

LEGISLATIVE ASSEMBLY OF SASKATCHEWAN
Third Session — Sixteenth Legislature
9th Day

Thursday, February 26, 1970.

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

WELCOME TO STUDENTS

Mr. Speaker: — I wish to introduce the following groups of students in the galleries to the Members of the Legislature. From the Henry Kelsey school 82 students from Saskatoon, from the Saskatoon constituency of Saskatoon Mayfair, represented by its Member, Mr. Brockelbank. They are in the east gallery under the direction of their teachers, Mr. Lukowich and Mrs. Peterson. Forty-four students from the Elrose composite high school from the constituency of Elrose represented by Mr. Leith. They are in the Speaker's gallery under the direction of their teacher, Mr. Housen, the principal; 92 students from O'Neill high school, in Regina North West, represented by Mr. E. Whelan. They are under the direction of their teacher, Mr. Berezny in the west gallery; 33 students from McLeod school in the constituency of Regina South West, represented by their Member, Mr. D.M. McPherson, under the direction of their teacher, Mr. Sewell; 29 students from St. Luke school from Regina Centre, represented by the Member from Regina Centre, Mr. Blakeney, under the direction of their teacher, Mr. Joerissen; 72 students from King George school, Saskatoon, from the constituency of Saskatoon-Riversdale, represented by their Member, Mr. Romanow, under the direction of their teachers, Mr. Zip and Mr. Schellenberg. I am sure all Members wish to join with me in extending to each and every one of them a very warm welcome to the Legislature of the Province of Saskatchewan and trust that their stay here will be enjoyable and informative and to wish them all a very safe trip home.

Hon. Members: — Hear, hear!

Mr. Speaker: — While I am on my feet, in connection with those who are in the galleries, we have had one of the most terrific loads of students passing through these galleries that we have ever had in any session in my memory, and I am informed that there are others who wish also to sit in the galleries and are waiting outside. I wonder if some of the children perhaps might make their stay just a little brief in order that others may get in, if that is the case.

STATEMENT

FAIR ACCOMMODATION PRACTICES ACT

Hon. Mr. Heald (Attorney General): — Before the Orders of the Day I have a statement that I would like to read to the House. Late yesterday I received a form of complaint requesting an inquiry under The Fair Accommodation Practices Act. The complaint has to do with an alleged incident on Friday, February 20th, last, in the waiting room area of the Greyhound bus depot at North Battleford, Saskatchewan. The complaint alleges discrimination because of race

and, if established, is contrary to Section 3 of The Fair Accommodation Practices Act. Under Section 5 of the Act I have the authority to require the officer designated for such purposes by the Lieutenant Governor in Council to inquire into such complaints. The officer designated by the Lieutenant Governor in Council under this Act is Mr. J.G. Gary Lane, my executive assistant and a law officer in my Department. I have instructed Mr. Lane to conduct the inquiry permitted under Section 5 of the Act immediately. Mr. Lane is already on his way to North Battleford to commence inquiry. Mr. Lane has been directed pursuant to Section 5, subsection (3) to forthwith inquire into the complaint and to endeavor to effect a settlement of the matter complained of and report the results of his inquiry and endeavors to me, pursuant to the provisions of subsection (4) of Section 5.

Hon. Mr. Thatcher (Premier): — Mr. Speaker, several months ago . . .

Mr. Speaker: — Order, order! The Member has made a statement and I think the Member on this side of the House wishes to comment on it.

Mr. Kramer (The Battlefords): — Mr. Speaker, I would like to ask the Minister in Charge of the Saskatchewan Transportation Company if he has at any time recently or at any time given any instruction as to accommodation in public waiting rooms in our bus depots throughout Saskatchewan, regardless of this particular incident or not. What are the instructions, if any, given by the Minister and have there been any recently?

Hon. Mr. McIsaac (Minister of Education): — Mr. Speaker, there are no particular instructions, nothing that has been issued recently. In this case of course the SPC does not own or operate the bus depot in North Battleford, but there have been no special instructions pursuant to this or prior to it.

ANNOUNCEMENT

CIVIL SERVICE WAGE AGREEMENT

Hon. Mr. Thatcher (Premier): — Several weeks ago the Saskatchewan Government Employees Association asked for a conciliation board, to help settle their wage contract with the Government of Saskatchewan. As Hon. Members know a board was accordingly set up in accordance with an order made by the Minister of Labour (Mr. Coderre) on the 27th of January. I wish to announce that the conciliation board has today brought down a unanimous report. In essence the board has recommended an average wage settlement of 5.8 per cent for the current year, October, 1969 to October, 1970. It has also recommended an across-the-board settlement for the second year, October 1970 to October, 1971 of five per cent. On behalf of the Government I wish to accept the recommendations of the conciliation board. If the union is also agreeable, we shall be prepared to implement the recommendations at the earliest possible moment. May I say, Mr. Speaker, in view of the current economic crisis in Saskatchewan that we feel the report is fair both to the union and to the taxpayers.

QUESTIONS

PUBLIC WAITING ROOMS IN BUS DEPOTS

Mr. Lloyd (Leader of the Opposition): — Mr. Speaker, my supplementary question arose out of the Minister's answer. He indicated that the Crown corporation doesn't operate the bus depots but they are by way of contract with him, I take it. Therefore does not the corporation assume some of the responsibility for the use or the regulations regarding the use of them?

Hon. Mr. McIsaac: — Yes, I suppose that could be said, Mr. Speaker. In this case as I understand it we have a contract with the Greyhound. It's a lady by the name of Mrs. Crookshank, I believe, who operates this particular bus depot. Her husband died just last fall apparently. But I understand from a report that I received just before the House opened here that our driver was acting at the request of the lady proprietor of the bus depot.

EMPTY BEDS IN GREY NUNS' HOSPITAL

Mr. Whelan (Regina North West): — Mr. Speaker, I would like to direct a question to the Hon. Minister of Public Health (Mr. Grant). Constituents of mine who are very ill and anxious to obtain a hospital bed advise that 20 per cent or more of the bed capacity in the Grey Nuns' Hospital are unoccupied because of the shortage of funds. Since the Hon. Minister is now planning his expenditures in this area, can he tell us when we can expect the empty beds in the Grey Nuns' Hospital will be made available to the sick.

Hon. Mr. Grant (Minister of Public Health): — Mr. Speaker, I am not aware that there are 20 per cent vacancies in the Grey Nuns' Hospital. There are always vacant beds at a hospital of this type depending on the particular specialty. As the Hon. Member realizes, depending on your ailment determines which part of the hospital you must be hospitalized in. I can assure him that this is a matter of determination of the hospital board and not my Department and it is not being done at the suggestion of the Department whatsoever. It is entirely up to the hospital to determine how many beds they should have open.

ADJOURNED DEBATES

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).

Hon. Mr. Heald (Attorney General): — Mr. Speaker, before adjournment yesterday we had an interesting discussion, I thought, about a couple of developments in the New Democratic party in the last year. I said it was instructive to see the NDP in action in Manitoba, how one of the limousine Socialists of yesteryear, David Cass-Beggs,

was now comfortably installed by the new NDP Government of Manitoba as head of their Power Corporation at \$45,000 a year. I reflected on the appointment of the Provincial President of the Manitoba NDP as head of the Manitoba Liquor Commission at \$17,500 a year, and the fact that the Schreyer Government had fired the whole seven-member Liquor Commission, a commission that everybody agreed, as is the case in Saskatchewan of course, was non-political, and replaced them with a whole new board, six out of seven of whom were card-carrying and are card-carrying members of the New Democratic party. Of course, I brought to the attention of Hon. Members one of the statements of the Minister of Agriculture in Manitoba which was particularly illuminating in view of the comments of Hon. Members who sit to your left, Mr. Speaker, about what a Provincial Government should be doing with respect to the farm cash crisis. Of course, you will all remember the headline in the Winnipeg Free Press, "Government can do nothing - Uskiw". Mr. Uskiw is the NDP Minister of Agriculture in Manitoba and he said and I quote:

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

Having to do with the many appointments made by the new Government in Manitoba, one wit was prompted to observe a new slogan for the '70s in this country; the slogan went something like this: Old Socialists never die they just move Manitoba way. That seems to be the trend these days. Then I also expressed concern over the Watkins Manifesto supported by the Leader of the Opposition (Mr. Lloyd) and at least one-half of the Saskatchewan delegation to the National NDP Convention in Winnipeg. This Manifesto which advocates complete socialism of everything in our economy, socialism in all the organizations in our community, the churches, the schools, the town councils, the sporting groups and so on; this Manifesto which says, this Watkins Manifesto, this Waffle Manifesto, which says that there are limitations on Parliament and voting and advocates extra parliamentary activity. Extra-parliamentary activity, Mr. Speaker. What is extra parliamentary activity? Stir up the students, stir up the farmers, stir up the hospital workers, picket, placard and protest, led by the Member from Regina North East (Mr. Smishek) in most cases. Is this the new politics of the 1970s of the NDP, Mr. Speaker?

And then we had an interesting discussion about the Prairie Fire and I asked my hon. friends opposite, who are much more friendly with the editors of the Prairie Fire than I am, to pass on a few words of comment that I had about the Prairie Fire. And then I find a very interesting thing, a very interesting little publication that came to my desk. As a matter of fact it was brought to me by a very irate parent, a parent of a grade nine student at Sheldon-Williams Collegiate in the city of Regina. Apparently some person or persons unknown are giving out his little scandal sheet known as the Plain Wrapper. I was very interested to know who published this little paper. There is nothing on the paper, of course, about who it is published by. It says, "Published occasionally," and then it says, "When tyranny is law, revolution is order," and then it advertises the new cafe that is apparently going to open pretty soon in Regina called The Red Nest, very appropriately named. The interesting thing about this, I am told, is that this little

paper is published by the same people who publish the Prairie Fire. They send this garbage around to the grade nine and ten students, certainly in the city of Regina. While you are giving the message that I gave you yesterday to the editors of the Prairie Fire . . .

An Hon. Member: — . . . news stands.

Hon. Mr. Heald: — Not this one on the news stands. No, not this one, they would be ashamed of this one; they wouldn't put this one on the news stand. Anyway when you are telling your friends on the Prairie Fire about the things they put in that paper, give them the word that most of the parents of grade nine students in the city of Regina don't want their students having this kind of garbage, and I am going to table it, this kind of garbage in the schools of this city and this province.

Some Hon. Members: — Hear, hear!

Hon. Mr. Heald: — Mr. Speaker, I indicated during my remarks yesterday that I would have something to say on the cash crisis that has struck our province due, in the main, to lagging grain export sales. This crisis has struck our farmers but not only our farmers. It has struck every segment of our economy. In Saskatchewan, Mr. Speaker, when the farmer has no money nobody else has very much. And so for many months now we have witnessed a chain reaction — the farmers, the machine dealers, the fuel dealers, the merchants, just about everybody in the economy.

When I was in Ottawa last May with my deputy, Mr. Meldrum, he and I discussed the whole matter of debt moratorium legislation with the Hon. Ron Basford, Federal Minister of Corporate and Consumer Affairs. We indicated to him that, if the prairie cash crisis continued to worsen, it might be necessary for our Government to ask the Federal Government for intervention. We received a most sympathetic hearing from Mr. Basford and a later indication from him that, before the Federal Government could consider such legislation, there would have to be a request for such legislation from at least the three Prairie Governments. Now most Hon. Members will know that under the Constitution of Canada, any truly effective debt moratorium legislation must be Federal legislation. Many Members will remember The Farmers' Creditors Arrangement Act passed during the 1930s. This was effective debt reduction and effective debt moratorium legislation and it was, of course, Federal legislation. You will remember also the efforts of the Governments of Alberta and Saskatchewan of that day to pass debt moratorium legislation of their own and that the courts held this legislation to be beyond the powers of a Province. In the light of the view of the Federal Government as expressed to us by Mr. Basford, the Government of Saskatchewan decided to approach the Governments of Manitoba and Alberta for support in the matter of a common approach to Ottawa for legislation if, as and when circumstances required it. Accordingly, our Premier raised the matter in September with Premiers Strom and Schreyer at a meeting of the Prairie Economic Council. It was indicated by these two Provinces that the farm cash crisis in their provinces had not at that time, in any event, reached the proportions where they felt they would be justified in joining with us to ask for Federal legislation. Since that time I have discussed that matter with Mr. Basford and the Hon. Otto Lang

who has interested himself in a most active way in this whole matter. I can assure this House and the people of Saskatchewan that we are watching this situation on an active and a daily basis, as is our Federal Minister; and if circumstances indicate that Federal legislation is necessary and indicated, we will take the necessary action.

Now what else have we done? In October of last year, the Premier, the Minister of Agriculture (Mr. McFarlane) and myself had a number of meetings with the officers and executive of the Saskatchewan Implement Dealers Association. At that time we were made aware of the difficulties that some machine dealers were having and their concern about being able to meet their legal obligations to their companies. Following these meetings and at the direction of the Premier, I held a series of meetings with senior representatives of the machine companies themselves – top executives from Toronto and from various parts of the country – individual and separate meetings with the representatives of each company. At each of these meetings I made very clear the great concern of the Government of Saskatchewan at any action on their part which would result in machinery dealers being forced to the wall through no fault of their own. I also expressed equal concern at any policy which would result in machinery repossessions from farmers, who were behind in their payments through no fault of their own and while having mountains of unsold grain on their farms. Mr. Speaker, without exception, I received the assurance of cooperation and forbearance from these companies in these difficult times. In these discussions I learned that the percentage of failures amongst machinery dealers was no higher in 1969 than in previous years. I also learned that the number of machinery repossessions from farmers was about the same in 1969 as in previous years.

In the past few months, I have had occasion to inquire about machinery repossessions of some of these companies. I haven't had too many complaints but I have had some inquiries and I have investigated each and every case. I have found in most cases, Mr. Speaker, that the delinquent debtors have had a history of delinquent payments over other years even in better times. Without exception, I have found the companies willing to take a second look and in some cases to grant further extensions of time to the farmer. While I am talking about repossessions of farm machinery, I would like all of our farmers to know what protection they have under present Saskatchewan law.

When a machine company wants to repossess a farm machine, where they hold a conditional sale agreement as a security, a particular type of security, a conditional sale agreement, they have to give the farmer 30 days' notice of intention to repossess. During that 30-day period the farmer can apply to the nearest District Court Judge for a hearing. During that hearing the Judge will look into all the circumstances of the case. The Judge has the power to stop the machine company from repossessing and selling the machine if he thinks the circumstances warrant it. Now this is some protection to a farmer, but he needs more and this Government is going to give him more at this Session.

The present law has two glaring shortcomings and I am surprised that my friends opposite who were the Government for 20 years didn't correct these glaring deficiencies during the time they were in office. First the present law doesn't cover all machinery that was bought on time. That's the first thing

that's wrong with it; it doesn't cover it all. You will note that I said earlier that the only deals covered by this legislation were where the farmer had given a conditional sale agreement as security. There are many, many farm machinery deals these days where the farmer gives a chattel mortgage, not a conditional sale agreement as security. These people who give chattel mortgages are not protected under the present law. Mr. Speaker, I will soon introduce amendments to The Limitation of Civil Rights Act which will extend the protection of this Act to all farm machinery time purchases.

There is another area where the present law doesn't give our farmers sufficient protection. A practice has grown up amongst machine companies where they give the 30-day notice of repossession to a farmer in arrears, not really intending to repossess at that time but hoping, by serving the notice, to get the farmer to make another payment. Frequently this is the case, this works. The farmer makes the payment; in some cases he really makes a new deal with the company with a new schedule of payments and may carry on with those payments for two or three years without default. Then, perhaps three or four years later, through no fault of his own – maybe he is into 1970 with no wheat sales – he defaults on his payments. I want you to note this, Mr. Speaker. Under the present law, there is no requirement for a new 30-day notice of repossession to the farmer. Under the present law, the machine company can rely on the notice served three or four years ago, walk in and repossess and sell without any new notice to the farmer. And what is even worse, in these circumstances, that I have just described, the farmer has lost his right to apply to the Judge for a hearing. Now that is a glaring deficiency, I suggest, Mr. Speaker, and that is going to be changed by these amendments which I have indicated.

Some Hon. Members: — Hear, hear!

Hon. Mr. Heald: — We will ensure that every farmer will have a chance to be protected from unfair repossessions where all direct efforts at settlement with the company have failed. We will be doing something else. We will be streamlining and simplifying the procedures so that, when a farmer gets a notice of repossession, the notice will spell out loud and clear in simple language his right to ask the Judge for a hearing. All he will have to do is to remove or tear off from the bottom of the repossession notice a request for a hearing, sign it and send it to the Clerk of the Court at the nearest judicial centre. The Clerk will then arrange with the Judge for a hearing date and both the machine company and the farmer will be notified by the Clerk of the date and place set for the hearing.

Mr. Speaker, as I said earlier, I have every confidence that in most cases the machine companies will act responsibly and reasonably in this crisis. But if they don't, after these amendments are passed, our farmers will have a simple, quick and relatively inexpensive means to protect themselves.

I have been talking about machinery repossessions. I want to turn now to land foreclosures and cancellations. First, I would like to mention my fellow veterans who may have farm loans under The Veterans' Land Act. We have recently been in touch with VLA officials. We are told that VLA are not putting

any undue pressure on veterans. We are also told that in the last six months VLA has been making farm machinery debts. In these cases the interest rate for the additional new loan is the same as the veteran's rate on his original loan. This is a very useful and beneficial program in these difficult times and I recommend it to veteran farmers who are having cash problems.

Let me now mention another Federal Government agency in the farm loan business. I refer to the Farm Credit Corporation. We made inquiries of the Saskatchewan office of Farm Credit. We were told that 86 per cent of all loans were in good standing, that the other 14 per cent were part of a year behind or at the most a year behind. We were also told that persons having difficulty meeting their payments should not hesitate to contact Farm Credit and explain their position in detail and arrange for deferred payments. It is suggested particularly that those farmers who presently have Farm Credit contracts or those who had them in the past might find this special new loan program very useful indeed. We have been assured, Mr. Speaker, by the Farm Credit officials that they will lean over backwards to assist farmers with their problems during these troubled times.

