

LEGISLATIVE ASSEMBLY OF SASKATCHEWAN
Third Session — Sixteenth Legislature
8th Day

Wednesday, February 25, 1970

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

WELCOME TO STUDENTS

Mr. Speaker: — On behalf of the Members of the Legislature I wish to introduce to the Legislature the following groups of students situated in the galleries: 67 students from Estey school from the constituency of Saskatoon Mayfair represented by its Member Mr. Brockelbank and under the direction of their teachers, Messrs. Demeris and Pierce; 33 students from Imperial school in the constituency of Regina North East, represented by its Member Mr. Smishek, under the direction of Mr. Jackman, their teacher; 78 students from Weyburn junior high school from the constituency of Weyburn, represented by Mr. Pepper, under the direction of their teacher, Mr. Weinmaster; 36 students from the Alvin Buckwold school in Saskatoon in the constituency of Nutana South, represented by its Member Mr. Forsyth under the direction of their teacher, Mr. Peter Boell; 36 students from North Park school, City Park-University represented by their Member, Mr. Charlebois, under the direction of their teacher, Mr. Longstaff; 40 students from the Glen Elm school, Regina North East represented by their Member Mr. Smishek under the direction of their teacher, Mr. Fraser; and 30 students from the Davidson high school, Davidson, Saskatchewan, in the constituency of Arm River represented by their Member Mr. McIvor, and under the direction of their teacher Mr. Musleh.

I wish on behalf of all the Members of the Legislature to extend a very warm welcome to these students and pupils situated in the galleries and trust that their stay here will be interesting, informative and educational. I am sure all Members will join me in wishing every one of you a safe trip home.

Hon. Members: — Hear, hear!

QUESTIONS

GRANTS FOR BASE HOSPITAL

Mr. Blakeney (Regina Centre): — Mr. Speaker, before the Orders of the Day, I would like to direct a question to the Minister of Public Health. With reference to his announcement concerning the South Saskatchewan Base Hospital, I wonder if he can advise whether or not the announcement that the Government was going to proceed with this project was conditional upon the Government of Canada agreeing to share 50 per cent of the cost or any percentage of the cost.

Hon. Mr. Grant (Minister of Public Health): — Mr. Speaker, the hospital is being designed as a teaching hospital, and as such will qualify for sharing under the Health Resources Fund and the announcement was not conditional. It was made on the basis that we have been proceeding

along these lines since the hospital was initially thought of.

Mr. Blakeney: — Mr. Speaker, a supplementary question. Does the Minister have any assurance from the Government of Canada that they believe that the hospital qualifies for sharing under the Health Resources Fund?

Hon. Mr. Grant: — Mr. Speaker, this cannot be determined in its final form as to the percentage of sharing, 50 per cent is the maximum. The detail drawings are approaching the point where we will be able to deal with Ottawa and we are presently in touch with them. I have every confidence that we will qualify for a very high percentage.

FLOOD DAMAGE GRANTS

Mr. Matsalla (Canora): — Mr. Speaker, before the Orders of the Day I would like to direct a question to the Minister of Municipal Affairs. In view that rural municipalities were asked to submit estimates for 1969 spring flood damage to roads and bridges, and in view that current appropriations for the fiscal year end on March 31, does the Government intend to assist the affected municipalities with payment of Flood Damage Grants?

Hon. Mr. Estey (Minister of Municipal Affairs): — Mr. Speaker, the answer to this question very briefly, the Federal Government has now a man in the Province checking our figures and more will be announced in due course, but it won't be until a month or six weeks.

ANNOUNCEMENTS

REFLECTORIZED LICENCE PLATES

Hon. Mr. Steuart (Provincial Treasurer): — Mr. Speaker, before the Orders of the Day, I would like to announce that fully reflectORIZED licence plates for all classes of motor vehicles will be introduced in Saskatchewan for the 1970-71 licence year.

Some Hon. Members: — Hear, hear!

Hon. Mr. Steuart: — The step is being taken in the interest of highway safety. For many years organizations involved in promotion of highway safety have requested the Government to introduce reflectORIZED licence plates to give warning of impending danger from vehicles left unattended on the highway at night. Several provinces in Canada and many states in the United States now follow this practice, and our Government has decided to accede to this request beginning with the licence year which starts in about three weeks. The overall quality of the new licence plate will be much improved and the safety factor . . .

Some Hon. Members: — Hear, hear!

An Hon. Member: — . . . going to buy ten one of these years!

Hon. Mr. Steuart: — . . . due to the use of reflectorizers, plates will be extremely high. The new licence plates will cost about two and a half times as much to produce as the previous type of plates, and as a result there will be a small increase in registration fees payable under The Vehicles Act this coming year. It is a very small contribution to make towards increased safety on the province's highways at night. As well, for the 1970-71 drivers' licence and registration certificates will be issued by the automatic computer system for all vehicles, except commercial, public service and miscellaneous classes which will continue to be issued manually for at least one more year.

Mr. Whelan (Regina North West): — Before the Minister takes his seat, can he tell us what is the actual cost per set of plates?

Hon. Mr. Steuart: — If you want to put a question in, I'll answer it. I don't have it . . .

Mr. Whelan: — The cost per plate?

Hon. Mr. Steuart: — Two and half times what it used to be. If you can find out what it used to be . . .

AUTOMOBILE INSURANCE ACT

Hon. Mr. Boldt (Minister of Highways): — Mr. Speaker, I want to inform the House that there will be no increase in private passenger and farm truck insurance rates this year under The Automobile Insurance Act.

Some Hon. Members: — Hear, hear!

Hon. Mr. Boldt: — This marks the third consecutive year we have been able to hold the line, since these rates were last increased in 1967.

Some Hon. Members: — Hear, hear!

Hon. Mr. Boldt: — There can be no doubt that the surcharge measures put into effect in 1967, plus more stringent legislation relating to drinking and driving, have had the desired effect.

During 1969, the Automobile Accident Insurance Act Fund paid 87 cents in benefits for every \$1.00 in premiums earned. Yesterday, one of the Hon. Members opposite suggested that we add an additional one cent per gallon gasoline tax.

Mr. Lloyd (Leader of the Opposition): — Is the Minister making a statement or entering into the debate again.

Mr. Speaker: — Order, order! I gather the Minister is making a statement in connection with licences and also in regard to licence fees, if I understand it correctly. If he made this same

statement outside the House, before making it inside the House, he would be in contempt of the House. Now it is proper for any Member on the other side of the House to comment on any statement a Minister makes, but I doubt very much if you can restrict the Minister in what he is going to say.

Mr. Lloyd: — On the point of order, he specifically referred to a statement made by a Member on this side of the House in the Debate yesterday, and my question is whether he is in order to so quote and so reply at this time this way.

Mr. Speaker: — He can't refer to what was said in yesterday's debate.

Some Hon. Members: — Hear, hear!

Mr. Speaker: — There isn't anything stopping him from making a statement as long as he doesn't refer to yesterday's debate.

Hon. Mr. Heald (Attorney General): — He read it in the paper.

Hon. Mr. Boldt: — Mr. Speaker, I have some very important news.

Mr. Speaker: — If he wishes to refer to yesterday's debate he can only do it in the same Debate today.

Hon. Mr. Boldt: — Mr. Speaker, I have some very important news for the Members and I am sure that they would like to know and the public would like to know. I pointed out that there would be no increase in rates in spite of the fact that we paid out 87 cents on the \$1.00 in benefits last year. This is 5 per cent more than the Socialists averaged in the years they controlled the funds. In spite of the fact that they were only able to return 82 per cent to motorists, they had been losing money at an alarming rate and had a deficit of over \$700,000 in the year 1964. I submit to our friends opposite they would have bankrupt the fund and placed The Automobile Accident Insurance Act in jeopardy, had they continued in power and handled the Act as they did the last few years when they were in office.

Mr. Lloyd: — Mr. Speaker, again on the point of order. The Minister is not making a statement; he is making a speech. I protest the fact that he is breaking the rules of this House.

Mr. Speaker: — I am going to wait to see what he has got to say and then I will see what some Member on the other side of the House has to say. A Member on the Opposition side will have just as much right and freedom to reply as the Minister who is now making his statement. I do suggest however that these statements shouldn't be too long and they certainly should not be political.

Hon. Mr. Boldt: — Thank you, Mr. Speaker. I have given my message and I am sure it sunk in.

Hon. Mr. Heald: — Mr. Speaker, I wonder if we

would defer questions until later this day.

Mr. Speaker: — I'll just wait and see whether we have any comments from the opposite side of the House on the statement the Minister has just made.

Mr. Lloyd: — Mr. Speaker, this is a flagrant abuse of the privilege of this House given to the Minister to make a statement while the Minister made a political speech.

Some Hon. Members: — Hear, hear!

Mr. Speaker: — And I repeat to you, that had he made his statement to the Press outside the House, before he made it in the House, it would have been a flagrant breach of the privileges of this House.

Mr. Blakeney: — Mr. Speaker, with all deference it is all very well for the Minister to stand up and announce that there will be no increase in motor licences. That is a proper use of the rules of this House, but with all deference, Sir, when he makes submissions – and I ask you to read what he said in his statements – I submit – that if the Government had done this in 1964 the fund would have been bankrupt, or as the case may be, I ask you on what conceivable rule this is within the rules of this House. I suggest that to be a submission of opinion, it may be right, it may be wrong, but it is not up to the Minister to make submissions of opinion as to what may or may not have happened in 1964, when he is allegedly, I say allegedly, making a statement of what the Government policy is in 1970. That is out of order, and should have been so ruled, Mr. Speaker.

Some Hon. Members: — Hear, hear!

Mr. Speaker: — The Member may have been in the grey area, but as long as I hold this position, I'll defend the right of freedom of speech in this House, and I'll defend your rights also.

Some Hon. Members: — Hear, hear!

Mr. Speaker: — And don't let one of you ever stand up in this House and say I haven't defended your rights! Don't you dare to do it!

Now if you have anything further to say in connection with the statement that was made by the Minister of Highways, say it now or forever hold your peace!

Mr. Lloyd: — I wish, Mr. Speaker, to say this, that I asked for an examination of the submission made by the Minister, so that we may be guided in future. I submit he was entirely out of order and that he was taking advantage of a privilege extended to him.

Mr. Speaker: — I say once again that he may have been in the grey area, but at the same time I'll defend the right of freedom of speech and for all of you. If you want it defended for yourself, then

you have got to respect it for other people also. The Leader of the Opposition has every right to say anything he wants to in reply to the Minister's statement. Now if anybody else wants to make a further comment, let him make it. I wait for comments.

Hon. Mr. Heald: — Mr. Speaker, before the petulant outburst by the Member for Regina Centre (Mr. Blakeney), I was trying to get the radio time for the Member for Turtleford (Mr. Wooff), and with that in mind I would suggest we defer questions until later this day.

Mr. Blakeney: — Mr. Speaker, on the point of order, I wonder whether the comment from the Member for Lumsden really facilitates the business of the House. I was making a point of order, I would ask him whether he wouldn't consider withdrawing his remarks.

Some Hon. Members: — Hear, hear!

Hon. Mr. Heald: — Mr. Speaker, I am still suggesting that we defer questions until later this day.

Mr. Speaker: — Is leave granted? Agreed. Questions deferred. Let me also add that I consider the comment by the Attorney General was uncalled for.

ADJOURNED DEBATE

ADDRESS-IN-REPLY

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

Mr. Wooff (Turtleford): — Well, Mr. Speaker, that is a real introduction, for the Member from Turtleford.

Before I pick up my remarks from last evening, Mr. Speaker, I would like to congratulate our Leader on his presentation in this Debate. I would also like to congratulate many and all of my colleagues who have so far made a real contribution to the Debate this year.

In my Throne Speech a year ago, Mr. Speaker, I said, "In many ways 1968 had been a momentous year, but for agriculture it had been a disaster." As I look back at 1969 it too has been disastrous for agriculture as a whole, but it has also been a disaster for the whole provincial economy. Agriculturally 1969 has been to say the least chaotic. For the first four months of the new crop year wheat sales are down by one third, the lowest, Mr. Speaker, in 14 years. Employmentwise, 1969 has been a disaster also. Unemployment figures have been the highest that Saskatchewan has had for the last 10 years. Populationwise, 1969 has been a calamity. It will take 20 years, Mr. Speaker, for the province to recover. Educationally we are now accelerating in reverse. I see the little red school house way down the road in the distance. Healthwise the province is a shambles. More and more people, Mr. Speaker, cannot afford to see a doctor, to go to hospital or to buy drugs.

Investmentwise it is in retreat. Small businesses in many cases face ruin. The cost of living continues to rise and potash has gone to pot.

In fact, Mr. Speaker, the only healthy growing factor in Saskatchewan's economy is taxes, and we just had another announced a little while ago. Taxes are the only single item that keeps ahead of the cost of living. We pay more and more for less and less. But, Mr. Speaker, from the standpoint of a Liberal Government, this is just a matter of history. Elect a Liberal Government in Regina and Mr. John Doe has troubles! Elect a Liberal Government in Regina and Ottawa at the same time and Mr. John Doe faces bankruptcy on many fronts.

I said a moment ago, Mr. Speaker, that this was just a matter of history, no guess work at all. Let's take a brief look at it. I came to Canada under a Liberal Government in 1906 and in less than two years the most impressive thing about a Canadian dollar was that you couldn't find one, much less hold it after you got it. Homesteaders slowly and painfully built up their cattle herds through the pioneer and First World War era only to face disaster about 1917 or 1918, when the Liberals got back via the Coalition Government of that day. Following the Liberal victory in 1921 under the new leadership of MacKenzie King, the Prairies like today got into real grain trouble. It was out of this debacle, Mr. Speaker, that the Wheat Pool finally emerged.

Then 1929 ushered in the Great Depression with the Liberal party in power both in Ottawa and Regina. To describe what followed is not to blame the Liberal party for the Depression except so far as their policies and regulations made matters worse. But the callous inaction, the refusal to protect a defenceless public against debt and foreclosure is a story of sheer disgrace.

During the 1930s the beginnings of the Wheat Board came into being under R.B. Bennett. I have to admit that a reluctant, and I repeat that, Mr. Speaker, a very reluctant Liberal party finally had to give in to the demands of the farmers who put the Wheat Board into action.

In 1934, Mr. Speaker, the Liberal Government sat in its seat in this House and voted itself back into power. Then, Mr. Speaker, then in 1944 came Saskatchewan's greatest miracle, the CCF came into power and in spite of some mistakes, in spite of every conceivable obstacle placed in their path by the Liberal party and those influential forces the Liberal party serves, in spite of today's bellowing Premier who substitutes noise for fact, 1944 to 1964 were the best 20 years this Province has ever known.

Some Hon. Members: — Hear, hear!

Mr. Wooff: — Mr. Speaker, the cold unadulterated truth is Liberal times have been hard times, difficult times, disastrous times because of whom the Liberal party serves, and today is no exception. I long ago learned that recessions and depressions do not just happen. These extremes in the rise and fall of the economy in the country are part and policy of government action, the things they do and the things they do not do. They do not come about by themselves. These things are planned. They directly and indirectly come about by what

governments fail to do on behalf of the people of the nation. In the sham battle that is going on over inflation at Ottawa, our swinging and rollicking Prime Minister is openly committed to go for six per cent unemployment. The millionaire play boy doesn't care whom he hurts in the process. But, Mr. Speaker, in the hidden recesses of his ivory towers he allowed interest rates for banks, loan companies and whom have you to rise to unprecedented heights. One even hears rumblings of threats to break contracts already written at lower rates. The Prime Minister tells farmers they must plan, plan, plan to become outstanding managers in order that they may compete. However to mention planning as far as government is concerned, we are told immediately that overall planning in government curbs incentive. It must not be tolerated in government departments. At the moment, it is anybody's guess, anybody's wager whether we hold our Arctic areas or not, because we have neither plan nor policy.

