

LEGISLATIVE ASSEMBLY OF SASKATCHEWAN
Third Session — Sixteenth Legislature
10th Day

Friday, February 27, 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 to the Members of the Legislature the following groups of students situated in the galleries — incidentally, I think numerically, the largest group we've ever had the privilege of welcoming this year. Eighty students from the Esterhazy high school in the constituency of Saltcoats under the direction of their school teacher, Mr. Chomosh; 43 students from the Ituna school in the constituency of Touchwood, represented by the Member for Touchwood, Mr. Meakes; 40 students from the Lumsden high school from the constituency of Lumsden, represented by the Attorney General, Mr. Heald; 53 students from Albert school in the constituency of Regina Centre represented by Mr. Blakeney, under the direction of their teacher, Mr. Sandness; 38 students from St. Charles separate school in the city of Saskatoon in the constituency of Nutana Centre, represented by the Minister of Municipal Affairs, Mr. Estey.

I am sure all Members of the Legislature wish me to extend an extremely warm welcome to all of these students and to express the sincere hope that they will find their stay here enjoyable and educational and to wish them a safe journey home.

Hon. Members: — Hear, hear!

ANNOUNCEMENTS

MISS DEMARIS RIGELHOF

Mr. Speaker: — I have a further interesting announcement to make. I am sure that all Members of the Legislature will be pleased to learn that one of our page girls, Miss Demaris Rigelhof, is about to be married, tomorrow in fact, to Mr. Dennis Simair. The wedding will take place in the Holy Rosary Cathedral tomorrow. I am sure all Members will wish to join with me in extending hearty congratulations and best wishes to our page girl who during this Session has served the House so well . . .

Hon. Members: — Hear, hear!

Mr. Speaker: — . . . and to express the very sincere wish that she and her husband-to-be will spend many wonderful years of happiness together.

Hon. Members: — Hear, hear!

SWIFT CURRENT ROTARY 50TH ANNIVERSARY

Mr. Wood (Swift Current): — Mr. Speaker, before the Orders of the Day I would like to draw to the attention of Members of the Legislature

that today the Swift Current Rotary Club, of which I am very proud to be a member, is celebrating its 50th anniversary. I am sure that the Members would like to join me in offering congratulations to this club for having given half a century of outstanding service to an outstanding community of this province. And I would also beg the indulgence of the Assembly because it is my expectation to leave rather early this afternoon so that I may be able to be present this evening.

Hon. Members: — Hear, hear!

ST. DAVID'S DAY

Mr. Blakeney (Regina Centre): — Mr. Speaker, I would like to call the attention of Hon. Members to the fact that we are approaching March 1st the National Day of Wales. You may see the odd daffodil over on this side. I want to remind Hon. Members that we are wearing these in honor of the national day of Wales and not in any sense wishing to emulate the Prime Minister (Mr. Trudeau). In any case he holds them by the bundle and has beads. We're just wearing a single chaste daffodil. I think Members will know that Wales is noted for its nurturing of opera singers and pirates and politicians and some people are unkind enough not to make any distinction among that group. I've seen recently in the Press calls to recognize the contribution to the life of Saskatchewan of the many citizens of different national and ethnic origins. I know that all Members of the House will wish to join with me in recognizing the contribution to the life of Saskatchewan made by people of Welsh ancestry and to express the view that the eve of St. David's Day, which is Sunday, is a fitting time to so recognize people of Welsh ancestry.

Hon. Members: — Hear, hear!

QUESTIONS

FEDERAL ACREAGE PAYMENTS

Mr. Lloyd (Leader of the Opposition): — Mr. Speaker, I am not rising to sing "Men of Harlech". I want to assure all Members that those who are daffodilists here are not members of the Welsh separatist movement. We are true blue members of the Commonwealth and all the rest of it.

Rather I rise to direct a question to the Premier. In view of the statement made by the Government of Canada today about the payment of incentives to persuade or encourage the transfer of acreage on to wheat, is the Premier going to make a statement on it to the Legislature?