Now what about foreclosures and cancellations generally? We have been watching this situation very closely. At the moment we are satisfied that the number of foreclosures and cancellations are about normal; there is no significant increase in numbers compared with earlier years. We have asked for and have received the cooperation of most creditors who hold mortgages and agreements for sale. We have made it very clear to these people – and I make it clear today – we expect their forbearance in these difficult times. This week I had a meeting with some insurance people, insurance company managers who have mortgages in this province and I received their assurance that they would not commence action where two situations prevail: (a) where the security is ample and the mortgagor's equity is substantial and (b) where the debtor's problems are caused almost entirely by current grain marketing conditions, either directly or indirectly. Now, of course, as most Hon. Members know, our people do have protection now under The Land Contracts Action Act. In the case of mortgages and agreements for sale, excepting CMHC mortgages and Farm Credit mortgages and some corporate mortgages, there has to be an application to a Judge for leave to commence foreclosure or cancellation proceedings. The Judge looks at all the circumstances and has the power to protect the debtor where in his opinion the debtor is entitled to it.

Mr. Speaker, the Provincial Mediation Board with headquarters at the Court House in Regina continues to do an effective job of debt counselling and debt consolidations for our people. Each Sheriff in each judicial centre in our province is a representative of our Provincial Mediation Board and is available to render assistance and advice on debt matters to the people in his area. A year ago, our debt adjustment and debt counselling services were enlarged and improved with the proclamation in Saskatchewan of the Federal Orderly Payment of Debts Act. These provisions have one serious shortcoming, however, Mr. Speaker. There is a ceiling of \$1,000 on the debts that can be covered by this scheme. Representations have been made to the Federal Minister to have this ceiling removed. There is a good chance of this happening soon, and when it does this legislation will do a much better job in assisting those people who need debt consolidation.

Mr. Speaker, as I close, I want to pay tribute to our farmers and our businessmen and our people generally who are experiencing so many difficulties, frustrations and disappointments, as they struggle to keep their heads above water in these difficult times. Thanks to their initiative and their determination, most of them, with the cooperation of their creditors, are getting by. I want them to know that, in these difficult times, they will have the ear of this Government and the determination of this Government to assist them as much as possible. Mr. Speaker, because the Throne Speech contains effective remedial legislation for our hard-pressed people, because it is a positive document, because it is a realistic document for Saskatchewan 1970, I will support the Speech from the Throne. I will support the motion and I will vote against the amendment.

Some Hon. Members: — Hear, hear!

Mr. Weatherald (Cannington): — Mr. Speaker, today it is my privilege and pleasure to have an opportunity to take part in this Throne Speech Debate. I would of course like to congratulate the new Lieutenant Governor. I know that we all look forward to his tenure and I am sure that he will do a tremendous job as did his predecessor.

Mr. Speaker, I would also like to express my congratulations to our Member for Elrose (Mr. Leith) and our Member for Hanley (Mr. Heggie) who did well researched and well documented speeches in supporting the Throne Speech.

Mr. Speaker, I also want to congratulate the new Member of this Legislature for Kelvington (Mr. Byers). I must admit that I . . .

Some Hon. Members: — Hear, hear!

Mr. Weatherald: — . . . did everything possible to try and prevent him from gaining a seat here, but failing to be very effective in that regard and failing to get the results which I was after, I want to express my best wishes to him. I am sure that he will do a fine job of representing his constituency.

Some Hon. Members: — Hear, hear!

Mr. Weatherald: — Mr. Speaker, I now want to turn to a few matters that have always been of great interest to me and I think that are of interest to an increasing number of people in this province and this country. I am talking about conservation and land utilization because I am convinced that scarcely has there been a time in our history that these particular items have been of more importance in the Province of Saskatchewan. The question that we are all facing ourselves is: how can we best use the abundant agricultural land which we have been blessed with here in this province? And in this regard, I want to make a few comments later on Government policy, but I first would like to start with a few assumptions.

The first one I am convinced, Mr. Speaker, is that we will be able to produce more grain products than we can sell or give away for a considerable number of years, basically

because countries are moving towards more self-sufficiency and other countries are moving to an increasing amount of population control. I think it is very interesting and well worth noting by our farmers in this province and indeed in Western Canada that the United States now has about a minimum of 48 million acres in the soil bank which they can neither grow hay or pasture livestock on. I think this is an indication that we are reaching a point of having an increasing amount of land but apparently there is no product which we can obtain a market for.

However, Mr. Speaker, tourism is our third largest resource, an increasingly important resource to Saskatchewan, and I am absolutely convinced can be greatly expanded if given the opportunity. Tourists come to Saskatchewan primarily as hunters, fishermen, and they come to our outdoors to take the pleasure of our regional provincial parks. However, Mr. Speaker, both provincial and federal of all political persuasions have simply not been given enough attention to preserving our land resources to develop a viable tourist industry and conserve these resources. We drastically need more policies to add to our national and our provincial park systems which have not been increased in recent years. Governments generally have always taken a look at a few fast dollars by clearing and draining all of the water. The fish and wildlife, scenic beauty, have never had an economic value placed on directly. It seems also, Mr. Speaker, that these recreational items will continue to grow as the affluence of our population continues to grow. We need more research and study into the potential demands for outdoor recreation and the resources required to meet these.

Mr. Speaker, I want to now turn to a few specific policies that I must say I am not very happy about in the least, and they cut across all political parties and all governments. First of all to bring to your attention what I think to be an absolutely ridiculous situation, I want to call to your attention two clippings which I picked from The Leader Post, January 6, 1970 edition. On one page, Mr. Speaker, we had in an item by the Economic Council of Canada suggesting that farmers in this country should reduce their acreage by about 10 million acres. Some of this they suggested could be diverted to grass. But even after this was done we should still have a surplus of grain land which we did not have a particular market for. But, Mr. Speaker, on another page in the very same edition, in the January 6th issue of The Leader Post, 1970, I came across a release from the Provincial Department of Agriculture which glowingly said that approximately 16,000 acres of newly cleared land in 1969 was put into the community pasture program, that another 1,800 acres of bush had been cleared for forage production, and that it is anticipated that additional clearing will be done this winter. I quote that from the paper. Mr. Speaker, here surely is an example of a situation in which Government policy has not taken account of the actual situation facing us. The same situation prevails in the Manitoba Interlake region where there are vast amounts of land being cleared and brought into production. In Alberta in the Peace River area the Government there still has a policy of promoting home study for farmers, when all of us know that most of us who are farmers today are having difficulty enough making land without increasing the number of farmers in the business. Community pastures, Mr. Speaker, are good projects but there is absolutely no reason whatsoever that the money that we are spending to clear and

open up new land could not be used to give grants to farmers to take some of their own land out of production or, failing this, could be used to buy up present land that is used in grain production and convert into community pastures.

Some Hon. Members: — Hear, hear!

Mr. Weatherald: — I want to stress, Mr. Speaker, that if there is one thing that we don't need in this country it is more new agricultural land. I am not anti-American by any means, in fact, I have always been convinced that they are the best friends that we have. But surely there is more and more evidence that we are making identical mistakes that they have made for about the last 50 years.

I want to come to a specific project which I might add makes me absolutely hostile every time I look at it, and this is the land-clearing that is taking place on the White Bear Indian Reserve in my constituency. I visited this area over the past two years and as recently as about 10 days ago I covered the whole area once more. About 5,000 acres of what is the only major forest area in all Southern Saskatchewan has been cleared in this area. I want to recognize the fact that this is the Indians' land and it is their right to do what they like with it. It is also equally recognizable that this agreement signed in 1963 with the Federal Government has, Mr. Speaker, had the Federal Government spend \$270,000 in development of this pasture, \$270,000 to clear over 5,000 acres of heavy bush that is right up to and adjoining the Moose Mountain Provincial Park. There isn't a stick or a tree hardly standing in the whole area. The effect that it will have on Carlyle Lake needless to say could be very disastrous. Despite my opposition over a four-year period, I must confess that I have had little if any effect on stopping the project. I am more hopeful now that there is 1,200 acres of bush left on this reserve. It may still be left standing. I would not even care, Mr. Speaker, were it that the Indian people would get a significant economic contribution from this. But, according to my calculation, this pasture at full production of over 9,000 acres and 3,000 head of livestock will only return to the Indian people something in the neighborhood of \$7,000 to \$8,000. The effects on this area and the effects on this recreational resource will only be determined in the next few years. The area now, Mr. Speaker, undoubtedly has lost one of its tremendous potentials for recreational use. What makes it even less palatable is the wide-spread recognition that we now have too much agricultural land in production, and we have just begun bringing more into production that was not required. The money could have equally been spent, Mr. Speaker, on buying grain production land to be made into a community pasture.

I want to say a few words about another project — the Cumberland River Delta, one of the last great marshes in North America.

Some Hon. Members: — Hear, hear!

Mr. Weatherald: — It is an expensive project to bring into production and on The Pas side it has been proven to be disastrous. The Manitoba Government years ago cleared their area, and farming in that area has proved to be anything but successful. I think

that we should take a very careful look before more money is spent on this project as its recreational potential for the future far outweighs any need for more agricultural land.

Mr. Speaker, I do want to say that there is a slight glimmer of hope on the horizon and that is, that this year, after the Department of Natural Resources has made a study of land in the southeastern part of Saskatchewan, 216 quarter sections of this land was turned over to the Department of Natural Resources for administration. What this means, Mr. Speaker, is that the present leases with farmers will remain unchanged and therefore can be used for the purposes of grazing. However, this land will not be sold and therefore it will not be drained or cleared.

Mr. Speaker, in conjunction with what I had said previously about the White Bear Indian Reserve, I would like to table a map for those Members who are interested to take a look to see the situation as it now stands.

Mr. Speaker, frequently we hear from economists and experts in this country that our standard of living is 20 per cent below the American standards. While this may be true if you want to measure it in terms of exact dollars, I for one have never been convinced that a person living on a net income of say \$4,000 a year in the city of Chicago would be as well off as a person living on \$4,000 net income in a small town in Saskatchewan or in one of our cities. And the reason is obvious, we have many recreational things that a person can do regardless of his income. Our regional parks, our outdoors are all things that require very little income but add a great deal to the quality of life. You simply cannot put a dollar and cents figure on many of these items. However, if we are intending to preserve such things, Mr. Speaker, it is increasingly obvious that we will have to do more to preserve them. The Public, I am thinking, Mr. Speaker, simply has to become more informed and to put more pressure on all levels of government to adopt policies that are going to preserve these natural resources and this natural heritage for the people that come after us.

Some Hon. Members: — Hear, hear!

Mr. Weatherald: — Mr. Speaker, I have been very critical of government action. Some of it was aimed at a government which I belong to and I am proud to belong to as well. But it is a speech which I think can be applicable to any government in this country today. It has not been a partisan speech nor was it intended to be one, because when I look at Alberta, Saskatchewan or Manitoba, with all three different governments, Mr. Speaker, I find a common denominator of all following similar practices. What is needed is a new public awareness of the value of many of our natural resources preserved in their natural state. The facts are that time is growing very short and that we haven't got too much longer, if we continue to drain and ruin many of the resources such as trees and water which we still possess, and which most people know is scanty enough in this prairie area of Saskatchewan, Alberta and Manitoba. As I said previously, Mr. Speaker, at the outset I am bringing this to the attention of Members of the Legislature, only because it has always been something which I have been particularly interested in. I don't believe it to be a particularly political issue but I do think that it is something which many people in 25 or 30 years will say has been very important.

Mr. Speaker, I completely support the Speech from the Throne and I would like to conclude my remarks by saying that I hope that if nothing else I have increased the public awareness on what I think is a very important question.

Some Hon. Members: — Hear, hear!

Mr. Berezowsky (Prince Albert East-Cumberland): — Mr. Speaker, may I first of all before I go into my introduction say that the speech I have just heard has been the best speech from the other side of the House today.

Some Hon. Members: — Hear, hear!

Mr. Berezowsky: — I would also like to say that I was shocked and surprised at what I heard from the Attorney General (Mr. Heald) because yesterday and this afternoon he has been talking about Manitoba and everything except what this Government should be doing. When he did get eventually into the problem of agricultural difficulties, all he could tell us that he has been talking about the debt moratorium that should be in effect today but so far it has done nothing about it. Mr. Speaker, if I bleed it is from sorrow at what I have heard.

Mr. Speaker, once again I have the pleasure of congratulating you on your obvious good health and on seeing you in authority, guiding the Sixteenth Legislature in dignity and decorum during its deliberations.

I am delighted to recognize the appointment of Dr. Stephen Worobetz to the highest estate of office in this province. His Honour as you know is of Ukrainian ethnic origin, as I am and will undoubtedly carry out and uphold the traditions of democracy which we are so used to in this country, this beloved land of ours.

Mr. Speaker, I doubt if I can continue in view of a bleeding nose. Even when I bleed I don't like to give up.

Some Hon. Members: — Hear, hear!

Mr. Berezowsky: — Mr. Speaker, I join with other Members . . .

Mr. Speaker: — Order, order! If the Member isn't feeling well I think by courtesy the House will be more than willing to make an arrangement whereby the Member could take part in the debate at a later time.

Mr. Berezowsky: — I think, Mr. Speaker, I can continue.

Mr. Speaker, I also join with other Members in wishing our former Lieutenant Governor, Mr. Robert Hanbidge, a most gracious and respected gentleman, a pleasant retirement. His excellent relationship with members of this House will long be remembered and we wish him well.

Mr. Speaker, I am proud to have represented Prince Albert East-Cumberland constituency for some 18 years now and I can

say that there are no finer people anywhere. Firstly, you have the native Métis people centred in Cumberland House, Deschambault, Montreal Lake and other northern points. Not only have these people been making an important contribution in production of primary wealth, as in trapping and in fishing, but they have as well stood out as hospitable and able and hardy northerners. At our annual festivals at Prince Albert and The Pas, these people have shown their stamina, their attributes and abilities in the outdoors. These people, Mr. Speaker, are mainly descendants of Courier Debois, Scotch explorers and Indian mothers and I am very proud of them. Others in the constituency, Mr. Speaker, are people from Europe and Eastern Canada, Ukrainians, French, German, Norwegians, Poles and others. These labor in our mines of Creighton and other places and in the forests north of Prince Albert. Most of them settled 50 or more years ago in a virtual wilderness, cleared the land and made the virgin soil produce wealth for Canada, for our country. And their contributions stand out in the professions and other occupations. The appointment of Dr. Worobetz recognizes the work of all our ethnic pioneers and I thank the Prime Minister of Canada for making that recognition.

Some Hon. Members: — Hear, hear!

Mr. Berezowsky: — But today I want particularly to honor the people of Cumberland House in another way. It is that community which brought forth one of the toughest and outstanding boxers of Canada and I am speaking of one Charlie Belanger. Charlie Belanger was a Métis, born at Cumberland House, Saskatchewan, in 1901. He was the son of Horace Belanger, a factor of the Hudson Bay Company. And Pierre Carriere and other members of the Carriere family, whom many of us know, are related to this outstanding professional boxer. In 12 years Charlie made \$300,000 from fighting. He turned professional in 1926 when he was only 25 years of age. He fought for the next 13 years and didn't retire until he was 38. It is said that he was one of the busiest ring men in the game. He fought and defeated Tommy Farr in England, as well as Harry Dillon, who was one of the top boxers of his age. This man's story, this man from Cumberland House, is a good one. He depicted a life from poverty to success, of a courageous and tough native of my constituency and of the Province of Saskatchewan. Sadly to say, Charlie died on January 20th of this year. He would have been 69 years of age on February 15, Mr. Speaker.

I congratulate my colleague, Neil Byers, MLA for Kelvington. He has already indicated in this House that he will make a valuable contribution in the governing of the Province of Saskatchewan.

Some Hon. Members: — Hear, hear!

Mr. Berezowsky: — Now the mover and the seconder carefully and sincerely struggled with the Speech in Reply. It would have been a difficult job for anyone in this House to do justice to such an anaemic, meaningless, prosaic and election-motivated document. No wonder neither they nor the Premier discussed to date the contents of this morbid excuse for a Liberal program. It really must have taken some special expert brains to concoct such an impotent and empty Liberal valedictory. Obviously and understandably this Thatcher Government has tailored one more

election program of petty promises and bribes, promises for everyone, but, Mr. Speaker, essentially nothing for anyone.

Some Hon. Members: — Hear, hear!

Mr. Berezowsky: — This Government in its empty Throne Speech has no answers to the Liberal man-made depression. And I suggest, Mr. Speaker, that the headlines of this Speech should have been “Poverty, hunger, unemployment, bankruptcy, dictatorship and disillusionment in Saskatchewan.”

Some Hon. Members: — Hear, hear!

Mr. Berezowsky: — Mr. Speaker, the welfare and freedoms of our people come first and other things can only be secondary, yet what this Liberal Government has given us in the Throne Speech is only secondary, not first.

It is true to say that our Province of Saskatchewan is in the clutches of a man-made Liberal depression. Liberal-oriented policies have been destroying everything that we, the Socialists, if you like, have built so long and so well. Our Saskatchewan people are now angry and resentful at their loss of incomes, loss of freedoms and opportunities, because, in spite of piles of wheat, many farmers cannot obtain cash or loans to purchase bare essentials. There is a shortage of work opportunities for our labor force and many are forced to enter the relief ranks. And even in cases where Government jobs are available, I am sad to say – and the Government knows it – that one has to pass the test of acid Liberal policing by specially appointed heelers in Government offices.

Some Hon. Members: — Hear, hear!

Mr. Berezowsky: — Many low income people such as hospital employees are subject to the hard dictatorial arm of this Government and they have had to accept wages decided by this tyrannical Premier.