Certainly, Mr. Speaker, education and health service costs have continued to rise along with the cost of living and the rising costs of doing everything, for one reason only. Liberal policies in Regina and Ottawa! It is planned that way!

Everything that M.J. Coldwell predicted, when the newly elected Liberal Government at Ottawa broke its election pledge in 1945 not to lift price controls, has happened. It has taken a little longer because the free enterprisers digressed in order to carry out two wars with all their indecencies and cruelties, but the chickens, Mr. Speaker, are back on the roost. Now instead of doing something about the cause of rising costs, this Administration along with Ottawa cuts back the services on education and health and increases the cost of the aged and the sick, the young people and their parents.

Liberal policies have created the confusion of today. Now the only cure they propose is to reduce services and charge more for what is left. This is exactly what the Provincial Treasurer was telling us about this afternoon. In this way they still allow one-fifth of Canada's population at the top to continue to plunder the birthright of every Canadian. Once again, Mr. Speaker, the taskmasters of Old Egypt are at work, taking away the straw and demanding more bricks.

My home town has been very hard pressed since last August to get enough boxcars to allow delivery of the units and the leftovers of the 1968-69 quotas. Only the other day did they receive a one-bushel quota and that is better than many points. Now it will be a case of fighting for boxcars. We have millions and millions of bushels of space in our terminal elevators and millions and millions of words spoken by Liberals in Ottawa and Regina, but for seven solid months, Mr. Speaker, little has happened. The terminals were empty and so were the farmers' pockets.

Attacks on the Wheat Board come ill from the Hon. Member from Elrose (Mr. Leith), a Western farmer along with his colleague, the Minister of Highways (Mr. Boldt). It is not the Wheat Board, which after all is but a creature of the Federal Government, that is to blame for difficult regulations, but the Liberal Government at Ottawa which lays down the policies by which the Wheat Board operates. It is a Liberal responsibility all the way.

Some Hon. Members: — Hear, hear!

Mr. Wooff: — In a recent issue of The Leader Post, February 21, it points out that for the first four months of this crop year, sales have been down by one-third, the lowest for the last 14 years, yet we allow the terminals to stay empty and the economy to suffer.

For many years there have been suggestions made to the Federal Government to extend the Wheat Board's responsibility into the international grain marketing area with an aggressive sales policy. Here again absolutely no action by the Liberals at Ottawa. Compare all this with the Premier's quick, deft, if doubtful, potash deal. It isn't a coincidence, Mr. Speaker, that Mr. Richardson of Winnipeg should appear in Ottawa at a time when the Wheat Board was having difficulties. Neither is it a coincidence that Mr. Richardson turns up in the House of Commons as Hon. Otto Lang's seat-mate. It is all shades of the Winnipeg Grain Exchange.

Some Hon. Members: — Hear, hear!

Mr. Wooff: — Mr. Lang's proposal that the 50 per cent of Western farmers, who he claims have sufficient wheat to fill quotas for the next four years, should not sow wheat is just a sheer laugh. Mr. Lang knows perfectly well that unless there is an alternative crop you can't fallow land year after year, first, because you would lose the land and secondly, because the cost is prohibitive. I know because I have been down to 50 per cent now for several years and this last year or two we were just doing some of the overlapping.

Let me turn for a moment to unemployment. The only place to start here, Mr. Speaker, is with the Premier's promise that there would be 80,000 new jobs. What a laugh for both his colleagues and the Opposition! It finally developed from a laugh to a concern as the unemployed increased and finally, Mr. Speaker, developed into one of Saskatchewan's tragedies. The Premier tries to bluff his way out of his own trap by claiming the figures for Saskatchewan are lower in comparison to many other areas of Canada. This is a callous, misleading statement. It is callous in the first place, Mr. Speaker, because loss of employment means loss of living, educational and health standards, regardless of unemployment figures.

Secondly, it is misleading because the unemployment figure would have been one of the highest, if not the highest, in Canada had not the Premier literally driven 60,000 people out of Saskatchewan.

Some Hon. Members: — Hear, hear!

Mr. Wooff: — It would probably have been 10 per cent at this very moment. Some of our very bright young minds from the home area are going to be forced out of the province following graduation this spring. This is a little more of the Liberal brain drain.

Potash, potash, potash, the meat of every speech the Premier made a little while ago. He tried to create the impression that he had fathered and fostered and even put the potash

in the ground for the American companies. One does wonder, Mr. Speaker, where some people have their personal investments. What he really did was to take the potash industry and by indiscriminate, unplanned development get it into the sorry mess it is in today so far as Saskatchewan is concerned. I am told that some of the companies across the line are doing very well. Such, Mr. Speaker, is the record of the Liberal party. Such are the conditions facing Saskatchewan in 1970.

The Throne Speech, Mr. Speaker, is too weak, too anaemic and too empty to even scratch the surface of our troubles.

Some Hon. Members: — Hear, hear!

Mr. Wooff: — Not until we have a sane humanitarian government, not until we have a New Democratic Government, will Saskatchewan start, the long road back to economic health and recovery. Mr. Speaker, I will be supporting the amendment and not the motion.

Some Hon. Members: — Hear, hear!

Mr. Kowalchuk (Melville): — I also want to congratulate the mover and the seconder for a job fairly neatly executed, considering the quality and quantity of inferior Liberal crumbs they had to offer. In fact, Mr. Speaker, every Member from the Government side so far has taken to wandering to all sorts of foreign countries and to other provinces except fight the problems and issues involving Saskatchewan. The Premier is the worst offender of all. He is either in Czechoslovakia or Great Britain or bitterly assailing the walls of Communist Ottawa, but seldom at the grass root problems of Saskatchewan and its people.

Mr. Speaker, yesterday afternoon, the Minister of Public Works (Mr. Guy) congratulated the Members on this side of the House who were promoted to the front, consoled those who were moved to the back and sympathized with those like myself who weren't moved at all. May I be permitted, Mr. Speaker, to remind the brash Member for Athabasca, not in his seat, of one other loud and noisy Minister of Public Works, whom the good people of the Melville constituency moved out of his Public Works seat and right out of this House.

Some Hon. Members: — Hear, hear!

Mr. Kowalchuk: — I want to suggest to all of the Hon. Members on the other side of this House that the good people of Saskatchewan will, after the next election, rearrange the seating properly. Those of you on that side of the House who will be fortunate enough to have a seat at all will have the whole front row of seats on this side of the House all to yourselves.

Some Hon. Members: — Hear, hear!

Mr. Kowalchuk: — Mr. Speaker, the people of Saskatchewan will see to it that by far the greatest majority of the 59 seats to your right, Sir, will be new Democratic Members. And as for the Minister of Public Works (Mr. Guy), the good people of Athabasca will see to it, I am sure, that the only way he will be able to get into this Chamber is through the door just back of me and only behind the rail.

Mr. Speaker, I do not intend to quote a lot of facts and figures. Today's issues are so glaringly clear and evident to all. There is no need to quote figures. The farmer, the hospital worker, the pensioner of Saskatchewan know they have been had by this Liberal Government. They know they have been deceived. They know they have been cruelly taxed when they were promised relief. The people know without question that this Liberal Government has been a nightmare of inefficiency. History has proven, once more, that Liberal times are hard times and especially so when there is a Liberal Government in power in Saskatchewan at the same time as in Ottawa.

I am sure, Mr. Speaker, that the people listened with amazement to the vicious attack delivered on Monday by the Hon. Minister of Highways (Mr. Boldt) upon the Canadian Wheat Board, the Pool, the Farmers' Union and other farm organizations. As a Cabinet Minister of this Liberal Government, he speaks for this Government.

Some Hon. Members: — Hear, hear!

Mr. Kowalchuk: — This attack is no surprise to the people of Saskatchewan. Such pro-rightist Liberal rumblings against these farm organizations have been heard in the background for quite awhile. Now it is in the open. The Winnipeg Grain Exchange, totally rejected by Saskatchewan farmers for decades, is today being championed by the Saskatchewan Liberal party.

Mr. Speaker, there is no doubt that all organizations have their failings, but the failings of the Canadian Wheat Board mirror the failings of the Government in control of it. If the Canadian Wheat Board is ineffective, inflexible and aimless, it is because the Federal Liberal Government is ineffective, inflexible and aimless.

Some Hon. Members: — Hear, hear!

Mr. Kowalchuk: — It is because of the inept and spineless Liberal Government at Ottawa, in charge, that the Canadian Wheat Board is what it is. I believe, and so do the majority of Western farmers, that, if the Federal Liberals were truly concerned with the Wheat Board's successful operation, there would be many fewer difficulties. What we need in Saskatchewan and in Canada is a government truly concerned with the Wheat Board's operation, in the interest of the farmers, not in the interest of the Winnipeg Grain Exchange. There is no doubt at all whom the Saskatchewan Liberal party supports, the Saskatchewan farmer or the Winnipeg Grain Exchange?

The Premier and the Provincial Treasurer continually keep

repeating, "The future of our province is bright." For whom may I ask is the future bright? For the farmer whose lifework is at stake and going down the drain? For the wage earner in Saskatchewan who proportionately earns less than his fellow worker earns in every other province in Canada except Prince Edward Island? For the implement dealer and small business man who are going bankrupt by the dozen daily? No, Mr. Speaker, for these people the future is very dim and dismal.

Let me point out to you, Sir, for whom the future is bright: for the banking and lending institutions; for the rich, big corporate cartels of this country and other countries; for the big farm corporations and its off-shoots; everything that is big and rich and can produce a profit is considered sacred by this Thatcher Liberal Government. It's for these people that the future is bright! This Government by its silence and tacit approval and lately by outright manoeuvring and special financing has implicitly stated its position that the small and the weak are not important, whether it pertains to small farmers or small hospitals, or small communities. These are a financial embarrassment and must go.

Some Hon. Members: — Hear, hear!

Mr. Kowalchuk: — It is big business and big agriculture that gets its unqualified support. Dollars and cents is the only bell that rings in the Premier's head. Other important human values are of little or no consequence.

Mr. Speaker, humanity is treated as excess baggage and the rich get richer and the poor get poorer. Unemployment rampant everywhere, the best people of Saskatchewan are leaving in droves. Deputy ministers, architects, engineers, welders, teachers, whole families, the cream of the best brains in the province have left and even some Liberals are leaving.

Some Hon. Members: — Hear, hear!

Mr. Kowalchuk: — We, in the Opposition, begged this Government last year to open up the purse strings and get Saskatchewan's economy moving, but the Premier and the Provincial Treasurer (Mr. Steuart) arrogantly declared, "We will have a balanced budget." This Provincial Government should pay heed as well as the Government of Canada.

Mr. Speaker, when Western agriculture is in a depressed state such as it is today, bordering on a depression of acute dimensions, the rest of Canada should pay heed. A gangrenous agricultural economy could be fatal for the rest of Canada. Today's agriculture and its directly related enterprises generate 42 per cent of Canada's gross national product. It generates \$26 billion of Canada's \$62 billion gross national product. Agriculture is even more important than that, because this figure doesn't consider the more complex role of farm supply and service firms in servicing other industries aside from the agriculture and food systems. These words of wisdom were spoken by the President of the Agricultural Research Council, Mr. Gordon McEachern.

Mr. Speaker, city people and Eastern industrial Canada and the far West as well had better recognize and squarely face

these facts because the cost of neglecting the Western agricultural industry, so crucially important to the overall welfare of the economy of Canada as a whole, can be catastrophic. Without a healthy agricultural economy the Canadian economy can never stand firmly on its own. A large scale depression would be inevitable.

What amazes me, Sir, is the aspirin treatment this Liberal Government is giving to Saskatchewan's agricultural industry. Yes, Mr. Speaker, we have heard of the loans for female cows at seven per cent, etc., etc. Caution is the word, Mr. Premier. The hasty kind of planning that has gone into all this diversification can be disastrous for many of these people who are borrowing all this money.

Some Hon. Members: — Hear, hear!

Mr. Kowalchuk: — My concern is for the way of life for the small farm, a one-section farmer and more. The silence of this Government on these farm units means only one thing, that everyone is quietly awaiting for this kind of farm to quietly die so that it could be decently buried. This Government is giving a helping hand by quietly waiting for the disappearance of the small family farm, the small business man and the small community because it believes in bigness. It believes in big business and big agriculture and big agriculture off-shoots. Those of us who are one section or three-quarter section farmers are destined for the scrap heap. We are to become the sacrificial fuel for big business philosophy and are being relegated to a future somewhere in the already overcrowded slums of the big cities.

In the Melville constituency where one-half and three-quarter and one section farmers are the most numerous, even in the larger farm area of Lorlie, Abernethy and Balcarres, where until now being on good, heavy soil, many farmers that thought they were safe, that their farming units were economically viable, today look at the agricultural scene with grim apprehension and dismay. This Government is giving aid to a few chosen farmers, but to the rest it is aspirin treatment.

Mr. Speaker, the future of our farms and farmers should have been thoroughly studied and examined a long while back. There should have been studies and research — continuous research — in all phases of the agricultural industry, research in world needs, research in regional production, research in future needs and growth, research in marketing, total research for the whole of the agriculture industry. In this technological age you would have thought that the Canadian Government in conjunction with the Provincial Governments would have bent every effort in dealing with this. But what was the word from the wise men at Ottawa? "Grow more wheat, farmers. We will sell all you can grow." The Liberals in Regina, not to be outdone, blindly followed the Federal Liberals. They even supported this move by encouraging the farmers, particularly the small farmer in the parkland region, to break up the bottom lowlands and sloughs, by paying him \$3 per acre. And they are still doing this today. Only last year when the Saskatchewan Liberals saw doom and foreboding, the political handwriting on the wall, did they then jump on the bandwagon in support of price support for grain and a two-price wheat system, the identical resolution they so strongly opposed the year before when it was introduced by the New Democratic party in this Saskatchewan Legislature.

Some Hon. Members: — Hear, hear!

Mr. Kowalchuk: — The New Democratic party has committed itself to definite agricultural policies, one of which is the creating of a Crown corporation, whereby a farmer wishing to quit farming would be able to dispose of his small holdings. He would be paid a fair price. This land in turn would be put together with other small holdings to form a viable economic farm unit and sold to a young farmer at reasonable interest rates. Similar treatment would be accorded to people who are today being forced to dispose of their land by social welfare, many of them selling at sacrifice prices.

The New Democratic party believes in the kind of legislation to protect and preserve the viable average family farm. Mr. Speaker, the biggest and most dreadful and final disaster of the whole Prairie region, next to a nuclear holocaust, will be the disappearance of the small family farm, the one section and the section-and-one-half farmer. Mr. Speaker, if these are allowed to die all else will die with them, towns, villages, whole communities, yes and even cities.

Mr. Speaker, why build schools, hospitals, homes? Why legislate for price supports? Why regulate farm industry? If this is being done today for the benefit of the big corporate farmer of tomorrow, I for one want no part of it.

I beg this Government and the other Provincial Governments and the Government of Canada to do everything that is humanly and financially possible to save our small Prairie farms and so save ourselves. Without this we may as well pack up and go home today.

