yours!

**Mr. Kwasnica:** — Mr. Speaker, I sympathize with the school boards who have to make these decisions, imposed on them by this present Liberal Government.

**Some Hon. Members:** — Hear, hear!

**Mr. Kwasnica:** — But what will hurt Saskatchewan people most by this policy will be the gradual closure of hundreds of schools in small towns across the province and their further centralization of education. This will lead to decimation of our communities. With our schools gone and many of our hospitals closed down by this Liberal Government what will happen to these communities? They will fade away into oblivion and thousands of our citizens

will lose the chance to live the good life, the happy, the secure, the friendly small town life. And this is being brought about by this stingy and boorish Government and a callous and hard-nosed Minister of Education (Mr. McIsaac).

**Some Hon. Members:** — Hear, hear!

**Mr. Kwasnica:** — Mr. Speaker, since farming is the backbone of my constituency, and indeed the backbone of the whole provincial economy, I would like to turn my attention to this area of concern.

I would like to place on the record of this House what the present Government has not done and compare that to the action and proposals put forth by New Democrats in this House.

**Some Hon. Members:** — Hear, hear!

**Mr. Kwasnica:** — The last two harvests have been tough ones in the central parts of our province. In October of 1968 our MLAs were aware of a crucial damp grain problem and called on the Minister of Agriculture (Mr. McFarlane) for immediate assistance. No reply came. All through November of that year we constantly reminded the Government to do something immediately. No reply. Our Leader, Mr. Lloyd, Jack Messer and Frank Meakes travelled to North Dakota to study how the farmers dealt with the damp grain problem there.

**Some Hon. Members:** — Hear, hear!

**Mr. Kwasnica:** — On their return, Mr. Lloyd recommended that the Provincial Government help our farmers by paying up to 10 cents a bushel for drying grain and by setting up huge grain dryers at several centres in the province.

Mr. Speaker, this is the kind of positive leadership shown by our Leader, Mr. Lloyd, as opposed by the negative, destructive leadership shown by the present Premier. Mr. Speaker, I am proud to be part of this team of New Democrats in this Assembly.

In the meantime let's go back to the damp grain story. Finally on December 14th after two months the Minister of Agriculture (Mr. McFarlane) came out with a press release stating that there was a damp grain problem. Mr. Speaker, this is a perfect example of Liberals in action. Do our farmers need anymore of this inaction? Liberals in Regina, who talk, talk, talk, and Liberals in Ottawa who say, 'Why should I sell your wheat', create a major catastrophe for the Western farmer.

**Some Hon. Members:** — Hear, hear!

**Mr. Kwasnica:** — But to carry this damp grain problem to conclusion, we learned during the dying days of the last session, that the Government of Saskatchewan was paying farmers to dry the Government's portion of grain on leased crown land. The Government's portion — what hypocrisy! This Government made sure its share of damp grain was dry but refused to help the farmers dry their own.

During the last session, due to pressure by New Democrats, a Resolution was brought forward to establish a two-price system of wheat. This Resolution was carried unanimously by this House. Mr. Messer, MLA for Kelsey, presented a Resolution to guarantee prices for farm products based on the cost of production. That Resolution was turned down flatly by the Liberals.

Mr. Speaker, Liberal inaction is obvious to Saskatchewan farmers. I must disagree with the Member from Elrose (Mr. Leith) who spoke last Wednesday and as a matter of fact with the Minister of Highways (Mr. Boldt) too, who spoke yesterday, both of these condemning the Canadian Wheat Board for its lack of sales. But does it occur to these Hon. Members that the Wheat Board comes under the direct control of their Federal counterparts? If the Wheat Board lacks sales representatives and staff, perhaps it is hamstrung by the lack of finances from the Federal Liberals. I am sure the Wheat Board is doing as good a job as it can under the policies set forth by the Trudeau Liberals.

The Hon. Member also said that he hoped that feed grains would never be allowed to come under the jurisdiction of the Wheat Board. I suppose he would like to see the orderly marketing of grains scuttled so that some of his corporate friends can take advantage of the shortage of cash on the farm and buy feed grains at firesale prices, just like they used to do in the good old days of the Winnipeg Grain Exchange. Yes, this is Liberal thinking, shallow and short-termed. Anything to make a fast buck.

Mr. Speaker, the Premier of this province with the help of certain news media has attempted to make political hay out of his barter deal for generators for the SPC. Now, there are many questions that need to be answered, but the number one question is: would the grain have been sold anyway? I would just like to quote what the chairman of the Wheat Board had to say about this matter. And I quote from the Star Phoenix, January 12, 1970:

Wheat for generators deal not a barter: McNamara. W. C. McNamara, Canadian Wheat Board chief commissioner said Monday the Saskatchewan Power Corporation's bartering of wheat for generators is not, in fact, a barter and does not add to Canada's export sales.

Mr. McNamara said that the wheat tied to this Power Corporation transaction is wheat that would have been exported in any event. He said that the Wheat Board is opposed to bartering on principle because it will work to the detriment of the farmers of Western Canada.

And he concluded by saying:

But it distresses me to see farmers giving away grain at a lower price that I think will sell at board prices before the end of the year.

Mr. Speaker, this news release clears up any misconceptions about that deal.

**Some Hon. Members:** — Hear, hear!

**Mr. Kwasnica:** — Mr. Speaker, many of our farmers caught with grain surpluses have begun to diversify by turning to hogs and cattle. This has some merit but the question troubling the farmers in my constituency is: how long have we got until the price of hogs and cattle drops to unreasonable levels because everybody is going into the business? Predictions have already been made that the bottom will fall out of the market next year. Mr. Speaker, something must be done now, immediately to prevent this from happening. Therefore, I propose that the Minister of Agriculture (Mr. McFarlane) call a meeting immediately of all Provincial Agriculture Ministers and the Federal Minister to establish a realistic floor price for hogs and cattle.

**Some Hon. Members:** — Hear, hear!

**Mr. Kwasnica:** — We need positive action now to prevent disaster next year.

Mr. Speaker, the incentive program for diversification into cattle herds provided by the Government looks like a good deal too, but when it's compared to the Industrial Incentives Program one begins to question its sincerity. Loans are guaranteed up to \$6,000 and the Government has agreed to pay the interest above seven per cent. But farmers in my constituency are asking: how come we are being treated like second-rate citizens? The Premier announced on January 26th that he is prepared to pay grants to businesses amounting to 20 per cent of the cost of setting up an industry. The grants for businesses would be in the form of interest-free loans and would not exceed \$300,000. The loan would be written off entirely after five years.

Mr. Speaker, I wonder how come industries are given interest-free loans of up to \$300,000, while the farmer has to pay seven per cent interest on loans of up to \$6,000. I wonder how come the loans are written off entirely after five years for big business but the farmer has to pay back his loan. I am sure the farmers want to know why. They'll be waiting for your answer, Mr. Premier, Mr. Minister of Agriculture, and I hope you will have one soon.

I have brought the shortcomings of this Government to the attention of this House and the farmers of Saskatchewan. Mr. Speaker, I want you to compare the Liberal inaction with the concrete proposals made by New Democrats to this Government in our brief presented to it in December to help our farmers. It's taken from the pamphlet which you are all familiar with, "It's time to act".

We propose that the Federal Government, with the full co-operation of the Province, inject cash into the farm economy by providing not less than \$200 million in supporting payments across the three Prairie provinces; by paying farmers for farm-stored grain at the same rates paid elevator companies; by moving grain immediately to fill terminal elevators. We also urge that the Saskatchewan Government support and cooperate fully with the Government of Canada and the Canadian Wheat Board to impartially enforce regulations necessary for orderly marketing. We also urge that all grains, including feed grains, be placed under the Wheat Board. Also to facilitate adjustments within agriculture because of the grain glut, we urge incentives to

farmers where appropriate to take specified acreage out of wheat production and to put it into grass or other fodder. I am glad to see that the Government has adopted that proposal; secondly, to provide outright capital grants as is done for industrial development, to assist farmers to shift to livestock production. To ease the credit problems we propose that loan companies use utmost restraint in their collection practices, to forego foreclosures and seizures and to grant loan extensions at no increase in interest rates. And, finally, we urge that the Canadian Wheat Board take the initiative in selling wheat abroad and provide it with the budget and staff necessary to do so.

Mr. Speaker, these are sincere proposals. We, on this side of the House, are confident that if these were implemented immediately, the plight of farmers would be eased tremendously.

Mr. Speaker, the saddest picture of Liberal deceit can be seen when one examines closely what this Government has done regarding taxation. Remember the Liberal promise in 1964 to greatly reduce taxes? Well, let us take a look at that record briefly. Since 1964 there have been well over 1,100 new or increased taxes and fees heaped upon the people of Saskatchewan. In their short six years in office the Liberals have increased more taxes and imposed more new ones than the CCF did in 20 years. If I were to list them all, and I would just love to do that, Mr. Speaker, we would be here until next Christmas.

**Some Hon. Members:** — Hear, hear!

**Mr. Kwasnica:** — Some of the most inhuman and vicious taxes have been imposed by this Government, particularly I mention, deterrent fees on the sick and the aged and the tax on farm fuels. I ask that these taxes be repealed immediately.

**Some Hon. Members:** — Hear, hear!

**Mr. Kwasnica:** — Mill rates have skyrocketed since this Government took office. Let me give you an example of taxes on a quarter section in my own constituency of Cutknife. In 1964 the taxes on this quarter were \$140; in 1969 up to \$192. This is an increase of \$52 in five years — 30.5 per cent increase in property taxes. Counting the \$50 Homeowner Grant paid in 1969 that farmer was \$2.70 in the hole on that one quarter. But this farmer owns 13 quarters and therefore the total tax increase was \$755. If we subtract the \$50 Homeowner Grant, this farmer is \$705 in the hole on that deal. No wonder this Government can now afford to increase the Homeowner Grant this year. It owes this farmer \$705 already. That's enough extra to pay him \$100 a year for the next seven years. What a sham! What a mockery of human intelligence!