Now I must ask the Government a few questions. Does this Government mention in its Throne Speech how it proposes to solve the tragic agricultural situation? It does not. Does this Government mention the 7.5 per cent unemployment story and indicate how the distress will be corrected? No, it does not. Does this Liberal Government realize that there is a general exodus of our people out of Saskatchewan and what is it doing about it? It doesn't seem to care. Does this Government tell us how or when high taxes will be reduced as has been promised over the years? No, we were just told the other day that the taxes will go up. Does this Government have a program to end industrial stagnation? Indeed, nothing. Does this Government propose to alleviate the economic difficulties of our people, such as having a debt moratorium on interest and principal such as having a debt moratorium on interest and principal declared at least for the current year? All we hear is the Attorney General (Mr. Heald) telling us that he is talking about it. There is nothing, Mr. Speaker, proposed in the Speech to control the high cost of living. There is no hope of removal of medical and hospital deterrents and hospitalization fees assessed by the Liberal Government against the poor and the sick. There is no promise of assistance to the many students who undoubtedly will need funds next year or next fall to go to

university, because lacking income there is nothing.

This Government may back down only on the farm fuel tax which is unfairly assessed because we are putting pressure on it and because there may be an election.

But the vicious Essential Services Bill which it imposed and which interferes with basic human rights has no such promise of being removed.

I'll say this, Mr. Speaker. There is no economic hope for the Saskatchewan people and no social justice in evidence for the struggling rank and file. And instead of the 80,000 jobs, instead of migration to Saskatchewan, we find tens of thousands of people fleeing this Thatcher, free-enterprise Saskatchewan paradise.

Mr. Speaker, I'll leave other things I want to say to the next debate. In the meantime I will just say this, that above all it is most essential that this Government and the Government of Ottawa inject at least \$200 million of cash into the province, to this provincial economy, so that we can find our feet once again and move towards better things. Failing to do so we will only increase the misery and the poverty and the starvation which virtually does exist in many communities of our province, and I know whereof I speak. Mr. Speaker, as I have said, I have many more things to say but I am slightly incapacitated and I will hope to say these things in the next debate. In the meantime I cannot voice confidence in the Government and I am going to support the amendment.

Some Hon. Members: — Hear, hear!

Mr. Messer (Kelsey): — Mr. Speaker, I want to say here and now that I want first of all to alternate the congratulations I was going to pay to some of the people that all of us have paid tribute to at this Session. The Member for Prince Albert East-Cumberland (Mr. Berezowsky), in spite of his difficulties from a bleeding nose, gave a very, very good and commendable talk in regard to his philosophies, his idealism and his fighting for those ideals.

Some Hon. Members: — Hear, hear!

Mr. Messer: — Mr. Speaker, I want to congratulate the Lieutenant Governor, Dr. Stephen Worobetz, along with the rest of my colleagues on his appointment to that most important position. At the same time I want to extend my best wishes and good health to the retiring Lieutenant Governor, Mr. Hanbidge.

In extending congratulations there should also be good wishes extended to the mover and seconder of the Address-in-Reply to the Throne Speech. It is my understanding that it is a considerable honor to have the opportunity to do so.

I also, Mr. Speaker, want at this time to extend congratulations to our new Member from Kelvington. His contribution to this House I am sure will be considerable.

I now, Mr. Speaker, want to remark just briefly on several of the statements that were made by the Hon. Attorney General

(Mr. Heald). His association or attempted association of the New Democratic party with the two periodicals that he made reference to, in particular the *Prairie Fire* and the *Plain Wrapper*, two periodicals which I, as a New Democratic Member, have never had the opportunity of ever even reading, should be one of considerable shame for that Member.

Some Hon. Members: — Hear, hear!

Mr. Messer: — I say that especially because of his position in this Government . . .

Some Hon. Members: — Hear, hear!

Mr. Messer: — . . . His remarks in regard to agriculture in this province and the feeble attempts of the present Liberal Government in regard to the alleviation of some of the problems that farmers are confronted with in Saskatchewan, I suggest, are a complete failure. In fact the only real significant point that he made concerned The Limitations Act in regard to civil rights, which I am not very knowledgeable of as a layman. He said that there were two areas where repossession of farm machinery could be carried through if machine dealers or companies chose to take action, and he is going to correct those. The simple truth of this matter is, Mr. Speaker, that under the former CCF New Democratic party we never had the conditions where repossessions were being carried out in the province as they are now.

Now, I want before I go into the main content of my speech, to congratulate the Member from Cannington, Mr. Weatherald, in regard to a very well constructed speech. He mentioned conservation and development and it certainly is a problem in the Province of Saskatchewan today. He mentioned that in spite of that this Government still continues to clear land for future farming needs, when we are in a situation of over-production.

I can only be critical of him in several areas. One in his remarks when he made the statement was to the effect that we can now grow more food than we can either sell or give away is not a truth. The millions of starving people that are in this world at the present day could consume the over-production that we have in a matter of months.

Now, Mr. Speaker, in the last few days there has been an extensive campaign of criticism in regard to the Wheat Board. I can only ask: could it be that there is indeed a deliberate movement toward the elimination of the Canadian Wheat Board? It seems that campaign of increasing momentum is reaching a crescendo of total destruction for the Wheat Board. This movement started last year with the pressure for reduction in grain-pricing policy — opting out of the International Grains Arrangement. Mr. Speaker, that campaign started from the Government of Saskatchewan, here in the spring session last year. There has been an ever increasing disrespect and criticism of the movement of feed grain, without orderly protection or safeguard for farmers. There has been criticism in regard to the bartering that actually does nothing for actual grain movement. Indeed it lessens the overall effectiveness of Canadian sales.

Federal-Provincial friction in regard to Wheat Board

regulations is creating an atmosphere of confusion for Prairie grain producers. There are strong voices for price reductions in order to compete, which mean nothing without subsidies. An example is the barley sales that France makes to Japan with subsidies in excess of \$1. Unless a subsidy program is incorporated with our pricing structure or a suggested pricing structure of decreasing prices, we cannot compete. There is also pressure for total movement of rapeseed, which would only take away the effect of supply and demand, by putting large quantities of rapeseed on the market at one time to enable importing countries to stockpile, thereby driving the future prices down. The enforcement of outmoded regulations, if indeed the regulations do restrict the giving of gristed grain to allegedly starving Northern Indian and Métis, is another move in soliciting support from the general public in order to scuttle the Wheat Board under false pretenses.

Why do I say this, Mr. Speaker? Because this legislation, if it is indeed applicable, constitutes violations in many areas, areas such as feed grains for tuition fees, grains for construction of curling rinks, grains for construction of skating rinks. I see no difference in farmers giving grain to allegedly starving Indians than The Leader Post sponsoring a program of barley for overseas food program. These regulations should have in the past received the same restrictive enforcement. As they did not, one can only assume that they were not of a major enough issue in order to draw criticism from the general public.

Suggested sales to Romania of some 200 million bushels and the delegation from this Provincial Government to Winnipeg to encourage that sale, because supposedly the Wheat Board was not taking any action, is further evidence of unfounded interference with Wheat Board operations. The fact, is, Mr. Speaker, Charles Gibbings of the Wheat Board is now in Bucharest, Romania, with a Wheat Board delegation trying to negotiate a sale with that country.

Some Hon. Members: — Hear, hear!

Mr. Messer: — The question is price. I say that if this sale is lost, it will be because of the interference of the Saskatchewan Government in its delegation to Winnipeg . . .

Some Hon. Members: — Hear, hear!

Mr. Messer: — . . . and its more increasingly obvious efforts to destroy orderly marketings of prairie grains.

Some Hon. Members: — Hear, hear!

Mr. Messer: — If this sale is lost, this Government led by Premier Thatcher and any other groups that are amalgamated with this coup to overthrow and eliminate the Wheat Board will have cost the Prairie farmers in excess of \$300 million which very well could be the deciding factor which affords the means for continuation of Saskatchewan farmers.

Now, Mr. Speaker, I think this Government should be commended in this particular Throne Speech for its recognition

that agriculture continues to be the founding industry in the Province of Saskatchewan. It should further be commended for recognizing that farmers have expanded in their technology and ability to administer and operate an industry in a province that has been able to yield bumper crops in spite of some climatic conditions that have been to their detriment, also for its observation that there have been major reductions in incomes of the farming people of Saskatchewan due to drastic declines in export sales and the reduction in prices of grain, particularly over the last year.

But that, Mr. Speaker, is the end of the commendations that I can bring to the present Government of Saskatchewan. Due to its recognition and admission of the serious situation in the Province of Saskatchewan, which is outlined in the Throne Speech, every Member in this Assembly, not only on the Opposition side, but on the Government side should be thoroughly ashamed and highly critical of what followed in that Throne Speech.

Some Hon. Members: — Hear, hear!

Mr. Messer: — I say this because there is no real, positive, meaningful, or enlightening legislation aimed at the solving of problems that are confronting the Saskatchewan farmer today. This Government, Mr. Speaker, that some years ago was prophesying a Saskatchewan that would be booming and a Saskatchewan that would be a ‘have’ province instead of a ‘have not’ province, has been able to do nothing but worsen the conditions that the people of this province are suffering under.

Some Hon. Members: — Hear, hear!

Mr. Messer: — Admittedly this Government has recognized the problems, but it has not taken, nor does it give an indication of taking, action towards a solution. I think it unfortunate, but we have to give it credit for having had the opportunity to take office in this province when the economy was on an upsurge and was, in fact, booming. But in the years that followed, we, the people of Saskatchewan, could see a trend developing which ultimately led to the present circumstances of suppression and depression. Granted that we were somewhat buoyant in the 1960s, shortly after the Liberal party took office, but let’s just briefly look at what was beginning to happen in 1969.

We found the farmers of Saskatchewan trying to dig themselves out from under a bumper crop of tough and damp grain with absolutely no assistance from the Saskatchewan Government, no assistance, that is, Mr. Speaker, until at the last session of the Legislature, when the New Democratic Opposition embarrassed it to at least making some meagre offers of assistance.

Some Hon. Members: — Hear, hear!

Mr. Messer: — By his ability, fortitude and persistence, the Saskatchewan farmer was able to bail himself out of that serious situation, but only to be confronted with a steady decline in markets for his produce. It was not uncommon, Mr. Speaker, to read headlines in the paper in the early spring of 1969, stating, “Wheat prices cut by two cents.” This article stated that the

Canadian Wheat Board, which last week announced its intentions to offer wheat below minimum prices set by the International Grains Arrangement, did so Tuesday by cutting prices of its top three grades, followed by headlines entitled, "Wheat prices cut again," meaning further reductions in income to the farmers, followed by headlines again entitled, "Wheat prices cut again." This article stated that the Canadian Wheat Board announced new cuts in export prices, the second major reduction in eight days. This was followed by headlines again, "Third wheat price cut in two weeks". This article stated that effective immediately the prices of all lower grades of grain were to be cut drastically. But this was not all that the farmer of Saskatchewan was to be confronted with in regard to disappointment in the liability of his enterprise.

On March 28th, 1969, headlines in the paper announced, "Final wheat payment 12.4 cents average". This meant a direct reduction of some 20 cents a bushel across the board for the Western Grain farmers in comparison to the payment that they received the year previous. Consequently, Mr. Speaker, the farmers of Saskatchewan in the 1960s saw themselves reach a peak of relative affluence only to be subjected to a series of circumstances that set them on a downward trend towards hardship and poverty.

Now, Mr. Speaker, we are in the 1970s. We are according to many in a new era. We in the Western world have conquered space, we have walked on the moon, we have transplanted hearts and other vital organs in the body so that we may prolong life. In the last decade we have progressed scientifically and technologically more than man has ever progressed before, putting us supposedly in the position of being the most sophisticated and advanced generation ever to inhabit the earth. We have, in short, Mr. Speaker, become the most affluent, humanitarian, benevolent, prosperous race, bathed in luxury, to inhabit this planet. But somehow, Mr. Speaker, this does not seem to apply to the Province of Saskatchewan, not only because of the happenings during the late 1960s but because of the continuing problems that are facing the people of Saskatchewan in 1970. Particularly in agriculture many significant questions have to be asked and answered. Will we continue to have inflation? Where will technology and basic research take us? How will agriculture be financed? Will we be able to move the produce that we grow? Will farm organizations unite? Will agriculture's political voice and influence continue to fade?

In Saskatchewan, along with the problems that these questions identify themselves with, we find that our economic conditions are worsening. The papers of the province tell us that lack of wheat sales has hit the stores severely in the communities of Saskatchewan. I have an article here from the Tisdale Recorder, entitled, "Council to take firm action in business licence collection."

Registered letters will go forward from the town office this week to those business places who have not as yet made payment of their first instalment of the 1970 business licence.

The 32 businesses will be advised that, if payment is not made before February 20, summonses will be served for court appearances for operating their businesses contrary to the town licence bylaw.

It goes on to say:

According to information presented to committee by the Administrator, 32 businesses for a total of \$9,695.55. This year marks the first instance since the introduction of the licensing bylaw has been brought in.

This means, Mr. Speaker, that these people are definitely in economic trouble.

The machine dealers in the province inform us that it is highly probable that their dealerships will be reduced by 50 per cent unless some rigorous changes take place in regard to the income of farmers. Net income in Saskatchewan has been estimated to have dropped from the relatively affluent years past of \$125 per farmer per week to some \$72 per week per farmer.

The Government opposite should be giving its attention to solving these problems, instead of trying to levy untruths on people of Saskatchewan that the conditions would be worse under a New Democratic Government.

Some Hon. Members: — Hear, hear!

Mr. Messer: — I take particular exception to statements made in this Assembly by the Premier and others of his colleagues in regard to New Democratic party advocacy of state ownership of land.

I want to bring to its attention and the Members opposite, especially the Premier, who has stated this as our policy, an article in The Leader Post of Monday, July 14, 1969. This article quotes, "New Democratic party turns down state ownership of land." It goes on to say that Saskatchewan New Democratic party Saturday balked at the concept of state ownership of farm land. It went on to say that the New Democratic party called for assistance to young farmers, through a Crown corporation if necessary, to acquire land and either lease or sell it to farmers with uneconomic units.

Some Hon. Members: — Hear, hear!

Mr. Messer: — It also further suggested the rights for farmers to bargain collectively for their incomes. This is proof positive of the accusations that are made by the Members opposite that have absolutely no foundation or truth in them.

The Premier and again several other Members of this Assembly made the comment in regard to a supposed stand that I had taken at the last Provincial Convention in Saskatoon in regard to cash payments. This is again an example of the twisting of facts and the half-truths that the Premier of this Province thrives on. For the information of the Members opposite, I would like to refer to The Leader Post dated July 11, 1969, in regard to my position on cash payments. I stated and I quote:

He said there is animosity by non-farmers towards such acreage payments and that they are not of much help anyway to the small farmer. It would be better to have pre-payment for grain and payment for storage of farm grain. If other measures approved by the panel were adopted by governments, there would be no need for acreage payments.

This simply meant, Mr. Speaker, that my position was that, if the Provincial and Federal Governments would launch a realistic and a long-term program in regard to agriculture, thereby giving farmers a fair and reasonable return for their produce in regard to cost of production, cash payments would not have to be made.

Some Hon. Members: — Hear, hear!

Mr. Messer: — If the Provincial and Federal Governments were not prepared to launch a policy along these lines, then cash payments would be necessary in order to maintain and stabilize the agricultural industry. Due to the negligence and the lack of foresight of this Provincial Government and its Federal counterparts in launching such a policy, I thereby move and I give full support to a cash injection of some \$200 million to the farmers of Saskatchewan.

Some Hon. Members: — Hear, hear!

Mr. Messer: — The proposals made by the Premier at the recent Federal-Provincial Conference certainly are not new proposals in regard to solving some of the problems which agriculture is confronted with in this Province. Of those 11 points which he proposed eight have been long-time proposals and policies of the New Democratic party.

Some Hon. Members: — Hear, hear!

Mr. Messer: — In spite of the Premier being happy about the Conference, and that his proposals would solve the problems of the Saskatchewan farmers, there is very little ground for the farmers of Saskatchewan to be happy. Mr. Speaker, one would have reasonable and justifiable ground to expect some solutions in this Throne Speech in regard to the problems that the farmers of Saskatchewan are encountering. But what does the Throne Speech do for the agricultural industry in Saskatchewan outside of merely recognizing it? Well, very little if anything. All that is offered is a diversification program.

This Government in offering only a program of diversification is either ignorant or unresponsive to the total problem that is confronting Saskatchewan agriculture. I am certain that at the outset it should know that not all farms in Saskatchewan can diversify nor is it realistic to have every farmer in the Province of Saskatchewan in a diversified enterprise. Diversification, which is good to an extent, loses all of its advantages unless some projections have been done in regard to the number that livestock can be increased by before a price reduction is suffered by those involved in that industry. In this regard, the Premier and his Cabinet, his Government and his colleagues in Ottawa are as negligent now as they were in the mid-1960s when they were promoting the increased production of wheat. That encouragement for increased production of wheat, with no relation to future market developments and trends, was one of the major factors contributing to the depressed agricultural climate that we have here today.

Some Hon. Members: — Hear, hear!

Mr. Messer: — The same people, Mr. Speaker, in the Province of Saskatchewan are now telling the farmers to diversify without any realistic projection in regard to what the province can stand in regard to increased numbers of hogs, cattle and other livestock. One thing that the program has done has driven the cost of breeding stock beyond the margin of allowing an ultimate net profit, unless abnormally high prices persist in the future.

Even if extensive research was done in regard to predicting with some accuracy the potential of the industry in the Province of Saskatchewan, there should have been some safeguards in regard to warding off the fantastic increase in this breeder and feeder stock. There should have been a program of guaranteed floor prices for this livestock if the unforeseen should happen, and the price of pork and beef fell to a much reduced finished price. This would have given some stability and assurance to the expanding or new producer, so that he would be able to see his way clear towards meeting the obligations that he had incurred.

Indeed the people of Saskatchewan had justifiable reason to be expecting more from the Throne Speech in regard to agriculture than what was made in its offer. The seriousness of the feed-grain situation and the bootlegging problem within the Province of Saskatchewan and the statements and actions made by the Premier and his colleagues from Cabinet led many people to assume that there would be some action taken in regard to easing this problem. When the Premier demanded the halt of seizure of quota books by the Canadian Wheat Board some weeks ago, it gave reason to think that the Premier would have some solution to this problem which would be introduced during this Session.