Hon. Mr. Thatcher (Premier): — Mr. Speaker, the Minister of Agriculture (Mr. McFarlane) has been in Ottawa for the past 24 hours and only returned before the Session commenced. We have called a special cabinet meeting to go into the proposals early Monday morning and I would prefer not to make a statement until that time. In a general way I can say that, as Hon. Members know, at the recent Federal-Provincial Conference our Government did in its paper propose that some kind of acreage payments be made along the lines that apparently have been adopted. My own off-hand thought would be that these payments aren't probably an overall

solution, but I do welcome them as a genuine effort to help Western farmers by the Prime Minister and his Government. As I say we would like to make a statement Monday.

Mr. Messer (Kelsey): — Mr. Speaker, the farmers of Saskatchewan will no doubt realize the program as one of assistance similar to the requests in the New Democratic brief submitted to this Government and it is also similar to requests . . .

Hon. Mr. Thatcher: — Mr. Speaker, this is no question . . .

Mr. Messer: — I am just commenting on . . .

Hon. Mr. Thatcher: — This is no question. We don't need a statement from him. He has spoken before. Who cares what he thinks anyway?

Mr. Messer: — Mr. Speaker, this is a statement on the program announced by the Federal Government today.

Hon. Mr. Thatcher: — It's none of your business at this time, not on Orders of the Day.

Mr. Messer: — The business of the farmers of Saskatchewan, that's what this party is spokesmen for.

Hon. Mr. Thatcher: — You haven't anything to say about it.

Mr. Speaker: — Order, order! Now if I understand the sequence of what has just taken place in the House, the Leader of the Opposition asked the Premier if he was prepared to make a statement in connection with a statement, which I haven't read or seen but has apparently been made by somebody in the Government at Ottawa. The Premier rose and made a statement in connection with that. Now the Premier made a statement and the Member of the Opposition has the right to comment on the statement and there the matter will end.

Mr. Messer: — Mr. Speaker, as I was saying, it is also similar to a request made by the farm organizations of this province. However, the general consensus by farm spokesmen in the province . . .

Hon. Mr. Thatcher: — Mr. Speaker, I must rise again. I was answering a question, not making a statement. I said I would make a statement Monday. Now in answering a question surely the Hon. Member — he's made it all to television anyway — so why should he waste the time of the House at this time?

Mr. Speaker: — I admit this is rather a double-barrelled deal. The Leader of the Opposition asked the Premier to make a

statement. Now if the Premier hadn't wanted a counter comment from the other side he shouldn't have made the statement.

Hon. Mr. Heald (Attorney General): — Mr. Speaker, May I speak to the point of order?

Mr. Speaker: — Yes.

Hon. Mr. Heald: — I would submit to you, Mr. Speaker, that the Premier was answering a question. He was asked a question by the Leader of the Opposition. He answered the question. Now the Member for Kelsey (Mr. Messer) wanted to get up and make a statement. I would submit that he doesn't have the right to make a statement after somebody has answered a question.

Mr. Speaker: — Well it's a good question whether he was making a statement or whether he was answering the question. I'll be hanged if I know which it was to tell you the honest truth. I took it that he was making a statement and that he would make a further statement on Monday next. That's the way I took it. Therefore, I consider that in as much as he made a statement, I think that it is proper for somebody, one person only on the Opposition side, to make a comment thereon. I would suggest that these things . . .

Some Hon. Members: — Hear, hear!

Mr. Speaker: — . . . I would also suggest that statement should be as non-partisan as possible.

Mr. Messer: — Yes, Mr. Speaker, entirely non-partisan. And as I was again saying, the program is estimated to cost the Federal Government in the neighborhood of \$100 million and still only half of what is generally estimated to be needed by the prairie economy to put some stability to agriculture. There are several areas of problems that could arise out of this that I would like to comment on on Monday. However, I believe that most grain producers and all of us in this province realize that their main job is for the production of grain, the production that is needed for this country's economy, the production that is needed to fill the world's needs. It is, therefore, hoped that the program is only a short-term one, and that programs are in the future establishing economic stability by production and not non-production.