**Some Hon. Members:** — Hear, hear!

**Mr. Kwasnica:** — And then the Premier writes a nice little letter to all homeowners saying how increased prosperity from industrial growth has enabled the payment of Homeowner Grants. It's our own money derived from oppressive taxation, Mr. Speaker. How ridiculous can you get? Under such management no wonder 10,500 people left the province since April 1. No wonder more than 69,000 have left the province since the Liberals took office.

No wonder there are over 16,000 unemployed in Saskatchewan today. No wonder business has dropped off drastically!

Mr. Speaker, this is positive and conclusive proof that the Liberal times are hard times for Saskatchewan people.

**Some Hon. Members:** — Hear, hear!

**Mr. Kwasnica:** — With Liberals in Regina and Liberals in Ottawa it is just too much! The Throne Speech has failed education once more, and it fails the farmer. It fails the taxpayer. Mr. Speaker, I will not stand idly by and see this Government heap abuse, deceit and suffering on the people of my constituency and of our province, and I ask for this Government's resignation.

**Some Hon. Members:** — Hear, hear!

**Mr. Kwasnica:** — This is what it should do right now. I cannot support this Speech from the Throne but I support the amendment moved by Woodrow Lloyd.

**Some Hon. Members:** — Hear, hear!

**Mr. E. Kramer** (The Battlefords): — Mr. Speaker, I don't mind too much the Minister of, I think the new name is, Pollution, taking three or four minutes of my radio time. I appreciate the Member for Saskatoon Nutana South (Mr. Forsyth) giving me about two minutes back. I appreciate the Hon. Member from Cutknife (Mr. Kwasnica) taking it back. He made a better speech than I am going to make at any rate. I am sorry that I couldn't say that about the preceding ones.

You know I wonder a little and I am sorry that the Premier isn't in his seat, because sometimes he intrigues me in his choice of Ministers. Some choices are logical you know, like for instance the Minister of Education (Mr. McIsaac). He is a logical choice. The Premier needed an emasculation job done on education and who but a veterinarian for that job. And certainly you need a fellow that is fast on his feet to do the job in Treasury. Ha, ha, no one but golfing Davey to do that! But until today – I knew about this sometime ago in fact, but today it was really brought to my attention just why the Minister of Public Works (Mr. Guy) has been appointed. You know mostly, Mr. Speaker, you choose a man because of his knowledge of architecture or his taste and knowledge in building. But you know, sewage and garbage are also a part of the Public Works Program, and that of course was the reason for the appointment of the present Minister.

Mr. Speaker, I want to add my congratulations to those who have spoken previously and especially to the new Lieutenant Governor, who represents a very important ethnic group of our province. I want to especially congratulate our new Member for Kelvington, Neil Byers. It is heartening to note that justice still prevailed after a long desperate manoeuvring by the Liberals to keep Kelvington from being properly represented in this House.

**Some Hon. Members:** — Hear, hear!

**Mr. Kramer:** — I congratulate our Leader, the Hon. Member from Biggar (Mr. Lloyd) for his speech in this Debate which was witty and articulate. You know I wish that part of the Session, the Premier and the Leader of the Opposition, could have been totally shown on television. The debate was over right then and it would have been wonderful for the public of Saskatchewan to see it.

**Some Hon. Members:** — Hear, hear!

**Mr. Kramer:** — I would like to congratulate the Premier in finally recognizing that there is a farm problem in Saskatchewan. Last year he didn't know. Last year when we brought in a Resolution, an emergency Resolution, to discuss this problem, the Premier and his Ministers didn't even know that there was a problem and we had to drag it in by its bootstraps. And then finally after they saw no way out, they said that you had better let us, the Government, introduce it because it will look better that way in Ottawa. It didn't work very well, did it, Mr. Speaker?

I think that their eyesight has improved and I think, possibly, the decisive trouncing in Kelvington has added to their education process.

**Some Hon. Members:** — Hear, hear!

**Mr. Kramer:** — I would like to thank the Premier once again for being more prompt than he was last time he lost out on a little commitment he made prior to a by-election. I appreciate his donations and I will be making some kind of gift in return before too long but not in the same way.

Mr. Speaker, no one is going to be fooled by this new phony stance of the Premier and his Liberal followers. The people are still aware of the Liberal shortcomings and the colossal loss that this province has suffered through six years of Liberal stewardship. People of Saskatchewan are not going to forget that the Liberal party during the election in 1964 pledged, promised, undertook to bring further prosperity to Saskatchewan. Eighty thousand new jobs. The kids around North Battleford have a saying, "I got one of those 80,000 new jobs that Mr. Thatcher promised in Edmonton, Calgary or Winnipeg," but never a job in Saskatchewan.

They promised to reduce taxes on all fronts. That was their promise and their battle cry and for three years they spent money like drunken sailors, using up the funds that they had inherited. Then they rushed into an election in 1967, when they knew the jig was up, after they had squandered all the savings, all the means that had been created by the former CCF and New Democratic, good business management. Then they proceeded to raise taxes on every front after they squeaked in. I am sure that you will remember, Mr. Speaker, and the people of Saskatchewan will remember. They weren't talking about help from the Federal Government at that time. Oh, no! Ross was going to do it all by himself. Whenever we suggested that there ought to be some assistance from the Federal Government prior to their election, we were crying to Ottawa. Well, who is crying to Ottawa now? Who is desperately trying to place all the problems of Saskatchewan at the foot of the Liberal Government at Ottawa?

Or at the foot of the municipalities, the school boards? Who is blaming everybody but the Thatcher Treasury benches for their mismanagement? Good, old Ross! Who is actually pretending that he isn't really part of the Liberal party, that Saskatchewan Liberals are something different than Liberals at Ottawa? I wonder who the Liberals think that they are fooling? I can just see the Premier sitting with his cigar in Pierre Trudeau's lazy boy, the evening before the Federal-Provincial Conference saying, "Well now, Pierre, you know things are awful tough for us Liberals out there in Saskatchewan, and if I say a few things to you tomorrow, that might look kind of rough, just remember that I have to look good out there, because I have to win an election before you do. And just remember too, Pierre, that if I lose that election it is going to be awful tough for you the next time around."

You know, Mr. Speaker, they remind me of the story at Noah's Ark. You will remember that Noah, before the flood, brought all the pairs of animals onto the ark. And because there wasn't much room on there and because they were going to be on there for a long time, Noah decreed that there should be complete abstinence for just about everything. In order to keep an eye on all these pairs of animals, the old giraffe had a long neck and a sharp nose, something like some of the recent Civil Service appointments that are poking their noses around the country on behalf of the Premier, and he said, "Now you just keep an eye on them. No hanky-panky." Well finally they disembarked and two by two they went off the ark. Finally the old tom cat and his mate came off, followed by nine kittens and the old tom cat winked at Noah and the giraffe said, "Ha, ha. You thought we were fighting."

This phony battle, this sham battle between Ottawa Liberals and Saskatchewan Liberals fools no one. And when the dust of battle is all cleared up, the only place where there are going to be cuts, bruises and blood is on the taxpayers of Saskatchewan and Canada.

**Some Hon. Members:** — Hear, hear!

**Mr. Kramer:** — That's the reason for this ploy. The Premier knows that the people of Saskatchewan and Canada are fed up with the Liberals, both Federal and Provincial, and is trying desperately to divorce himself from the Federal Liberals.

It is amazing you know. Two years ago, 1968, the Federal Liberals were desperately trying to divorce themselves from Ross. Now the shoe is on the other foot! That was when the Federal election was on. It is a pretty grim picture!

Mr. Speaker, I have said something about priority and that the priorities of the Government are wrong. Whenever anyone suggests new programs for assistance, for basic needs, these people put on their beggar's cloak and say, "Where are we going to get the money?" Where are these proud politicians who were going to create a new heaven and a new earth? Today they have a poor mouth and their beggar's clothes. And I feel so badly about this, Mr. Speaker, that I have got some things here that I think are appropriate at this time. I think the Premier, possibly, will need to have a tin cup and some smoked glasses to sit on a street corner and do this begging job right. And just in case that he gets an organ and an organ grinder, here is



enough red material for a monkey suit for his Provincial Treasurer (Mr. Steuart). And if there is anything left over, Mr. Speaker, the Hon. Minister of Highways (Mr. Boldt) can use the rest for warning flags along the highways and God knows he needs them. He needs them. I would ask the Page to take this across to the Premier's desk with my compliments.

I want to dwell for a few minutes on the needs of my constituency and Northwestern Saskatchewan. I want to draw the attention of the Government, once again, to the fact, getting back to the red flags, that No. 40 Highway from Battleford to the Alberta border, which was programmed by the former Government and to be dust-proofed and graded by 1965, is still in a terrible condition. Those portions that have been rebuilt are deteriorating rapidly because of the lack of blacktop, the lack of maintenance that is prevalent all over Saskatchewan and it is particularly evident on No. 40 Highway east of North Battleford, and I urge the Government to do something about this again. Lack of maintenance has allowed water to seep into these roads. There will be frost boils again next year – more of them than last year – and heaven only knows that last year it was broken up so badly there were more red flags on that than you could find on the road to Moscow.

Property taxes have increased and have reached an unbearable level, both urban and rural. And surely with the increased Federal grants the Government will see fit to provide increased money necessary to prevent another drastic rise in property taxes, not only in The Battlefords are concerned with the sad situation of higher taxes and less people in our trading area. We have been saddled with a debt for a beautiful, new comprehensive school. There is real concern now whether or not we are going to have the population in order to take advantage of this new service. Many people in The Battlefords are also concerned because they will still, even after this school is built, have to send their young people to other centres like Saskatoon or Moose Jaw to finish their training if there is room.

I want, once again, to register my disappointment that the Government did not proceed with the technical college that was budgeted for and promised by my party prior to 1964. Yes, the Minister of Education (Mr. McIsaac) says we got a \$5 million school. True enough, but we are still going to have to finish the technical training and send our children out of North Battleford to places that probably will not even be able to take them, because you haven't provided enough facilities even in Moose Jaw or Regina, Mr. Minister of Education.