The fact has been stated that on Highway No. 7 in Saskatchewan as many as twenty truck and trailer rigs a day have crossed the border carrying 30 to 40 million bushels of grain into cattle country in Alberta. The fact is that Saskatchewan's present bootleg grain prices range from 45 to 60 cents a bushel for wheat, 25 to 40 a bushel for barley, 15 to 35 cents a bushel for oats. The fact is that there is a farmer near Kyle, Saskatchewan, who recently bartered away 6,000 bushels of oats for 10 cents a bushel because he needed the cash. A guaranteed floor price for feed grain should have been introduced in this Throne Speech . . .

Some Hon. Members: — Hear, hear!

Mr. Messer: — . . . so that some stability could be given to farmers until a long-term solution could be introduced. Such lack of legislation is indeed disheartening, but it becomes even more discouraging when Members opposite make statements levelled at the Wheat Board such as those made by Mr. Leith, the Member from Elrose, and I quote:

The stupidity of the regulations of the Canadian Wheat Board.

And further quote:

Had become hidebound, riddled with oppressive inertia and had become absolutely divorced, at least pretty well insulated from the people it is supposed to serve.

I can agree to some extent with those statements, Mr. Speaker, but I have to ask him why his Government and the Federal Government stood by the wayside, immobile, and watched the situation develop . . .

Some Hon. Members: — Hear, hear!

Mr. Messer: — . . . and after reaching crisis proportions still did nothing, nothing, except in the case of the Premier, who put the blame on the Federal Government and in the case of the Minister of Highways (Mr. Boldt) and the Member from Elrose put the blame on the Canadian Wheat Board. The Members opposite know full well that the Wheat Board can only operate under regulations that are laid out for them by the Federal Government. Therefore, rather than heaping their criticism and blame on the outdated regulations of the Canadian Wheat Board, they should have been directing them at the Saskatchewan Government and the Federal Government of Canada.

Some Hon. Members: — Hear, hear!

Mr. Messer: — I am certain that all people who are involved in Western agriculture in one way or another are aware of needed updating and modernization of the Wheat Board. The Members opposite have not brought forward anything new in regard to suggestions in changing the Wheat Board regulations. Much has happened since the Canadian Wheat Board was established in 1935. I and the New Democratic party have stated for some time that the system requires updating, updating and modernization in regard to quotas, selling policies, closer coordination with other Canadian agencies to mention a few.

We have, however, never suggested lessening the powers of the Canadian Wheat Board as the Hon. Members opposite suggest. In stating that it should devote itself to market promotion and grain sales only and should immediately get out of non-productive activities relating to the internal grain movement, such as policing and because of its ability demonstrated in the last few years, its jurisdiction should not be extended to flax, rye and all seeds.

That is the suggestion that the Liberal Government of Saskatchewan is making toward the Wheat Board updating. Mr. Speaker, I bring to your attention the statements of the Hon. Minister of Highways, and I presume he was speaking on behalf of his Government when he stated that there was no justification in the quota book seizures for overdelivery of grains and that farmers should have the right to deliver to any point in Saskatchewan that they desire, rather than where he as a producer takes out his permit book.

Mr. Speaker, how short-sighted can he be? Does he not see the consequences of such a situation, the fact that, if you do not have controlled deliveries, we have in essence a first-come first-served system? It would mean, if we had a system such as that proposed by the Minister of Highways, that when space was available at a given delivery point due to no regulation in regard to delivery, whoever could haul grain to that point the fastest would be the person to fill that space, meaning that there would be many who would deliver nothing. It would also mean that farmers from other districts could haul to other

elevators outside their district, thereby congesting delivery points in other areas, and local farmers in that area would be without space at their own delivery permit point.

As you know, Mr. Speaker, rapeseed can be delivered to any point that has space and a quota where rapeseed is open. Under this system numerous grain agents have told me that, when a quota opens at these points, it is not uncommon to have literally dozens of people haul to that point from outside areas, thereby taking space and delivery opportunities from the people in the area that the point normally serves. It means, Mr. Speaker, that, if a farmer has two trucks, he will haul twice as much grain as the man with one. It means that, if a farmer has a tandem or semi-trailer truck he will haul and sell far more grain than farmers with smaller trucks. What it really means, Mr. Speaker, is the end of the smaller farmer or the farmer who has considerable distance to haul, or because of road conditions cannot haul quickly. The almost guaranteed assurance that these farmers will go broke is what this Government is offering in these ridiculous suggestions brought down by the Minister of Highways (Mr. Boldt).

To further show how unfounded and unknowledgeable the Minister of Highways statements are, I want to comment on his criticism of wheat board sales. In spite of the reduction of wheat sales made by Canada, an examination of Canadian exports on a market-by-market basis shows that commercial sales to non-Communist countries actually increased by one million bushels in the last crop year. When you take into consideration that Government Aid Programs fell by over three million bushels in the last crop year, the total export reduction from the previous crop year is almost entirely accounted for by the reduction in shipments to Communist countries. These reductions in shipments to Communist countries cannot be blamed on the Canadian Wheat Board.

In all fairness I think it should be brought forward that Canada is not the only country to suffer from reduced foreign wheat sales in the years 1968 to 1969. It was a condition that was common to all the major wheat-exporting countries. The United States dropped from 750-million bushel export in 1967-68 to 543 million bushels in 1968-69, a reduction of 217 million bushels. Australia dropped from 256 million bushels to 195 million bushels, a reduction of 61 million bushels.

In further fairness it must be pointed out that there are a great many variables in regard to grain sales. Not only is price a factor, although it is a major factor in terms of payment, I mean by this the length of time extended, the interest charged on the unpaid balance, the amount of money paid down, all play a major part whether a sale is negotiated or not. Quality of grain graded by protein content is certainly another contributing factor.

When we consider some of these conditions, we find that the United States has a program which includes interest rates as low as 1½ per cent with payment periods of up to 40 years. It is because of these circumstances that there has to be considerable change made within the Canadian Wheat Board. There should, however, be no moves made to lessen the powers of the Board to take away its orderly marketing procedures.

Some Hon. Members: — Hear, hear!

Mr. Messer: — It is an absolute untruth to state that farmers and farm organizations compelled the Wheat Board to exorbitant prices and that sales were lost due to high prices. Has this Government opposite so soon forgotten that we were a participating country in the International Grains Arrangement and that when some unknowledgeable and ignorant Minister states that we could have sold 500 million bushels more of grain by lowering prices during the 1960s, it would have meant the breaking of the Grains Arrangement. It is not the farmers or farm organizations we should blame, Mr. Speaker. They are not the people who formulate and enforce the regulations of the Canadian Wheat Board. It is the Federal Government of Canada, the Liberal Government of Canada, from which this Liberal Government of Saskatchewan cannot separate itself.

Some Hon. Members: — Hear, hear!

Mr. Messer: — And because the fault lies with these two Governments it proves that Liberal times are hard times.

Mr. Speaker, I ask: where was the voice of this Government when the Barber Commission Report on Farm Machinery Prices was tabled, pointing out that there were excessive prices tagged to farm machinery that was being purchased by the farmers of Saskatchewan, particularly in the field of farm tractors? I ask you: Mr. Speaker, what did the Premier of this Province have to say at that time on behalf of the farmer, thereby showing what his true colors are and where his true patriotism lies, whether it is with the farmers or whether it is with the big business? Mr. Speaker, as it was pointed out, the Premier was silent. Where was the Minister of Agriculture (Mr. McFarlane) and his comments in regard to the unfairness that was being dealt to the farmers in regard to non-competition of farm machinery? Mr. Speaker, this Minister heads a department that associates itself with the biggest industry in the Province of Saskatchewan. He should have been first and foremost in his criticizing the large companies in the price-fixing, combining and non-competition in the pricing of farm machinery. But, Mr. Speaker, this Minister was also silent. Where was the Minister of Labour (Mr. Coderre) — none of these Ministers are even in the House now — the Minister who passes Bills such as Bill 2 forcing workers back to work without the freedom of negotiation, the Minister who is in a Cabinet position in a Government that so often and too often criticizes labor and tries to directly identify labor with the spiralling and increased cost of production in consumer goods? Mr. Speaker, when a report was tabled, such as the Barber Commission Report, proving beyond a reasonable doubt that labor was not responsible for the exorbitant prices of farm machinery in Canada, where was the Minister of Labour voicing his concern and admitting the unfairness that they have dealt the laborers in the past in regard to that blame? Mr. Speaker, there was no voice from any of these men. Indeed, there were only meagre replies from the Liberal Government in the Province of Saskatchewan in regard to this serious situation.

Mr. Speaker, if they were truly concerned about the farmer and the industry that services the farmers, meaning the small businessmen in the communities of Saskatchewan and the machine dealers who are in most serious trouble now trying to maintain their businesses, they would have actively spoken out against these machine companies and shown their allegiance to the

farmers, and indeed, the smaller businessmen in Saskatchewan.

Some Hon. Members: — Hear, hear!

Mr. Messer: — But no statement was forthcoming, no action was forthcoming, proving positively and conclusively that his Government is not for the people whom it represents, for the people that pioneered and make up this province as a functioning and producing unit.

Where were the spokesmen of the Provincial Government when there were mass layoffs at terminal elevators due to shortage of grain deliveries to fill vacant space at the Lakehead? In early January, Mr. Speaker, there were hundreds of grain handlers laid off due to the fact that there was some 70 million bushels of storage space at the terminals but there were no deliveries being made to them. At that time it was stated that they could efficiently handle and unload some 800 to 900 cars per day and they were getting less than 300 cars.

If action had been taken in regard to filling these terminals, it would have meant millions of dollars injected into the farm economy. And it would have meant that all farmers in Saskatchewan would have had an opportunity to sell some grain. If quotas had been opened, it would have solved the problem of having only half of the points in Saskatchewan on quota or unit delivery.

Another area, Mr. Speaker, where this Government was silent, was when the grain handlers were forbidden the opportunity to load grain at the West Coast during their strike with their employers some months ago. At that time the grain handlers, the longshoremen, the dock workers in British Columbia assured the farmers that they would continue to load grain. And, Mr. Speaker, every Member opposite knows that the only reason that grain was not loaded for several days was because the Employers Association forbade them to do so. Yet do we hear any spokesmen from the Liberal party in the Province of Saskatchewan telling the truth about this situation and informing the farmers that these dock workers were doing their outmost to maintain and fill commitments of grain that had been ordered and was ready for export?

Was there any action taken by the Provincial Government, and in particular by the Minister of Agriculture (Mr. McFarlane), in regard to the shortage of box cars so that grain would be able to move at a much faster rate to the terminals in order to take advantage of the abundant space that was available there? I suggest, Mr. Speaker, that this Government and the Minister in charge of the Department of Agriculture did nothing to encourage and pressure the railways to supply cars so that grain could begin its movement to terminals.

Some Hon. Members: — Hear, hear!

Mr. Messer: — However, Mr. Speaker, this Government is not silent about all matters. One in particular that they are and, were very vocal about was the barter deal. News items could be found by the dozens in papers across the province trying to sell this transaction for generators. Then Mr. Boldt, the Minister of Highways, had to get into the action several days ago by

ridiculing an article in the Western Producer criticizing the barter deal. He stated that the Western Producer wasn't a reliable source of criticism as it was prejudiced. I then for the Hon. Minister's and the Government's benefit want to bring to their attention articles from several other papers in regard to the barter deal. The Winnipeg Tribune, dated December 20, had this to say and I quote:

. . . but the barter condition had to be observed and so the Premier got in touch with the grain exporting firm in Winnipeg. The exporter has placed an order with the Wheat Board for the required quantity of wheat – 193,000 bushels of No. 2 Northern – to make up the equivalent of some \$400 thousand for transformers. The exporter will then sell the grain overseas and then Pioneer will pay the exporter for the proceeds of the transformer. It is, however, a delusion that payment will be made in Saskatchewan wheat. The Canadian Wheat Board does not sell wheat by province. It ends up in one undistinguishable pool according to grade.

Another statement from The Leader Post of November 18th, in regard to a statement that Mr. Pepin had made.

Mr. Pepin said the barter offer is potentially harmful to the interests of Western grain producers and the economy in general. It would jeopardize the basis of wheat pricing. Furthermore other wheat exporting countries might follow suit. The long-term result would be a decline in the earning of the wheat producer.

The Leader Post had further to say about the barter on January 13, regarding statements made by Mr. McNamara. He said:

Saskatchewan Power's bartering of wheat for generators is not in fact a barter and does not add to Canada's export sale.

He went on to say:

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

Even the Premier had something to say in regard to this bartering deal. The Leader Post of November 29th and I quote:

I must caution our farmers that barter is no solution to the wheat crisis – our farmers must still look to the Department of Trade and Commerce and the Wheat Board for any real significant sales.

By his own admission that this was just a deception in order to retain some strength from the farmers of the Province of Saskatchewan.

Just one last comment in regard to the bartering deal. It has been found that the grain that was purchased from the Wheat Board by McCabe Grain Company on behalf of the equipment supplier, Pioneer Electric Company of Winnipeg, to the amount of 193,000 bushels is still sitting in this country and has not indeed been exported, meaning that there has not, to date, been a

barter made by the Saskatchewan Government in the truest sense.

To date, Mr. Speaker, this Government's actions and inadequate actions show gross negligence and give grounds for the depressed and drastic economic conditions of the Prairie farmer today. A great amount of this hardship could well have been avoided, if this Government had been active and realistic in regard to its analyzation of and its solution to the problems that they could see forming in the agricultural industry in the late 1960s. Because of its reluctance to run a government as a long-term and businesslike administration, which would provide some stability for the people of Saskatchewan and the province as a whole, and the fact that it does administer on a day-to-day haphazard, unknowledgeable, unresearched manner, and with limited public servants, the result is the harsh conditions in which we find ourselves today. It personifies that Liberal times are hard times.

Some Hon. Members: — Hear, hear!

Mr. Messer: — Saskatchewan people cannot believe the Premier. They have found, unfortunately by experience, that his actions and results are different than his words.

To substantiate this statement, Mr. Speaker, I refer this Assembly to the Western Business and Industry, dated October, 1964. On the front cover we see the Premier smiling in a background of wheat fields. It states on the cover, "Ross Thatcher selling new confidence in Saskatchewan." I suggest to the Members opposite that his selling program has not been too successful.

On page 32 of this magazine we find an article entitled, "Private enterprise takes over." I am sure the Premier will recall the article as being a question and answer feature and I believe some of the answers the Premier gave should be brought to the attention of Members opposite to refresh their memories.

The question was asked: what do you consider to be the basic reason for the overthrow of the New Democratic Socialist Government in Saskatchewan? The Premier, I quote:

The first reason was the general disenchantment with the whole Socialist program. The population in Saskatchewan in the 1930s was 930,000. The population of Saskatchewan when the Socialists were defeated was 930,000. At a time when Canada as a whole had been progressing rapidly in virtually every field this Province was standing still. Two thirds of our university graduates were obliged to leave the province to find employment elsewhere as well as many of our collegiate graduates. About all we seemed to be exporting, aside from wheat, was population. Our people decided that they wanted a government which would get some new industries, provide jobs right here in Saskatchewan and keep our young people at home.

Mr. Speaker, the Premier and his Government have failed as has been pointed out in this House by my colleagues. Population has actually dropped in Saskatchewan for the first time since 1951. He, however, goes on to say:

We based our whole program on private enterprise and thus

appealed not only to Liberals but to Conservatives and Members of the Social Credit party as well. And with some success. In constituency after constituency people who did not want the Socialists voted Liberal even though some of them were members of other parties. Finally, we won the election because we had a program which made sense. We did not try to neutralize our opponents by out-promising them. By and large people are coming to realize that pie-in-the-sky political promises have to be paid for. The only place they can be paid for is out of the taxpayers' pockets.

Out-promising them, Mr. Speaker, pie-in-the-sky political promises! I assure him the people of Saskatchewan are now well educated. The pockets that the Premier then referred to are now empty due to increased taxation applied by his Government.

Some Hon. Members: — Hear, hear!

Mr. Messer: — This article went on questioning the Premier.

Judging from your platform which promised that the Liberal Government would create 80,000 new job opportunities for Saskatchewan young people in four years, you have a staggering task before you. How do you specifically propose to accomplish this?

The Premier stated:

We promised in the election that we could get 20,000 new jobs in mining and manufacturing and we said we could get 60,000 new jobs in other fields. This is a realistic promise because Alberta is doing that already. So is British Columbia and they are still doing it. All we are suggesting is that we can do what other provinces are doing. The first step, of course, is to create a political climate sympathetic to business.

Now what is the real situation here? Potash production 60 per cent of potential; Gulf Oil phasing out of Saskatoon; Robin Hood Flour Mills closed in Moose Jaw; Regina Sash and Door closing this Saturday by reports; Westeel Rosco manufacturing plant moved to Edmonton and Winnipeg from Saskatoon. Present unemployment in Saskatchewan is 7.5 per cent, the highest in the Prairie Provinces. It has now got to the point in Saskatchewan that the younger generation that is in the process of completing their higher education and looking to the labor market, ask themselves: where do we go from here? What does the next generation in the city of Regina do? Where do they go and what do they do? What does the next generation attending the University in the city of Saskatoon want to do and where are they going to go? What do the children in the next generation of all ages in the Province of Saskatchewan want to do? Well, Mr. Speaker, they want to get out. There are already indications of increased migration from farms to towns, from towns to cities, and then, as the Dominion Bureau of Statistics points out, from the cities out of the province to a more prosperous province, other than Saskatchewan.

Some Hon. Members: — Hear, hear!

Mr. Messer: — Just a further reference or

two in regard to the questions asked and answered by the Premier on that day. A question was phrased to him:

You said that the Saskatchewan people are the highest taxed people in Canada. What is your tax reduction program. Mr. Premier.

And I underline reduction program.

In the 20-year regime of the Socialist Government the CCF introduced 600 completely new taxes and increased 650 other taxes. These included taxes not in effect in our sister provinces in Alberta and Manitoba, like the five per cent sales tax. We pay six per cent more income tax than do the people in British Columbia. Our corporation tax is higher than in any other Province in Canada but one. In our campaign we said that we would reduce taxes by a minimum of \$20 million in one year. We didn't say we would do it in the first year, but this is our four-year program.

Four-year program, Mr. Speaker, four-year program of what? The Premier and his Government have shown us not only in that first four years, but to this very day, tax increases by the hundreds in nearly every field of taxation possible in this Province.