Hon. Mr. Thatcher: — Mr. Speaker, I serve notice that the next time a ruling is made of that kind I will appeal your ruling.

Mr. Speaker: — I want to service notice on the Premier that you can just jolly well hop right to it and do it.

Some Hon. Members: — Hear, hear!

Mr. Speaker: — And while I am on the subject let me say that I defended the right of the Minister of Highways (Mr. Boldt) to make a statement the other day in the interests of the right of freedom of speech.

Some Hon. Members: — Hear, hear!

Mr. Speaker: — And let me also add that in my view those who are making statements and those who are making comments should be a whole lot less partisan and less political than they have been. But regardless of that I will defend the right of free speech for each and every one of you.

Any time you want me on the floor of the House just say so. I'll get down there, quick. I'll be happy to do it and get right back into the battle.

TABLING OF REPORTS BY DEPARTMENTS

Mr. Lloyd (Leader of the Opposition): — I was going to raise another question if I may. This is a nice simple one. There are a number of departments of Government who have not put the reports on the table as yet. Ordinarily these are available much earlier in the year. I wonder if perhaps the House Leader could enquire as to when we may expect the reports of the other departments of Government.

Hon. Mr. Heald: — Yes, Mr. Speaker, as a matter of fact I drew to the attention of the Ministers yesterday the fact that they hadn't been tabled and I receive their assurances that they would be tabled. Hopefully some will be tabled today, and if not all today I will see that they are tabled on Monday. I became aware by looking at my timetable the same as the Leader of the Opposition so . . .

LONG WAITING LIST AT REGINA HOSPITALS

Mr. Whelan (Regina North West): — Mr. Speaker, I would like to direct a question to the Minister of Public Health (Mr. Grant). In view of the reported increase in the waiting list at the Regina General Hospital from 1,396 last February 1st to 1,653 this February 1st, and the reported waiting list at the Grey Nuns' of 1,000, what immediate steps are being taken to meet the rising demand on Regina's hospitals?

Hon. Mr. Grant (Minister of Public Health): — Mr. Speaker, we are proceeding with all haste on the start of construction of the South Saskatchewan Hospital Centre.

1969 DEFICIT AT REGINA GENERAL HOSPITAL

Mr. Blakeney (Regina Centre): — Mr. Speaker, may I direct a further question to the Minister of Health. I refrain from making any comment on his last answer for fear I would find myself in the business of making a statement. May I then direct to him the question, in view of the reported deficit of the Regina General Hospital of \$438,000 on operating for the calendar year for 1969 and in view of the long-standing practice of Saskatchewan Hospital Services Plan of picking up these deficits, I wonder if the Minister can advise whether or not the Saskatchewan Hospital Services Plan will pick up all or a major portion of the 1969 deficit of \$438,000.

Hon. Mr. Grant: — The Regina General Hospital will be notified in the next day or so of the portion that the Saskatchewan Hospital Services Plan will pick up. It will be the portion that is a legitimate expense over and above the budget and will be quite major.

Mr. Berezowsky (Prince Albert-East Cumberland): — Mr. Speaker, a supplementary question. In the past the Government has always — the previous Government and this Government — has picked up the deficits as far as I know. Is the Minister suggesting that now it is not going to pick up the full deficits?

Hon. Mr. Grant: — Mr. Speaker, it has never been the policy of the Government to pick up all the deficits of the hospitals. If this were the policy to pick up all the expenditures and deficits of the hospital system in Saskatchewan, instead of a budget of some \$80 million this year, it would be a budget of \$120 million. They know as well as we do that it is just not practical to give a blank cheque to all the hospitals in Saskatchewan. We've done a better job than they have and I'll demonstrate later on in my speech to this House.

Some Hon. Members: — Hear, hear!

Mr. Speaker: — According to my count we've had three oral questions and I think that's about sufficient for any oral question period and customary supplementary questions. The Member for Regina North East (Mr. Smishek), that's the last supplementary question for this afternoon, and the last question.