The Minister of Education can make his speech later on. That is fine with me. I would like to just point out while we are talking about my constituency that we have suffered tax increases in five municipalities, Mr. Speaker, tax increases in five municipalities in the five years of Liberal Administration of \$1 million – a \$1 million increase. That is an increase placed on taxpayers of about \$200 per year. I suppose that if we get another \$50 homeowner grant that \$200 per year is supposed to be acceptable. That's a \$200 increase for the average taxpayer throughout my constituency because of the lack of leadership of this Liberal Government. I suggest that this homeowner grant should salve us some and it will be a help, no doubt. But I suggest, Mr. Speaker, I am opposed to the priorities and the favoritism. I suggest that you shouldn't have second-class

citizens. I would suggest that if you are going to give a grant you should give it to all taxpayers, renters as well as home owners. I suggest that if you wanted to take all this political malarkey out of the picture you could just simply provide a grant to everybody. Do it fairly by wiping out the per capita family and medical and hospitalisation tax. Do this right across the board and you would be treating all Saskatchewan citizens, as if they were Saskatchewan citizens, not some of them second-class Saskatchewan citizens. I suggest that this would be good for everyone but the Liberal party. They wouldn't get the propaganda value out of it. We want to see both winter and summer recreation facilities improved in the Northwest. We want to see this Government, while it lasts, take speedy action in both welfare and health levels, to see that released patients known to be violent do not run at large to menace an unsuspecting public. We have had more than enough tragedy in Northwest Saskatchewan and throughout this province now. The Government had the Frazier investigation into psychiatric services in Saskatchewan. It was condemned by it; it has not nearly started to carry out its recommendations. Mr. Speaker, before this Legislature is out, I am going to ask for an inquiry into the whole dismal affair by some method or other.

This Government has increased taxes on the people of Saskatchewan by nearly twice the amount they were paying in 1964 under a New Democratic Government, more than \$100 million per year, much more. Not only that, it has squandered and spent countless millions of dollars of various funds and savings from the sale of public property and Crown lands. This will add up to another \$100 million. And even while collecting all these countless millions of dollars in new taxes and levies, this Government has been forced to borrow more millions of dollars until our public debt in Saskatchewan has risen by more than \$200 million. Now this Government has the nerve to ask, "Where are you going to get the money?" Before we give you more money the people of Saskatchewan should ask and will ask: what did you do with the money we gave you? This province is cluttered with monuments of waste and mismanagement by this Thatcher Government, this Thatcher Government with the so-called firm hand on the wheel, steering this province straight on to the rocks, as our Leader (Mr. Lloyd) said earlier in this Debate. Saskatchewan taxpayers are paying this Government close to \$200 million a year in taxes and in liquidated assets. The Province's provincial debt has risen by \$200 million. You know this looks, Mr. Speaker, like about \$3 million a week. You're costing us, Ross, you're costing us too much. I don't think you can be trusted with the money.

**Hon. D. V. Heald** (Attorney General): — Twenty years we tried it. How about Schreyer?

**Mr. Kramer:** — Never mind, we're talking about Saskatchewan. This is what I said, Mr. Premier, when you were out of the House. You would like to blame everybody but yourself. You would like to talk about Ottawa, you would like to talk about these terrible school boards, you would like to talk about the terrible municipal councils. Why don't you take a look in the mirror? Why doesn't he take a look in the mirror, Mr. Speaker, and then he will see the one that is really guilty of putting Saskatchewan on the rocks. Take a good look when you shave. Millions of dollars have been squandered on pipe dreams, pipe dreams and promotion stunts all over this province. I will list only a few

of them. I have talked about them before and I am going to keep on talking about them. That \$1,200,000 spent on a highway from Canoe to Cummine, how's it coming? We hope the Premier will tell us.

**Hon. W. R. Thatcher** (Premier): — Hardtopped.

**Mr. Kramer:** — Oh, yeah! You know you get to it over a road that was built at the cost of \$1,000 a mile from Waterhen River to Canoe Lake by the Department of Natural Resources and then it broadens out – a beautiful 200-foot right-of-way, 46 miles ending up in a dismal swamp. Yeah! Ending up in a dismal swamp.

**Mr. Thatcher:** — We need it for the pulp mill.

**Mr. Kramer:** — There is more pulp in your head than there is up in that country. But you know all is not lost. It's good for moose hunting. It's real good for moose hunting. In fact my party got a beautiful moose up on Mile 21 last fall. My golly, it was a pretty good size, it dressed clear, clean 715 pounds. And immediately I thought of the Premier. I thought, well doggone it, you know the Premier has never had a dividend and is not likely to have any dividend from that \$1,200,000 investment. The Premier is pretty good at figures, I believe, \$1,200,000 five years ago – what's the interest on that, Mr. Speaker? It looks like about \$2 million now. That's a \$2 million investment by now. That's pretty fair. But just so the Premier doesn't feel bad I have a moose roast for him. I'll roast the Premier, Mr. Speaker, and he can roast a portion of our moose. Page, would you please take it over to the Premier. Now there is your first dividend from your Primrose Path.

**Some Hon. Members:** — Hear, hear!

**Mr. Kramer:** — Your first dividend, probably your only one. Maybe I'll be lucky again next year, maybe I'll get a caribou, and as a good Socialist I promise to share it with you again. I know you have a refrigerator, the Premier has a refrigerator. I would suggest that he has one of the Pages put the roast in the refrigerator because it might drip and he has enough drips on that side of the House already.

You know that famous path, it's a real beauty. The traffic count, according to Old Rusty (Mr. Boldt), is still five vehicles a day. Those people got lost and didn't take the turn to Canoe Lake and of course some were moose hunting.

**Mr. Thatcher:** — Just one minute, I would like to tell the Hon. Member that we have been working most of the day on a fairly major lumbering operation for that area, which will certainly use this highway and provide many, many jobs for the area.

**Mr. Kramer:** — Mr. Speaker, the Premier no doubt will make another speech. I appreciate his offer, it's the same offer, not quite as flamboyant as the one he made on April Fool's Day, 1965 to the people of Meadow Lake. Oh, yes, Primrose Forest Products to be built in Meadow Lake. Not a brick, not a board, not a

nail. Where's Mr. Nelson, Mr. Speaker? He is up logging in good old Social Credit Alberta. He has moved out. Mr. Speaker, the Premier even built a bridge for him to haul this supposed product on a land slide down at Deer Creek instead of giving it to the people at Maidstone where it should have been built. It would have been built in Saskatchewan. But you flew in the face of your Minister of Highways, the Hon. Mr. Grant at that time, and you chose to build it where your friends wanted it. Oh, yes, we haven't forgotten that, so don't come along and talk to me about this supposed employment for that 40 million feet of spruce timber that is up there. Look, Mr. Speaker, the Premier doesn't know, but they have been hauling timber out of that country over the ice for years. He didn't need a \$1,200,000 highway. If he had completed his pipe dream it would have cost this province \$3 million. Why, Mr. Speaker? I would like him to get up again and tell us why. At the end of a \$1,000 per mile bush road going in and out for forest access and fishermen, why did this Government choose to build this massive, \$25,000 a mile, starting nowhere, ending nowhere.

**Mr. Thatcher:** — I'll tell him, Mr. Speaker, we built it because we are going to have a major lumbering operation. In order to get trees out you have got to have a road up there and next session we will tell the Hon. Member of the major lumbering operation that will be by that time . . .

**Mr. Kramer:** — Mr. Speaker, once again . . .

**Mr. Speaker:** — One at a time!

**Mr. Kramer:** — That's fine, Mr. Speaker, I appreciate this information even if it's not correct. The fact of the matter is, if you took your rejuvenated figures from the Department of Natural Resources, and the Hon. Minister of Natural Resources (Mr. Barrie) can verify this, the forestry people used to tell us that there were 40 million feet of merchantable spruce timber in there. But then they revised that figure and said that there were 77 million feet of merchantable timber. Merchantable timber. Does that include the jack pine and the poplar, and we are poplar and jack pine poor all across the forest belt. The Premier doesn't know, but supposing this 77 million feet was harvested at \$5 a thousand, that would have brought us revenue of \$385,000 and this Premier was going to build a \$3 million road to extract royalties of \$385,000.

**Mr. Thatcher:** — This project is so big that we need more . . .

**Mr. Kramer:** — With the fertilizer that the Premier spreads about I don't wonder, but what we might even grow a whole forest up in that country overnight.

Mr. Speaker, my time is a little limited. If they want me to talk about P.A. I would be very glad to anytime. I have a few more things to say about wasting money, wasting the public money. What about Anglo-Rouyn? Now the Premier wasn't satisfied with blowing a couple of million in Primrose, he wasn't satisfied with that. Let's get a little closer to home, up around North Battleford. There were 21 miles of road from Lashburn to Lloydminster. The Government fiddled around with it for

four years or better, originally contracted for \$600,000, re-estimated to \$800,000. The final payment out of the Treasury was \$1,500,000. How about that? What about No. 29 Highway? You turned down the contractors that knew something and you brought in another from outside because it was a few dollars lower. The overrun on that doubled the price of the original bid. These are not exceptions, they are the rule. We'll go back to those landslide bridges that the Premier ordered against the advice of engineers, another \$300,000 you threw against the wall. I could use another term – into the quicksand. You are wondering right now, you know they are watching that crack in the bridge, just wondering when it is going to slip again.