That four-year program turned out not to be a reducing taxing program but one of astounding tax increases, many burdened on the people with the least ability to pay: one per cent general increase in the tax; increases in the hospitalization and medicare; tobacco tax, liquor tax, gas tax, telephone tax, tax on meals and hotels, motels, surcharges and fees, and on and on.

I just want to refer to another question that too was answered by the Premier:

I have heard it said that you have had sharp differences with Ottawa. However, at Charlottetown recently you were quoted as saying you believe that Ottawa's powers should not be watered down any further. How do you see Saskatchewan in relation to Federal power?

The Premier stated, and I quote:

Any differences that I have had with Ottawa are party differences, not as between Saskatchewan and Canada.

That is hard to believe now!

I believe if we are to have a strong nation that the time has come for all the Provinces to be a little more careful in their demands of Ottawa. Ottawa can't be simply Santa Claus. It seems to me the Provinces are generally eroding the strength of our national government by their demands. I hope that Saskatchewan in the next few years will not be going to Ottawa too frequently simply for handouts. We will take whatever money is coming to us and be glad to get it. But I hope that Saskatchewan will not be making unreasonable demands of our national government.

I am certain that you will take any handouts that are

available from Ottawa, Mr. Premier. The economy of Saskatchewan needs capital and its main reason for that is the poor Provincial administration for the past year.

Some Hon. Members: — Hear, hear!

Mr. Messer: — I also suggest that, if this Liberal Government had the influence on Ottawa that you would expect of a Liberal colleague, we may have received consideration and equalization in regard to Federal spending. But due to the lack of confidence in the Saskatchewan Government we receive nothing or very little.

Just two last questions from this article, Mr. Speaker.

You have been quoted as saying that the New Democratic party is basically a spent force. What is your view? I feel this very strongly. I don't think the CCF-NDP will ever recover as a major political force in Canada. I expect they will disintegrate and their Members will join either the Liberals or the Conservatives. This, however, may take four years but no more.

This is 1964 and we are now in the '70s.

The other question was:

Two years ago you told me in an interview that there is nothing wrong with Socialism except that it won't work. Obviously you haven't changed this view.

The Premier stated:

I consider myself to be an expert on very few things, . . .

And I can agree with him on that!

. . . but one of these is Socialism. I know it from the inside and from the outside. My opinion still holds.

Well, I suggest to the Premier he recall the results of the by-election in Kelvington, electing Neil Byers, New Democrat. I suggest his Government look to the East, Manitoba, if it thinks the New Democratic party is a spent force.

Some Hon. Members: — Hear, hear!

Mr. Messer: — I further suggest that he ask the people of this province, by any measure he wants, but preferably by an election. He then to his dismay will find how spent the New Democratic party is.

Now, Mr. Speaker, I think these are some of the reasons that we in Western Canada have for the talk of separatism, national unity and the breaking away from the East. The depressed economic conditions we have in the Province of Saskatchewan today in comparison to that of Eastern Canada, combined with the expenditures made by the Federal Government for Eastern Canada, particularly in Quebec and Ontario, could do nothing but cause concern and discussion in regard to whether a united Canada is advantageous for us in the West.

Who is responsible, Mr. Speaker? I say that it is the Provincial Government of the day. It is the Federal Government of the day. It is these two Governments, these two Liberal Governments, in spite of what the present Premier of Saskatchewan is trying to do. They are the people responsible for the present depressed economic conditions that we are suffering under and there is no way that they can transfer the burden or responsibility of our economic conditions on Ottawa alone. And it simply boils down again to the fact that Liberal times are hard times.

Some Hon. Members: — Hear, hear!

Mr. Messer: — And because of these facts, Mr. Speaker, I will not be supporting the main motion but will support the amendment.

Hon. Mr. MacDonald (Minister of Welfare): — Mr. Speaker, I cannot refrain in making a comment to the Member who just sat down. Mr. Speaker, he just stated that Charlie Gibbings was now in Bucharest. I want to say that that is a great compliment to the Member from Yorkton (Mr. Gallagher) and the Member from Watrous (Mr. Schmeiser).

Some Hon. Members: — Hear, hear!

Hon. Mr. MacDonald: — Mr. Speaker, it would appear that their trip to Winnipeg, their telephone calls to the Federal Government have really paid off. It is another indication of the major efforts put in by this Government to sell wheat. Mr. Speaker, he also remarked about the terrible unemployment in Saskatchewan today. Here we have the biggest wheat crisis in history and yet unemployment was higher in 1961, 1962, 1963, than it is today and you can check the records. This was under Socialism.

Now, Mr. Speaker, during the past week much has been said in the Press and across Canada about Indian and Métis hardship in Northern Saskatchewan. This began in the House of Commons last Friday when Mr. Cadieu, Member of Parliament from Meadow Lake, attempted to move a motion to change Wheat Board regulations to permit farmers to contribute wheat to be converted to flour for people of Indian ancestry in Saskatchewan. In moving the motion he read a letter signed by Dr. Howard Adams, Father John Owen and Sister Ray Steuart that mentioned the word “starving”. Immediately two NDP Members of the House of Commons demanded to know if this was true and what was being done about it by the Federal Government. These two Members were Frank Howard, a Member of Parliament from British Columbia, who knows no more about the Province of Saskatchewan than about the lobby of the Saskatchewan Hotel, and good, old Tommy Douglas, former Premier of Saskatchewan. Mr. Speaker, of all the people in the Dominion of Canada, to complain about these conditions, Tommy Douglas should be the last. For 18 years he ignored the native people in Saskatchewan and by ignoring them did more to create the problems of today than any other man in Saskatchewan’s history.

Some Hon. Members: — Hear, hear!

Hon. Mr. MacDonald: — He, with an assist from Dr. Adams, threw a bomb and

directed it at the Métis people, the public of Saskatchewan, and the Liberal Government. The Métis of Saskatchewan are a proud and sensitive group. They are a vital and important segment of Saskatchewan life. Their contribution to our history and to our culture is second to none. They resent the image that has been created across this nation.

Let me say at the outset that when we became the Government in 1964 we inherited a problem that had been brushed under the carpet for 20 years. There is no question that poverty exists in Northern Saskatchewan. The Métis people realize it has been done and much progress has been made but there is still a great deal to be done.

In Saskatchewan the area that is of the most concern is Northwest Saskatchewan in what is known as the Meadow Lake area. This takes in La Loche, Buffalo Narrows, Ile-a-la-Crosse, Beauval, Green Lake and many other smaller communities. It is an area of Saskatchewan with little or no agricultural land, no major forest reserves, lakes that are all but fished out, trapping reduced to a minimum and almost a complete lack of industrial activity. However, Mr. Speaker, the question goes beyond hardship and poverty. It encompasses two very important concepts:

1. What are the basic reasons for these conditions in 1970 in a country where the standard of living is second to none? When did it start and how long has it existed?
2. What is being done by the people of Saskatchewan to eliminate this condition? What programs have been undertaken? What progress has been made and how long have these efforts been made?

The problem of poverty among our native people has been with us for 200 years. In Saskatchewan it has been with us longer than we have been a province. We have been the Government for five years. Major emphasis has been placed on improving the lot of our native people. Millions of dollars have been invested and I hope, Mr. Speaker, that members of the Press, the Métis Society, the Opposition Members, and the Federal Government will assume the same responsibility in reporting the positive progress to the Canadian public as they have in reporting the problem itself.

Some Hon. Members: — Hear, hear!

Hon. Mr. MacDonald: — Let me first deal with some of the basic causes. Mr. Speaker, one of the major causes of poverty in Northern Saskatchewan is because for 20 years the NDP ignored the native population of this province.

An Hon. Member: — All true!

Hon. Mr. MacDonald: — The callous indifference of the Socialists made the people of the North a people forgotten by the public, ignored by the Government, left to struggle for themselves without the help or guidance they needed and deserved.

Mr. Davies (Moose Jaw South) — Nonsense!

Hon. Mr. MacDonald: — I'll prove it to you. It will take this Government years to catch up to 20 years of Socialist indifference. Despite massive appropriations of funds, despite a major effort by all interested parties, it will take years to bring our native population up to the standard of the rest of the people of our province. This was not only an economic hinterland but a social hinterland in education, in housing, in welfare service, in vocational opportunity.

A few days ago the NDP sent a telegram to Mr. Lang urging him to direct that the distribution of farmer-donated wheat to Saskatchewan native people be made possible. This was only after all the publicity broke, Mr. Speaker. Well, Sir, it is interesting to see that the Members opposite are finally showing some interest in our native population in an effort for cheap political grain.

Some Hon. Members: — Hear, hear!

Hon. Mr. MacDonald: — Let me outline their record of 20 years in dealing with our native population. Let me indicate the conditions we found in the North when we became the Government and outline what we have done to improve that situation.

First, Mr. Speaker, I am pleased to announce the increases in welfare payments to needy people in Saskatchewan. This will have a direct bearing on the native population as well as other poor people in Saskatchewan. I also want to say, Mr. Speaker, this is the third increase in welfare allowances since 1966 as well as other adjustments: food allowance 10 per cent in 1966; food allowances 10 per cent in 1967; board and room increased from \$60 to \$75 in 1969, personal allowances increased on April 1, 1967.

This year, Mr. Speaker, we have made a third increase that will be effective in the next fiscal year. These adjustments have been scaled in proportion to the number of people in a family: a single adult from \$28.50 to \$32; a married couple \$54 to \$60; a family of four \$95 to \$105; a family of six \$125 to \$137. Clothing allowances have now been increased by 10 per cent across the board.

I want to say, Mr. Speaker, that makes the Province of Saskatchewan almost identical — some up and some down depending on the category — with Manitoba and Alberta and far ahead of the Province of British Columbia. And this, Mr. Speaker, despite the . . .

Some Hon. Members: — Hear, hear!

Hon. Mr. MacDonald: — . . . fact that they refused and ignored welfare allowances from 1958 to 1964. I am sure that everyone in Saskatchewan will be pleased to see this adjustment take place.

The rising cost of living has generated hardship on all people of lower fixed incomes. Now, Mr. Speaker, how does this compare to our Socialist friends, those great evangelists of the common man, those great spokesmen of the poor?

First let me say that the reason that we have had to make

food adjustments for the third time in four years is because the Socialists refused to make any adjustments in food from 1958 to 1964. The poor people of Saskatchewan were far behind their neighbors in Western Canada.

Let me give you an illustration. A family of six under the NDP received \$105 to buy food for their entire family compared to \$137 with our allowance. They averaged \$73.92 expenditures on each welfare case including families compared to \$117.90 under a Liberal Government.

Their total welfare budget for approximately the same number of people (within a few hundred) in 1963-64 was \$16,581,000 as compared to nearly \$25 million this year and add to them the food increases.

Now is it possible, Mr. Speaker, for these sanctimonious hypocrites to completely ignore the poor of Saskatchewan for this length of time? Their slogan, "more abundant living" was certainly not for the poor people and particularly not for our native people.

It must be one of the greatest examples in Saskatchewan history of closing their eyes to the reality of poverty and hardship.

And who was the Provincial Treasurer and Premier during this time? None other than the Member from Biggar (Mr. Lloyd) who was the Premier at that time.

An Hon. Member: — Shame, shame!

Hon. Mr. MacDonald: — Now, Mr. Speaker, he wonders why people in Saskatchewan are faced with poverty. Had he opened his eyes when he was the Premier this situation would not be as difficult. An outstanding example of the callous indifference of the NDP towards the needy in Saskatchewan.

Some Hon. Members: — Hear, hear!

Hon. Mr. MacDonald: — Surely, Mr. Speaker, one of the basic hopes for the people of the North must be improved education. Many of our native people in the North still cannot speak English. If we are ever to succeed in bringing improved standards of living to our Northern communities, we must first of all provide major services in upgrading and training so that our native people can compete in a modern society.

What has our Government done in this regard? What emphasis has been given? What response has been made and how does this compare to the Socialists' record? Let me give you the figures of this program carried out by the Department of Education in Saskatchewan last year as compared to 1963-64. These, Mr. Speaker, are special programs offered by the Department of Education to the people of Saskatchewan over and above the normal elementary and secondary system. They are the kind of programs that are of particular use to the native people, and these programs they are using to advantage.

Here is a list of these programs and the number of people they are offered to: technologies 325 in 1964 to 1,212 in 1969;

education upgrading — and this, Mr. Speaker, is the one that shocks me — 108 people in the total Province of Saskatchewan took upgrading in 1963-64. This included native people as well, compared to 3,653 in 1969.

Some Hon. Members: — Hear, hear!

Hon. Mr. MacDonald: — Training in trades pre-employment 696 in 1964 compared to 1,697 in 1969; training in industry none in 1964, 1,697 in 1969.

Some Hon. Members: — Hear, hear!

Hon. Mr. MacDonald: — Business management, none in 1964, 468 in 1969. 2,287 people in 1964, 10,749 people in 1969 when you exclude the farm program.

Some Hon. Members: — Hear, hear!

Hon. Mr. Steuart (Provincial Treasurer): — You don't even deserve to be the Opposition!

Hon. Mr. MacDonald: — A large majority of these people, particularly in upgrading and pre-employment, were native people scattered from one end of Saskatchewan to the other. Oh, Mr. Speaker, I forgot — there was one special program call "Training for Northern Indians and Métis" — it was offered to a grand total of 22 out of nearly 70,000.

This is the performance of the do-gooders, the educators, the champion of the educators, the fighters for the poor, the spokesmen for the common man, the critics of 1970, the self-righteous apostles of the native people.

How disgusting, how deplorable, how intolerable is this record.

Some Hon. Members: — Hear, hear!

An Hon. Member: — You're being too kind!

Hon. Mr. MacDonald: — It bespeaks discrimination, intolerance and, in my judgment, stupidity.

An Hon. Member: — You're being too kind!

Hon. Mr. MacDonald: — Another example of the NDP's callous indifference to the native people in Saskatchewan.

How about housing? Surely, Mr. Speaker, one of the biggest indications of poverty is the lack of decent housing for the native people of the North. For Members of this House to walk into homes of our native people in the North would shock and astound them. If there is anything the native people want it is improved housing. How often has our Premier (Mr. Thatcher) described this condition as unacceptable! How often has he pointed out the urgency of immediate action to alleviate this terrible situation!

Well, Mr. Speaker, we are working full speed ahead to do everything in our power to improve this situation. Let me outline the steps to date:

1. Under an agreement for cost-sharing with the DNR and CMHC, 260 new up-to-date homes have been built in Northern Saskatchewan for our native people. These are sold under an Agreement for Sale to our native people so that they can own their own homes.
2. There have been grants up to \$500 to 150 families in the North to improve their existing homes or to construct new ones. In addition timber for floor joists, studding, roofing, etc., has been provided free for many of these families.
3. A program for rent on a subsidized basis to people of Indian ancestry who move to industrial areas to find jobs has placed 95 families in modern homes. Four others are nearly ready for occupancy. One hundred more are planned for next year. This is one of the most progressive programs in Canada. If we are to relocate native families, find them jobs, we must provide living accommodation.
4. In addition a program of over 1,000 subsidized low-rental homes scattered throughout the province contains many additional native families. For example, in La Ronge, 20 homes have been built for native people only, 13 in Green Lake for native people only, 22 in Meadow Lake, and many others in other scattered communities of the province of which they are able to take advantage.

Now, Mr. Speaker, what about our sanctimonious do-gooder friends, the NDP? What did they do for the native people to assist them to improve these terrible housing conditions? What did they do to improve the housing standards of the native people throughout the Province?

An Hon. Member: — Nothing!

Hon. Mr. MacDonald: — Well, let me tell you. The NDP in Saskatchewan in 20 years of government contributed a total in cash of two \$500 grants to two families in Northwestern Saskatchewan in what we call the Meadow Lake region.

An Hon. Member: — Oh, oh, shame, shame!

Hon. Mr. MacDonald: — Yes, Mr. Speaker, \$1,000 to the entire native population of the Meadow Lake area in 20 years. I repeat, \$1,000. These generous Socialists, these conscientious hypocrites, these spiritual reformers. Is it any wonder, Mr. Speaker, that the present housing conditions exist in the North?

An Hon. Member: — No!

Hon. Mr. MacDonald: — Is it any wonder that it will take us years to catch up. But, Mr. Speaker, they did undertake one special project but I am sure they won't appreciate me mentioning it, the 22 homes constructed in Canoe Lake. Let me tell you this exciting story.

Early in the 1960s the Federal Government established the Primrose Lake bombing range at the north end of Canoe Lake. The Provincial Government moved the families living in this area to Cole Bay. When it moved them to this area it constructed 22 homes that were to be occupied by the people of this settlement.

An Hon. Member: — Great planning!

Hon. Mr. MacDonald: — The Department of National Defence paid as compensation for the loss of their fur and fishing rights \$1,500 per family. The Provincial Government set up a housing co-op and the money paid in compensation by the Federal Government was demanded by the NDP as payment for the houses and the necessary furniture. What kind of houses were they, Mr. Speaker? Well here are the figures.

The total cost of the 22 houses was \$22,117 or \$1,005 per house . . .

An Hon. Member: — Aren't you ashamed, Eiling?

Hon. Mr. MacDonald: — . . . Added to this figure was the amount of \$36 it assessed for some free labor, plus cement, some rough lumber, and the use of a farm truck. The NDP gave a \$400 grant and the residents were expected to pay the additional \$605. You can imagine, Mr. Speaker, what happened. The native people refused to turn over their compensation and there is still \$11,638 owing out of the original \$22,117.

An Hon. Member: — We'll write it off!

Hon. Mr. MacDonald: — I wonder if any of the Members in this House can imagine the kind of a home you could build in 1963 for \$1,000. I have been in these homes, Mr. Speaker. They are not insulated. They are substandard and very small. Yet despite this these native people have maintained them in excellent condition and have done a great deal to improve them. Not only that, Mr. Speaker, they did not even give these people title to the land or Agreements for Sale. I can't find them in any records of the Department. The only way they own their homes is by law of possession. I urge the Minister of Municipal Affairs (Mr. Estey) to immediately give these people title to their property.

Some Hon. Members: — Hear, hear!