In 1964 this Liberal Government to your right promised increased services and tax relief. Wilf Gardiner, the then Member for Melville constituency said, “We will improve services and lower taxes.” So did Mr. Thatcher on numerous occasions! What a hoax, Mr. Speaker, what a brazen, detestable hoax!

After five years in office this Liberal Government has burdened the people of Saskatchewan with no less than 1,000 new and added taxes. It gave you a \$50 homeowner grant in one pocket and siphoned off \$300 out of the other. Today it is going to tempt you once again with another \$50 sugar-coated homeowner aspirin to cure your \$500 property tax increase headache.

The shift in taxation from government to taxpayer has been glaringly evident on every hand, in education and everywhere else. The area bargaining shifted on to the shoulders, costing millions of dollars, on the back of the local taxpayers. This year, once again, another added burden is the Research Program instituted by the Trustees’ Association. Mr. Speaker, a hard, fast line on pupil-teacher ratio can only impair the quality of education. We in Melville and district made an effort to build on to our comprehensive school large teaching areas, which would have assisted us in this effort of pupil-teacher ratio, but we were forced to cut, pare and emasculate these features because money wasn’t available.

In the Throne Speech, Mr. Speaker, it says, “My Government welcomes the Federal designated area legislation which was

amended and approved a few months ago.” Amended and improved, what a joke! May I say that the people of Melville and Yorkton and the Qu’Appelle Valley region, who were left out in the cold, disagree totally with this statement. We in Melville need all the assistance we can get to get the new industries. And some of these, I am going to say, that have come about through SEDCO I agree with, such as the plastic plant, the trailer factory and the distillery. And we are looking for the Vernal Industries, a carpet factory. They will also be welcome.

An Hon. Member: — Carpetbaggers.

Mr. Kowalchuk: — I heard you, Mr. Minister of Agriculture say, carpetbaggers. I will relate that message for you, Sir, to the people of Melville that they are considered by you to be carpetbaggers. We accept the carpet industry if it will come there. The Qu’Appelle Valley region from Lebreton east to Highway No. 9 needs all the Federal and Provincial assistance it can get for parks, roads, etc.

Mr. Speaker, as this Session progresses, I will have a lot more to say about people in the Melville constituency, the pensioners, the laborers, the Indian and Métis people, the farmers, the small business people and the old and the young people.

Mr. Speaker, this Government has lost faith with the people of Saskatchewan, its promises of lower taxes and more services unfilled. It’s a Government completely out of touch with small people. I cannot support the motion but I will support the amendment.

Some Hon. Members: — Hear, hear!

Mr. Loken (Rosetown): — Mr. Speaker, may I add my congratulations to the mover and the seconder of the Address-in-Reply to the Speech from the Throne for a job well done.

The Speech from the Throne again this year, Mr. Speaker, points up the concern that our Government has for the citizens of the Province of Saskatchewan. It displays an understanding and an appreciation on the part of this Government for the many problems facing our citizens, particularly at this time. What is more important, Mr. Speaker, instead of just talking about the situation, as our friends opposite are so renowned for doing, this Speech indicates that this Government has a number of concrete, effective steps which it intends to take to tackle some of our problems and hopefully solve them.

I refer for instance to the added incentives proposed to encourage our farmers to diversify, the increased assistance to municipalities for police protection, home construction and industrial incentives, the increased funds which will be provided and many more. How different this compares to the record of the Socialists, not only while they were in office, but even in their public statements and policies during the past year. We all know, Mr. Speaker, that the main cause for the depressed condition of our provincial economy at the moment rests with the lack of wheat sales and the resulting shortage of cash among the farmers.

This Government during the past year, has done its best to assist our farmers in overcoming the current crisis. Without exception these efforts have met with fierce opposition and criticism from the NDP ranks. In an effort to do whatever can be done to increase the movement of grain from Saskatchewan this Government has endeavored to barter Saskatchewan wheat for machines and electrical equipment required by our Government departments and Crown corporations.

I have in my hand an advertisement from The Regina Leader Post that reads as follows:

Saskatchewan Power Corporation notice of tender. Tenders are invited to supply and deliver 150 steam Turbo-generators complete with condensing plant and feed water heating plant for the Boundary Dam power station at Estevan, Saskatchewan. In addition to normal price and technical consideration preference may be given to bidders prepared to accept payment in Saskatchewan wheat.

As Hon. Members know two deals have now been completed, exchanging Saskatchewan wheat for electrical equipment required by the Saskatchewan Power Corporation and for the betatron for the Cancer Clinic. I am told that several other deals are being negotiated, including the tender advertisement which I have just read to you. I am told also that the inquiries with regard to barter possibilities have been overwhelming. Yet, what have the Members opposite had to say about these efforts to help our farmers? They have criticized and ridiculed these efforts on every occasion.

I may say in passing that the Federal Government and the Wheat Board have not done much better. Here we have, however, Mr. Speaker, a party opposite, which purports to be so preoccupied with helping the poor, the under-privileged and the hard done by, and they have the gall to criticize a constructive and imaginative program spearheaded by our Premier to get Saskatchewan wheat moving.

We all recall several weeks ago, Mr. Speaker, the rather shocking news that the Lakehead terminals were almost empty and that men were being laid off due to a lack of wheat movement into the terminals. Again our Government urged the Canadian Wheat Board, the railways and the Federal Government to get wheat moving off Saskatchewan farms.

I am sure we all recall the Leader of the Opposition's (Mr. Lloyd) statement in The Leader Post. At that time he expressed grave concern over the Eastern unionized employees who had been laid off, while scarcely mentioning a word about the Saskatchewan farmer. He was more concerned, Mr. Speaker, with the union employees at the Lakehead than with the Saskatchewan farmer with wheat bursting out of every building on his farm. Hardly suitable qualifications for criticizing the constructive, positive efforts of our Premier and our Government in assisting our farmers at this crucial time!

Another NDP policy stand which certainly doesn't sit well with the farmers in my area is with regard to the movement of feed grains across provincial boundaries. Time and time again our party and our Government have pressed for a change in this regulation. We think it is ridiculous to establish trade barriers between provinces for feed grains. Surely with the current farm

crisis farmers should enjoy the privilege of selling feed grains wherever a market can be found for them.

Repeatedly the NDP and their cousins the National Farmers' Union have condemned any such change in these regulations. If the NDP thinks they are standing for the farmer's best interest in this regard they are going to get the shock of their life in many areas around my constituency come the next election.

Mr. Speaker, the Throne Speech represents continued responsible and effective management of the affairs of our Province. It includes many measures designed to assist our citizens. I am sure the people of my constituency will be happy to know that there will be more grants for education, free text books for grade 12 students, continued grants to municipalities, also increase in the homeowner grants . . .

Some Hon. Members: — Hear, hear!

Mr. Loken: — . . . guaranteed Government loans for the purchase of female breeding stock, industrial incentive program to encourage industry to smaller towns and communities. Completion of the Outlook-Broderick irrigation system and the construction to irrigate lands in the Conquest area will be commenced in 1970. The Coming of Age Act will also be most welcome, especially to the young people. Mr. Speaker, there is one matter that I wish to raise in my remarks today. Two weeks ago the farmers in my constituency eagerly awaited the spotting of 200 boxcars allocated to the elevators at points in my constituency. Due to the grainhandlers' strike at the West Coast at that time, the boxcars from my area were cancelled and redistributed to other points that were shipping to the Lakehead. The people in my area now have concrete evidence as to the effect of dockworkers' strikes on the Saskatchewan farm economy. The wheat now remains piled on the ground and the loss of approximately \$400,000 in income for this one area will not soon be forgotten by my people. In the face of this I would like the NDP Members opposite to show me where there is a common interest between the farmers of Saskatchewan and the unionized laborer and union bosses who control the NDP.

Some Hon. Members: — Hear, hear!

Mr. Loken: — Mr. Speaker, you will note from my remarks that I will support the motion but not the amendment.

Some Hon. Members: — Hear, hear!

Hon. Mr. Estey (Minister of Municipal Affairs): — Mr. Speaker, at the outset I want to join with other Members of this House in congratulating the mover and the seconder of the Address-in-Reply to the Speech from the Throne, not only on their delivery but on the content of their addresses.

I also join with others in congratulating His Honour, Dr. Stephen Worobetz, MD, on his elevation to the highest office in our province. I want to point out that His Honour, Dr. Worobetz, is a resident of the Nutana Centre constituency.

I also join in paying tribute to our former Lieutenant

Governor, Mr. Hanbidge, a man who occupies the unique position of having served on all three levels of government in our country and we wish him well in his retirement.

Now, Mr. Speaker, I noticed this morning in reading the paper that the Hon. Member from Regina South East (Mr. Baker) is going to attend Expo 1970, and I believe he has just returned from Vienna in 1969. I would hope, Mr. Speaker, that this trip will not increase the already operating deficit of the city of Regina and not increase the mill rate to the citizens of our Queen City which we regard as a very fine city.

Some Hon. Members: — Hear, hear!

Hon. Mr. Estey: — I say that, Mr. Speaker, in all sincerity, coming from the city of Saskatoon.

Some Hon. Members: — Hear, hear!

Hon. Mr. Estey: — But, Mr. Speaker, we will follow with interest the trip of the Member from Regina South East as he tippy-toes through Japan distributing buffalo hats and cuff links to a nation where the majority wear neither a hat nor cuff links.

Some Hon. Members: — Hear, hear!

Hon. Mr. Estey: — Now, Mr. Speaker, . . . I see I have support from the Front Benchers opposite. Mr. Speaker, when I spoke in this House last year, I referred to a resolution passed at a conference of the Young People's Branch of the New Democratic party which called for the nationalization of farm lands. As the Member for Athabasca (Mr. Guy) yesterday pointed out, a similar resolution was passed by the Agricultural Committee of the Provincial Convention of the New Democratic party held in Saskatoon last July. But, Mr. Speaker, this subject goes much deeper than just having passed at the Agricultural Committee. My understanding, Mr. Speaker, is that consternation ruled supreme in the minds of several of our Members opposite when this resolution passed the agricultural panel, for they realized the consequences, namely that a political platform containing such a resolution could not be sold politically to the people of this province. When this resolution reached the floor of the House, or I should say the plenary session, the chairman of the plenary session apparently initially took the position that the resolution had already passed through that session, but eventually the resolution was brought back to the convention floor, according to my understanding, amended to camouflage the phrase and idea, nationalization of farm lands. According to a report in The Leader Post of July 14, 1969, the fight against the amendment was led, and I quote, by one Len Wallace, described as a trade unionist and one Gerry Hudson, described, and I quote, as "A Moose Jaw trade unionist."

Some Hon. Members: — Hear, hear!

Hon. Mr. Estey: — Both of these gentlemen, Mr. Speaker, I am sure are experts in the fields of socialization but certainly not in the field of agriculture. The interesting point concerning this matter, Mr. Speaker, is that when this camouflage amendment

came into the floor of their convention, it passed by only a majority estimated to be 10 to 15 per cent of the delegates present. The citizens of this province now know, I submit, that there is still a large element in the NDP party who favor socialism and particularly the nationalization of our farm lands.

Some Hon. Members: — Hear, hear!

Hon. Mr. Estey: — I would suggest to the Member for The Battlefords (Mr. Kramer) if he finds it so funny that he mount his steed and drive off into the darkness and return in order to collect his honorarium.

Mr. Speaker, it would be interesting to know I submit where the Members opposite stand on this question of nationalization of our farm lands so that their constituents will know.

Now, Mr. Speaker, I wish to turn to another matter which gives me a great deal of concern in these times. I wish to refer to a subject which arose at the National Convention of the New Democratic party held in Winnipeg in the fall of 1969. And this deals with the inferior position to which women are relegated in the NDP. We in the Liberal party regard women as partners in forming our policies. There is no need for women members of the Liberal party to fight for their legitimate place in our party. But, Mr. Speaker, . . .

An Hon. Member: — Hear, hear!

Hon. Mr. Estey: — . . . I cannot hear the Member for Melfort (Mr. Willis). But, Mr. Speaker, what happened at the National NDP Convention in Winnipeg? Apparently the governing body of the NDP is the Federal Council which is made up of about 120 persons on which women have a minimum membership of five. Five out of 120, Mr. Speaker.

Some Hon. Members: — Shame, shame!

Hon. Mr. Estey: — A proposal came to the convention floor from a group, apparently a very attractive group, asking that the minimum number of women on the council be 25 which would amount to approximately 20 per cent of the council membership. Mr. Speaker, in this day of enlightenment I regret to inform you that the proposal was turned down by the committee. But again, Mr. Speaker, an elected representative of the New Democratic Party, Mr. David Lewis, M.P., saw the political consequences of this matter and proposed that the request by the young ladies of 25 seats in the council be reduced to 15 and this proposal was adopted by the committee.

Now, Mr. Speaker, nothing is easy in the New Democratic party and it was now necessary for the ladies to take the matter up as a constitutional amendment, and this constitutional amendment, Mr. Speaker, required a majority of two-thirds of the voting delegates. According to reports from this notable convention, a women's liberation movement immediately reared its head. I regret to inform this House, Mr. Speaker, the two-thirds majority was not obtained and women are now in a position in the NDP where they have a minimum of five members on a Federal Council consisting of approximately 120 members, Mr. Speaker. Now, Mr. Speaker, at the very same convention, trade

unions affiliated with the New Democratic party were given 12 seats in the Federal Council. These 12 people, Mr. Speaker, do not represent constituencies, do not represent provincial organizations, but are guaranteed these 12 seats because their unions are affiliated and contribute financially to the NDP on an annual basis. I am told, from reading the newspaper, that the contribution from the unions represented by these 12 unions represent between \$85,000 and \$95,000 annually. Again, Mr. Speaker, this is more evidence to the fact that the New Democratic party puts dollars before people. It is inconceivable, Mr. Speaker, that in 1969 a political party such as the New Democratic party would treat its women members in such a shoddy manner. The Liberal party I say again welcomes women of all ages and invites them to participate in the activities of our party.

Some Hon. Members: — Hear, hear!

Hon. Mr. Estey: — The Members opposite may give us an explanation of this deplorable situation which exists apparently within their own ranks, but actions, Mr. Speaker, speak louder than words.

Mr. Kramer: — Hear, hear!

Hon. Mr. Estey: — Mr. Speaker, we appear to have a breeze blowing from the Northwest, from in and around The Battlefords. Now, Mr. Speaker, I wish to refer to legislation which was brought into this House some two years ago dealing with potash-sharing, and to point out to this House that 1969 represented the first year in which our potash-sharing board operated and during that year, \$976,482 was distributed between 41 R.M.s and 43 towns and villages. To give you some idea of the assistance accruing from the potash-sharing, the town of Lanigan in 1969 received \$11,283 for potash-sharing while seven municipalities received in excess of \$15,000. The largest amount payable to any rural municipality by the Potash Sharing Board was \$97,000. Prior to the potash-sharing the entire municipal tax was received by seven municipalities. Potash-sharing is carried out as you know by a board controlled by the S.A.R.M., and I would like to point out that, during the first 18 months of operation of this Board, it cost less than one-half of one per cent to administer and that includes costs in connection with setting the Board up.