**Mr. Thatcher:** — Are you hoping, Eiling?

**Mr. Kramer:** — No, I'm not. As a matter of fact, Mr. Speaker, this was where I would have liked to have the bridge myself, but when the engineers told the Department that it wasn't safe to build there I think the sensible thing was to look for a new location. But let's get back to this bridge bit, \$300,000, if it isn't a bit higher. Incidentally, the Minister of Highways (Mr. Boldt) is not here but I have just a little report about some more nonsense, and this is pretty tragic nonsense. I would like to report while I am on my feet, Mr. Speaker, and while I am in the North Battleford area, I would like to report on the famous deadman's crossing on top of the hill there that I have said plenty about; the place where those so-called two-bit stop signs were erected. Let's see what's happened. The first nine months before they were erected and after the Minister of Highways had refused to listen to the police of North Battleford, refused to listen to the Chamber of Commerce, he refused to listen to everyone there. I raised it on several occasions and the Government refused to listen to me as well. This is not a laughing matter. At that crossing during the first nine months three people were killed, 22 hospitalized, 37 cars wrecked. It is now 18 months, Mr. Speaker, since those stop signs were erected by myself that Mr. Boldt objected to so much but took action. Since modification there haven't been more than two minor accidents in 18 months. I would like to suggest to these very wise and very clever people on the Treasury benches that they had better get on with the job and start doing something for the public instead of for a few friends down in the United States.

**Mr. Thatcher:** — Put up the tax . . .

**Mr. Kramer:** — Never mind, there he goes. I suggest you get the Premier to take that expensive plane of his and just flip off to Winnipeg, flip anywhere as far as we are concerned. It would save us a bit of money. That is the understatement of the year. It would make the people happy, it would make everybody happy.

Mr. Speaker, there is one more item that I would like to talk about, that Anglo-Rouyn road that the Premier built for Rio Tinto. You know the DNR Construction Branch estimate, when we were talking to the smelter people at Flin Flon about developing this coppermine . . .

**Mr. Steuart:** — Do you want the North opened up?

**Mr. Kramer:** — Oh, yes, we want to open the

North up but not the way you open it up. Let's take a look at it and you can make your speeches tomorrow. The estimate of the construction branch was \$750,000 for that 50 miles from No. 2 across to the Hanson Lake Road south of LaRonge.

**Mr. Guy:** — . . . horse and buggy . . .

**Mr. Kramer:** — Then we will take a look at the contracts that were let. After you have given contracts out and employed all the construction plant in Saskatchewan, no one was sharpening their pencils on estimates anymore in that particular year and there were only two tenders. The contract was finally let for that 50 miles for \$1,500,000. What did this careful, cautious, good business-like Government pay these contractors finally? Just a few thousand under \$3 million. Nearly twice the original bid again within a few thousand dollars.

**Mr. Thatcher:** — That's not right.

**Mr. Kramer:** — According to the answers that were given by the Minister of Highways (Mr. Boldt) last year and the year before this is right. What is the traffic count on that road, Mr. Speaker? Fifteen vehicles per day. And we haven't yet got one penny of royalties out of that Anglo-Rouyn mine. The Hon. Member from Prince Albert East-Cumberland (Mr. Berezowsky) was ridiculed when he called that a peanut mine five years ago. He was wrong; it didn't even give us peanuts. The Member is not very often wrong, but he was wrong. It didn't even produce peanuts for the people of Saskatchewan. If you took that \$3 million and if you added the maintenance, the improvement up to Waden Bay and over to Manitoba, it will be close to \$5 million and not one ruddy cent of revenue have we got out of that highway yet, Mr. Speaker.

**Mr. Thatcher:** — We think of humanity . . .

**Mr. Kramer:** — Look, you could take \$5 million, Mr. Speaker, and put a work program on that would do far more good. He says, think of humanity. The late Mr. Winters and Mr. Thatcher knew a lot more about that deal. Well, Mr. Speaker, I don't want to dwell on this, but I am simply saying that I have just given three examples of gross mismanagement by this Government. Just three locations and that is about \$7 million or \$8 million. If you took all their fiascos, their monuments of waste, you could add it up to countless more millions of dollars.

**Mr. Thatcher:** — You will be heading for the back benches if you don't do better than this.

**Mr. Kramer:** — Well, that's fine. I am perfectly satisfied to say what I know to be facts. I have a few more things to say even if it does bother the Premier. Don't let that moose roast melt now, Ross.

I am not going to steal time here, I am not going to take a page out of the Minister of Pollution's book. Mr. Speaker, I have only scratched the surface of waste and frivolity, just three examples. This Government that pretends to be a sound

business government. These three examples and they are the Primrose Path, those fiascos around North Battleford, Anglo-Rouyn Road and as I said they have added up to \$7 million without even starting to sharpen a pencil and there are literally hundreds more. Small wonder we are in financial trouble in Saskatchewan. The money that has been wasted over the last five years of Liberal Government would more than pay for all the deficits and the needs for health and education, for increased grants to give tax relief to the people of Saskatchewan.

Remember the battle cry of the Liberals in 1967, “Keep thins moving in the new Saskatchewan.” They’re doing that alright, on, over, and out. Farmers are moving, tradesmen are moving, businessmen are moving, professional men are moving at the rate now of about 2,000 per month. These Thatcher Liberals promised to make things better for business. Remember how he promised he was going to make things better for business. Well, you know, in one instance he did – the moving business. The trade is brisk. We understand the truckers are moving seven out to every one they are moving in to the various big centres, moving them out to British Columbia, Manitoba, Alberta, anywhere just to get away from this oppressive burden of taxation, to get away from this Robin Hood in reverse who takes from the poor to give to the rich.

**Mr. Thatcher:** — You hurt my feelings . . .

**Mr. Kramer:** — Well, I’ll admit that the Premier was a little generous with his \$100 but that was a commitment that he couldn’t very well get out of. And you know, Mr. Speaker, I didn’t take part in Kelvington by-election unfortunately.

**Mr. Steuart:** — That’s why you won. \$100 . . .

**Mr. Kramer:** — Did I donate Ross’s \$100 to that, well, amazing, I had forgotten. Mr. Speaker, it is one more reason why I wonder a little, you backbenchers ought to listen. You know he is reckless with his money. Don’t take too much financial advice from him.

Talking about financial advice the other day, Mr. Speaker, this chap was asking me what I thought was a good investment and I said, as long as the Liberals stay in Saskatchewan, invest in taxes, they’re always going up. If anyone wants another illustration of the priorities of this Government they need only look at the Liberal vote in the last Budget, \$5,200,000 for an increase in pay for the 700 doctors in Saskatchewan. Once again this was a big boost for the city practitioners but did very little to assist the doctors in the smaller centres and the outposts where it is difficult for communities to secure and retain doctors. Taking the law of averages, here was an increase in pay for the wealthiest group in the province and one of the wealthiest groups in Canada professionally. The Dominion Bureau of Statistics indicated last year that the Saskatchewan doctors were the highest paid in Canada with the exception of Alberta and Ontario, contrary to a statement that I heard from the Minister of Health and a few other people. Yet, this Liberal Government chose to give them a pay increase.

**Hon. G. B. Grant** (Minister of Public Health): — I wonder if I could ask the Hon. Member a question?

Did he refer to those figures as the 1969 Dominion Bureau of Statistics? If so . . .

**Mr. Kramer:** — I was quoting the 1968 Dominion Bureau of Statistics.

**Mr. Grant:** — Well, the Hon. Member said last year.

**Mr. Kramer:** — I was talking about the Budget last year, Mr. Speaker.

**Mr. Grant:** — Last year was 1969.

**Mr. Kramer:** — You gave them the increase last year when they were listed as the wealthiest with the exception of Alberta and Ontario by Dominion Bureau of Statistics 1968.

**Mr. Grant:** — Mr. Speaker, this is not correct. He was referring to last year which was 1969.

**Mr. Speaker:** — Order, order!

**Mr. Kramer:** — Mr. Speaker, suffice it to say that they are doing much better than the people who are carrying the pots and brooms in the hospital that this Government is too niggardly to pay. They are being paid something less than welfare levels in most hospitals.

**Mr. Grant:** — Ottawa . . .

**Mr. Kramer:** — Mr. Speaker, have I got the floor? This Government became very niggardly and careful with these underpaid people, the hospital workers. They were generous, \$7,000 a year for the doctors but the hospital workers have to go on strike in order to get some consideration. And recently it seems to me the Minister talked of pay increases for the doctors in Saskatchewan again. I agree that doctors in small centres and outposts should probably receive an increase, but I object to a general increase especially when one considers that the greatest beneficiary will be the Treasury at Ottawa through income tax. Did you ever stop to think about this fight that the Premier has with Ottawa? You know, in the income tax bracket that these people, the doctors, are in, Sir, it is a wonderful way to get into a fight. Out of that \$5 million about \$2 million plus will wind up right in Mr. Trudeau's pocket down at Ottawa, just like half the \$2.50 deterrent fee winds up right in Mr. Trudeau's pocket in Ottawa and he is fighting with Mr. Trudeau, Mr. Speaker. This is an amazingly wonderful way to get into a battle.

**Mr. Thatcher:** — They are entitled to get their half back.

**Mr. Kramer:** — Well, Mr. Speaker, I would just like to say one or two more things. We've got some announcements in the Speech from the Throne of various things. Liquor outlets, now that's one that I would like to talk about. We would like to talk about some of those examples, some of the recent ones. Well, we've



got Bill Lofts, former Liberal MLA at Glaslyn.

**Mr. D. G. MacLennan** (Last Mountain): — Outstanding citizen.

**Mr. Kramer:** — Agreed. He made room among his tires and his cans of oil and there is a liquor outlet there.

**Mr. Thatcher:** — If you want to be corrected, Bill Lofts was not given the liquor outlet.

**Mr. Kramer:** — Well, Mr. Speaker, it seems to me that it is in Lofts' garage.

**Mr. Thatcher:** — It wasn't given to Bill Lofts.

**Mr. Kramer:** — Well, alright, was it given to William Lofts, Jr.?

**Mr. Thatcher:** — It might have been given to his son-in-law, I'm not sure but not Bill Lofts.

**Mr. Kramer:** — Well, Mr. Speaker, the Hon. Premier is drawing some pretty thin lines. I'll concede him that point. Let's go to Spiritwood, Mr. Speaker, and take a look at what they have done there. They closed an existing store and added to the unemployment and where did they put that liquor outlet, into Louie Vey's.