Hon. Mr. MacDonald: — Can you imagine the NDP offering anyone in Regina \$1,000 to build a home?

An Hon. Member: — Not even Henry!

Hon. Mr. MacDonald: — But \$1,000 is all they gave to 22 native families uprooted from their homes, moved to a new community, no jobs or land provided. Compare this, Mr. Speaker, with the average cost of \$17,000 for the new homes constructed in Meadow Lake under a Liberal Government.

This is from the party crying the blues day in and day out

on behalf of the poor, this from a party who pretended to be interested in the native people of Saskatchewan. This record reminds me of the old proverb when you open your mouth. Remember what it is: boast not about your open mind or people will think you've got holes in your head.

Some Hon. Members: — Hear, hear!

Hon. Mr. MacDonald: — This record in the field of housing of the Socialists is disgusting and scandalous and demands an explanation. It is another outstanding example of the callous indifference of the NDP towards the native people in Saskatchewan.

Let's look at electrification. Surely in 1970 one of the primary indicators of living is electrification. The NDP have often made the boast that they brought electricity to rural Saskatchewan, that almost every farmer in rural Saskatchewan had the opportunity to receive electricity, the same as his neighbor in the towns and villages.

Well, Yes, Mr. Speaker, they did try to bring electricity to most people in rural Saskatchewan to everyone but the Indian people on the reserves.

An Hon. Member: — Shame, shame!

Hon. Mr. MacDonald: — With rank discrimination they refused to offer electricity to our native people, electricity that belonged to the people of Saskatchewan, not to the NDP.

Let me point out their record. Despite the thousands of miles of electrical power lines constructed in Saskatchewan prior to 1964, many of them going right by a reservation, they only provided four reservations out of 84 with electrical power.

What did they offer to these four? They gave power to schools, churches, stores and a few families along the power line. What is the situation today, Mr. Speaker? Well thanks to the concern of the Liberal Government 64 reservations now have electrical power. A total of 3,360 native families live a complete electrical life with fridges, stoves, radios and other advantages it offers.

An Hon. Member: — Action, not words!

Hon. Mr. MacDonald: — You bet. How can the NDP justify this rank discrimination. Don't the Indian people of Saskatchewan deserve the same treatment as the white? Is it any wonder that our native people will require years to catch up to the rest of our province?

An Hon. Member: — It's all true, Bill.

Hon. Mr. MacDonald: — Another example of discrimination and callous indifference.

An Hon. Member: — Unbelievable!

Hon. Mr. MacDonald: — In addition to the expenditures of welfare, education,

housing, the Department of Indian Affairs Indian and Métis, many special projects have been initiated by this Government to concentrate on this problem. Let me outline a few of them.

Indian and Métis training farms have been established at various centres throughout the province in localities where a concentration of native people reside. At these farms employment and training in agriculture are offered and the opportunity given of establishing independent farm units for native people who complete the training program. Some of these farms at Cumberland, Lebret and Green Lake have been in existence for some time. Massive sums have been invested to expand and improve them. New farms are being built at Mortlach, Ile-a-la-Crosse and La Loche. This year alone, Mr. Speaker, \$800,000 will be spent on this program.

Some Hon. Members: — Hear, hear!

Hon. Mr. MacDonald: — Last summer 98 people of Indian ancestry were receiving employment and training.

We are supporting and carrying out research and a development program in wild rice in Northern Saskatchewan. This year 48,000 pounds were harvested.

The Adopt Indian and Métis Program was adapted to place native children in permanent adoptive homes. Over 200 native children have been adopted since the inception of this program.

The Keewatin Centre at Meadow Lake and Prince Albert Work Training programs have been established to help to rehabilitate the socially and culturally environmental-handicapped in Northern Saskatchewan. The total family participation in this program at the Keewatin Centre alone was 29 families. They are the first two work-activity programs in Canada that have been inaugurated under The Canada Assistance Act.

A construction grant of \$43,918 was given to the Northland Pioneer Lodge for nursing care in that region. Two new group homes have been established in the northwestern part of Saskatchewan for the care of children who have been neglected or abandoned. The Department of Welfare has hired a special staff of natives called “welfare fieldmen” to interpret our policy. These are only a few of the special efforts made by this Government to attack these problem areas. In addition, Mr. Speaker, the millions of dollars and the incentive to the mining industry, millions in roads, the development of the pulp industry.

Now, Mr. Speaker, what about the NDP? Well once again their record is dismal, unbelievable and scandalous. They did start one major project in Saskatchewan and I wish to comment on it, the Green Lake Farm. When this Government assumed power in 1964 the settlement at Green Lake, located 35 miles north of Meadow Lake and comprised in a large part of Métis families, had virtually no base for subsistence except for a central farm operation started in 1940.

This story is one of the most dismal chapters in the history of Saskatchewan. There were some 80 small holdings in that area leased to the Métis containing plots of less than 40 acres. In some instances they were as low as eight acres. Many were not cultivated or improved. It was almost like a Communist

communal farm that even Chairman Mao would have been ashamed of. Few of the settlers, perhaps two or three, carried out any of their own work.

An Hon. Member: — All true!

Hon. Mr. MacDonald: — On the other hand those who had cultivated acreage relied entirely upon the Government to carry out all the farming operations. To demonstrate the futility of the small farm plot scheme, as of January 1, 1967, debts outstanding to the Métis families amounted to \$29,700. This unbelievable fiasco was the Socialists' method of helping the Métis population. I invite the Opposition Members to visit the Green Lake Farm today. I invite you to visit the Métis families that have been provided with economic farm units, equipment, livestock and new houses when necessary. Yes, Mr. Speaker, another example of callous indifference.

Now, Mr. Speaker, in no area of Saskatchewan economic or social activity has there been a greater mess to be cleaned up when we became the Government as in the field of policy and progress related to our native people.

Let me also say that I challenge any member of the Opposition to point to one single provincial government in Canada that is doing more . . .

Some Hon. Members: — Hear, hear!

Hon. Mr. MacDonald: — . . . giving the people of Indian ancestry a greater priority, spending more per capita, more genuinely concerned, nor one that has made greater progress.

The expansion of the budget in 1970 of the Indian and Métis Department will reflect this concern. Our Premier (Mr. Thatcher) has repeated on many occasions that massive sums will be required and massive sums will be spent. Compare this to the indifference of 20 years of NDP.

Because of the grave situation and the enormity of the problem of finding a solution to lifting the level of our native population the Saskatchewan Government established a new department. It called it the Indian and Métis Department. This, Mr. Speaker, is the first department of its kind set up by any provincial government in Canada. Its specific function is to respond to the needs of our native population. It is to concentrate on employment opportunities and to assist in education and relocation.

What has been the result? 1. In the field of placement from April 1st, 1969 to January 1st, 1970 – a nine-month period – 1,694 placements were made compared to 1,478 in the year previous. This despite the wheat crisis. 2. Supernumerary training positions in the Public Service cost the Government \$900,000 and resulted in approximately five per cent of the Public Service staff being of Indian ancestry.

In my own Department, out of a total of 1,013 people, on November 1st we had 148 people of Indian ancestry and 12 are located in the Meadow Lake Region in order that they can work with their own people, almost 15 per cent. No other government

department has a better record. 3. The Department has worked closely with the Departments of Education and Indian Affairs and Manpower to provide much better special upgrading and training programs. 4. A special emphasis has been given to economic development. Grants have been given to many native organizations to assist in the organization and operation of native enterprises. The scrap metal operation at IPSCO is a good example. 5. The Task Force made up of business, government, education, churches, labor, has been organized to gather the best minds in every field to guide and develop this program.

What about our NDP friends, Mr. Speaker, when they guided the destiny of our native population for 20 years? No special departments. They carried on the services to our native people through normal government agencies. Another example of the NDP callous indifference.

Now, Mr. Speaker, I want to discuss three subjects related to the issue of the day. First of all I want to say a word about Dr. Howard Adams and his telegram. I do want to say that I have just received information from my Department that Dr. Adams has written me a letter this afternoon. I haven't had the opportunity to read it. In this letter he has stated that his Association wishes to keep the names private, and I respect his decision, and accept it as such. However, Mr. Speaker, I do want to say and give a message to Dr. Adams. The Métis are not interested in sensationalism. They are interested in action, not in separating the Métis from the white population. They are interested in making them full-fledged citizens of this province.

Some Hon. Members: — Hear, hear!

They want to work with the Government. They want to work with the communities. They want to work with the rest of the people.

An Hon. Member: — They don't want to go on trips!

Hon. Mr. MacDonald: — He has a great challenge here in Saskatchewan. If he refuses to respond his people will certainly lose confidence in his creditability and in his leadership.

Let me say also categorically that I disagree with the decision of the Canadian Wheat Board in refusing their request. Surely the needy people of Canada have a right to the wheat belonging to the farmers if they wish to contribute it. Charity begins at home and here was an excellent opportunity. Let me also say that many of our welfare clients are poor. Welfare is only a very minimal standard of living. This is the reason we are raising the food allowances. Any help would be welcome.

I want to also say that one of the major problems of the native people is not only the amount of money they receive but the management of their income. Education on home management is almost as important as the dollars they receive. If people do not plan, organize their income, the welfare allowance will make it difficult for any family in Saskatchewan.

But, Mr. Speaker, I read some of the quotations in the

Toronto Globe and Mail made by the Métis Society at their meeting in Saskatoon. Here is one of them:

The Federal fact-finding team was too late. They arrived in the communities the day after the monthly welfare allowance cheques were received.

This was the 21st of February and welfare allowances arrive on the first of every month. How can the public accept these remarks? It may be, Mr. Speaker, they meant the family allowance. I hope this was their intention. Another quote:

Métis families in the area, out of fear of retaliation from Provincial officials, would be unlikely to speak out to white officials who arrived with a Press entourage for a short visit.

What nonsense! What about civic leaders that were canvassed? What about medical officers questioned? What about dependent Press surveys? What about welfare clients who were very outspoken in their remarks? I also find out that one of them works for the Métis Society and is under the direct supervision of Dr. Adams.

I want to repeat that my only desire to receive those names was to make sure that no one was suffering. I would have respected the complete confidentiality and under no conditions would I have revealed those names to anyone.

Some Hon. Members: — Hear, hear!

Hon. Mr. MacDonald: — Mr. Speaker, I also want to say that I would gladly meet with the Métis Society at any time to discuss the problems of welfare in the North or in any other part of Saskatchewan, but I have never received a request. I also want to say there is no question that there was a list of names, but it is also true that it is a list of names of people requesting flour. It is not and never was intended to be anything else. Anyone who suggests otherwise is making a farce out of a legitimate request for flour.

Then, Mr. Speaker, good old Woody entered the picture. The Member for Biggar (Mr. Lloyd) got his feathers ruffled the other day in the House and then left the House to make a statement to the Press and I quote:

It is sheer and utter nonsense as well as being wickedly wrong for the Minister to say that he can't do anything until he gets the names of people from Dr. Adams or anybody else. He has a large department staff. It is up to him to go out and find out whether there is hardship.

What an asinine statement to expect 300 social workers to find 879 families in a province of one million people. I am not sure, Mr. Speaker, if he meant a door-to-door canvass, an advertising campaign, or did you want me to bring in Scotland Yard? I want to also say that in a democratic society no one is forced to take welfare or take assistance. It is their right to apply if they so desire, not to be investigated or coerced.

Let me tell you, Mr. Speaker, how the Member for Biggar handled welfare in Northern Saskatchewan when he was the Premier

of the Province. They had five social workers in the entire Meadow Lake region. They had absolutely no one in La Loche, Buffalo Narrows, Dillon, Ile-a-la-Crosse, Canoe Lake or any of the other communities. Assistance cheques were handed out as a handout one day a month by the Department of Natural Resource officials. If there was no DNR official in that community, they were out of luck. It could take a week for them to find him or to travel to the community where he resided. Is this how you suggest we handle the welfare in the North?

Another example of the callous indifference of the NDP to the natives of the North. Social workers in Regina, Yorkton or any other white community, but none for the natives. Today there are welfare offices in Buffalo Narrows, La Ronge and Creighton. Social workers travel to various communities on a regular basis.

Now, Mr. Speaker, I want to say a word about the Federal team who came to Saskatchewan to check these reports. First let me say that I agreed to have them come and offered cooperation because the original charge included Indian and Métis. Indian people are a Federal responsibility, and they had every right to come and investigate the charges. However, Mr. Speaker, I am concerned that they did not go near a reservation even in Meadow Lake where they were just across the road. I am also concerned that they spent their time in an area of Provincial responsibility. I am equally concerned with the statement of Norman Cragg, the Director of the Canada Assistance Plan, describing housing conditions in Meadow Lake and comparing them to the ghettos of Nova Scotia.

No one denies the housing conditions. But he made no attempt to point out to the people of Canada the positive steps taken by the Government of Saskatchewan to improve these conditions. Right down the street there were new low-rental houses for rent.

Dr. Haidasz has also criticized welfare procedures after talking to a handful of people and making no effort to discuss them with us and learn the facts. He also painted a false picture of Saskatchewan and our Métis people, to the rest of Canada. I was pleased with the comments made by the Hon. John Munro in the House of Commons. He reported that the Federal team found no examples of starvation or extreme poverty. He also stated that welfare was a responsibility of the Government of Saskatchewan. I hope he passes this word on to his officials in no uncertain terms.

Last, Mr. Speaker, I want to answer the question of my Department's policy in relation to employable people on the case-load. Let me outline it briefly:

Each spring in the month of April we send to every individual on our case-load that we class as employable the following letter as an example:

The season is approaching when job opportunities will be increasing and we suggest that you avail yourself of these opportunities for employment. It would, perhaps, be wise to renew your application with the local Canada Manpower Centre. As an employable person, we expect that you will be able to take care of the needs of yourself and your family from your own earnings. Assistance

to you will be discontinued effective June 1, 1967. This means that your last payment of assistance will be issued May 1, 1967.

Should you be unable to get employment, it will be necessary that you make further application for assistance to your regional office of the Department. In doing so you should be prepared to provide evidence of your efforts to find employment.

In classifying people as employable, we consider all able-bodied people medically fit who, unless otherwise classified by a doctor, are capable of work. This does not include social or mentally handicapped people. We expect every single one of them to register at Manpower and demonstrate clearly and without question that they have explored every possible avenue of employment. Usually our people have a knowledge of prospective employers and they inquire into exactly what efforts have been made. These letters are sent once a year, and once a year only, during the month of April.

Mr. Romanow (Saskatoon-Riversdale): — Did they go out this year?

Hon. Mr. MacDonald: — Yes, they will. If the employable person has been unable to find employment and has demonstrated this fact clearly he has no difficulty in once again receiving assistance.

Mr. Speaker, this is one of the most positive welfare practices in our Department. By making the individual reapply, by demanding that he explore every possibility guarantees that this individual will do his utmost to become a contributing member of the community. It is an excellent social tool to motivate and encourage people to take training, upgrading and all other rehabilitative tools at our disposal.

What about the rest of the year after the first of May or June? Well, we expect each applicant to discuss his problem with his worker once a month and to ensure that he is continuing his efforts to develop a plan to improve his training or education. This is my responsibility to the people of Saskatchewan. If welfare is only a handout to anyone in Saskatchewan whether they can work or not, with no responsibility on our part to ensure maximum effort on the part of every individual, then, Mr. Speaker, I want no part of it.

This year in Saskatchewan many employable people are receiving assistance. This winter due to our wheat situation our regional services account last month was \$437,525 including 3,016 cases. This is the account that employables and all temporary cases are paid from. However, Mr. Speaker, I assure you that each of these employables has made these efforts to secure employment.

What about the Meadow Lake region, Mr. Speaker? The exact same situation exists there. However, one thing that people fail to realize is that in that region often the only opportunities for employment are in the winter. Logging, trapping, fishing are all carried on in the winter and logging and trapping only in the winter. The mill at Green Lake has employed up to 25 employees in the winter time and anywhere from 6 to 10 logging crews of approximately four men each in the bush. This

can total up to 65 to 70 people.

Our employables in Meadow Lake region are often higher in the summer than in the winter. For example, last April and May we had 148 employables receiving assistance and today only 105. No one who attempts to explore all employment opportunities is denied assistance if no jobs are available. Emergency assistance is always available even to those who refuse to cooperate.

Now, Mr. Speaker, what was the policy towards employable persons under our sanctimonious friends, the NDP? What was it under the Member from Biggar (Mr. Lloyd) when he was the Premier? Well, Mr. Speaker, let me read you another letter dated April 30, 1963, addressed to all municipal secretary-treasurers, city and town clerks. It is signed by K.J. Torrance, Acting Regional Administrator. This is only a sample of every letter that was passed out in every region.

Dear Sir:

Now that the warmer weather is upon us, job opportunities will be increased and we should all be encouraging those social-aid recipients who are not disabled to seek employment. You will be interested to know that it has been a common practice in other parts of the province for municipalities to adopt a policy of discontinuing social aid to employment persons, once jobs are available. We would urge you to do so now.

Your policy statement might simply be that since employable social-aid recipients are expected to seek employment when it is available, your municipality will continue social-aid payments to them when employment conditions are such that they can be reasonably be expected to obtain a job. You may wish to give them formal written notice with their May cheques, since job opportunities should be at a peak in May, depending on the weather. If you have taken action along this line already this is good social-aid practice on your part.

Experience has also shown that some recipients do register for employment with the National Employment Service, but present so many limitations on such things as what they will do, where they will not go, etc., that they automatically rule themselves out of consideration by prospective employers. If you are requesting that recipients provide verification of attempts to obtain employment, you might also ask them to indicate the type of job they said they would accept. If a recipient is unrealistic in the conditions he places on what he will do, you may wish to consider him as not making himself available for employment.

You will be aware that recipients may appeal any decision concerning their application. For this reason we would urge you to establish a municipal policy concerning discontinuance of aid to employables when jobs are available, and that you follow it consistently in dealing with your employable recipients.

That is well done! And, Mr. Speaker, this is the identical policy that is in effect today. Why then, Mr. Speaker, do they

stand on their feet with this holier than thou attitude as if we were monsters from outer space.

This is one of the few positive things they did do. They know it is good social practice. Why should they now hide under the cloak of innocence and horror?