1969 DEFICIT AT ST. PAUL'S HOSPITAL, SASKATOON

Mr. Smishek (Regina North East): — Mr. Speaker, I would also like to direct a question to the Minister of Health in regard to a much smaller deficit in respect of the St. Paul's Hospital in Saskatoon of some \$49,000 at the year-end. Can the Minister inform this House whether the Saskatchewan Hospital Services Plan will pick up that deficit and whether the Province will assume that responsibility?

Hon. Mr. Grant: — Mr. Speaker, the same answer as previously. The St. Paul's Hospital will be advised within the next week and only the legitimate extra expense involved in this deficit will be picked up, the same as for any other hospital in the Province.

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).

Mr. Romanow (Saskatoon-Riversdale): — Mr. Speaker, yesterday I had some remarks to make

respecting certain of the comments by the Attorney General (Mr. Heald) on the Debate and comments made by the Hon. Minister of Welfare (Mr. MacDonald). I am sorry to see the Premier of the Province of Saskatchewan not in his jovial mood today as he was last night at the Canadian Petroleum Association banquet. I don't know what it is that changes the mood. He, you know, spoke for the second or third time – I believe it was Mr. Premier – last night and was given an appreciation of his very worthy words an old 1890 Saskatchewan buggy and this Government's half way there. All it needs is a horse and this Government is back in the horse and buggy days.

Some Hon. Members: — Hear, hear!

Mr. Romanow: — Most of us on this side know that anyway and have known it for quite some time.

Now, Mr. Speaker, I just want to make one additional comment respecting the question of the Indian and Métis problem in the northwestern part of the Province of Saskatchewan. Yesterday the New Democratic Party Members on this side urged the Minister of Welfare and the Government to set up an independent commission of inquiry to look into the entire question of the Indian and Métis problem, the entire procedure of the Department of Welfare methods of getting payments to the needy in that part of the Province. Thus far we haven't heard yet from the Government whether or not it will accept the proposal that we have made. I would like to inform the Members of the House that this morning we received some additional information, since I last spoke to the House on this topic, which further seems to indicate that there is confusion, contradictory welfare policies, a great deal of trouble for the Welfare Department in the northwestern part of the Province of Saskatchewan and I again invite the Premier and the Government of the Province of Saskatchewan to take up the suggestion of having an independent inquiry in this area.

Some Hon. Members: — Hear, hear!

Mr. Romanow: — I can assure the Members of the House that the full cooperation of those on this side will be had.

A brief word or two about the Attorney General's comments on the legislation to protect businesses and farmers in these very, very hard times in Saskatchewan. We welcome the announcements made by the Attorney General. We say the improvements that he has outlined are all beneficial and worthwhile improvements. However, it is of extreme regret to us that the Attorney General and the Government have not seen fit to make any recommendation respecting what we submit is much needed moratorium legislation as far as the Province of Saskatchewan is concerned, and that the Minister was not able to report to the House on his negotiations and discussions with the people at Ottawa that the same rules that he announced in other areas would apply to farm improvement loans. I am sure that about 75 per cent of the farmers of the Province of Saskatchewan are directly affected in some way with farm improvement loans. This is a vital area where some important protection is needed for them. The Minister, the Attorney General (Mr. Heald), unfortunately was not able to announce that type of protection.

Some Hon. Members: — Hear, hear!

Mr. Romanow: — More Important there are some areas that are entirely within the jurisdiction of the Province of Saskatchewan. I don't know, but I've heard reports, that farmers are having some trouble paying their power bills. Farmers are having some troubles with respect to keeping up their day-to-day bills that are within the jurisdiction of the Province of Saskatchewan, and we regret extremely the Attorney General's (Mr. Heald) failure to announce that the Province of Saskatchewan was acting within the area of jurisdiction that he did have some control over to give protection for the farming people and the small business man.

Some Hon. Members: — Hear, hear!

Mr. Romanow: — I think that could now very well have been the time for the Attorney General to announce the organization of an information program to inform the farmers of their legal rights, not merely the statement that he made for two or three minutes over the radio but a full-scale information program advising them of their legal rights, a legal advisory service, free legal advisory service for those who live in the cities and on the farms and who are caught in this very, very critical farm crisis that Saskatchewan is facing.