Now, Mr. Speaker, I wish to turn for a moment to the question of municipal roads. For all practical purposes our grid road construction program has been pretty well completed. We now have approximately 15,200 miles of grid road in this province. Many of our R.M.s have gone into the farm access road program and as of now we have between 2,000 and 3,000 miles of farm access roads constructed. You will recall that during 1969 we inaugurated a gravelling assistance program for towns, villages and hamlets and I can report that this has been a most successful program. A formula of assistance was devised which amounted to a grant of 40 per cent of the cost of each individual project which was submitted to the Department. It is my hope that this program will be increased during 1970 so that we may give additional assistance to the larger towns who have a real need for street improvement. In 1969 in co-operation with the Federal Department of Indian Affairs, we commenced a cost-sharing program for the construction of roads on Reserves to the grid road standard. Under this program the location of

the road is designated by the Department of Indian Affairs with the Municipal Road Authority arranging for the design and construction. During the first year of this program I am happy to report that 35 miles of grid roads were constructed on Reserves and I have no doubt that this number will be practically doubled in 1970. The real advantage of this program, Mr. Speaker, is that it provides better transportation for our citizens living on Reserves.

Now I turn to the question of equalization grants, to which we allotted in the last Budget approximately \$2.5 million. To give this House some idea of the benefits conferred on some of our municipalities by equalization grants, grants were paid from the Equalization Fund in 1969 in excess of \$10,000 to each of 77 rural municipalities. Many rural municipalities in our province received equalization grants in excess of the administration cost of that municipality, and it is my hope that the majority of equalization grants paid are used for the purposes of improving services rendered by the municipality to its ratepayers. The Member from Kelvington (Mr. Byers) mentioned the lack of financial assistance to R.M.s in his constituency. I would just like to point out to him what equalization grants are paid to two or three of his municipalities. If you take R.M. 275 in the fiscal year 1963-64, which was the last Budget of the New Democratic party's government, an equalization grant was paid to R.M. 275 of \$3,260, while in the fiscal year 1968-69, the equalization grant paid to R.M. 275 amounted to \$15,669 . . .

Some Hon. Members: — Hear, hear!

Hon. Mr. Estey: — . . . nearly five times the grant of five years ago. I point out to the Member from Kelvington his R.M. 276, in the last year of the NDP Government a grant was paid to R.M. 276 of \$4,975. But in 1968-69, his municipality No. 276 received \$16,275.

Some Hon. Members: — Hear, hear!

Hon. Mr. Estey: — Now I'll give the R.M. 305, which likewise is located in the Kelvington constituency. And I hope the Member takes this down, I'll read the figures slowly. The largest grant paid to R.M. 305 by an NDP Government amounted — just get this — to \$2,105. In 1968-69, the present Liberal Government of the Province of Saskatchewan paid to R.M. 305, \$12,189, six times what was ever paid by a generous NDP Government.

Now let's turn to the Canora constituency. Take R.M. 274. R.M. 274 under the NDP Government received — I'll go slowly so the Member can write it down — \$2,150, two, one, five, 0, whereas in 1968-69, the present Liberal Government paid to R.M. 274, \$13,693.

Some Hon. Members: — Hear, hear!

Hon. Mr. Estey: — Now, Mr. Speaker, there is a Mr. Matsalla, who happens to be secretary-treasurer of R.M. 304, and I cannot prove legally that he is the one and same person as the Member from Canora, but in R.M. 304, the present Liberal Government in 1968-69 paid an equalization grant of \$11,347. Now I haven't got the figure for your largest NDP Government grant but I'm certain it wouldn't

exceed \$3,000. The story is the same I might point out in R.M. 275 and in other R.M.s in that constituency.

Now, Mr. Speaker, I want to turn for a moment to housing and I want to point out at the outset that there has been a decrease in both starts and completions in housing in the calendar year 1969. If you take the province as a whole, during 1969, the CMHC figures show a decrease of 12.4 per cent in our housing starts, and a drop of 5.8 per cent in our housing completions when compared to the immediate previous year. I also want to state that there has been a rather drastic decrease in housing starts in both the months of December and January. I am not for one moment suggesting that this is a healthy situation and one which the Government can ignore. Indeed the Speech from the Throne has already indicated that legislation will be brought before this House during this Session dealing with the building or acquiring of homes.

Some Hon. Members: — Hear, hear!

Hon. Mr. Estey: — The Government of Saskatchewan during 1969 continued its policy of increasing the housing units for persons of modest income. And as of December 31, 1969, there were 1,208 subsidized rental units in this province available for occupancy as against 814 subsidized units on December 31, 1968. There was therefore an increase of 394 subsidized rental homes in Saskatchewan during the year 1969. Over and above these figures we have of course 72 economic rental units and 40 units which are under construction in the urban centres of Northern Saskatchewan. As of December 31, 1969, we had 169 subsidized units under construction which will be completed in 1970, and I would think some have already been completed.

Now the Member for Regina North West (Mr. Whelan) referred to this question of subsidized housing and referred to the great need of low-rental housing. I want to suggest to the Member for Regina North West that the greatest service which he could render to the people of Regina would be to assist the housing authorities in occupying the ten units which are vacant as of this date.

Some Hon. Members: — Hear, hear!

Hon. Mr. Estey: — The program initiated a year ago of purchasing residences to be occupied by persons nominated by the Indian and Métis Department has in my opinion, been a success and will be continued during the present year. I think the success of this program to date has in the main been due to the wives and mothers, who in many cases have realized that re-settlement would provide opportunities for their families and have encouraged their husbands to seek the assistance of the Indian and Métis Department in finding positions. I want to stress however that the families occupying these homes pay a rental according to income, based on the same schedule as any other family would pay in a subsidized rental residence. Recent surveys of the need of rental housing in Saskatchewan have indicated that a need exists in one and two-bedroom suites, and I would think that the emphasis in 1970 will be on constructing or acquiring one bedroom suites for senior citizens and young couples, and two bedroom suites for families with one or two children. However, I do think that our program has reached a point where

we are entitled to say to the centres requesting low rental housing that a portion of the units to be constructed must be occupied by persons who are moving out of substandard rental accommodation, which will be condemned by the municipality for further occupancy until such time as they are brought up to the standards required by the municipality. One of the prime purposes of this housing program, Mr. Speaker, must be to upgrade the housing stock of the community. Mr. Speaker, I want to say something else about this low-rental housing and to point out that they are constructed on the basis of only a five per cent contribution to construction costs and subsidy by the municipality concerned. This is the lowest municipal contribution in Canada. We are told in this debate about the virtues of the Government of Manitoba. I want to tell this House that the Province of Manitoba requires a contribution by the municipality concerned of 12½ per cent of the cost of construction of low rental housing units and 12 and one-half per cent of the subsidy required. That's an NDP benevolent government. It is no wonder the Province of Manitoba does not have a large number of subsidized houses. The reason is obvious. The municipalities concerned just cannot afford 12½ per cent of the cost of constructing a large program and 12½ per cent of the subsidy which may go on for 50 years.

Now, Mr. Speaker, I turn to the question of homeowner grants. The homeowner grant again proved to be a very popular program. During the fiscal year up to January 20, 1970, I should say during the calendar year, Mr. Speaker, of 1969, and up to January 20 of this year, there was paid out in homeowner grants in round figures \$8.8 million and that amount was paid to 180,298 applicants, which was an increase in applicants of 2,353 over the previous calendar year. My understanding is that at the last Provincial Convention of the New Democratic party a resolution was passed to do away with these grants. The Member for The Battlefords (Mr. Kramer) stated in his address in this debate that he favors homeowner grants but that such should be paid to renters, while the Member for Cutknife (Mr. Kwasnica) says that he will vote against any increase in homeowner grants. In my opinion, Mr. Speaker, the present homeowner grant program meets with the approval of the vast majority of the citizens of this province, and it will be interesting to note how the Opposition will vote when the proposed Bill comes before this House dealing with homeowner grants.

Now, Mr. Speaker, a great deal has been said about tax collections in 1969. And a great deal of gloom and doom has been spread by the Members opposite. And this gloom and doom seems to be pretty well embedded. I noticed an ad in the paper, Mr. Speaker – and I presume you read it last night – where there is going to be a NDP dance on Friday night and the music will be supplied by an orchestra known as the “Blue State of Mind.”

Some Hon. Members: — Hear, hear!

Hon. Mr. Estey: — After much comment was made about tax collections, we made a survey of 69 R.M.s in this province, about evenly divided between north and south. On averaging the R.M.s in the south we found that there was 94 per cent collection of levy. When you take those 30 odd in the north, we found that there was a 92 per cent of levy or in those 69 municipalities in 1969, 93 per cent of the current levy was collected. In 1968 taking

those same municipalities the percentage of levies collected was 94 per cent. I think this is an excellent tax record and a credit to the rural people of Saskatchewan when you consider the economics of the year 1969. Now, I am not for one moment – and I don't want anyone opposite to construe my statement – attempting to guess what the collections will be in 1970. I don't think anyone in this House is in a position to do so.

Mr. Speaker, it is quite obvious from my remarks that I am supporting the motion.

Some Hon. Members: — Hear, hear!

Mr. Michayluk (Redberry): — Mr. Speaker, in rising to add my contribution to the Throne Speech Debate, I rise with a great deal of dismay and some grave misgivings, dismay because of the content, and grave misgivings over the fact that on previous occasions the present Thatcher Liberal Government used the Speech from the Throne as a propaganda device. Now this Throne Speech is spotted with rather flowery portions, as a vote-catching means, without any indication that it is the intention of the Government to implement it in its totality.

To me this is a rather disappointing Throne Speech as it offers nothing to our basic agricultural industry to meet the farm crisis. There is hardly a word about worthwhile programs to meet our serious unemployment situation and absolutely nothing about health. I am perturbed over the fact that no mention has been made for the provision of the removal of patients' utilization fees while in hospitals. This surcharge, Mr. Speaker, has created untold hardships on young families with children who require doctor and hospital care in these depressed times. In some instances required services are delayed to such an extent that the results of their postponement will only reappear some time later in life to the ultimate detriment of the future well-being of the matured adult.

Before I proceed any further, Mr. Speaker, I wish at this time to congratulate His Honour the Lieutenant-Governor on his appointment to the very honored position to represent Her Majesty the Queen in this province and in this Legislature. The appointment of Dr. Stephen Worobetz from the city of Saskatoon to this eminently honored position was indeed a great honor to the constituency of Redberry and the community of Krydor, which I have the honor to represent. Dr. Worobetz was born, raised and received his education in the village of Krydor, where I now reside. As a matter of fact, His Honour and I sat in the same classroom in the Krydor high school for two years in the early thirties. I want, Mr. Speaker, on behalf of my constituents, my community, and all those people who personally know His Honour, to again thank the Prime Minister of Canada for his choice and also to those who are responsible for the ultimate recommendation of Dr. Stephen Worobetz for his esteemed position.

Some Hon. Members: — Hear, hear!

Mr. Michayluk: — May I, Sir, also wish Mr. Hanbidge many more years of health on his retirement. His smile, his gracious charm, and the grace and dignity with which he fulfilled his undertaking will be long remembered.

Mr. Speaker, with your permission may I spend but several moments on some of the remarks that were given to us only a few moments ago by the Minister of Municipal Affairs, the Hon. Mr. Estey. He is not in his seat unfortunately. Two Ministers have taken it upon themselves to resurrect a dead cow, a cow which was brought to light by the Liberals and the Liberal party, prior to the 1944 Provincial election. That cow was stated to be a fact if you ever elect a CCF Government you will lose your farms. I have brought this Liberal literature to the attention of the Hon. Members of this Legislature on previous occasions, a pamphlet which was published by the Liberal party. I have it here, Sir, and probably the Minister or the Premier wants to have a photostatic copy of it. I will send one over for him. I mention that this pamphlet is printed in the Ukrainian language and issued by the Saskatchewan Liberal Association, printed by the Redeemer's Voice at Yorkton. What does it say? It says literally translated into English, "You will lose your farms if you vote for the CCF." Then, Mr. Speaker, the entire content of this pamphlet is of a type which the Minister of Public Works (Mr. Guy) and the Minister of Municipal Affairs (Mr. Estey) are trying to resurrect for the Saskatchewan people in their speeches in this Legislature at this time. Now this is not the only thing that the Liberals are guilty of. They printed another one that is just as good, Mr. Speaker, also issued by the authority of the Saskatchewan Liberal Association, printed by the Redeemer's Voice, 1944 election, "Where do we go?" Now do you know where we go, Ross? This pamphlet is motivated with fear to scare the people that there will never be another election if a CCF Government were to be elected in Saskatchewan. Then there was one to my English friends – "Don't let them fool you. Your money, your farms, your insurance, are what the CCF Socialists want to experiment with. Don't let them experiment, keep socialism out of Saskatchewan." Then in 1945, a year after the CCF was elected to form a government in the Province of Saskatchewan, when public opinion polls throughout the length and breadth of this country favored the CCF party to become the next government of Canada, what did the Liberals do? They engaged an eminent lawyer, B.A. Trestrail to publish this "Social Suicide." Incidentally, Mr. Speaker, this pamphlet "Social Suicide" was sent to every householder in the Dominion of Canada. What is the content of this "Social Suicide?" It is similar to the garbage we heard from the Minister of Public Municipal Affairs (Mr. Estey).

There are a few goodies, Mr. Speaker, in the Speech from the Throne, such as the \$500 winter building incentive grant and an increase in the homeowner grant, but these are like band-aids on our ailing economy when some major surgery is called for. A \$500 incentive grant is not much good to people who can't afford to build houses anyway. Besides, it is too late to do much good this winter. Nor will an increased homeowner grant help most citizens whose local taxes have skyrocketed much more than \$50 or \$100 since this Liberal Government took office.

Reduced bus fares are very fine for senior citizens, but with the Liberal galloping inflation eating into their meagre incomes I doubt if they can afford to travel very far, even on reduced fares.

The disappointing aspect of the Throne Speech, Mr. Speaker, was the fact that it offers very little to the very sick

agricultural industry other than a program of diversification without production analysis and a guaranteed floor price for livestock. Mr. Speaker, the Premier and the Minister of Agriculture (Mr. McFarlane) should get their heads together in respect to the unplanned expansion and diversification into the hog and the livestock industry. The Premier, Mr. Speaker, has chanted loud and long, telling the farmers that their difficulties lie in the fact that there is an overproduction of wheat with limited sales – the farmers know that – and that the only way out of the dilemma, and to avoid reoccurrences of this situation, is to diversify into production of livestock. Mr. Speaker, the Premier knows as well as anyone that there are various factors why this could not be done by all farmers. Water supply, lack of pasture, feed, small holdings, are just some of the barriers that stand in the way of such diversification. Many farmers know that in an unplanned free enterprise economy the laws of supply and demand play a very vital role with regard to prices that are received by the producers.

Time and time again in the past the farmers have experienced these tragic results. Most Hon. Members will recall that not too many years ago the farmers went out of hog production. The prices per pound for dressed pork rose to almost 40 cents a pound. This price, Mr. Speaker, became very attractive and a large number of farmers in Western Canada went into hogs in varying scales. What was the end result? When large volumes of pork arrived at the market the prices dropped drastically and had to be given back to people almost at no cost. Prices dropped by almost 40 per cent in most instances.

It is recognized, Mr. Speaker, that there would be no problem should the prices of beef and beef sales remain what they are at present. There is, however, every possibility that uncontrolled overproduction may have an adverse effect on other parts of Canada. This doubt was expressed by the Minister of Agriculture himself when he spoke to the Ontario Institute of Agrologists and was reported in the Saskatoon Star Phoenix of November 18, 1969. It is titled “Swing to cattle could hurt country, McFarlane warns.” Mr. Speaker, here is part of what the Minister is reported to have said, and may I quote:

The whole country will feel the impact if Saskatchewan farmers are forced into the production of cattle because of the wheat glut, Agriculture Minister D.T. McFarlane said in Toronto Monday.