**Mr. Thatcher:** — Oh, no, no, no!

**Mr. Kramer:** — Mr. Speaker, the liquor outlet is in Louie Vey's store.

**Hon. D. T. McFarlane** (Minister of Agriculture): — He's got the wrong place, Mr. Speaker.

**Mr. Kramer:** — Mr. Speaker, I notice the Minister of Agriculture (Mr. McFarlane) sitting over there saying that I was wrong again. You should see the credibility gaps when he goes out talking to the Wildlife Federation. You will be surprised, Mr. Speaker, that this Government takes credit for Tobin Lake and the Squaw Rapids Dam.

**An Hon. Member:** — I'll have no part of that.

**Mr. Kramer:** — I heard it out of the Minister's mouth. In fact it also takes credit for building the South Saskatchewan Dam. It seems to me that a Mr. Diefenbaker and a Mr. Douglas had something to do with it but not when you hear the Minister of Agriculture, who is so hard up for accomplishments that he has to go steal them from previous governments.

Now, Mr. Speaker, let's get back to Spiritwood. I said there is a liquor outlet in Louie Vey's store, the former Returning Officer, the former constituency president, secretary, you name it. You know it won't be very long before the Premier

will find a good Liberal that has a butcher shop or a beauty parlor or a barber shop or God knows what. We'll find liquor outlets there too. It won't be long, Mr. Speaker, before we see some signs, "Change your tires here", "Get the best in beer". Over in Spiritwood they will say, "Get your ballot box and your booze at the same time." This good former returning officer, Louis Vey might go for a sign "Buy a suit of clothes, look for a mickey under every dickey."

Mr. Speaker, this ought to be good . . .

**Hon. D. G. Steuart** (Provincial Treasurer): —That's a good one, eh!

**Mr. Kramer:** — Mr. Speaker, I am really not trying to be funny. I apologize to you, Sir. I am simply trying to point out to the people how ridiculous they are with their silly political patronage in liquor outlets. I am pointing out to them that there are fairer . . .

**Mr. Thatcher:** — We don't go first class!

**Mr. Kramer:** — Mr. Speaker, you know these fellows are on the East side of the province but they sure like to get out of this province fast. And boy! We'll be happy when they go.

Mr. Speaker, I want to make a suggestion, and I want to say this, instead of monkeying around playing politics with liquor outlets, why don't they just put them into the hotels where they already have a liquor outlet, where you would have one stop for the liquor inspector, where you already have a licensed outlet. You can supervise them better and so can the local police supervise them better. Let's cut out the politics and get down to some sensible business.

**Mr. Thatcher:** — We give them on merit!

**Mr. Kramer:** — Oh, ho . . . and how! Remember how it used to be. The Premier likes to ease it into the public a little. Some did go into some of these drug stores when it first brought in the legislation. He thinks, you know, drug stores would be a good place to have them. Just how many places of business and how many different types of business will be chosen for outlets. Just depending, Mr. Speaker, on where there is a good Liberal, where there is a good Liberal, if there is such a thing.

**Mr. Thatcher:** — If there isn't a drugstore!

**Mr. Kramer:** — Well . . . well, Mr. Speaker, I want to say this. I have watched the performance of this Government for five years now. In fact the Hon. Member for Moose Jaw said, "It sure seems an awful lot longer, six years this spring." It has failed on practically every count to give the people of Saskatchewan what they really deserve. It has squandered, and I have given instances, and there are a lot more, it has squandered the resources, the financial resources, it has taxed and taxed and is heaping more taxes. Now you are talking about heaping some more on.

**Mr. Thatcher:** — That's Schreyer!

**Mr. Kramer:** — What about the income tax . . .

**Mr. Thatcher:** — That's Schreyer!

**Mr. Kramer:** — Oh is it now! Well, I'll tell you after as many years of Liberal Government as Manitoba had, they sure must be in the hole a long way and maybe he has to tax to get out of it.

**Mr. Thatcher:** — That's a Tory Government!

**Mr. Kramer:** — Mr. Speaker, I am simply saying this. I am generous with the Government. I have tried for the last two weeks, I have scratched my head trying to think of something nice to say about the Treasury benches. I am sorry, but I can't. I just don't seem to be able to find anything that I could truthfully say was good. I suggest to the Premier the best thing he could do, the kindest thing — I know he loves Saskatchewan — just please fold up, call an election and make Saskatchewan Homecoming '71 really worthwhile coming home to. Mr. Speaker, I will support the amendment, but not the motion.

**Some Hon. Members:** — Hear, hear!

**Mr. E. Whelan** (Regina North West): — Mr. Speaker, before proceeding with my remarks, I wish to welcome to this House a young school teacher who was elected in a by-election, he sits on this side with the New Democratic party, the Hon. Member for Kelvington, Neil Byers.

**Hon. Members:** — Hear, hear!

**Mr. Whelan:** — Mr. Speaker, his election represents the protests by the electors against mismanagement of an election, it represents dissatisfaction of the present Government, and I am sure the teaching profession has one more voice. The people of Kelvington are fortunate to have this young man whose aggressive campaigning and ability were in no small part responsible for his election in that riding. Mr. Speaker, his maiden speech caused the Liberal speakers to fret and worry. No wonder, it was one of the best initial performances ever witnessed in this House.

**Some Hon. Members:** — Hear, hear!

**Mr. Whelan:** — The worry in the Liberal benches opposite is a good measure of the effectiveness of the Hon. Member for Kelvington. I spent some time in that by-election, Mr. Speaker, and his speech has compensated me in full.

My next remarks, Mr. Speaker, are directed in a congratulatory fashion to the Hon. Member for Hanley (Mr. Heggie) who moved the Reply Motion and the Hon. Member for Elrose (Mr. Leith) who seconded the motion. Both Members are gentlemen and their speeches were on a high plane and delivered well. The Hon. Member for Hanley did very well considering what he had to work with. The Hon. Member for Elrose hardly mentioned the Throne Speech. It is difficult to discuss something so vague and indecisive. This speech was delivered at a time when the

Province of Saskatchewan is suffering from the bad political judgment of Liberals federally and provincially. The history of the Liberal party is a history of being pushed into progressive action only when faced with political oblivion. This Liberal Government has a record worse in this respect than any other Liberal Government. There is no sign of action, there is no sign of progress and all around it are the signs of impending economic problems. Its ability to practise bad judgment on the people of the province, while blaming its blood brothers and political partners at Ottawa, seems to be the only consistent and persistent policy that it has.

**Some Hon. Members:** — Hear, hear!

**Mr. Whelan:** — Mr. Speaker, many comments have been made about by-elections. Since this Government took office in 1964 there have been four by-elections. We won two and it won two. In the two it won we cut its majority by 1,344 votes, Moosomin and Bengough. In Hanley and in Kelvington from a dead heat we won by a majority of — add the two of them together — 1,350 votes. In the four by-elections since this Government came to power, the New Democrats gained a total of 2,694 votes. Two provincial elections were held in Western Canada this year. In Manitoba led by Ed Schreyer, a brilliant young linguist, who speaks five languages and taught at the Jesuit college at the University, at the age of 33 after 12 years as a legislator, swept the New Democrats to power. The Liberal party leader was defeated. The Conservatives — and I want the Members opposite to remember this — the Conservatives whose only answer to every problem was to fight Ottawa, were left battered and broken.

**Some Hon. Members:** — Hear, hear!

**Mr. Whelan:** — They had only one policy, tear up the Ottawa Government. Blame it for everything that was wrong. The former Manitoba Premier deliberately went to the Federal-Provincial Conference to blame Ottawa. Facing the TV camera with an angry look he proceeded to blame Ottawa for Manitoba's political plight. The people of Manitoba spoke and when they spoke they answered the critic of Ottawa, the unconscionable crier who had failed to solve any of his own problems at home. They sent the Conservative leader out of power, forgotten except as the angry man who told off those fellows in Ottawa.

One would have thought the Manitoba people would have fallen for this. After all, Conservatives were in power provincially and the Liberals are in power federally. Conservatives should have applauded this natural inclination to batter an Ottawa Liberal. There is a good political lesson to be learned from the demise of Mr. Weir. This lesson will be repeated when the voters cast their ballots in this province, particularly where there is a . . .

**Some Hon. Members:** — Hear, hear!

**Mr. Whelan:** — . . . Provincial Liberal Government putting on a sham fight with a Federal Liberal Government. The people of this province will have no patience with wild criticisms, threats of separation, tirades against the Federal Government when they

know full well that the same Liberals who elected this Government elected the Government at Ottawa.

In my constituency in poll after poll the same Liberals who worked provincially are the Liberals who worked federally. They were scrutineers, they were poll clerks, and they were the same people.

**Some Hon. Members:** — Hear, hear!

**Mr. Whelan:** — In spite of an attempt to separate Provincial from Federal Liberals the party says in effect, “We are the same people.” The Provincial and Federal organizations are manned by the same Liberals, have the same officers, organize the same campaigns for candidates, federally and provincially. There is no denying it, the facts prove that these people opposite are the same people who helped the Trudeau Government get elected at Ottawa. One of the Members on the Treasury benches, the Hon. Member for Lumsden (Mr. Heald) organized the Trudeau campaign in Saskatchewan. We cannot sell our grain because of the callous indifference of the Prime Minister. He says, “Sell your own grain.” Every farmer in his riding should know that he chose this man. If I were campaigning in his riding that would be the main plank in my platform. If the Hon. Premier dislikes the Federal Liberals and distrusts them then how does he feel . . .

**Hon. D. V. Heald** (Attorney General): — Bring your union in!

**Mr. Whelan:** — . . . about the people who sit all around him, people who helped choose the Prime Minister and who helped elect Otto Lang and Ab Douglas.

**Mr. Steuart:** — A great Prime Minister!

**Mr. Whelan:** — The gloating by the Members opposite about British Columbia has a hollow ring, for they must know the Liberal party there completely collapsed. In spite of a greater number of candidates they increased their vote over the previous election by a mere 23,000 votes. Compare this with the New Democrats. The New Democrats received 67,000 more votes than they did in 1966, and their vote increased in all but one riding in the Province of British Columbia, and we won that one.