Mr. Speaker, I just want to say that my time is up, but the Government of Saskatchewan is concerned with the Métis people of this province and all people of all Indian ancestry as no other Government in the history of this province. We will continue to make major efforts on our part to improve their lot in life. We also look forward to working with them in the years ahead, so that together working harmoniously, we can give to them every opportunity to be full partners in the Province of Saskatchewan.

Some Hon. Members: — Hear, hear!

Mr. Speaker: — The question before the House is on the amendment.

Mr. Lloyd (Leader of the Opposition): — Pardon me, Mr. Speaker. Is it not the rule that the vote will be 30 minutes before the regular time of adjournment and adjournment tonight is at 9:30 or whatever it is and not 5:30, so don't we go on?

Mr. Speaker: — The rule is that today, this is the day, that the amendment is put to the House 30 minutes before the normal time of adjournment which is 10:00 o'clock tonight. But if a Member doesn't like to speak then I put the amendment now. It is up to the House. They want the question on the amendment. Now don't forget that when the amendment is cleaned off, the debate continues on the motion.

The amendment was negatived on the following recorded division:

Yeas — 23

Lloyd	Dewhurst	Brockelbank
Bowerman	Meakes	Baker
Kramer	Berezowsky	Pepper
Messer	Smishek	Matsalla
Wood	Thibault	Wooff
Blakeney	Whelan	Willis
Davies	Snyder	Kwasnica
Romanow	Michayluk	

Nays — 30

Thatcher	Grant	Radloff
Howes	Larochelle	Weatherald
Boldt	MacDonald	Mitchell
Steuart	Estey	Coupland
Heald	Hooker	Gardner
McIsaac	Gallagher	McPherson
Guy	MacLennan	Charlebois
Barrie	Heggie	Forsyth
Loken	Breker	McIvor
MacDougall	Leith	Schmeiser

The debate continues on the motion.

Mr. Romanow (Saskatoon-Riversdale): — Mr. Speaker, my first words have to be, of course, as everyone has already expressed before me, congratulations to His Honour Dr. Stephen Worobetz, Lieutenant Governor of Saskatchewan. I know Dr. Worobetz casually and have talked to him on many occasions. I know that he is going to be an excellent Lieutenant Governor and is going to represent the Province well and able on all occasions.

I also wish to again repeat my congratulations to Neil Byers who is the new Member from Kelvington, having won that seat in the by-election that we have heard so much about in this Debate. In conclusion, Mr. Speaker, I should also like to congratulate the mover and the seconder with respect to the Throne Speech. They have done a good job, again as has been said, with the material that they had to work with.

Mr. Speaker, this afternoon we have heard a rebuttal or an answer, supposedly, by the Minister of Welfare (Mr. MacDonald) respecting the crisis that exists in the northwestern part of Saskatchewan as it relates to the Indian and Métis of this province. It was billed to be a special address, according to the Press of Saskatchewan, by the Minister of Welfare to explain the situation. And if it was a special address, if it could be likened to a sale, I don't want to be around when there is a fire sale that the Minister of Welfare is going to be promoting or advocating or explaining to the Province of Saskatchewan.

Some Hon. Members: — Hear, hear!

Mr. Romanow: — The Minister's address was, I think, best described as sound and fury, noise, political harangue, everything and anything, but concrete and constructive proposals to deal with the immediate crisis of starvation. Oh, yes, the Minister of Welfare very ably put forward a lot of blame on the previous Government. He put a lot of blame on the press in the Province of Saskatchewan. We know all about that Socialist press, The Regina Leader Post and The Saskatoon Star Phoenix, as well as the Toronto Globe and Mail. He blamed the Press left and right. He blamed the Métis Society. He condemned the leadership of the Métis Society. Not today. He tempered his remarks about Dr. Howard Adams, but yesterday and a couple of days before that when the crisis first hit, he placed blame everywhere, anywhere that he could, except where it belonged, squarely on his shoulders.

Some Hon. Members: — Hear, hear!

Mr. Romanow: — So we heard from ten or 15 minutes, or 20 minutes, at length, the question of what we did when the CCF was in power from 1944 to 1964. We heard from 1964 to 1970. He takes credit for educational payments that I might say, Mr. Speaker, are not due to anything that this Government has done, but because of the increase in assistance by the Federal Government, the boys at Ottawa. Any credit that he takes in respect to housing and education isn't a credit to the Premier and the Saskatchewan Government. No! It is a credit to the Federal Government. They are just administrating. But in the typical Liberal fashion the Minister of Welfare feels it necessary to take this on as a Liberal credit. I say that precious little has been done for the Indian and the Métis people in the six long years that this

Government has been in power.

Six long years! Six years far too long! He talks about us and Tommy Douglas being in power for 18 years. All I can say about the Minister of Welfare and the Liberal Government that it just seems like 18 years that they have been in power. That is how slow the wheels of government have been progressing.

Some Hon. Members: — Hear, hear!

Mr. Romanow: — Well, Mr. Speaker, as I have said, we have heard blame being placed everywhere, but I ask the Members seriously to stop and think about the remarks of the Minister of Welfare. Here we have, for good or for bad, a four-man Federal delegation from Ottawa coming to Saskatchewan. This four-man delegation represents Members of the Minister of Welfare's own party, the Liberal party. This delegation includes Dr. Haidasz, a very qualified professional person who is the Parliamentary secretary to the Minister of National Health and Welfare, Mr. Munro. They toured the Province of Saskatchewan. They toured these areas and concluded that the welfare policies of this province are confusing. They conclude that the welfare policies are mixed up. They call for immediate improvement and change by the Welfare Department in the Province of Saskatchewan because it is their responsibility.

Now you can say whatever you want about the validity of those opinions, but, Mr. Speaker, I submit to you that what you do have is four very highly competent, skilled, trained and above all, responsible government officials who are urging this Government to take action to reform and change the discrimination of the Welfare Department of the North.

I would have suspected that in circumstances like that, today, this being the special address of the Minister of Welfare, that we would have heard some immediate emergency programs to help alleviate the problem. Sure it has existed for 200 years. It existed for 90 years. It existed from 1944 to 1964. It exists in 1970, but right now there are very serious allegations that have been at least partially substantiated by the Liberal Government at Ottawa, but no action by the Provincial Liberals to follow up on that. He goes on and on and on to outline what his Government has done for six years, which is not all that impressive, telling them all the benefits that they have, announces an increase in welfare, says that this is going to benefit them. It reminds me of Marie Antoinette. It is a let them eat cake attitude that the Welfare Minister has adopted in his special address that we heard today.

Well, Mr. Speaker, reports by one newspaper after another newspaper tell Canada about this abject misery. The four-man Federal delegation told us about the misery. You know, the four-man delegation said they found no direct evidence of starvation, just a little bit of starvation, found malnutrition, found poor housing. The newspaper, The Saskatoon Star Phoenix, records a situation where there are cracks on the doors and the floors of houses where people are eating rabbit as the meat they have had to obtain this winter. Mr. Minister of Welfare, not in 1944 or 1964, but the winter of 1970.

Some Hon. Members: — Hear, hear!

Mr. Romanow: — Allegation after allegation mounts against the Minister of Welfare and the Liberal Government pleading for some remedial action to be taken with respect to the Indian and Métis situation which is critical and desperate in the northwestern parts of Saskatchewan. Well, what does the Minister say today? He told us very generously about an increase. And, we accepted any increase if it's going to be an increase in welfare payments, but nothing again, I repeat, nothing, absolutely zero for the Indian and Métis people to relieve them from their plights. Absolutely nothing, and Mr. Speaker, they are derelict and negligent and bear all the responsibility for a crisis that exists. Theirs.

Some Hon. Members: — Hear, hear!

Mr. Romanow: — Well, one of the newspaper reports that I also read about is the complaint by a 53-year-old lady. I had thought the Minister would have told us about some of these complaints that the Saskatchewan Press recorded who said that the Métis people have had to fight — those were her words — fight the Welfare Department every month for regular assistance. Every month they had to fight the Welfare Minister and the Government for assistance. On top of that she said that she was paying \$50 a month in rent, \$50 a month in rent, but she couldn't keep the house warm now. She says that in the \$50 house, things are freezing. She cannot buy meat. Things are in a desperate situation for her, so she stopped paying the rent. This is a serious allegation reported by the Saskatoon Star Phoenix. Did the Minister come forward and give us an explanation as to whether or not that was a legitimate complaint put forward by that lady, one of many? No he didn't. Nothing whatsoever. Absolute silence about it. Another woman told a reporter that she was, "fighting the Welfare Department for years, since 1964. After a while you get tired of asking and being refused." That's the cry that the Minister of Welfare talks about. That's the welfare policy for the Indian and Métis in northwestern Saskatchewan. "After awhile," she says, "you get tired of asking and being refused by the Welfare Minister and the Liberal Government."

Well, another interesting aspect of this was that the four-man delegation couldn't understand why \$50 a month was being paid for some of the rents for the shacks that have been described there in the northwestern part of Saskatchewan. Mr. Speaker, where that rent is being paid by people who are on social welfare what that really means, is that the Department of Welfare is paying the landlord. The Department of Welfare in the Province of Saskatchewan is paying the landlord a rent that the four-man delegation from Ottawa says is unjustifiable, unreasonable and unbelievable.

Some Hon. Members: — Hear, hear!

Mr. Romanow: — What the Department of Welfare is doing is paying \$50 to unscrupulous landlords without any obligation or responsibility on those landlords to improve and repair those shacks that we have talked about. It is straightly a \$50 dole out to landlords who are taking advantage of a miserable situation. But nothing by the Minister of Welfare as to what he is going to do to remedy the program. Nothing whatsoever. We hear

nothing but silence. He says that things have been going well for six years, that in six years we received all these Federal grants and look at what we are administering, not instituting by way of new policies. I say to you, Mr. Speaker, I ask the Members of the House: did you hear anything constructive? did you hear any proposal about the charges and allegations of Dr. Howard Adams? the charges and allegations of Dr. Haidasz? the charges and allegations of the Press of Saskatchewan? the charges and allegations of the Press of Canada? Nothing! The Province of Saskatchewan has heard nothing from the Minister of Welfare (Mr. MacDonald) in this regard. Well . . .

Hon. Mr. Steuart (Provincial Treasurer): — Hear, hear!

Mr. Romanow: — . . . Mr. Speaker, if the Treasurer went up to the North and toured his constituency once in awhile you'd see the problem that faces the . . .

Hon. Mr. Steuart: — Hear, hear!

Mr. Romanow: — That's all right, you are just holding the constituency in trust until the next election and then you are finished.

Some Hon. Members: — Hear, hear!

Mr. Romanow: — No, I certainly won't be running there. Well I shouldn't say that I won't be running there. You never can tell what the Provincial Treasurer (Mr. Steuart) will define by way of new constituency boundaries this year.

Now, Mr. Speaker, this Government says, the Minister of Welfare (Mr. MacDonald) himself says, that it is their intention to get people off the welfare rolls and we all agree with that as I think that is an admirable objective. But the newspaper tells of a very interesting situation with respect to some of the Indian and Métis people trying to get off the welfare rolls. When a person tries to do something to get off the welfare rolls, what assistance does the Minister of Welfare and the Government give? Nothing.

Hon. Mr. Steuart: — We help them.

Mr. Romanow: — Nothing. Nothing again. The newspaper says that the Department wanted — just listen to this — a lady wanted the Department to assist her to move into a larger home. The idea was, she said, that she could get tenants, perhaps she could keep boarders. Perhaps eventually she would become self-supporting. Perhaps eventually she could get off the welfare rolls. One isolated example to be sure but a very concrete and important example. She is still on the welfare rolls. She has received no cooperation, no assistance by the Minister of Welfare and by the Government opposite. Nothing whatsoever. That's how sincere they are about their attitudes to get people off the welfare rolls. This Department, Mr. Speaker, is bureaucratic and top-heavy. There is something wrong with the setup in the North as it relates to Indian and Métis people and that something wrong must be investigated by this Legislature in the Province of Saskatchewan.

Some Hon. Members: — Hear, hear!

Mr. Romanow: — Now, Mr. Speaker, I want to say just a word or two about Dr. Howard Adams because he was mentioned very casually in the Debate today and he was mentioned several days ago. It is a very interesting change in attitude. A couple of days ago when the matter first broke, Mr. Speaker, Dr. Howard Adams had caused irreparable harm. He had done a great disservice to the Indian and Métis people. The letter was a hoax. Did you hear the Minister of Welfare (Mr. MacDonald) say inside the House and outside the House that the letter was a hoax? But, not today. Oh, no. The letter today is somewhere around. Today he says he would have respected the confidentiality of that list. Today he says that he doesn't think that Dr. Howard Adams is all that bad. If he doesn't separate from the established channels, then he can progress. But, Mr. Speaker, make no mistake about it, what this Government has done, what the Minister of Welfare has done over the last several days, as this Debate has progressed, is to launch a wholesale attack on Dr. Howard Adams and the Métis Society of the Province of Saskatchewan. Not only Dr. Howard Adams but two other people, a Father and a Sister connected with a responsible organization in society. The Minister said that Dr. Adams was irresponsible, that he had done a great disservice. I hold no brief for Dr. Howard Adams of the Métis Society, but I just ask the Hon. Minister to check what some of the statements have been about Dr. Howard Adams, statements by the Premier of the Government opposite when the second reading came before the Legislature last year on the introduction of the Indian and Métis Affairs Department. I am not going to quote at length about this but it might be very well worthwhile for the Minister of Welfare to consider this before he makes irresponsible statements. I am quoting from page 1221. Dr. Howard Adams is described this way by the Premier of the Province. He said and I quote:

As has already been pointed out, we did offer this job . . .

He is referring, Mr. Speaker, to the Deputy Minister's job.

. . . to Dr. Howard Adams who is a PhD Professor at the University of Saskatchewan. I had Dr. Adams in my office after a meeting of the Task Force. I said, "Doctor, anyone can complain, but can you find solutions. Why don't you take one year off from the University, and come and tell us how you think this department should be run." We told Dr. Adams that we would give him carte blanche in running the department. The Doctor, as many Hon. Members know, has only recently returned to Saskatchewan.

And do you want to know why, Mr. Treasurer, because the Premier said "He felt that having been at the University only for a year or more, he did not want to take time off." And then the Premier said this, Mr. Treasurer:

I am not blaming him. I have a high regard for the ability of Dr. Adams. The department looks forward to using him in a consulting basis in the months ahead. I do regret that he was not able to take on this tangible position . . .

That is what the Premier said. The Premier said that he believes

that Dr. Adams was a worthwhile person but not the Minister of Welfare. He doesn't read the old speeches of the Premier's and sometimes frankly I don't blame him. I wouldn't read them either.

Some Hon. Members: — Hear, hear!

Mr. Romanow: — Now, Mr. Speaker, when the Attorney General talked yesterday of vilifications against persons and he urged us in a lecturing manner to set that good example, I say the Minister should have lectured the Minister of Welfare about vilification against persons.

Some Hon. Members: — Hear, hear!

Mr. Romanow: — Really though what we have seen is a situation where this Government has once again displayed that anyone who dares but cross the objectives of the Government or dares to criticize the Government is attacked whole scale in any way that is possible and I say that is unfair to Dr. Adams. It is unfair to the Indian and Métis and unfair to the problems.

Some Hon. Members: — Hear, hear!

Mr. Romanow: — Well, Mr. Speaker, the Premier also said that we are holding a time bomb with a short fuse when it comes to the Indian and Métis problem. I agree with him. I can tell the Minister of Welfare this though that the CCF Government from 1944 to 1964, to my knowledge, never once was accused by any responsible organization or official of having created a situation where there is starvation in the Province of Saskatchewan. I challenge the Minister opposite, who is leaving now, challenge the Minister opposite to just produce one statement, not one, that may say one thing about our administration, but it says another thing about their administration and that it is incompetent, that it has bungled the job, that it has messed it up as far as the Indian and Métis are concerned in Saskatchewan.

Some Hon. Members: — Hear, hear!

Mr. Romanow: — We regret very much the highly political and partisan speech that the Minister of Welfare (Mr. MacDonald) has made and I think all Members will agree that this is a critical problem. Much confusion and many allegations, political or otherwise have been made by Members, by people outside, by the Press. And I think the time is now to make some construction proposal. I am going to make a suggestion respectfully, Mr. Speaker, that this Government get to the bottom of the problem by trying to alleviate some of the doubts and the suspicions that have been cast on the head of the Government with respect to this problem. The only way this can be done is by setting up an independent commission of three or five people . . .

Some Hon. Members: — Hear, hear!

Mr. Romanow: — . . . to include a person of Indian and Métis ancestry and others, laborers, farm people, an independent commission that is in no way attached or directed to the operation and control of the Minister of Welfare, to go out and carry out an

extensive thorough, hard-nosed look, in cold blood, at the problem in Northwestern Saskatchewan as it relates to the Indian and Métis problem and this allegation of starvation. This independent commission could be started to act immediately if the Minister of Welfare and the Government so accept. Perhaps it could be an inter-party committee of the Saskatchewan Legislature with full powers to investigate the Department of Welfare records, to investigate the case records and what the decisions have been. This is a concrete suggestion and proposal that we make and I hope that the Hon. Minister of Welfare (Mr. MacDonald) will accept it before it is too late.

Some Hon. Members: — Hear, hear!

Mr. Romanow: — Now, Mr. Speaker, one other brief word about the Minister of Welfare. As I said earlier, we welcomed the announced increase with respect to welfare payments. We welcome any improvement. We say it is long overdue and it is far too little. But I express one fear when the Government announces an increase of this nature. It has a notorious habit of somehow announcing increases but stopping them from getting into the hands of the needy and the poor in the Province of Saskatchewan. You will all recall that in 1968, the Federal Government announced an increase in old age security and pension supplements. I think, the two per cent cost of living escalator which was a big deal and very charitable by the Federal Government – doubtless all Members would agree. The pension was raised by two per cent. The Government of the Province of Saskatchewan deducted that increase before it got into the hands of the old age people.

Some Hon. Members: — Hear, hear!