Mr. McFarlane told the Ontario Institute of Agrologists that Saskatchewan farmers may have to go into livestock production on a massive scale if a solution for marketing their province’s tremendous wheat surplus cannot be found.

Here, Mr. Speaker, is the portion of the report which confirms my contention that the production should be planned, or, if not planned, then the producers should be guaranteed a minimum price for beef. May I, Sir, quote a further portion in part:

We will become serious competitors with other parts of Canada and Canadian agriculture in general will suffer as a result, McFarlane said.

Mr. Speaker, at this point I will take this opportunity to congratulate the mover and the seconder of the Address-in-Reply to the Speech from the Throne. I am aware of the

preparation that the task requires, as I did have, since my election to this Legislature, the honored privilege of performing a similar task. Much depends upon the policy of the Government and its performance, together with the material which one has to work with. Granted it would be difficult at best to defend the record of any Liberal Government, be it provincial or federal, so that instead of glorifying the accomplishments of the Thatcher Administration it seemed to me that the mover proposed to deviate from facts only to draw a future blueprint for the basic agricultural industry, by trisecting the province into interdependent zones. I would suggest to the Hon. Member from Hanley (Mr. Heggie), the mover of the Address-in-Reply, to go into the Hanley constituency and pose his proposition to the farmers of any given area. Their response will undoubtedly be very enlightening to the Hon. member.

The Hon. Member for Elrose (Mr. Leith), the seconder of the Address-in-Reply, went to great length to justify the highhanded method used by this dictatorial Thatcher Government to scrutinize budgets of the various school jurisdictions in this province. Mr. Speaker, could you conceive what would have happened had this been undertaken by a New Democratic Government, or a Minister of Education in a New Democratic Government? There would have been door kicking upon the doors of this Legislature. There would have been inciting people to take up arms and marches to the steps of the Legislature, or asking for an outright dissolution of the Government, as was suggested by the medicare crisis. In all probability, Mr. Speaker, there would have been a committee organized, financed, publicized under a probable title of "Save our Democracy." Yet, today, Mr. Speaker, the local school jurisdictions have been reduced to roles of mere puppets. The Premier and the Minister of Education no longer have trust and faith in duly elected boards. They feel that their good judgments are not beyond reproach and that they are unable to manage the revenues entrusted to them under provincial statute.

The Minister may want to defend the position of his department that this is in the name of economy, that departmental officials may be able to pare expenses with a Liberal meat-axe until educational bones come into full view. Mr. Speaker, is it possible – and I have my doubts – that the Saskatoon School Board, which has managed its affairs without interference since the erection of its first school, could have overestimated its budget by some \$175,000, and that its teaching staff had an overload of some 54 members?

Mr. Speaker, because of the unwarranted action in the name of economy the quality of education in this province will suffer. Cuts in staff may force many of our programs to be limited and narrowed to a bare minimum. The 25 to 1 student-teacher ratio will further have a deteriorating effect on the quality of education. For purposes of illustration, Mr. Speaker, the teaching staff where I teach will be further reduced by an additional teacher, and it has already been reduced by two, and at a time when two of its members were already sharing between two schools in different communities on a half-day per school basis. One commutes between two schools to teach a half a day in one school, the other half in the other school. This is the first time in 37 years of my teaching career that this has come into being. Programs and choices of subjects will be cut. There is every possibility that the commercial room will be closed and that the principal will have

no spare time for administrative duties.

Last year, Mr. Speaker, in discussing some of the Government's tax reductions I had intimated that the people of Saskatchewan had been led down the garden path as far as tax reductions were concerned. At that time, may I quote in part:

I am convinced as sure as I am standing here, Mr. Speaker, that once this Government calls the Kelvington by-election the message will come clear.

Well, it did come clear. Today, Mr. Speaker, I want to congratulate the Hon. Member from Kelvington (Mr. Byers) on winning the Kelvington seat by a decisive majority. After listening to his maiden speech two days ago, one could only conclude that the people of Kelvington made the only choice possible by rejecting the Liberals and their outmoded free enterprise, dog-eat-dog philosophy. The Hon. Member, Sir, in his maiden speech demonstrated that his contribution to the proceedings will be constructive and critical, and that this Legislature will greatly profit by his presence here.

I want at this time, Mr. Speaker, to discuss a matter which is vital to the Minister of Natural Resources (Mr. Barrie), to the sportsmen of Saskatchewan, and to those who come from other provinces and from the United States. The Province of Saskatchewan has for many years, Mr. Speaker, been referred to as a hunter's and sportsman's paradise. Fishing and hunting have attracted sportsmen from beyond our borders. All in all, Mr. Speaker, approximately 150,000 resident and non-resident hunters' licences and angling licences are sold annually in Saskatchewan. Even the sportsmen, hunters and fishermen were not spared by this Government. The Department of Natural Resources has increased licence fees several times. During the last big game hunting season, the licence fees were increased from \$6 to \$7 for a deer licence, the second deer licence were increased from \$5 to \$7, a non-resident Canadian deer licence went up from \$21 to \$25, an alien deer licence from \$36 to \$40, resident moose and elk increased by \$2. Even the resident bear licence went up from \$2 to \$5. Likewise game bird fees were raised in all categories. I am further given to understand that \$1 increase in the angling licence will take effect for the 1970-71 angling season, with minor regulatory changes.

It is quite understandable, Mr. Speaker, that sportsmen and hunters contribute to wildlife management, care and protection. What perturbs me is the fact that the game branch does not adequately inform hunters and sportsmen, or does not issue warnings or give information to hunters that some wild game may be infected. What is more, that adequate precautions are not taken by the DNR officers at checking points during the early and the late moose hunting season. Our American friends come in large numbers during the early moose season. They are charged \$100 licence fees for this hunting privilege. I have no quarrel with that, Mr. Speaker. Yet, Sir, there is every possibility that the game that sportsmen take, be they resident, non-resident, or alien, may be infected. Granted, Mr. Speaker, moose heads and not carcasses are checked at checking points by the Department of Natural Resources officials. Yet, Sir, many of the animals that are taken are infected, and only by examining the liver and lungs could the infection commonly known as parasitic cysts be detected. During last year's moose hunting season moose hunters from the Blaine Lake

area discovered that some of the animals were infected. Dr. P.J. McCann, veterinarian, gave a report to the Shellbrook Chronicle and may I quote in part some of the report as it appeared in the press. It is entitled "Caution to Hunters. Parasitic Cysts in Wild Meat." And I quote:

Shellbrook Chronicle Special Report – Reports have been coming from moose hunters, especially in Blaine Lake area, that many of the animals shot are affected with numerous cysts in the meat. They are concerned to know if these cysts render the meat unfit for consumption and if there is any danger to human health.

Dr. P.J. McCann, veterinarian, has informed the Chronicle that the cysts are the intermediate stage of certain tapeworms and, while they are no threat to human health, the meat should not be eaten and on no account fed uncooked to dogs or left to be devoured by coyotes or other wild carnivores. If no other use is to be made of the meat, the carcass and offal should be buried or burned.

The cysts have been identified, says Dr. McCann, at the College of Veterinary Medicine, Saskatoon, as the intermediate stages of two tapeworms, *Tenia krabbei* and *Tenia cervi*, which infect wolves, coyotes, bobcats and possibly dogs. The tapeworm eggs are shed by the definitive host (wolf, coyote, etc.) and swallowed by the intermediate host, which may be moose, elk or deer. The eggs are then hatched and the larvae migrate to the muscles or the organs, such as the liver or lungs, where they develop into cysts. These average about a quarter of an inch in diameter and may escape notice unless present in large numbers.

The cysts are an essential stage in the life cycle of the tapeworm, and the cycle is completed only when meat or offal containing the cysts is swallowed by the definitive host (wolf, coyote).

Man is not a suitable host for these tapeworms and in any case the cysts are easily destroyed by cooking. However, when cysts are found in the meat, it should be rejected as unfit for human consumption on purely aesthetic grounds. Few people would relish eating the meat, knowing that it contained parasitic cysts, harmless or not.

The meat can be safely fed to dogs or other farm animals – cats, swine and poultry, only if it is well cooked. Otherwise the carcass and offal should be buried. Dogs, which have been fed raw infected meat, should receive treatment for tapeworms.

Mr. Speaker, it is my contention that this type of information should be given to hunters and hunting guides by the Department of Natural Resources. Some form of forward warning should be given that some game taken may be infected. Mr. Speaker, the Redberry Lake and District branch of the Fish and Game League at its annual meeting passed the following resolution, which was later presented at the District Wildlife Federation meeting in Prince Albert early in January, and may I read the resolution:

As a result of the increasing number of moose that are affected by tapeworm cysts, that the flesh of such animals is not fit for human consumption and that special care should be taken to dispose of said flesh, keeping it away from dogs and cats, etc. Further that it is the opinion of many that people are eating this flesh unaware that anything is wrong with it. Therefore be it resolved that the Department of Natural Resources issue a warning to hunters and sportsmen to let such people know how to detect the cysts in the animal and give instructions how to dispose of it.

It is signed A. Nesdoly, Secretary, Redberry Lake and District Fish and Game League.

Mr. Speaker, it is understandable that hunters and sportsmen at great expense of money and time and for the love of the sport and the recreation undertake this pastime. I for one am fond of hunting and of this sport. However, there are people who are hunters because of the food which they obtain by hunting. Therefore, in all fairness to those so concerned I would urge the Game Branch of the Department of Natural Resources to oblige the sportsmen by issuing in the hunting guides the information requested by the sportsmen.

Mr. Speaker, I wish to congratulate the Hon. Member from The Battlefords (Mr. Kramer) for giving the Premier (Mr. Thatcher) a ride on the Primrose Path into the moose country yesterday and ultimately compensating him with a good-sized moose roast, which was shot on that stretch of the Primrose Path. Later on in the day, Mr. Speaker, my discussion with the Hon. Member from The Battlefords (Mr. Kramer) convinced me that this animal did not fall into the category that I mentioned several moments ago and received his blessing and stamp of approval. The Premier may safely eat that meat.

Some Hon. Members: — Hear, hear!

Mr. Michayluk: — Mr. Speaker, since the election of this Government, session after session both on the Debate and on the Department of Highways estimates, I have brought up this matter of urgent necessity for a connection between Highways No. 5, 40 and 3 up to the junction of No. 24 into the Leoville and Chitek Lake area.

There is, Mr. Speaker, and the Hon. Minister of Highways, (Mr. Boldt), a stretch of almost 100 miles from Highway 40 in the east to 4 on the west with no connection between the highways mentioned to run north and south. I too am aware that the Minister (Mr. Boldt), Mr. Speaker, has had various delegations, suggestions and requests from those communities on Highway No. 40 or No. 5 which this connection was to fan out from. It seems that every community on Highway No. 40 beginning with the town of Blaine Lake wants to be at the junction of this connection. This, Mr. Speaker, and Mr. Minister, is only natural. However, if the Minister of Highways (Mr. Boldt) wants a direct route from Saskatoon to Rosthern, what happens? It's there. Although another highway which is already dust-proof, oiled from Saskatoon to Rosthern is there via Waldheim.

An Hon. Member: — True!

Mr. Michayluk: — If and when the Minister of Highways (Mr. Boldt) wants to take in a stub road leading into various communities or an urban centre in his constituency, what happens? He either builds it or takes it into the highway or he just oils it. I was also given to understand that the new 300 series from the junction of No. 12 and the old 11 will be rebuilt via Waldheim to Rosthern making four routes from Saskatoon to Prince Albert and from Saskatoon to the town of Rosthern. Well, Mr. Speaker, too much is too much. From Saskatoon to Prince Albert there are already three routes; between Highway No. 40 and No. 3 and No. 5 for as I mentioned a few minutes ago, almost 100 miles not a single connection. Mr. Speaker, I have received a petition from the Spiritwood, Rabbit Lake, Mullingar, Mayfair and Alticane area which I will present to the Minister of Highways (Mr. Boldt). It is signed by some 115 signatures, asking the Department of Highways for a highway connection between No. 5, No. 40 and No. 3.

Some Hon. Members: — Hear, hear!

Mr. Michayluk: — And it is my wish, Mr. Speaker, that the Department of Highways and the Minister (Mr. Boldt) will take this into consideration and include this connection in their 1970 Highway Building Program.

Yesterday, Mr. Speaker, the Hon. Member from The Battlefords (Mr. Kramer) brought to the attention of this House and of the Minister of Highways some of the conditions which exist in the North Battleford area and the tardiness with which the Highway Department or the highway contractors are building the roads. I want to concur with his remarks by going into other parts of the province, Mr. Speaker. I have a reprint from the Yorkton Enterprise which appeared in the Saskatoon Star Phoenix on August 28, 1969, under the title (and I quote): “Condition of Highway No. 14 . . . “ This article may have gone unnoticed by the Hon. Member from Yorkton (Mr. Gallagher) and I am taking the liberty, Mr. Speaker, to bring it to his attention and to the Minister of Highways (Mr. Boldt) at the same time. Might I, Mr. Speaker, with your permission read portions of the press report which shows the deplorable condition of Highway No. 14 between Yorkton and Saskatoon. May I quote:

An article dealing with Yorkton’s Tourist Information Services took note of the fact that the most common complaint received from visitors passing through the area concerned the deplorable condition of Highway No. 14 between Yorkton and Saskatoon.

I don’t know the distance, Mr. Minister (Mr. Boldt) or Mr. Speaker, between Yorkton and Saskatoon but presumably it’s in the vicinity of 170 or 180 miles.

The city’s Chamber (I am quoting, Mr. Speaker) of Commerce has also expressed concern about the condition of this main route and has made its views known to the Provincial Government. Most motorists accept the fact that some inconvenience must be expected when construction operations of this nature are underway. At the same time most are agreed that work on this highway with the exception of some areas is being carried on with little regard for the interests, safety or comfort of the

motoring public. Contractors responsible for the work might well benefit . . .

Listen to this . . .

might well benefit from a visit to other provinces and an examination of their construction methods. In most cases the motorist is warned well in advance that a construction zone lies a specific number of miles ahead and that it extends for a stated number of miles. This is done by means of Department of Highways signs which also note that a specified number of dollars are being spent on this particular contract designed to improve the Provincial highways system.

The Minister (Mr. Boldt) dare not say how much it is costing because he's not very sure it's going to cost three times what the contract was let at. I am quoting again:

Detours where necessary are laid out to provide motorists with a safe and relatively smooth passage. They are well marked with signs, flashers and flags. Where machinery is working, signalmen are on duty to ensure that vehicles pass safely, and where necessary dust abatement measures are used.

On No. 14 the motorist is often on his own as he attempts to navigate construction areas. He may have to follow poorly marked and tricky single land tracks hovering over yawning holes. He is lucky if he doesn't knock off the muffler or tear loose every bolt in his car as he bounces and jolts over the craggy road surfaces. To top it off he is usually enveloped in a cloud of dust which may cut his or her or the following driver's visibility to zero and when it rains he is warned to stay off the highway altogether.

Certainly the people of this area are pleased to see improvements being made in this highway which forms an important segment of the Yellowhead Route. The fact remains, however, that in many instances the construction work has been poorly handled from the motorist's point of view and for this the Department of Highways must be held responsible.