Why did the Liberals lose Kelvington?

**Mr. Steuart:** — Should have left Eiling there!

**Mr. Whelan:** — Oh, I’ll tell you. A very able editorial writer speculated it was the wheat situation. He reviewed the results in one poll. I jotted down, after interviews the reasons why the Liberal vote in that particular poll dropped from 36 to 20 and our vote increased from 9 to 24. I met some of the Hon. Members in the poll. Let me tell them about it. I recall vividly a long-time Liberal, who had voted for the Liberal party for many years, telling me, his voice shaking with emotion, that his mother was in the hospital and had been there for 29 days, at \$2.50 per day. He said, “I don’t have \$2.50 per day,” and

holding Neil Byers' pamphlet in his hand, he said to me, "I'll take the smile off the Premier's face."

**Some Hon. Members:** — Hear, hear!

**Mr. Whelan:** — I recall interviewing a young lady who was voting for the first time, who had been out of school for a year, didn't have the money to pay tuition fees, couldn't obtain employment. She said, "My family voted for them before. They promised 80,000 jobs, I only want one."

**Some Hon. Members:** — Hear, hear!

**Mr. Whelan:** — I recall talking to an elderly farmer who said, "I have seen taxes on everything in my day, but when they put taxes on my telephone, I quit them. This time I am not voting Liberal." The results show that he didn't vote Liberal.

When I canvassed along the highways that were being built, the criticism was loud and clear. "They were messing around with construction; it took too long; the road has been a mess for a long time; they must be spending money foolishly. Why don't they get it over with? That road has been torn up for years." The people who lived along the highways they were building expressed their opinion of the Highway Department when the ballot box was opened.

Mr. Speaker, there was the farmer who, sitting on the frame of a one-way disk, told me emphatically that to blame the Federal Government for the high cost of machinery, while at the same time putting a two cent tax on farm gasoline and diesel fuel was preposterous arrogance.

There was a teacher — and I am saving this one for the Hon. Member for Lumsden, because he'll know who I'm talking about — in a town close by, who incidentally was called on by the Hon. Member for Lumsden, the Attorney General, who spent hours trying to convince him to vote Liberal — as a matter of fact, I wanted to canvass him, and I had to wait two hours — he knows all about it — because he had voted Liberal before. He lost the teacher's vote, the teacher's wife's vote, the teacher's mother's vote, the father's vote and his brother's vote. To put it in one sentence, after the Hon. Member for Lumsden had left, he said to me, "As a teacher the Premier infers that I am a money-grabber and yet I am getting \$1,000 less than if I taught the same subjects in the same type of school in Manitoba."

There was the farmer who held his tax statement in front of my face as he ranted and raved. He showed the increase from 1966 to 1969 in the school mill rate and he said, "These people got my vote on the basis that they would lighten the tax load. What hypocrites they turned out to be."

**Some Hon. Members:** — Hear, hear!

**Mr. Whelan:** — There was the late model automobile without a licence, the grass growing around its tires in the farmyard. The battery had been removed. They were going to buy part of a year's licence; the compulsory insurance rate in one lump sum was beyond their financial reach.

There was the senior citizen who had his vote challenged at the official count in the 1967 election on the basis that he wasn't eligible. He happened to be in hospital. He had lived in the town for many years and everyone knew him. Although he was close to 80 they said he wasn't old enough to vote.

There was the section man who said that in 1967 about half of his group had voted Liberal, people who worked with him. This time there were two Liberals and nine New Democrats, because their pay cheque didn't cover the cost of living, and the Premier insisted that the wage earner, that the working man was making outrageous salary demands.

There was the pensioner whose friend lives in a senior citizens' home. The maintenance grant had been removed and the rent had gone up; the pension had remained the same. Too proud to ask for social assistance, they had cut back on food items. The editorial writer says it was the wheat problem.

Mr. Speaker, after a defeat by 532 votes you would think the campaign manager would be quiet, wouldn't you? You would think he would know enough to keep his mouth shut at least, but he wants to draw attention by making a racket over there on his side of the House. While the Federal Government may be inept, may not have the initiative, the courage or the imagination to sell grain, the people of Kelvington didn't vote against the Federal Government. They voted against deterrent fees, jobs that were promised and never materialized, taxes on telephone calls, the fumbling ineptness of highway construction, tax on diesel farm fuels, ridiculing of teachers by some of the Cabinet Ministers opposite, the high mill rates on their land, high automobile insurance rates on late model cars, the unfairness of procedures in the previous election, the Premier's criticism of railway workers, the withdrawal of grants to senior citizens' homes.

**Some Hon. Members:** — Hear, hear!

**Mr. Whelan:** — Mr. Speaker, in summary, the people of Kelvington voted for Neil Byers. They voted against the Liberals in spite of swarms of civil servants, in spite of Liberal MLAs, in spite of an aggressive campaign, in spite of all the tactics they used. They voted against them because of their bad performance, their bad judgment, their bad administration and their failure to keep faith with the people of the Province of Saskatchewan.

**Some Hon. Members:** — Hear, hear!

**Mr. Steuart:** — Tell the truth!

**Mr. Whelan:** — When I was in Kelvington polls, the polls I canvassed had been strong Liberal polls since away back, a long time. These polls had been strong Liberal polls. I now found that they were inhabited by many ex-Liberals, some of them pretty bitter, but they didn't blame their sorry plight on the Liberal party, not even on Pierre Elliott Trudeau. They didn't vote Neil Byers because of the Federal Prime Minister, Mr. Speaker. Please allow me to enlighten the Members opposite of what these strong Liberals think. The reason for their disenchantment and the distrust and the disagreement, they said was the leadership of W. Ross Thatcher. Over and over again they told me they had

to get rid of this man. Oh yes, he's causing all the trouble. I had a good deal of enjoyment conversing with them and picking a successor for the leadership of the Liberal party. It was a delightful experience. Mention of the Provincial Treasurer brought a snort and a full head of steam about taxes. A real up-roar at that stage. The suggestion that the Minister of Education might be suitable brought a tirade about putting the cost of schools on property taxes. The suggestion that the Hon. Member for Lumsden was a possible candidate drew a retort that he was already on his way to the bench. A reference to the Minister of Welfare brought forth a list of people who had been cut off, threatened, humiliated or had their pride punctured by the Department of Welfare. The suggestion that the Hon. Minister of Public Works was a candidate brought about the most profane, most unholy, most caustic and heated response of all. The final admission was that none of them held hope for the Liberal party, and when I insisted that Ross was really the best of them all, they shook their heads and quietly announced, "I am voting for Byers." Mr. Speaker, I suggest that's what they did. I want Hon. Members, if they aren't already aware of their plight, to consider two very obvious facts when they speculate on their own political future.

First, although we had a better candidate and he proved this when he spoke in the House yesterday, Bryan Bjarnason was one of the ablest campaigners in the Liberal party. That's one point I want all Members opposite to remember. Second, the Liberal party has made a good many more mistakes since the by-election was held last June. That is the second point I want them to remember. In view of this set of circumstances, unless a Member opposite has a huge majority, I would think that he is not very safe.

Let us look at the Hon. Members opposite who have a majority of say less than 532, which was our majority in Kelvington. Let's speculate on the Members' future. Arm River, Liberal majority 34. I would say that the future was not too bright for the Hon. Member for Arm River. Bengough, majority 214. Times are getting worse; the Hon. Member for Bengough is sort of up against it. I would say he is in trouble. The Hon. Member for Elrose had a fantastic majority of 124. It is going to get pretty rough there, I would say his chances are pretty slim. Then the Hon. Member for Gravelbourg. Look at him, majority 525, I am sorry he is not in the House. Times are worse now, a lot worse. The Provincial Government has made a lot more mistakes, I suggest he is not in the clear. Hanley, the Hon. Member for Hanley, majority 133. He is in real trouble, even after they redraw the boundaries. Do you think they could find enough votes to get him elected? Last Mountain . . . we heard the Hon. Member speak, the sound of his voice, the desperate plea for attention, for work to be undertaken in that riding. He has told us clearly that his majority must be all of 26, that's what it is, 26. He was the campaign manager in Kelvington and he knows what he is up against. He is headed for political oblivion and he knows it. Meadow Lake, the Hon. Member for Meadow Lake had the magnificent majority of 106 the last time. Our majority in Kelvington was just five times that, five times that much. What do you think his chances are? Not so good I would say. Now it is Nipawin where the majority was 8. Well, you know, it has been nice knowing him. He hopes they don't call an election this year. I am sure the Hon. Member is enjoying representing the people of Nipawin because he won't be representing them after the next one. Pelly, Pelly has always



been a close seat, and this time a majority of 249. Well that isn't very much not when we have been winning by-elections by 330 or 335 votes. Prince Albert West, the question is: can he draw a goofy set of boundaries that anyone can call a constituency after he has come within 160 votes of being defeated, a miserable 162 votes and still win? I say he can't.

**Mr. Steuart:** — Horizontal . . .

**Mr. Whelan:** — Rosetown, now there is a constituency where they have a big majority, but I don't think it is big enough, only 505. Shaunavon, the Hon. Member for Shaunavon with 407 vote majority! When he considers what happened. Don't think they didn't put up an effort. They really put on a show in Kelvington, it was a real effort in Kelvington. We won by 535 votes. The Hon. Member for Shaunavon won't feel exactly safe when he considers it. Now Watrous, chances are they will try to redraw that one every way you can think of, but it won't do any good. His majority was only 65 votes. There are 13 of them with majorities of less than 535. There are 5 or 6 around 600. I don't think a 750 vote majority is the least bit safe, I think it would be enough to worry about, even ridings like Lumsden with a majority of 698, ridings like Milestone a slim margin of 571. I don't think they are in the clear at all.

**Hon. A. R. Guy** (Minister of Public Works): — Mr. Speaker, I wonder if I could ask the Hon. Member since he didn't mention my seat, what his crystal ball shows for Athabasca?

**Mr. Whelan:** — Well, I certainly would like to answer that, Mr. Speaker. He has a pretty good chance except if he keeps making the kind of speeches he made today on radio he'll blow it sure as heck!