So I say to the Government and to the Attorney General, we welcome the proposed amendments and the changes but we say that it is not going far enough for the people of the Province of Saskatchewan and we urge them now to implement some action before it's really too late.

Some Hon. Members: — Hear, hear!

Mr. Romanow: — Before I get into the bulk of my remarks this afternoon I want to make one other comment about the question of population in the Province of Saskatchewan.

We've heard much in this Debate about population. I think some of the backbenchers of the Liberal party opposite really didn't believe the statements made by the New Democratic Members here on this side about the population decline. I draw to the attention of the Hon. Members that in The Regina Leader Post last night a front page story blared out the headline that Saskatchewan's population in 1969 has dropped by 13,000 persons, 13,000 persons in one year according to the Dominion Bureau of Statistics.

Now consider this with the rest of Canada where according to the statistics the population has on the average gone up 1½ per cent but Saskatchewan is down 1.4 per cent. Every province in the Dominion of Canada has recorded a population increase and rise, except New Brunswick and the Province of Saskatchewan.

Some Hon. Members: — Hear, hear!

Mr. Romanow: — New Brunswick is down 3,000 persons. The Province of Saskatchewan is down 13,000 people in one year.

An Hon. Member: — Unbelievable!

Mr. Romanow: — If you want to translate that in other terms, Mr. Speaker, that means roughly about 36 to 40 people leaving the Province of Saskatchewan every day. From the time that the Treasurer (Mr. Steuart) left his seat in the Saskatchewan Legislature yesterday and by the time he took his seat today 43 people have left his jurisdiction in the Province of Saskatchewan. If you add on top of the figure of the Dominion Bureau of Statistics that there is a 13,000 decline in population – if you add on top of this, Mr. Deputy Speaker, - that there ought to have been by natural increase an additional 9,000, that really means the population dropped in the Province of Saskatchewan by 22,000 persons and that is shameful as far as the people of the province are concerned.

We can politic about this but the fact of the matter is that the Province of Saskatchewan is in a crisis and if the population figures tell us anything, they tell us that, under this Government administration, the province is going down, down, down and out steadily under Premier Thatcher and the Liberals.

Some Hon. Members: — Hear, hear!

Mr. Romanow: — Mr. Speaker, last Friday the Hon. Premier discussed at length Western alienation in Canada. Several reasons were stated by the Premier, culminating with his opinion that failure to correct these complaints could mean the break up of Canada. I wish to direct my remarks this afternoon to those problems of Confederation, as I see them, and the Premier's address.

At the very beginning let me state clearly the propositions that we on this side adhere to when it comes to Confederation and the problems of Western alienation, so-called. Firstly, we are irrevocably and unalterably committed to the concept of one united Canada in the Federal form of government.

Some Hon. Members: — Hear, hear!

Mr. Romanow: — We say this, recognizing all the while that past Federal and Provincial Governments, Federal Governments primarily, have failed to use the instruments of the Federal Government imaginatively, wisely and justly, to provide the economic and social progress that we Western Canadians have expected.

A second proposition that I want to advance is that the several reasons for Western alienation that were put forward by the Premier last Friday are directly attributable to the actions and the policies and the programs of the one political party that has governed Canada for over 100 years, or for the bulk of 100 years, namely, the party of the Premier of this Province, the Liberal Party of Canada.

Some Hon. Members: — Hear, hear!

Mr. Romanow: — We say as a second proposition that the problems of Western alienation and the reasons for them, as put forward by the Hon. Premier, are not criticisms of the federal system of government, rather, they are criticisms of the men and the

women who have controlled the structures in that federal system of government, namely the Liberal Party of Canada.

Some Hon. Members: — Hear, hear!

Mr. Romanow: — This is the party of which the Hon. Premier is a member and active supporter and adherent. This Liberal party has created Western alienation, Mr. Premier, because it has been hide-bound to a political and economic philosophy that has long bypassed the Dominion of Canada and the Province of Saskatchewan. It has been hide-bound to the proposition that governments must be passive, that they must not play a positive and active role within Confederation and with the Province of Saskatchewan to solve our economic and social ills, a political philosophy that says it's acquiescence and not positive forceful action for governments, a philosophy that has been endorsed wholeheartedly by the Premier and the Members opposite.