Mr. Speaker, not only is there extravagance, waste of public funds in the highway construction, but to the travelling public, and particularly the tourists, this may remain a sore spot for many years to come, Mr. Speaker.

Radio broadcasting of the proceedings from this Legislature has been the major concern of the Liberal Government since its election in 1964. Since that time reports emanating from the daily press have in half-hearted fashion defended their continuance. In 1965 a report appeared in the Star Phoenix, "‘Legislature on the air may end,' Hon. Mr. Steuart for Prince Albert West."

In the 1967 session an article appeared in The Leader Post of February 8th under the title, "Under the dome" by Mary Ann Fitzgerald. May I quote:

At this time of every year the Members of the Legislature turn radio performers.

And then further down in the article:

In Saskatchewan it is known that Premier Thatcher and an estimated 75 per cent . . .

Note this.

. . . of his caucus have doubts about the value of the broadcasts of debates . . .

Some Hon. Members: — Hear, hear!

Mr. Michayluk: —

. . . but there is hesitancy, Mr. Speaker, about cutting them out because it might be interpreted as trying to withhold information from the Saskatchewan people.

Some Hon. Members: — Hear, hear!

Mr. Michayluk: — In '68 in the name of economy two more days of broadcasting went by the board. This year a further cut to only 1,050 minutes. Of course there is a proviso that we may get the two days, or a reduction of some 455 minutes from 1964. The Premier bases his justification for the cuts on the larger coverage by more Saskatchewan stations. This does not hold water, Mr. Speaker, as far as I am concerned. The Premier is motivated by fear as this is one media of information over which he has no direct control when we are speaking. Individual Member's debates which are broadcast must abide by parliamentary rules and may be brought to order either by the Speaker of this House or by any Hon. Member on a point of privilege. It is evident, Mr. Speaker, that the discontinuance of the broadcasting was, and is, uppermost in the mind of the Premier and the Members opposite . . .

Some Hon. Members: — Hear, hear!

Mr. Michayluk: — . . . and their only motivation is fear that the people of Saskatchewan would be able to hear both sides of proceedings from this Legislature.

In conclusion, Mr. Speaker, may I just make a few comments about some of the other statements made by Members opposite during this Debate. A couple of days ago the Minister of Highways (Mr. Boldt) made one of his patented, well-known speeches in which he condemned just about everybody and every organization in Saskatchewan, particularly farm groups. One could not disagree with all the criticisms the Hon. Member (Mr. Boldt) made but unfortunately he chose to throw out the baby with the bath water. For instance he took several potshots at the Wheat Board. I suggest, Mr. Speaker, that his gun was aimed at the wrong direction. There is nothing wrong with the Wheat Board or the concept of orderly marketing that it represents. What is wrong is the fact that the Board is being managed, or mismanaged, by a Liberal Government.

Some Hon. Members: — Hear, hear!

Mr. Michayluk: — There is nothing wrong with many of the programs governments run today, Mr. Speaker, except that they are run by

Liberals who manage to completely foul up the works in most cases. They have taken unemployment insurance and made a mess of it. They have taken our health and medical programs and almost wrecked them. Now they are attempting to do the same thing with orderly marketing and the Wheat Board.

You see, Mr. Speaker, Liberals are capitalists.

Some Hon. Members: — Hear, hear!

Mr. Michayluk: — They don't really believe in these socialistic, publicly beneficial programs, so they either run them in a half-hearted manner or deliberately attempt to wreck them. Then they say publicly sponsored programs just don't work.

Orderly marketing and the Wheat Board are fine programs, Mr. Speaker, and they will work and work properly just as soon as the people of Canada throw the Liberals out of office and put in a government . . .

Some Hon. Members: — Hear, hear!

Mr. Michayluk: — . . . which is dedicated to running them properly and in the public interest.

Mr. Speaker, the same could be said about the statements that have come from the Premier (Mr. Thatcher) and some other Members opposite about the so-called separatism. By deliberately inflaming the situation by their foolish statements they are harming the cause of the West, not helping it.

Some Hon. Members: — Hear, hear!

Mr. Michayluk: — The only kind of separatism that will be of benefit to the people of Saskatchewan will be when this province is separated once and for all from the scourge of Liberalism . . .

Some Hon. Members: — Hear, hear!

Mr. Michayluk: — . . . and we can get on with the job of building that which was so rudely interrupted in 1964.

Mr. Speaker, as you have perhaps gathered from my remarks, I will not support the motion but will support the amendment.

Some Hon. Members: — Hear, hear!

Mr. Smishek (Regina North East): — Mr. Speaker, let me join with other Members of this House in extending my congratulations to the Hon. Member from Kelvington (Mr. Byers) on his election and commend him for his speech he made in this House on Monday.

May I also join with other Members in the House in congratulating our new Lieutenant Governor on his appointment and extend to him the best wishes in that office.

May I also express my best wishes to the former Lieutenant

Governor who had served this Province well and hope that he has a happy retirement and many, many years of health.

Hon. Members: — Hear, hear!

Mr. Smishek: — Mr. Speaker, in the last two or three months in almost every newsworthy publication one picks up to read, or on every radio or television public affairs program that one listens to, public-minded and socially concerned leaders are talking about the '70s. They are setting out the problems and talking about our society's responsibilities and objectives for the new decade. They look to governments to set the priorities, provide the leadership, and accept the challenge.

The '60s was a decade of great scientific and technological achievement, the decade of the computer, the perfection of the nuclear weapons capable of destroying life on earth within minutes. It was a decade noted for man's exploration of outer space, man landing on the moon, transplantation of human organs raising new hope for life, a decade where we found 90 per cent of all scientists and engineers that have ever lived are alive now. It was a decade which had profound effects on all of us.

While the '60s may have been dedicated to science and technological progress this decade, the '70s must be dedicated for social and human progress, if man is to survive.

Some Hon. Members: — Hear, hear!

Mr. Smishek: — It is in this direction that we, as politicians, as governments, are called upon to set our priorities. But before we set our priorities we must examine the basic problems. What are they here in Saskatchewan and in Canada? Well, Mr. Speaker, as I see them, poverty is one of the key issues. The Economic Council of Canada in its Fifth Annual Review put it this way, and let me quote:

Poverty in Canada is real. Its numbers are not in the thousands but in the millions. There is more of it than our society can tolerate, more than our economy can afford and far more than existing measures and efforts can cope with. Its persistence at a time, when the bulk of Canadians enjoy one of the highest standards of living in the world, is a disgrace.

Some Hon. Members: — Hear, hear!

Mr. Smishek: — Mr. Speaker, the Minister of Welfare (Mr. MacDonald) told us last Monday that some 5 million Canadians exist on incomes below the poverty level. It means that one in every five, or one in every four, of our Canadian citizens is in this unfortunate and unenviable category. It means that in 1968 some 200,000 Saskatchewan residents were in this poverty group. So I ask what is there in this Throne Speech that is going to help these people? More private liquor outlets? Expanding air strip programs? Huge sums of money for highway programs? Removal of deficiencies in The Mechanics' Lien Act and other such items like the reform of the Legislative Rules? And I am not against that. The answer I come up with is No. These things are not going to help them.

I admit there is the announcement of increasing food and clothing allowances for welfare recipients but not all the poor are on social assistance.

An Hon. Member: — It's too hard to get!

Mr. Smishek: — Increasing welfare allowances does not require legislative action. It can be done at any time and should have been done several months ago.

Some Hon. Members: — Hear, hear!

Mr. Smishek: — Perhaps another handful will be helped. There is to be some adjustment made for superannuated civil servants and widows.

Mr. MacDougall (Souris Estevan): — Read faster!

Mr. Smishek: — Mr. Speaker, I looked at the Government's housing program. The \$500 grant to those who will construct homes in the winter months, is this going to help the poor? No. The truth is that the poor people cannot afford to build homes. And I also recall that the Federal Government had such a program. It sure didn't resolve the housing crisis in Canada. It was scrapped about a year and one-half ago. And who is going to be building homes when you can buy one now at a cheaper price than you can build and at a lower interest rate? Go down any street in any of our cities and look at the "For sale" signs.

But the 200,000 Saskatchewan poor — that was 1968. Since this Debate got started Members on both sides of the House have described in detail the plight of our farmers. They have made it clear to me — we have a new category of poor — they have satisfied me that at least half the Saskatchewan farmers are below the poverty income level established by the Economic Council of Canada. So I look again at the Throne Speech and re-read the agricultural section. I checked the Government's proposals made to the Federal-Provincial Conference on February 16 and 17 and I don't see anything here that is going to remove poverty from the doorsteps of thousands of our farm people.

The Premier (Mr. Thatcher) has spelled out the depressed conditions of the construction industry. This means that the majority of the 15,000 workers in this industry are faced with poverty, since many of them have not held jobs for most part of the year. Many of them have exhausted their unemployment insurance benefits. For example in 1968 there were 1,100 structural steel workers employed in Saskatchewan. Now less than 250 have jobs. Statistics show that at mid-January 7½ per cent of the non-agricultural labor force was unemployed or 18,000 workers. But the full story isn't revealed in these statistics since it does not include the Métis and Indian people who live on the Reserves. It does not include the people who are on partial employment, the thousands that have been placed on part-time employment since Christmas and whose incomes have been cut to a fraction of their regular pay cheque.

Add to this the hundreds of self-employed, the machinery dealers, the commission car salesmen, the corner store merchants, the small contractor who has not seen a full pay cheque for

months, and you start seeing the full dimension of poverty in Saskatchewan. There is more of it than we can tolerate. More than our economy can stand. It is a disgrace.

Some Hon. Members: — Hear, hear!

Mr. Smishek: — If there are those who doubt me then come to Regina North East. Maybe they don't wear tattered clothing but they are not clothed well. Maybe they are not starving but they are not getting enough to eat.

Let me take you to a mother whose son is 9 and daughter is 16. Come and let her tell you, as she told me last Monday evening as she cried, that for the last month her children eat only twice a day and very poorly at that. Come to Regina North East and I will take you to dozens of homes where you will witness poverty in true and living color. The Throne Speech does not come to grips with this number one problem of poverty our people are facing.

Everywhere you go people are expressing concern about pollution. Our environment has become dangerously unsafe. This thing called free enterprise has caused our air, land and water to become so poisoned, we are told, there is great danger of us throwing the whole balance of nature off kilter. Let us not be so naïve as to believe that because of lack of industry, sparse population and generally strong winds, this problem does not exist in Saskatchewan. Again I invite you to come to Regina North East. Come and smell the foul odors of the processing plants or oil refineries, the discoloration of homes caused by chemicals injected from processing and manufacturing plants, the dust and fumes that pour out only to fall back on us, the mercury and phosphate poisoning of our rivers and lakes because of inadequate or complete lack of sewage treatment facilities in our urban centres. Four years ago the Government passed The Air Pollution Control Act, appointed an advisory committee and then stopped dead. Well, perhaps, Mr. Speaker, I ought not to say "stopped dead" they did something. They relaxed the regulations making it possible for feedlot operators to locate closer to populated areas so that the people can have the full benefit of pollution.

Some Hon. Members: — Hear, hear!

Mr. Smishek: — What about land pollution? We are told by authorities there is enough DDT poisoning in Saskatchewan soil to outlast this generation and this century before it deoxidizes.

School children are aware of the problem. They are doing lab tests, writing essays, studying; they are concerned about the problem. Just the other day a group of grade eight students from Imperial school, located in my constituency, visited the Legislature. I met with them. The second question asked by a 13-year old boy was this: "Is this Government doing anything about pollution?" He knows the problem. He lives in North Regina. But this Government is oblivious. The Liberals in Ottawa are talking about it and doing nothing. The Liberals in Regina are just doing nothing about it.

Some Hon. Members: — Hear, hear!

Mr. Smishek: — Problem three — education. Authorities tell us our whole education system needs complete overhauling. The Liberals tell us they will give a little more money and then they go on to say and I quote: “And rigid controls on spending will be imposed.” They say they will give school boards more money, providing they reduce the number of teachers and increase the student-teacher ratio and reduce the courses offered to students. What the school boards are worried about is, if they don’t do what the Government tells them, they will not get the money; and if they do what the Government tells them, that is, reduce teachers and eliminate courses, then the Government will say, “You did such a fine job you don’t need the money.” They will be damned if they do and damned if they don’t.

I know the people are concerned about the cost of education. I know they are concerned about property taxes. I also know that in the city of Regina, Liberal candidates promised that a Liberal Government would pay 50 per cent of the education cost in Regina, the CCF Government paid only 40 per cent, but the Liberal Government last year paid less than 28 per cent, Mr. Speaker.

I also know that the people in Regina North East are very much concerned about a high school. I have told this Legislature before, students attending high school from North Regina have to catch buses as early as 7:15 in the morning and don’t return home until 5:30 in the evening. Transportation costs are high and recently we had a 25 per cent increase in the cost of student bus fares. As a result of the long distances travelled to school, other costs are increased, such as clothing, lunches and other things. If they lived in the country they would be provided with transportation, and the Province would contribute to the cost of such transportation, but because they live in the city the parents must pay the bill directly. No other area in the province with as large a population is less fortunate or more discriminated against. A citizens’ organization was formed last year. They have made representations and petitioned the Board of Education, the Separate School Board, the City Council, but so far have received no results. The local authorities see the need, but are faced with a serious economic problem, because of the failure of this Government to provide adequate operating and construction grants for education. The Premier, during his speech, said that \$1 million additional funds will be provided from the public works program for the construction of schools. Mr. Speaker, may I be the first to make a bid for some of this money so that a high school may be built in Regina North East. I said that the people are concerned about the cost of education. It is only one factor. There are also very many people concerned about the quality of education their children are and will be receiving. They want their children to be properly equipped in this age of super science and technology. Saving pennies today may mean both losing and spending millions tomorrow. I regret that the Throne Speech does not have a more positive approach to this total problem of education.

Problem four in my judgment is health. Much remains to be done to improve the quality and provide more health services to people. What about the hospital crisis the Government has created? How does it propose to make amends? The Throne Speech does not say. The words “health” and “hospitals” are not even mentioned. The Premier, speaking during the Throne Speech, quoted statistics to show that since his Government took office wages for hospital workers have been raised by 27.2 per cent.

He did not explain, however, that these figures include wage increases of management and professional employees and that this Government has a double standard when it comes to treatment of management and professional employees compared to the lay employees. The truth is that management and professional categories have received preferred larger increases than the lay staff. But, even if one were to accept the Premier's figures, it means that these increases are almost 10 per cent below average wage increases in Canada for the last five years. Certainly the cost-of-living in Saskatchewan is not lagging 10 per cent below that of Canada.

Mr. Speaker, perhaps even a more pertinent question to ask the Premier, since he has raised the hospital question. If wages to hospital employees have been increased by 27.2 per cent since the Liberals took office and since wages represent about 70 per cent of the operating costs of hospitals, how come the hospital administrative and operating costs have increased from \$48 million in 1964 to over \$81 in 1969? When deterrent fees are added, this means an increase of 69 per cent in the hospital costs. In this five and one-half-year period, hospitals have been closed, hospital beds have been closed, services have been reduced, benefits have been cut, per patient hospital stay reduced, hospital deficits incurred, and now municipal governments, Mr. Speaker, are told to finance hospital operating costs. The Government is attempting to change the Hospital Services Plan from one which paid all administrative and operating costs for insured services to a plan which pays grants towards operating costs, leaving the balance to be paid partly by the sick who require hospital care and partly by municipalities and religious orders. Mr. Speaker, I shall have much more to say and many more questions to ask on this topic later.