Mr. Romanow: — And, Mr. Speaker, the Government of the Province of Saskatchewan still deducts that two per cent increase in times of inflation and hardship for the old people of the Province of Saskatchewan. That's an increase, Mr. Minister of Welfare (Mr. MacDonald) That's an increase of assistance, Mr. Treasurer (Mr. Steuart), to the old and the needy, those who are in need of welfare. And where do they get it? Well that's not all. I have another clipping with respect to welfare bonuses. It is a small thing but this is the attitude of the Government with respect to getting assistance to the needy in The Saskatoon Star Phoenix, 1966: "No Christmas bonuses will be given welfare recipients, said Welfare Minister Cy MacDonald." That's how this Government assists and helps the needy people and the indigent in the Province of Saskatchewan. Again I hope you don't blame us too harshly. We, on this side, are somewhat fearful about this announced increase actually getting into their hands.

But more importantly is the attitude of the Government when it comes to welfare. I say its attitude about able-bodied people is nothing more nor less than a sham, an absolutely phoney attempt to use the welfare system to penalize the sick and the poor and the indigent and the old,

Some Hon. Members: — Hear, hear!

Mr. Romanow: — because, Mr. Speaker, it doesn't believe in welfare. If you had checked with anyone of the gentlemen opposite there, deep down, you know what they would say. Any person who

really wants to get a job can get a job. Good old-fashioned private enterprise motivation, you know. Go out and inherit yourself a good life, if they really had the incentive to do it. No, this Government has already shown how it concerns itself with the welfare and the need. Here's The Regina Leader Post: "One thousand people cut off welfare, told to find work and where?" In the northwestern part of the Province of Saskatchewan. Mr. MacDonald provided figures for the Meadow Lake welfare region. It showed that as of May 1, 1968, 814 persons were receiving aid in the region of whom 310 were classified as employable. The 310 employables were recipients of a letter notifying them that they would be cut off the payroll as of June 1, 1968.

That created and contributes to the problem. All the Minister (Mr. MacDonald) says in that area "you can't find employment in the summer." And what does the Department of Welfare do in the summer. It cuts off all the assistance for 310 people.

Well, no one really found much benefit in that policy, except one person. The Hon. Member from Meadow Lake (Mr. Coupland). He added his few wise words of wisdom to this welfare policy. He said, on January 29th, 1968, the headline says: "Social aid cutback pays off, says MLA," right from Meadow Lake. This is the area that was affected. Well what are the wise words? Is the Member (Mr. Coupland) here today? Oh, yes, there he is, I see. Please take note of this. The newspaper report says, quote:

A cutback in social aid payments to able-bodied trappers and fishermen in Northern settlements has paid off according to Hal Coupland, Liberal MLA for Meadow Lake. Mr. Coupland said when able-bodied trappers and fishermen were offered a choice between supplies which included snowmobiles and starving . . .

(Big choice – snowmobiles and starving)

. . . they returned to their former occupations.

They picked the snowmobiles because that's what they could eat. The Minister (Mr. Coupland) seasoned it with a little bit of humility and a little bit of salt and a little bit of pepper. But it's all been too hard a cross to bear for the people of Northwestern Saskatchewan, the Indian and Métis.

Some Hon. Members: — Hear, hear!

Mr. Romanow: — You'll forgive us if we do say that the Government opposite isn't concerned about humanity. Again I say it's the Marie Antoinette complex. Let them ride their snowmobiles but let them starve. That's the Government philosophy subscribed to by the Member from Meadow Lake (Mr. Coupland). He says there is no starvation, on the television station at Regina. He says, "Let them ride their snowmobiles." That's the Government. Let them eat their cake.

Mr. Speaker, this Government is absolutely and totally negligent and stands to be faulted very seriously for its attitude toward social welfare.

I'm going to say just a few words and I want to extend my thanks to the Members for the courtesy extended to me in this area. It's as a result of the comments made by the Attorney General (Mr. Heald) yesterday in this Debate. I will have some further words to say about the Attorney General's remarks tomorrow when I ask leave to adjourn the Debate, respecting the legal provisions he's made for assisting the people in the economic crisis. However, some matters just have to be answered. He had a lot to say yesterday and again today about the Province of Manitoba and the election of Ed Schreyer . . .

I'm sorry the Member from City Park-University (Mr. Charlebois) is in the House again. I really didn't hear what he said, but I can assure the Members of the House that his constituents didn't hear him either.

The situation is that, according to the Attorney General, the election of a Manitoba Government was a good comparison of what ought to be done or what ought not to be done. I want to assure the Members that the Attorney General's assessment of the Manitoba election is a solitary and lonely assessment. What he really is saying by his anger displayed yesterday is that he's hurt and upset, and he doesn't know how to react to the election of a dynamic and young and new Premier in the Province of Manitoba.

Some Hon. Members: — Hear, hear!

Mr. Romanow: — He doesn't realize that the election of Ed Schreyer, as has been said, is really the first step to the removal once and for all of the reactionary and conservative philosophies represented by the Government opposite from the Prairies.

Some Hon. Members: — Hear, hear!

Mr. Romanow: — But what area of the Attorney General's comments really bears some further consideration? You know he said, "Why we have got an NDP Government, we can really analyze this problem of political patronage and appointments in good perspective." Well I can tell the Hon. Attorney General you don't have to go to Manitoba to get a lesson on political patronage from this Government right here. That's not my intention to talk very much at length about Liberal patronage, but . . .

Some Hon. Members: — Hear, hear!

Mr. Romanow: — . . . well it might take a little too long. Has anyone here heard about Mr. Franklin Foley who has recently been appointed as superintendent with the Department of Education, the defeated Liberal candidate in Turtleford? I thought the Hon. Member from Turtleford (Mr. Wooff) had done a great service to the people of Saskatchewan. Lo and behold he pops up again in another place. Has anyone heard of Mr. George Trapp, personnel training for Saskatchewan Power Corporation, defeated Liberal candidate in Touchwood? We thank you very much, the Member for Touchwood (Mr. Meakes), for alleviating one crisis for the Province of Saskatchewan. Has anyone heard of a man by the name of J. Walter Erb, chairman of the Workmen's Compensation Board, defeated Liberal candidate in Regina East? I have another name to mention for the Attorney General, Mr. Wilf Gardiner.

With respect to Mr. Gardiner we can't say defeated Liberal candidate, we must say, many times defeated Liberal candidate. We can't really say a Deputy Cooperative Minister. We have to say many times Deputy Cooperative Minister. I can tell the Hon. Attorney General that, if he gives leave to the Deputy Cooperative Minister to run again in Melville, you will have to hire him back again, and I hope it is not more than a six per cent increase because of inflation. Has anyone here heard of Mr. Richard Keesey, teacher recruitment officer, President of the Wilkie Liberal Association. No, no mention of that. Anyone ever heard of Mr. Gordon Tanner, director of Emergency Measures Organization, Liberal organizer. Now here is a good name, Doug Degan, Information Services, presently vice-president of the Regina Centre Liberal Association. Mr. Pat McKerral, Mr. Attorney General, you know Mr. Pat McKerral. He is the investigator in the Provincial Secretary's office, a very able man and a former Liberal candidate in Regina Centre. That is how able he was when he lost his deposit due to my learned friend over here.

Some Hon. Members: — Hear, hear!

Mr. Romanow: — Now we are always interested in one Mr. Bernard Bierschenk, executive officer of the Highway Traffic Board, Liberal organizer at one time, kindly directing traffic in the Kelvington constituency, not very well though. I don't think he knows his left from his right unless he steered them down the right side — far right to defeat. Well, one could continue on and on. The list goes on. I thought we were doing the people of Saskatchewan a favor, as I said, when we defeated all of these people. One advantage about some of the names in Manitoba is that none of ours were losers like everyone of these people when they ran. Defeated, defeated, defeated Liberal candidates. Losers, losers, every one of them. On top of that deputy after deputy, deputy minister after deputy minister . . . I suppose the Hon. Deputy Minister of Cooperative Affairs was only partially so. The point I wish to make here, Mr. Speaker, is that when you have a situation where deputy minister after deputy minister in this Province has been running away from this Government, it doesn't behove the Hon. Attorney General to make mention of one or two civil servants when it comes to the whole list of Liberal hangers-on that I have outlined to the Members of this House.

Some Hon. Members: — Hear, hear!

Mr. Romanow: — Now the Hon. Attorney General talked about the Waffle Manifesto and the NDP Convention. Members opposite know so much about the NDP Conventions I wonder which one of them attends. Which one did you attend? Would you stand up, the Member for Hanley (Mr. Heggie)? Is it you? Or is it the Hon. Member for South West in Regina? Is it you that attends the NDP Convention? Where do you get your source of information from? Well, he says the Waffle Manifesto urges extra-parliamentary activity. Well this is a great concern for the Hon. Attorney General. Extra-parliamentary activity. None of this stuff, Mr. Speaker, for the Attorney General about communicating Government policies and issues to the people. Oh, no, we don't want them involved outside of this Chamber. None of this business of involving the people in democracy and decision-making and debate. Oh, no, we don't want them involved. Nothing about farm problems outside of this House. We know all the answers according to the

Attorney General. I want to remind the Attorney General that his favorite, his very favorite Liberal, Pierre Elliott Trudeau talks of participatory democracy and extra-parliamentary activity, Mr. Attorney General.

Some Hon. Members: — Hear, hear!

Mr. Romanow: — The Prime Minister wants dialogue. Not the Attorney General. The Attorney General supported dialogue and extra-parliamentary activity when Pierre Elliott Trudeau advocated it, but was he sincere when he supported the Prime Minister in that position? Was he really sincere? Perhaps he wasn't, and if he was sincere, then was he really sincere when he was telling the House about his comments on the Waffle Manifesto and extra-parliamentary concessions?

Some Hon. Members: — Hear, hear!

Mr. Romanow: — When the Attorney General talks of extra-parliamentary activity, he talked of pickets and strikes and demonstrations. And he and that Government opposite should know all about those things. What about 1962, Mr. Speaker, when medicare was introduced? Who struck and who promoted the strike in that extra-parliamentary form of activity? Where was the Premier when that strike started? What extra-parliamentary activity did the Premier engage in? What about my hon. colleagues talking about the KOD, that infamous and black and dark page of history in the Province of Saskatchewan?

Some Hon. Members: — Hear, hear!

Mr. Romanow: — Yes, yes that was extra-parliamentary activity. That was extra-parliamentary activity that the Liberals opposite promoted, pushed, advocated and supported.

Some Hon. Members: — Hear, hear!

Mr. Romanow: — They organized it to fight and defeat medicare. I ask you, Mr. Attorney General (Mr. Heald) were you involved in that form of extra-parliamentary activity? No, no, not today. Oh, no. Well, now the Attorney General talked about another area – vilification of the Premier of the Province of Saskatchewan. He said, "Look boys, you are vilifying the Premier too much, you know. You might hurt his feelings. He can't take it. After all, Ross Thatcher was the leader of the West." And I have some remarks to make about that tomorrow about where he is leading the West in terms of Confederation in Canada. If there is any vilification, Mr. Attorney General, just look to your own Liberal party for vilification of the Premier of this Province. We are not promoting or sponsoring it. Just in case you haven't read some of the newspaper clippings, I want to tell the Members of this House, rightly or wrongly, I don't support personal vilification, but rightly or wrongly, the Premier has been the victim of Members of his own party from coast to coast because of his policies, not Members on this side. I have here one quotation from a man by the name of Meldrum who calls "Thatcher most conservative." This comes from Sackville, New Brunswick. "W.W. Meldrum, Education Minister of New Brunswick's Liberal Government says he thinks that Saskatchewan's Premier Ross Thatcher is the most conservative Premier of the provinces. A

Liberal writes, Mr. Meldrum, "Premier Thatcher of Saskatchewan seems more conservative than any other premier." Some Members of his Government are convinced that every government in Canada except Saskatchewan is a Socialist government. "I note that in the matter of making subsidies to wheat," and he goes on to talk about that. "The most conservative and reactionary." That's a Liberal from the Maritimes talking about the Premier of the Province of Saskatchewan.

Some Hon. Members: — Hear, hear!

Mr. Romanow: — Does anyone know a man by the name of Mr. Mel Hurtig? Mr. Mel Hurtig is a very wealthy and noted Edmonton publisher, a very leading Member of the Liberal party, particularly in the National Policy Committee. He writes a very interesting article about the Premier of the Province of Saskatchewan. He says this:

Liberal parties in the West will never be a success unless they advocate progressive and reform policies. With Liberals like Bobby Bend and Ross Thatcher as their spokesmen, Prairie Liberal parties are at least a decade if not a generation behind the expectations of the electorate.

Some Hon. Members: — Hear, hear!

Mr. Romanow: — And then, Mr. Attorney General (Mr. Heald) you tried to assess the election in Manitoba. I'll tell you how the Liberals in the West and part of Alberta and British Columbia assessed the election of Manitoba. Mr. Hurtig sums it up like this:

Politicians have a much more important responsibility than simply to their wards, their cities or towns or their provinces. They have a responsibility to the society at large and their country. In a democracy, that political system works only so long as the electorate is concerned and informed.

I want the Members to note this, and particularly the Attorney General.

I view the victory in Manitoba as at least partly purposeful repudiation of the three Premiers, Thatcher included, and an endorsement of a belief in the future of a united Canada.

Some Hon. Members: — Hear, hear!

Mr. Romanow: — That's the assessment that Liberals are making from coast to coast of the Premier of Saskatchewan. Mr. Attorney General, don't forget to lecture your own party the next time you come up for a convention, on vilifying the Premier of the Province of Saskatchewan.

Well now, Mr. Speaker, I want to make one final comment about the Young Liberals and how happy they are with this Liberal party. We had another convention. This is an annual ritual of the Liberals. You know last time the Young Liberals were worried about beer and kegs and things like that. They are all very important issues in their place. This year from the

Qu'Appelle Conference it says, Saskatchewan Young Liberals are disillusioned with Premier Thatcher's Government. So now we have it in the East. Now we have it in the West and now the disillusionment is setting in right here at home. This was evident Saturday. You listen to this, Mr. Member from City Park-University (Mr. Charlebois), you might learn something. This was evident Saturday when the Young Liberals referred to themselves as 'Yes men and stamp lickens for the Government.' There were also charges that the Government spends too much time talking about free enterprise and highway building and neglecting important principles. The scene was the Young Liberals' seminar. Then there was one young man that says this: "The Government was criticized for overplaying free enterprise by one Mr. Dave Sheard, past president of Regina Campus Young Liberals. He said:

'I believe in free enterprise' is all the MLAs ever say when asked what being a Liberal means.

We should start telling the Premier that, if he wants the youth vote to stop talking about free enterprise. He said the Government should stop emphasizing free enterprise over socialism and start talking about things such as equality of opportunity and good work. That is Mr. Dave Sheard speaking.

I don't know who has convinced whom, Mr. Sheard, Mr. Thatcher or Mr. Thatcher, Mr. Sheard. I am afraid however he is just a little bit too young in that area.

I conclude by saying this, Mr. Attorney General (Mr. Heald). You concluded by saying you challenge us to make certain statements about labor bills and other matters of our policy to the people of Lumsden. I don't know if you will be the other participant when that explanation comes. In many ways I hope you are and in many ways I hope you are not. But I can say this, that we will do just that. We will also tell the people of Lumsden about some of your statements. We talked a lot about Liberal statements.

Last year, Mr. Attorney General, in conclusion I wish to draw to the attention of the Members, one of the statements that you made. You criticized the colleague of mine from Regina North West (Mr. Whelan) about being a man from Ontario and one who doesn't know very much about farming problems. Well, I can tell you, Mr. Attorney General, from the volumes of the 1969 Saskatchewan Legislatures, you don't know very much about farm problems either, because we have a letter that the Hon. Attorney General introduced to show how good a land of bounty and plenty this was in 1968. Things were wonderful he said and in support of that I am going to read a letter to you. And this letter, he said, was this:

The average farmer has his bins full of wheat, his barns and corrals full of cattle and feed, and most wives are full of babies for the bonus.

An Hon. Member from our side very appropriately said, and I must record it because it is on the record, he said, "That's a lot of bull." But the Attorney General didn't accept that, he said, "How could times be better. I hope you tell them how good when the House opens." That was what the Attorney General subscribed to and told the farming people of the Province of Saskatchewan and no other statement but that puts in better perspective what the Attorney General knows about farmers, what the Attorney General knows about the Province of Saskatchewan

and how the Attorney General will fare when the next election is called. Now, Mr. Speaker, I have . . .

Hon. Mr. Heald: — Mr. Speaker, before the Hon. Members takes his seat I know he wouldn't want to misquote anybody and I would like the record to show, and I am sure he will acknowledge this, that I was quoting from a letter and don't think you made that quite clear. It was what the farmer who wrote the letter said, not what I said.

Mr. Romanow: — Let the record show, Mr. Speaker, that the Hon. Attorney General is quoted as saying this on page 814 of Debates and Proceedings:

Mr. Speaker, politicians are always reminding one another of the grass roots. What are the people at home thinking and saying? And of course this is as it should be. The very essence of a vibrant and effective parliamentary democracy is an interested, informed and articulate electorate. And so I thought this afternoon that Hon. Members might be interested in a letter that I received January 27 of this year from a resident of this province. I know this gentleman and I accept full responsibility for the letter, and I would like to quote his views on one or two subjects . . .

Hon. Mr. Heald: — But it is what he said in the letter, not what I said. He said it in the letter and you kind of misled the Hon. Members. The letter was from a farmer, I accepted the responsibility for the letter, but it is what the fellow who wrote the letter said, not what I said.

Mr. Romanow: — Mr. Speaker, all I can say is as a farmer the Attorney General makes a better lawyer and that was a good example of it. No, we can assure the Attorney General that we will keep the records straight come the next election in the Province of Saskatchewan. But he can rest assured with us that we will not misrepresent or wrongfully state what he said about the farmers and the farming prices.

Now, Mr. Speaker, I have a few more words to say about the problem of Confederation and the remarks made by the Premier in the Debate last Friday. Accordingly I would request leave to adjourn the debate.

Some Hon. Members: — Hear, hear!

Debate adjourned.

The Assembly adjourned at 5:57 o'clock p.m.