Let's take a closer look at these reasons of Western alienation. As I say, it is my intention to show that they are the result of old and irrelevant Liberal private-enterprise philosophies and not the system of Confederation, not the problems or the fault of Canada.

The first reason that the Premier advanced for Western alienation was the lack of an agricultural policy. He stated that the farmer was caught in a cost-price squeeze and that the Federal Government has failed to relieve that problem. And with that we agree. We say the Federal Government has failed to act to alleviate the problem and the farmer is caught in a cost-price squeeze. But we also say that the Government at Ottawa and the Government here in Regina have failed Western Canadians in failing to come to grips with solving those problems of the cost-price squeeze and the agricultural policy.

What are some of these costs? I don't pretend to enumerate all of them, but he said one of them is the skyrocketing costs on interest rates. These are interest rates that are breaking the farmer. They are unfair and they are unjustifiable. Another reason for the cost-price squeeze is the prices for farm machinery that are being charged as exposed by the Barber Commission. We've been telling the people of Canada for a long time of these gouging tactics by farm machinery operators. Interest rates, Mr. Deputy Speaker, and gouging farm machinery prices have victimized the Western Canadian farmer for years. But I ask you who is responsible for those interest rates. Who is responsible for those gouging farm prices? These interest rates are the direct result of actions taken by chartered banks, financial lending institutions, insurance companies in the Dominion of Canada and the Province of Saskatchewan, the institutions that are the citadels of the private enterprise philosophy subscribed to and supported by the Premier and the Liberals in the Province of Saskatchewan.

Some Hon. Members: — Hear, hear!

These interest rates, as I have said, have been usurious and unfair. They take millions in dollars from the farmer. But make no mistake about it that those who take the millions of dollars are private enterprisers and Liberals, true blue, through and through. Farm machinery is exactly the same. They are the

product of this private enterprise system we hear so much about. They operate international cartels freely and at will within the Dominion of Canada, exploiting our farmers, forcing them to pay millions of dollars and excessive and exorbitant prices. Even during the depression, the Dirty Thirties, I am told, these companies refused to stand with the Western Canadian farmer in his time of need.

And today when the farmer is caught in the same situation, has there been an announced reduction in prices that have been significant on farm machinery? Not a word. They still refuse to stand by the farmers. In fact, if anything, there have been increases in the prices charged for machinery.

Some Hon. Members: — Hear, hear!

Mr. Romanow: — Mr. Speaker, this is corporate capitalism at work in Canada. That's the system that is encouraged. That is the system that is promoted. That is the system that is protected by law in Canada and Saskatchewan by the Liberals of this country and this province. The Premier's Liberal party has defended it by law. It has defended it because it has refused to take action on these unfair practices.

Recently we also heard the Minister of Highways advocate another form of return, if you will, to private enterprise, return to private enterprise as far as the Grain Exchange is concerned. We have heard them advocate a return to the type of philosophy that has caused hardship for the Western Canadian farmers. Yes, Mr. Premier, there is a lack of policy federally for agriculture. There is a lack of policy and confusion on agricultural policy as far as your Government is concerned as revealed by statements by the Minister of Highways (Mr. Boldt) and others in the backbench. This Provincial Government has contributed as much as if not more than the farm machinery companies and the high-interest charging companies and the Federal Government to Western alienation and the discontent of the Western farmer.

I give you an example in the mission of mercy that the Member from Watrous (Mr. Schmeiser) and the Member from Yorkton (Mr. Gallagher), undertook with the cooperation of the executive assistant to Winnipeg. They were going to sell the wheat for us to Romania. This is the type of meddling and confusion that dominates as far as the Liberal party is concerned. The type of action that prompts the highly respected Chief Commissioner, Mr. MacNamara, to say of the Premier, unfortunately, and of the two MLAs, that took the journey, that their charges and allegations against the Wheat Board's decision are totally unfounded and are doing a disservice to the farmers. Mr. Boden of the Saskatchewan Federation of Agriculture called the Hon. Minister of Highway's statement "most irresponsible". And then he said, "I am surprised that a Minister of the Crown would display such ignorance of the facts."