Some Hon. Members: — Hear, hear!

Mr. Smishek: — There is the matter of organizing, financing and improving the quality of health services, extending medicare to cover drugs, dental care, chiropractic care, improving services in sparsely populated areas. Not a word about these important problems in the Throne Speech. The truth, Mr. Speaker, is that neither the Liberals in Regina nor the Liberals in Ottawa believe in public health services. They only believe in wrecking them.

There is the question of rural and urban redevelopment and renewal. Mr. Speaker, 25 years ago there were some 140,000 farmers in Saskatchewan. The number has now been reduced to about 85,000 and the exodus continues. Some Ottawa bureaucrat told us recently there are at present 430,000 farmers in Canada. He said that at the present rate of attrition the number will be reduced to 300,000 by 1980. He then implied that the rate of attrition, by some deliberate means, ought to be accelerated so that the figure is reduced to 150,000. What he is really talking about is corporate farming. Mr. Speaker, I reject this notion, as I reject any idea that the people from our hamlets, villages and towns should be evacuated into larger communities, into cities. What we do not want is a displacement and an evacuation plan. We need a plan to strengthen economically and improve services for our rural communities, for our farm people. Building more and better roads is just not enough, important as it may be. Through government action we need to give them a solid economic base. We need to develop more parks, recreation and community centres, better education facilities, community

colleges, health centres. We need a redevelopment plan for the 1970s, beautification of rural Saskatchewan, a plan of new opportunities, Mr. Speaker.

Some Hon. Members: — Hear, hear!

Mr. Smishek: — Mr. Speaker, we also need an immediate plan for the '70s in our urban communities. I will admit that our problems are not as monstrous as those of major metropolitan cities. But, nevertheless, they are with us. Housing problems, transportation crisis, pollution, unemployment, high property taxes, overcrowding, lack of recreation facilities, education, are on the lips of every urban dweller. But this Government has no plan, no ideas. It has proposed nothing in the Throne Speech to deal with these problems.

The next question which I think is extremely important, Mr. Speaker, is the question of Canadian sovereignty. Several Government Members during this debate have said they hear talk of Western separatism. I attend a lot of meetings, meet a lot of people every day. I hear it on the news, I read it in the newspaper the odd time, but I really don't hear it from the people. The only separatism I hear about a great deal these days is, let's separate ourselves from this Liberal Government and the sooner the better.

Some Hon. Members: — Hear, hear!

Mr. Smishek: — The Premier talked a lot about Western alienation. Again I don't hear much about this. But what I do hear a lot about is people's concern about Canada's foreign domination, Mr. Speaker, foreign control of our resources and means of production; how prices of goods we buy are determined in the board rooms of foreign countries. This is the real concern, Mr. Speaker. We are told that two-thirds of our economy is now controlled by non-Canadian residents, mostly Americans. The Winnipeg Tribune, on January 3, reported the Hon. Ron Basford, Minister of Consumer and Corporate Affairs, as saying in the House of Commons and let me quote:

Foreign companies, since 1963, have taken over a total of 606 Canadian businesses, which come under Federal jurisdiction of the Combines Investigation Act.

There were 155 takeovers in 1968 and 102 in 1969. How many more have been taken over that don't come under the combines legislation? The takeover continues, day by day, one may say almost relentlessly. Now they want our water; tomorrow they may want our air, Mr. Speaker. No nation can pretend to be politically independent when so much of its economy is in the control of foreign hands, Mr. Speaker.

Some Hon. Members: — Hear, hear!

Mr. Smishek: — It is hard to believe that the Premier of Saskatchewan, a Canadian, would devote so much of his speech to the question of Eastern control and yet not say a word about the much more crucial question of foreign domination and foreign control. Mr. Speaker, if being a Canadian is to mean anything, Canada must belong to us.

Some Hon. Members: — Hear, hear!

Mr. Smishek: — Mr. Speaker, these I believe to be some of the priorities for this decade. These are the priorities that require Government attention: poverty, unemployment, the farm crisis, pollution, education, health, rural and urban redevelopment and renewal, Canadian sovereignty. It is shocking that basically the Throne Speech does not deal with these problems at all. It is so deficient, Mr. Speaker, that the Government private Members are embarrassed with it. The day after it was read they came to this Assembly, and several of them just about broke their legs jumping to their feet, presenting Resolutions, so that they would have something to talk about when they go home.

Mr. Speaker, I couldn't resist looking back at the 1960 Throne Speech to find how the CCF Government approached the new decade. What were the problems? What was the plan and what were the programs? What the CCF Government did to set the stage for challenging the '60s? What was 1960 like? I suggest to each Member that he read the Throne and Budget Speeches of 1960.

In 1960, like in 1970, Saskatchewan farmers faced depressed prices and markets. Unusually heavy fall rains and early snow in 1959 meant that farmers were unable to harvest their crops. There was a fodder shortage. It was worse than the fall of 1969. But did a CCF Government sit on its hands and cry to Ottawa? It is true we made strong representations to the Government of Canada, but without delay we introduced an emergency program. The CCF Government of the day introduced a plan of more than \$5 million in direct farm assistance. Fodder reserves accumulated by this Government were made available to farmers and freight assistance was offered. Special farm work and wage programs were introduced. The Municipalities Seed Grain and Supplies Act was announced. A Federal-Provincial system of acreage payments was introduced. Crop insurance legislation was enacted. Farm-electrification was completed. These were just some of the programs introduced to help the farmers.

The CCF, with its concern for people, and always desirous of making life more pleasant for people, in 1960 introduced a plan to bring water and sewage disposal facilities to farm homes, and introduced a program to assist towns and villages to install water and sewerage systems.

Industrial development was steaming ahead. The Department of Industry was established. The Municipal Industrial Development Corporation was brought into being. Electrical-generating capacity was increased; the Queen Elizabeth power station at Saskatoon was commissioned; the Boundary Dam generating station near Estevan became available for commercial use; construction was started on the first hydro-electric generating plan at Squaw Rapids. Natural gas extension programs were announced. Then there was the beginning of the multi-purpose South Saskatchewan River Development program. A new network of microwave facilities was planned. Mineral and crude oil production reached new heights; production of uranium, base metals and other minerals were at the record levels. Helium and new potash discoveries were announced. New industries, Mr. Speaker, new jobs for the people. A new program of regional park development was introduced. Mr. Speaker, despite the agricultural crisis in 1960, the CCF Government ensured the solvency of the overall economy. Capital investment remained at a record peak, manufacturing and

mining forged ahead, and retail trade climbed to an all-time high with broadened employment opportunities. Our population continued to grow, Mr. Speaker.

Some Hon. Members: — Hear, hear!

Mr. Smishek: — But that was not all. New human rights programs and social programs were introduced which had multiplying effects on the whole economy and the whole country. Treaty Indians were given the right to vote. Major law reforms were introduced protecting the rights of people and making it easier to secure justice. Minimum wages were increased. Workmen's compensation and welfare benefits were improved.

The Provincial Technical School at Moose Jaw was opened. Plans for the new Regina University Campus was initiated, improvements in the quality of education were announced.

Construction of regional mental hospitals was announced, new geriatric centres were started and the regional health service program was completed.

Mr. Speaker, perhaps the most significant of all of these was the announcement of the introduction of the public Medicare Plan, the first in North America.

Some Hon. Members: — Hear, hear!

Mr. Smishek: — Yes, Mr. Speaker, the CCF Government faced the '60s with a plan and with confidence. This Government on the other hand has no plan and lacks confidence in the people of Saskatchewan. This Throne Speech we are debating would be deficient in any other year, but to consider it in the light of our entering a new decade, one must describe it as bloodless and lifeless.

Some Hon. Members: — Hear, hear!

Mr. Smishek: — It offers no hope for the farmers, no consideration to the wage earners, no future for the young people, Mr. Speaker. It is a glaring example of this Government flying by the seat of its pants. It doesn't know where it is at and has no idea where it's going. Surely, Mr. Speaker, all the crises I have described earlier facing this province cannot be blamed on the loss of grain markets.

Take the exodus of public servants. Since the last session prorogued, every few weeks there have been announcements that some senior public employee is leaving the Government service. As we came closer to the opening of this Session it was impossible to keep track of the announced resignations; every few days another Deputy Minister was resigning.

The Director of Economic Development Board quit early last spring and then the whole branch was dissolved, the only overall research and planning branch of the Government. This branch came under the Premier's jurisdiction. His Director of Information Services resigned and now his executive assistant has quit. I don't know what is the cause but for some reason nobody wants to work for the Premier.

Mr. Speaker, you can't have a good government without proper research, advice and planning assistance of a strong public service. But like the people of Saskatchewan the Government employees have lost confidence in this Government and are leaving. You can't blame them. They have been the subjects of political abuse and persecution since 1964, wage freezes, increment increases denied, restrictive bargaining legislation. Mr. Speaker, under the CCF Government, Saskatchewan was noted for having the highest calibre public service in Canada.

Some Hon. Members: — Hear, hear!

Mr. Smishek: — Wages and benefits paid to Government and Crown corporation employees in 1964 were among the highest in Canada but now they are among the lowest, at a time when our cost of living is rising out of all proportion. These highly skilled people have no difficulty in obtaining jobs in other provinces. Saskatchewan people are the losers of all this. Don't blame the farm situation for these and other crises. Mr. Speaker, these people across the way have created the problem. They must assume the responsibility. For these and other reasons, Mr. Speaker, I shall support the amendment and I will oppose the motion.

Some Hon. Members: — Hear, hear!

Hon. Mr. Heald (Attorney General): — Mr. Speaker, my first words must be words of thanks to the Members of the Opposition, the gentlemen who sit to your left, for the courtesy and consideration they have shown me this afternoon. I hope at some future time to extend to them the same kind of courtesy and consideration.

I would like to join with other participants in this debate in expressing my most sincere congratulations to His Honour Dr. Worobetz, our new Lieutenant Governor. I am confident, as I am sure all of us are, that His Honour will add lustre, distinction and dignity to this high office. At the same time I would like to express my thanks and appreciation to the Honourable R.L. Hanbidge, our retiring Lieutenant Governor, for his very distinguished and dedicated performance during the seven years he was Lieutenant Governor in Saskatchewan.

Now, Mr. Speaker, for a few minutes this afternoon I would like to add a word or two of comment, if I might, on the performance in this Debate. First, I would like to make a general comment if I might on the Opposition performance. One of my impressions, a general impression, their insatiable and ever-present desire to return to power, for power's sake, not because they have any more answers than they had from 1944 to 1964, not because they have any genuine plan to lift our economy to greater heights or to alleviate the problems of our people, but what comes through in most of their speeches loud and clear, Mr. Speaker, is their almost indecent yearning for the Treasury Benches, perhaps to replace some other limousine socialists who have retreated in past years to healthier and warmer climes. Let me tell the Members of the Opposition that they will return to government only if and when they deserve it. So in the meantime . . .

Some Hon. Members: — Hear, hear!

Hon. Mr. Heald: — So you like that — in the

meantime I invite you, each and everyone of you to put aside your bitterness, your negative attitudes, resign from the wrecking crew, join the builders, and think positive . . .

Some Hon. Members: — Hear, hear!

Hon. Mr. Heald: — . . . act positive and help us over here to build a better Saskatchewan.

Some Hon. Members: — Hear, hear!

Hon. Mr. Heald: — Now the Member for The Battlefords (Mr. Kramer) yesterday, my good friend, the Member for The Battlefords, you know, Mr. Speaker, as he was speaking one of the Members over here was charting his course — we have a couple of cartoonists over here — one of our Members was charting his course in the form of an arrow, straight and true from the front benches to the boondocks at the back, under the balcony . . .

Some Hon. Members: — Hear, hear!

Hon. Mr. Heald: — No doubt about it after this debate, I'm sorry. He said he tried real hard for several days to think of anything good he could say about this Government. Well, Mr. Speaker, it doesn't really say very much for the Member's thought processes — perhaps I can assist him in this laborious exercise. I would like to remind him of three or four things that have happened fairly recently in his own constituency. If he didn't know about them, he should have. First of all the North Battleford cemetery fiasco occurred . . .

Mr. Kramer: — That's a dead issue.

Hon. Mr. Heald: — Yes, you'd like to forget it, you'd like to forget it occurred while you were a Member of the Treasury Benches, while you were a Member of the Government and Cabinet of this Province. \$33,343 it cost the taxpayers of this province to bail the people of The Battlefords out of this mess that you were involved in. Five hundred and eighty-six contract holders in your constituency paid for their contracts in full. You let this company go in there. They didn't comply with the civil laws of this province, they didn't comply with the moral dictates of any person who has respect for those who have gone before us. This Government had to bail the people of The Battlefords out from the mess that you left when you were a Member of the Treasury Benches. Mr. Speaker, this piece of legislation . . .

An Hon. Member: — Liberal . . .

Hon. Mr. Heald: — Mr. Speaker, I have all evening. If the Member will allow me to make my speech I will. He made his speech yesterday. I listened to him very patiently and I wish that he would extend the same courtesy to me if he will.

Yesterday he said that he didn't know anything good that had happened in The Battlefords. You know we passed a piece of legislation a couple of years ago known as The Criminal Injuries Compensation Act in this province. It was long overdue. The

Members who now sit to your left had 20 years in which to pass that kind of progressive legislation and they didn't do anything about it. I want to tell the Hon. Member that in the last three or four months, two members of the North Battleford city police, who were injured while doing their duty, applied to The Criminal Injuries Compensation Act and received awards. Now you ask them whether or not the Government of Saskatchewan has done anything for them in the last little while.

Another thing that I would like to remind the Hon. Member of is that when he was a Member of the Government it wasn't possible for a city the size of North Battleford to enter into a policing agreement with the RCMP. Through negotiations which we made in 1965 we were able to change rules and regulations. Now, I think, the people in North Battleford, if you talk to them, the mayor and the members of council, will tell you that they are very happy with the services of the RCMP which they have been able to obtain through the initiative of this Government in negotiating a better deal with Ottawa. So those are two or three things, Mr. Speaker. His constituents are grateful whether he is or not.

And then, Mr. Speaker, the Member for Regina North West (Mr. Whelan) the master of hearsay and innuendo. Once again 35 minutes of tiresome stories about what somebody, somewhere told him. This year 35 minutes about Kelvington. His stories, I suggest, were noted for what he didn't tell us. For example, the couple in Kelvington constituency – and he and I played ducks and drakes for two or three days – the couple in Kelvington who were absolutely convinced, Mr. Speaker, after a visit from the Hon. Member that, if Neil Byers was elected, utilization fees would be done away with the next day. That is the kind of impression that he left. No matter about the Government. Then, Mr. Speaker, he didn't tell us about British Columbia. I was like the Minister of Public Works (Mr. Guy) waiting with baited breath to hear of the thrilling adventures and the exciting exploits of the Member from Regina North West in the British Columbia general election campaign. I understand that he spent considerable time and effort working his campaign magic in that province. I have a message for him and his other colleagues who contributed so much to the Social Credit victory in British Columbia. The message comes from Members of the Social Credit Government and this is the message to the Member from Regina North West (Mr. Whelan) and those other Members who worked with him.

“Come again! We hope that you enjoyed your stay; we certainly did.”

Some Hon. Members: — Hear, hear!