**Some Hon. Members:** — Hear, hear!

**An Hon. Member:** — Blow it for the rest of them!

**Mr. Whelan:** — These people come before us and they state they have been good to them, their buddies at Ottawa mistreat them. But their buddies at Ottawa are friends of theirs. Consider for a moment what this Government does to the city of Regina, if you want to see discrimination and mistreatment. They don't like the politics of some of the Members that represent the city of Regina and they say so and as a result they discriminate against the city in school grants, library grants, payment for police protection and health grants.

Ottawa is good to them compared to the way they treat the city of Regina, Mr. Speaker. There is talk of the need for construction. The construction industry in Regina has collapsed. The statement that they are going to spend money — just so many words on so much newspaper when you study their actions in housing alone. What are the facts? Mr. Speaker, this Legislature for the fiscal years 1968 and 1969 votes \$5.7 million for housing. Regardless of what excuse they give and regardless of whom they put the onus on, they did not have the initiative, the administrative ability or the sense of purpose, to recognize the urgent need because they spent less than one-half of the amount

voted to them for housing. I quote Public Accounts Municipal Affairs Vote No. 39 for the year ending March 31, 1968 and the year ending March 31, 1969, Vote No. 39, page 409.

In law enforcement alone in Regina crime has become a problem. Crime has become part of the everyday news. Short of police personnel, short of probation officers, without money for parole officers or a corrections program, Regina police department is financially hamstrung. I say that it is being discriminated against. Regina people receive no assistance for police help. Other areas do. The Speech from the Throne talks about assistance to police forces around the province. I welcome this. Many of those who have taken up crime could not be offered a job right now because there is none available. A young man in my own neighborhood on parole has hunted relentlessly for employment without success and he is prepared to work at anything including washing dishes. The employment picture is desperate, is part of the cause, as those people involved in crime are without money, without any standing in the community and they are without guidance. A preventive program in these areas isn't being undertaken and hasn't been developed, and unless there is enough money to increase personnel and work out a preventive counselling program, Regina's crime problem will not be solved.

The students in my constituency when they finish grade 12, unless they can put up the money required for university, go untrained. There is need of a technical school in Regina and a community college to further their training. This is an urgently needed project and should have been on the drawing board five years ago.

The low-income housing picture in Regina is recognized as an urgent need in our cities. Allow me to quote, if I may, from the Hellyer Report on Housing, on page 13:

Urgency. That certainly is among the strongest of the Task Force impressions. The need to act while reasonable action is still possible. Many Canadians, whose needs are of yesterday, want adequate housing today and not tomorrow. There is the voice of frustration that no longer will accept the explanation that it is that other government's responsibility to act. Theirs is the growing anger of people who, amid the material plenty around them, refuse to wait that little bit longer for their minimal share. In a world of rising need and increasing expectations, a bit more and a bit better are not good enough.

Mr. Speaker, housing is an absolute need if we are going to head off the frustration and anger the Hellyer Task Force documents in its report. Housing construction provides more employment per dollar spent than any other type of construction. There is a need for university campus-type housing, for single people and for families, on the Regina Campus. When the Speech from the Throne came down, The Leader Post ran a headline: "Speech predicts winter house building grant. A \$500 grant for persons building homes during the winter months."

Last year there were 169 dwelling starts in Regina in January. This year there were 11 housing starts in January in Regina. This is quoting The Leader Post of February 21, 1970. With the interest rates at 9-1/2 per cent, even with the \$500 bonus I predict there will be no home building. If this \$500

grant deserves headline attention, then I say that the Speech from the Throne is a terrible flop.

**Some Hon. Members:** — Hear, hear!

**Mr. Whelan:** — Money voted for housing, voted even now, has not been used. Money at 9-1/2 per cent and 10-1/2 per cent of whatever it may be, is hopeless and will not encourage the construction of housing for the low-income group, for the people who need housing. Unless the Government opposite gets up enough courage to organize a method of construction that is economical, provides funds at a low rate of interest, and plans the construction of housing each year, this \$500 bonus is just so much hot air and will not encourage anyone to build a house.

**Some Hon. Members:** — Hear, hear!

**Mr. Whelan:** — The housing industry is sick, desperately ill. Half an aspirin in the form of a \$500 bonus will not cure the construction industry's economic problems, provide employment or housing for those who need it. The bonus is too small and too late. No one wants interest at 9-1/2 per cent on a long-term basis unless it is those who loan money. It will make the mortgage companies, the trust companies and the investors happy but it will not build houses; it will not solve the construction problem and it will not provide employment.

**Some Hon. Members:** — Hear, hear!

**Mr. Whelan:** — Mr. Speaker, I suggest the following type of construction work should be undertaken immediately if we are going to do something about the construction industry and something about unemployment in the city of Regina. Strong, aggressive representations should be made to increase the facilities necessary to provide adequate training, equipment and space for the Royal Canadian Mounted Police at their headquarters in my constituency. They are badly handicapped in facilities when training recruits in water lifesaving methods. The administration offices now rented downtown should be located adjacent to the barracks. Pressure should be brought to bear on the Federal Government to begin this type of construction immediately. Personnel for the RCMP staff find it difficult to obtain housing. Adequate housing for their personnel should be and could be built in the area close to the barracks.

Regina Grey Nuns' Hospital needs renovation in some areas and this work should be undertaken immediately; capital expenditures should be made. This type of money spent could well mean lives saved. Construction of ring roads around the circumference of the city if undertaken would provide employment. Policies of the present Government, its lack of confidence in itself and in the province, its failure to take initiative, has left the people of this province leaderless, rudderless, worried and in despair.

The people of Regina are no exception. Every day another tradesman leaves my immediate neighborhood looking for work elsewhere. One business after another has closed its doors. In the last election, as the Hon. Member for The Battlefords (Mr. Kramer) said, every Saskatchewan Liberal ad ran the following slogan and they used it over and over again: "Keep Saskatchewan

Moving.” Well, Saskatchewan is moving, Mr. Speaker. Businesses are moving out. Regina Sash and Door which has operated in the city of Regina since 1912 closes its doors on Saturday. It is the latest in a long list of long-established businesses that have shut their doors. The rumors of bankruptcies and stories of financial collapse increase day by day. The people of this city have lost confidence in this Provincial Government.

**Some Hon. Members:** — Hear, hear!

**Mr. Whelan:** — We are all familiar with the steady decline in the population of our province, which has fallen back to 956,000 and is falling continually. 1,800 people, perhaps 2,000, are now leaving Saskatchewan every month. Let’s say that is 60 every day. Today 60 people are leaving this province. Sixty more people have gone, people we spent money on to educate, who had their roots down in Saskatchewan, their relatives buried here, sixty people who farmed their land and worked in the city, holidayed in our parks, enjoyed the company of their neighbors. Sixty people will leave Saskatchewan today because the Liberals at Ottawa and the Liberals at Regina are combined together to drive them out.

**Some Hon. Members:** — Hear, hear!

**Mr. Whelan:** — I visit the people at Pioneer Village early and often. Those who have lived longer than some of the rest of us are shaking their heads when their rents have been raised as a result of the removal of the Provincial Maintenance Grant. They shake their heads in dismay, when their medical cards which they have had for years are withdrawn, when they pay a tax on their telephone and at the outrageous increase in the cost of food. And these older citizens say with conviction and with plenty of evidence to fortify their convictions, “Liberal times are bad times.”

**Some Hon. Members:** — Hear, hear!

**Mr. Whelan:** — Mr. Speaker, I want to turn for a moment to the Government insurance area. First, I want to congratulate the Hon. Minister for loaning staff to the Government Insurance office that is being organized in Manitoba, particularly the loan of the well-known insurance lawyer to the Government of Manitoba. We know his stay there was limited but I am sure that he made a fine contribution to the Manitoba insurance scheme. I hope that this fine cooperation continues.

To discover, in Kelvington, unlicensed, late model cars sitting idly in farm yards came as a shock to me. The onus is on us to find a way to make sure that these automobile operators can drive their cars. You know, the Minister tells The Leader Post that the Government Insurance plan has never been in a better position. It has a \$6 million surplus. I have a clipping of January 24, 1970 from The Regina Leader Post.

Last year’s financial statement substantiates this, with automobile owners and operators paying taxes amounting to almost \$2 million. First they pay a \$2 levy if they are 25 years of age or under. Then there is a 3 per cent tax on all policies, and the \$25 surcharge for those 50 per cent responsible

for an accident. And if you add all these up it comes to \$1,870,000. In addition the cost of the package policy has gone up. In 1964, and I am now talking about the compulsory automobile insurance that you buy with your licence, car owners paid \$12,019,000 for compulsory insurance you buy with your licence. In 1968 they paid \$23,800,000 – almost a 100 per cent increase.

This increase is hardly explainable when one realizes that there is an increase in registrations of vehicles of less than 15 per cent. In view of the decrease in accidents, in view of the decrease in traffic deaths, as the result of the introduction of the .08 breathalyzer test, in view of the fact that people are short of money to purchase gasoline and there will be fewer miles driven particularly by rural people, in view of the fact that we are losing population rapidly and there will be fewer people driving cars than there were last year, and registrations will drop, in view of the fact that many people under 25 are paying the \$2 levy which is unfair discrimination if they are good drivers, and the only reason they are paying the levy is because of their youth and by charging everyone under 25 a \$2 levy without any consideration of their driving record, we are finding people guilty of being bad drivers just because of their age and for no other reason and because of all of these facts we should have a good look at this whole picture of compulsory automobile insurance.

Each year the Hon. Minister in charge gets up in this House and gives us his ham act about compulsory insurance not going up. Those who repair automobiles complain bitterly about the rates for body shop and auto repairs being held at a low rate. Registrations have increased less than 15 per cent and yet the premium income from compulsory auto insurance has risen from \$12,019,000 in 1964 to \$23,858,000 in 1968. We are building up reserves and hiding them in every conceivable fashion.