Hon. Mr. Heald: — And then the Member for Regina North West thought I should tell my Lumsden constituents that I supported Pierre Elliott Trudeau for leadership of the Liberal party. I have never made any secret of this. I think that most of my constituents know it. You know, Mr. Speaker, the Member for Regina North West is at a disadvantage. He is a relative newcomer to the Province of Saskatchewan, from the Province of Ontario. He grew up in Ontario and he just doesn't understand the Saskatchewan people, particularly rural people. You know, Mr. Speaker, he doesn't realize that in Saskatchewan people are judged by their sincerity, their dedication to their given task

or job. And whether people always agree with a particular opinion or not, in rural Saskatchewan you are always given full marks for sincerity and hard work. Mr. Speaker, I am quite content to be judged by the voters of Lumsden on the basis of my representation of their interests, both in and out of this Legislature.

Mr. Speaker, I invite the Member for Regina North West to test his credibility and his record of public service with the electors of Lumsden at some appropriate time. And if he ever does this I invite him to tell them that he was against purple gas. It is interesting what he said about purple gas and I happen to have it here. Yes, Arthur was against it too. The fearless five, Mr. Speaker, five out of 59 that voted against purple gas. Here is what the Member for Regina North West said about purple gas. He said:

Let's do without purple gas.

And then later on in 1965 he said:

The thing that bothers me about this legislation is that I am worried, Mr. Speaker, because when you look at the results in Hanley, three years from now we are going to inherit this administrative nightmare.

He was talking then about winning the next election, just what he always talks about. The other thing that I would ask him to talk to the electors in Lumsden about when he comes out there, if he ever does, is to tell and remind them he was against Bill No. 2, The Essential Services Emergency Act, that he would in all likelihood – and I am making a prediction here but I am sure that I will be right – vote against the Resolution proposed by the Member for Notukeu-Willowbunch (Mr. Hooker) at this Session, which asks the Federal Government to invoke legislation similar to Bill No. 2 in respect of the Essential Services performed by dock workers in the movement of Prairie grain. He will vote against that.

And finally I would like him to tell my Lumsden constituents or any other rural constituents in this province that neither he nor his party to my knowledge have ever sent any telegrams or letters of protest to striking dockworkers over the past number of years, strikes, which have taken, Mr. Speaker, millions of dollars out of the pockets of the Prairie grain farmers. You tell the people in the country about that!

Now, Mr. Speaker, there have been many significant happenings since we last met and I know that the Members would like to applaud what I am going to say, so in a minute I am going to give them a chance to applaud. One of the most important things, probably the most important thing to everybody in this province, has to be the farm crisis. Just about every facet of this problem has been dealt with and tomorrow I expect to say something about this. But there was an instructive event that occurred last year in our neighboring province to the east. Now you can applaud in a minute. The election of an NDP Government. No applause? I say this was an instructive event, Mr. Speaker, for the people of Saskatchewan for a number of reasons. First of all it will serve as a reminder of what can happen when the forces of those that believe in democracy and freedom of enterprise and freedom of ownership, divide their efforts and split their vote at the poll. And secondly, Mr. Speaker, it will

remind us in this province every day of how the NDP act in office compared to how they talk out of office.

Some Hon. Members: — Hear, hear!

Hon. Mr. Heald: — The people of Saskatchewan had years of socialism. Then in 1964 they were fed up and threw you out, they had enough. That's six years ago and possibly the passage of time dims our memory. People tend to forget how really bad you were until the Schreyer Government came along. And now once again, Mr. Speaker, we see the NDP in action in government.

Hon. Mr. Thatcher: — Stagnation!

Hon. Mr. Heald: — You know it is a lot of fun these days, Mr. Speaker, to read the Winnipeg newspapers and do a bit of Schreyer watching. I must confess that I have been doing my share of this. I was interested particularly in the light of the speeches that we have heard from the Members opposite about what we should be doing about the farm crisis. What a Provincial Government can do, to read from the Winnipeg Free Press a quotation by a gentleman by the name of Mr. Uskiw. Mr. Uskiw is the Minister of Agriculture in the Schreyer Government. The headline says, "Government can do nothing." And I would like to quote:

Selling grain . . .

This is a man who has the responsibility of office and listen to what he has to say.

Selling grain is still a Federal problem and there is little a Province can do about it, Agriculture Minister Samuel Uskiw said Tuesday in the Manitoba Legislature.

You should read that.

And then I come to part of a headline, a very interesting headline of January 8. "Cass-Beggs Hydro's new chairman." Very, very interesting indeed. \$45,000 a year as chairman of the Manitoba hydro! The news report says that Mr. Cass-Beggs was only appointed for six months because he was getting leave of absence from some position that he had in Ottawa. However, the Western Producer isn't quite so charitable. The Western Producer, Mr. Speaker, in speaking about this appointment of Cass-Beggs states this:

Mr. Cass-Beggs, former head of the Saskatchewan Power Corporation, has been given a six-months' leave of absence from the Science Secretariat at Ottawa. However, in Ottawa sources close to the Science Secretariat said Cass-Beggs six-months' leave of absence was designed to enable him to retreat if there was much political wrath raised by his appointment.

And it appears there will be, so he sort of put his foot in the water to see how the temperature was and then he could always pull back.

And then there is another very interesting article, Mr. Speaker. And in light of the comments yesterday by the Member for Turtleford (Mr. Wooff) about liquor outlets, I think that I

will send this over to him after I have finished with it. It is the Winnipeg Free Press, December 3, 1969 and is headed:

New liquor boss quits as NDP chief.

Now this is really a hot one.

The new chairman of the Manitoba Liquor Commission has resigned as Provincial President of the New Democratic party. In an interview, Monday, Frank Syms said that politics did have some bearing on his appointment to the Liquor Commission.

And then he goes on to say:

Although acknowledging that his political stripe might have had something to do with the appointment, he said 'I am quite confident that my ability and experience also had something to do with it.' As well as being president of the Provincial party Mr. Syms was president of the Springfield constituency when Premier Schreyer was a Federal MP, in fact, Mr. Schreyer acted as his campaign manager when he ran for the NDP in 1963.

And he said:

Back on the topic of what part politics played in his appointment to the post, Mr. Syms said: 'Sure it had some bearing. But as I mentioned about the Premier and the Attorney General, we have been friends for some years and this would have been so had it not involved politics.'

And this is the best of the whole thing. Save the best to the last.

Mr. Syms said that he firmly believes that he would have been appointed to the Commission if he had been president of the Liberal party, rather than the New Democrats.

What a dreamer! And then while we are still on the Manitoba Liquor Commission, Mr. Speaker, an article also from the Winnipeg Free Press and it is entitled, "Holier than thou" and I will quote from it.

It is regrettable that Premier Schreyer has seen fit to inject political patronage into the appointment of members of the Manitoba Liquor Commission and the Manitoba Licensing Board. Six of the seven new appointees named last week are members of the NDP.

One other little touch in the Free Press of January 28, 1970:

Government stationery used for NDP messages. A Provincial Cabinet Minister has been using Government stationery for distributing New Democratic party material to his constituents with the official five-cent postage meter of the Provincial Government.

Mr. Speaker, another event occurred in Winnipeg a few months ago that was also quite instructive for everybody in Saskatchewan. I refer to the NDP National Convention. The NDP National Convention witnessed the emergence of a new political doctrine known as the Watkins Manifesto now better known as the Waffle

Manifesto. I would like to draw your attention, Mr. Speaker, to a little family journal that seems to find its place on the streets of Regina from time to time. I am sure that it is well known to the Members opposite. The article here, and it is a January issue:

Waffles organized.

The Prairie Fire. Yes, you know all about it. Your friends run it. Here is what the Prairie Fire says about the Watkins Manifesto:

About 35 per cent of the delegates to the convention supported the Waffle Manifesto.

And listen to this:

About half of the Saskatchewan delegates took this side on the vote. The Manifesto demands that NDP policies and programs be based on six basic principles.

I am not going to deal with them all, but I am going to deal with two or three. First of all, this is the flag of the Leader of the Opposition (Mr. Lloyd) and at least half of the delegation that he took to Winnipeg. This is their new belief, this is their new bible.

1. Canadian society cannot really fulfil basic human needs so long as it is capitalist. Canadian capitalism must be replaced by the public ownership and control of the whole economy.

Now the next one and this is an interesting one:

2. Quebec has its own language culture and aspirations. Many of the leaders of the Liberation Movement in Quebec want to create a Socialist Quebec.

3. If we are going to build a socialist society we must build socialism in all the organizations of our communities. We must recognize the present limitations of parliament, limitations of voting and established political parties.

Now this is the part that really gets me:

We must be willing to make extra-parliamentary activity a major part of our movement.

Please note, Mr. Speaker, that half of the Saskatchewan delegates, including the Leader of the Opposition, supported this manifesto which says that Canadian capitalism must be replaced by public ownership and control of the economy – everything which supports the separatist movement in Quebec and says that we must build socialism in all the organizations of our communities. Does this mean socialism in the churches? Socialism in the service clubs? Socialism in the sporting and athletic organizations? Socialism in our school boards? Our municipalities, our city councils? It makes you think, doesn't it? And then again:

We must recognize the present limitations of Parliament and voting. We must be willing to make extra-parliamentary activity a major part of our movements.

So, Mr. Speaker, this is the new Waffle socialism of the Leader of the Opposition and his delegation. After you have read this and you have this background, this curious game of musical chairs amongst the Members opposite begins to make sense. Why, after so many years of faithful service to their party, their constituency and their province, are the Members for Turtleford (Mr. Wooff) and Melfort-Tisdale (Mr. Willis), who has gone home as he couldn't hear back there anyway, moved from their place of honor and distinction to the very back row under the balcony? Why is the Member for Prince Albert East-Cumberland (Mr. Berezowsky) one of the most dedicated and hard-working and best-liked Members of this House . . .

Some Hon. Members: — Hear, hear!

Hon. Mr. Heald: — . . . removed from his place of honor to a lesser place? Why was the Mayor of Regina leap-frogged over by three first-termers? Imagine, a serious contender, Mr. Speaker, for the national leadership of your party and you demean and belittle him in this manner. Shame on you! Why, Mr. Speaker? I'll tell you why. Because for some time there has been developing amongst the Members opposite and the party opposite a split, a rift, and a power play. There has been a power struggle going on between the old guard, the Members of the old CCF, moderates on the one hand and the new left on the other hand. The new left, the trade union bosses, the activists, the NDY and the proponents of the Waffle Manifesto, and this split and this rift became crystallized at the Winnipeg Convention. The division and the dissension are now so wide that it makes the Grand Canyon look like Wascana Creek. And so we observe some Members of the old guard publicly humiliated for all to see in this place and elsewhere.

Another thing becomes clear. I remind you of objective six in the Manifesto, "We must be willing to make extra-parliamentary activity a major part of our movement." Extra-parliamentary activity — demonstrations, strikes, picketing and so on. These activists are now engaging in the politics of confrontation and controversy, demonstration and disorder. Stir up the students, stir up the farmers, stir up the hospital workers, picket, placard and protest. It is interesting how some of the Members opposite arrange to be present at most of these demonstrations. Is this the extra-parliamentary activity recommended by the Waffle Manifesto? What other kind of extra-parliamentary activity are we witnessing by the activists who sit to your left and by their friends and financial backers in some trade unions?

Well, most activists start by attacking existing institutions such as our courts. Raise doubts about the integrity and objectivity and the impartiality of our judges. In this connection, I would like to refer you to the vicious attack by Mr. Gordon Quale, Saskatchewan representative of CUPE and Lloyd Jacobson, general vice-president of CUPE, on one of the distinguished members of the Magistrate's Court of this Province, His Honour Judge Flynn of Moose Jaw. These union spokesmen conveniently forgot that, in at least 25 cases in the past, they the trade unions, had shown their confidence in Judge Flynn by asking for his appointment as chairman of a conciliation or arbitration board. They also conveniently overlooked the fact that the Prince Albert hospital award was a unanimous award. Their own nominee on the board came to the same conclusion as the judge and the hospital nominee. And yet, because they

didn't get what they wanted, they engaged in personal vilification and abuse.

Mr. Speaker, since these scurrilous and scandalous statements were made last month I have expected some of the Members opposite to publicly condemn these statements. I have expected and do still expect at least the Member for Regina Centre (Mr. Blakeney), who is resting his eyes, and the Member for Saskatoon Riversdale (Mr. Romanow) to get up and condemn this kind of nonsense. Stand up and be counted and disassociate yourself from this slander.

Mr. Speaker, a few minutes ago I quoted from the *Prairie Fire*. In that same issue there appears one of the most disgusting and libelous articles that I have ever read and because it defames . . .

Mr. Blakeney: — Sue the *Prairie Fire*.

Hon. Mr. Heald: — Sue what? Because it defames, libels and unfairly attacks many of my Lumsden constituents, along with the Premier of this Province, I want to deal with it for a minute.

First of all it is the little article by Mr. Mitchell, "Orderly marketing undermined." And here is what it says:

The infraction involved the failure by the farmers involved to record grain sales to Ferguson's Feed Mill.

Then it goes on:

The seizure of the permit books in Drinkwater is also interesting because Ross Thatcher was among those caught with his fingers in the cookie jar.

And then further on:

In the Drinkwater case the farmers who were trading with Ferguson's Feed Mill were part of an illegal operation in grain trade.

Mr. Speaker, these people broke no law. These farmers broke no law. The Premier broke no law. They had every right to sell this feed to Ferguson's. "An illegal operation in grain trade," nonsense. I say that Ross Thatcher and these farmers have done nothing wrong and the *Prairie Fire* owes them an unconditional apology and retraction. Of course the farmers could sue the newspaper, but of course there wouldn't be much point in this because I don't suppose the paper has any assets.

I think, perhaps, you people have more influence with the editors of the *Prairie Fire* than anybody over here and I wish that you would pass on the message.

Some Hon. Members: — Hear, hear!

Hon. Mr. Heald: — Mr. Speaker, a few minutes ago, I mentioned personal vilification and abuse. Well, of course, Mr. Speaker, it is well known that some of the Members who sit to your left are experts at personal vilification and abuse, and as in the past their attack centres again on the Premier. The Member for Moose

Jaw North (Mr. Snyder) was at it the other day inferring that nobody in Ottawa could get along with our Premier. Well, I suspect that much of the Member's information comes from the Saskatchewan Mafia as they are called in Ottawa, socialist bureaucrats who worked for the Socialists here in Saskatchewan before 1964. It is not surprising that they would have few kind words for our Premier.

Mr. Speaker, the Premier said in this Debate and other Members of the Government have said on many occasions that we will disagree with the Federal Government every time the interests of the people of Saskatchewan make it necessary for us to do so, and we will do this with all the energy and initiative at our disposal.

Some Hon. Members: — Hear, hear!

Hon. Mr. Heald: — Mr. Speaker, one more minute and then I am going to ask leave to adjourn the Debate. What is the real reason for the Socialist attack on the Premier? Most people know the reason. It is because Premier Thatcher is now acknowledged, both in Ottawa and across the country, as the unchallenged leader of Western hopes and aspirations.

Some Hon. Members: — Hear, hear!

Hon. Mr. Heald: — Our Premier's words and actions at Federal Conferences, his forceful and articulate statement of Western needs, have clearly marked him as the Number One Western spokesman. And this, of course, is most disturbing to our Socialist friends, so they snipe and they sneer in a vain attempt to alter the image of Ross Thatcher as a fighter for the rights of Saskatchewan and Western people.

Debate adjourned.

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