Until we have spent the \$2 levy, plus the 3 per cent tax on driver training – and it is obvious this has not been done – I think there is a perfect justification in reducing the tax because of the economic hardship on motor vehicle operators who are finding it difficult to make the lump sum payment for compulsory insurance. A gasoline levy for insurance would be equitable because the levy would be paid on the basis to some degree of use being made of vehicles, the more miles of driving the more gasoline used. In some provinces in Canada our party has been advocating that the cost of all compulsory insurance be borne by a gasoline tax levy. It would certainly solve the problem the farmers in Kelvington are faced with, a problem that many farmers and many working people will be trying to solve, the problem of raising an amount necessary to pay for compulsory insurance each year.

I would also propose that consideration be given to the good driving record of those 60 years of age and over. Study after study indicates that the 60-year and over drivers are a good risk. In the July 1969 issue of True Magazine from the United States, Senator Philip A. Hart in an article headed, “Let’s reward good drivers”, says as follows:

... For years, apparently, it was simply assumed that older citizens, due to diminished reflexes and alertness, were bad insurance risks. In the past few years that assumption has been put under the microscope. The result,

survey after survey, showed older drivers are about the best risks around.

A 1964 study by the Illinois Department of Public Works and Buildings indicated ‘that senior drivers have a lower accident involvement than any other age group. While 6.05 per cent of drivers studied were in the 64 to 74 age groups, they were involved in only 3.95 per cent of all accidents.’ Dr. Donald P. Kent, former special assistant for aging in the U.S. Department of Health, Education and Welfare, reported: ‘The accident index for drivers aged 60 to 69 is below the national average . . .’

This is the conclusion that many people have come to because of the fewer miles they drive, the care they exercise and the long years of experience that they put into practice when they are behind the wheel of a car.

Mr. Speaker, to alleviate economic hardship for those in the cities and for the rural residents who must operate an automobile and are finding it difficult to dig up the required payment, I propose: 1. that we reduce the 3 per cent tax on all premiums to 2 per cent; 2. that we eliminate the \$2 levy for those 25 and under for drivers who are accident-free for three years; 3. that one cent a gallon on gasoline used in automobiles and commercial vehicles other than farm trucks be set aside as part payment for compulsory insurance. This would raise approximately \$3 million.

Reduction of the tax and of the \$2 levy would reduce the compulsory premium payment in the neighborhood of \$500,000. By using some of the huge reserve money we should be able to reduce all passenger auto rates across the board 25 per cent.

**Some Hon. Members:** — Hear, hear!

**Mr. Whelan:** — In conclusion, Mr. Speaker, let me return to the only explanation that these people opposite seem to have, and that is to blame Ottawa. “Blame Ottawa,” they say. Well, I ask you. They promised 80,000 jobs and they didn’t say they would come from Ottawa. Can they blame Ottawa for that? They say the construction industry is in terrible straits and they are right. We voted them money and they didn’t use it. Can they blame Ottawa for that? The cost of farm production has gone up and yet they put a 2 cent tax on diesel fuel and drive it higher and higher. Can they blame Ottawa for that?

There are Federal grants for medical care, for comprehensive care, and yet they ignore that. They put a \$2.50 levy on the sick and the dying, the women and children and the people who are in our hospitals. Also the people who need therapy treatments in order to walk because their limbs are aged and their muscles are stiff have to pay \$1.50 a trip to see a therapist. Can they blame Ottawa for that? There was a grant per unit for Pioneer Village that was taken away and the rates went up. The Provincial Government took the grant away and up went the cost of living for the senior citizens. Can they blame the cost of living for the senior citizens. Can they blame Ottawa for that? The cost of Government Insurance has risen from \$12 million to \$23 million for the compulsory coverage. Vehicle operators pay almost \$2 million in taxes. Can they blame Ottawa for that? Potash companies ruin our roads. They

will have to be reconstructed at a cost of many millions of dollars to Saskatchewan taxpayers. Can they blame Ottawa for that? The price of potash has been raised 50 per cent. It may cost us markets around the world, it may cost us royalties, it may cost us jobs. Can they blame Ottawa for that?

The cost of construction of highways has gone sky-high. Construction techniques are fumbling and slow. The public is impatient with the progress that is being made and the money that is being spent. Can they blame Ottawa for that? And if they can blame Ottawa and if Ottawa is even 3 or 5 or 10 per cent to blame, these people across the way helped to elect them. Can they blame Ottawa for that?

**Some Hon. Members:** — Hear, hear!

**Mr. Whelan:** — No, Mr. Speaker, I say put the blame where it belongs. Put it on the Government opposite. It is without planning, without judgment, without leadership and without imagination. And surely it can't blame Ottawa for that.

**Some Hon. Members:** — Hear, hear!

**Mr. Whelan:** — The province is in an economic landslide. The confidence of the public is gone. The people who are left are left to pay the taxes that have been levied by an irresponsible Treasurer whose projects are not socially motivated but add up to aeroplanes and gravel and blacktop, in preference to senior citizens' homes or campus or low-income housing. Mr. Speaker, it adds up to proof of the statement that the senior citizens in Pioneer Village make with a sad shake of their heads: "Liberal times are bad times."

**Some Hon. Members:** — Hear, hear!

**Mr. Whelan:** — I will support the amendment. I will oppose the motion.

**Mr. R. H. Wooff** (Turtleford): — Mr. Speaker, I would like to add my words of appreciation to the retiring Lieutenant Governor who made many friends and left only the warmest of feelings amongst all Members of the Legislature. I would like to congratulate the incoming Lieutenant Governor on his ascension to the duties that face him and I'm sure that he is going to fulfil those duties with grace and in a fitting manner.

I wouldn't miss this opportunity for anything, Mr. Speaker, to congratulate my new colleague representing the constituency of Kelvington.

**Some Hon. Members:** — Hear, hear!

**Mr. Wooff:** — Not only that he won an election but that he is seated on this side of the House. Also, I wish to congratulate him on his maiden effort in this House, both on its substance and on the manner in which he delivered it.

**Some Hon. Members:** — Hear, hear!

**Mr. Wooff:** — For some time, Mr. Speaker, I have been very interested in natural gas for the northwest corner of the province. I have made many inquiries as to when and from where we might get natural gas. Only last winter, in Crown Corporations, I asked some of the staff privately if there was any chance that the northwest corner of Saskatchewan might receive natural gas. I was assured that efforts had been made but all supplies were too far away and too costly to bring in. There was no mention made of drilling in the western end of Meadow Lake constituency. I knew that there was some drilling going on, some prospecting for gas. I assure you that it is a great disappointment to me after all these years of waiting to have gas discovered in the quantities that it is at the present time in the Beacon Hill fields and watch it being piped right out of the area. This field is much more expensive than many people realize. It covers an area of some 25 townships. Its southern borders spill over the edge of my own constituency. At the present time there is some 200 billion cubic feet of gas that is proved up and they are still prospecting, still drilling. I'm not blaming the Government for this, Mr. Speaker. This is one of the eventualities of circumstances. The only criticism that I would level is that their policies have been such as to bring us into such dire economic circumstances that had the gas line come south from the field, villages of any size, simply could not afford to switch over at the present time.

There is another problem that I was going to mention and that is a matter that I feel very irate about, Mr. Speaker. But my colleague from North Battleford (Mr. Kramer) covered it in a very able manner, and that is the closing of the Spiritwood liquor store. But there are one or two things about it that I would like to acquaint the House with. No matter where the outlets have been put I must give Mr. Vey this credit, that he fought to save the Government liquor store in Spiritwood to the extent that he nearly got thrown out of the Premier's office. The other thing that I would wager will take place is that both Mr. Vey, a former Liberal returning officer and Mr. Lofts, the former Liberal MLA will both get some rent out of this deal even if they didn't get the contracts. This, Mr. Speaker, has been one of the most flagrant games of mixing liquor and politics that I have seen in a long time. They will have to talk to me earnestly and long before they convince me that the Premier doesn't stoop to anything to gain support and to pay off friends.

**Some Hon. Members:** — Hear, hear!

**Mr. Wooff:** — I have a few remarks re-telephones. Again I am very pleased that there is activity of this kind in my constituency, that there are small companies being formed and that the policy of the Government re-unserved areas is being carried out. But again, Mr. Speaker, the economic situation at the present time has almost called many of these projects to a standstill. I have had constituents who have had their money paid in for three years who still have no telephone and have no definite commitment that it will be here with them in 1970. There is one aspect of this whole telephone question that I think should be given consideration by the present Government and that is that the grants, construction grants to these companies, rural companies, especially pole grants, are too low. They are too low in comparison to the amount of money that the Department of Telephones is taking out of rural subscribers. They are so low



that small companies building their own line will go for 18-foot poles and no grant rather than the 20-foot standard pole and the grant that the Department is paying. This means that the grant is so niggardly that it really doesn't pay to have the grant and put in a standard line.

The other question that I would like to spend a few moments on, Mr. Speaker, is this question that I hear bandied around so often, that Sweden has labor courts. This, Mr. Speaker, is just not true. Sweden does not have labor courts. This, Mr. Speaker, is just not true. Sweden does not have labor courts. Strikes in Sweden are practically unknown because they don't wait over there for contracts to run out for 6 months or 18 months or 2 years, until all nerves are frayed and tempers are hot, before something is done about it. In fact wage scales in Sweden are constantly under review. Members of the government, members of industry and members of the labor organizations are constantly reviewing wage rates, not by the demands of labor or what the industry says they won't pay. Wages in Sweden are reviewed on the level of the national economy from time to time whether it is up or whether it may be down. The people are guaranteed that they do have income which keeps them abreast of the cost of living. This, Mr. Speaker, I would like you to compare with Mr. Trudeau's going for 6 per cent unemployed to put over a sham battle against inflation, or, compare it with what this Government did to hospital workers in Estevan and Prince Albert.

Mr. Speaker, I would like to adjourn the debate.

**Some Hon. Members:** — Hear, hear!

Debate adjourned.

The Assembly adjourned at 5:30 o'clock p.m.