Well, Mr. Speaker, those are the problems from the lack of Federal and Provincial agricultural policies. Confusion, lack of policy? Yes, we agree with the Hon. Premier that there is confusion and lack of policy. But I say that no fair deal will ever be struck for the Western farmer until such time as there is a Government in Ottawa and Regina committed to the principle of using Confederation imaginatively and progressively, so that

Federal and Provincial laws together will be enacted to right these injustices of the Western farmer.

Some Hon. Members: — Hear, hear!

Mr. Romanow: — There has been alienation because of agricultural policy but it is due to the party opposite refusing to accept the principle of a social role for governments in Canada within Confederation. Mr. Speaker, I say we do not have to separate from Canada in order to eliminate this program. We do not have to tamper with the instruments of Confederation in order to ease the burden. We must, however, remove the non-doers, the disinterested, the faint and the weak who are unable and unwilling to fight for Canadians within Canada. And that's what the Hon. Premier and the party opposite that he represents stand for. They are either unable or they are too weak to fight for the problems of Canadians within Canada. I say, Mr. Speaker, that this means the election of a party which is committed to taking positive action in implementing a new and total agricultural policy, and that party is the New Democratic party and the Members on this side.

Now, Mr. Speaker, the second reason for Western alienation stated by the Hon. Premier was the national tariff policy. Well again I ask Hon. Members who implemented this national tariff policy. Who has perpetuated it for over 100 years? The Premier's Liberal party. Who does the national tariff policy protect? The large corporate capitalists of this country of Eastern Canada. Again it is direct evidence of laws passed federally by private enterprisers, and parties who are committed to that philosophy, for the benefit of private enterprise. These are corporations, Mr. Premier, that have year after year and including this year, scored high profits once again under the protection of this national tariff policy. The Premier is correct, we agree, that the national tariff policy has made Western Canada a colony for Eastern exploitation. But I ask him again who set that policy into motion. Who perpetuates it and works it against the interest of Western Canada? I say it is the Liberal party of Canada, the party the Premier is a member of. The Premier believes the best way for life in Canada is through corporate capitalism. Last night I heard him say to the Canadian Petroleum Association that he was not ashamed to say he was a private enterpriser. We give him credit for standing up for his views, but it only stands to reason that when you are committed to promoting private enterprise, you are committed to protecting it. When the interests of private enterprise are in conflict with the interests of the average farmer and the average laborer, you can bet your bottom dollar that corporate capitalism will always win with the Liberal party and injure the farmer and the worker.

Some Hon. Members: — Hear, hear!

Mr. Romanow: — Yes, Mr. Minister of Public Works (Mr. Guy), it is correct to say that the maintenance of the present national tariff policy is injurious to Western Canada. But Western Canadians realize that federalism does not have to be changed, that Canada does not have to be scrapped in order to change this national tariff program. We do not have to separate from Canada. We must act positively within the framework of Canada. We must again, I say, Mr. Speaker, choose men and women who are committed to using our structures of Canada for the elimination of this national

tariff policy and the removal of Western alienation. I say again this means removal of this laissez-faire party opposite and the election of those committed to using the system that way.

Now, Mr. Speaker, the third reason stated by the Premier was high freight rates. Too bad that his words weren't really taken to heart because the news, as announced yesterday, says that the freight rates are going to go up again, I think on March 1st. High freight rates. We agree with the Hon. Premier. They have been unfair and they have gouged the Western Canadian farmer, the Westerner. We have been telling the people of Saskatchewan that the only way to stop discriminatory freight rates is to remake the entire railway system of Canada into an efficient and modern one, under one integrated railway program, directly under the Government of Canada, working for the people of Canada. We find no merit in two railway companies, the Canadian National Railway and another one only 50 yards or so down the line, the Canadian Pacific Railway, going side by side in the same direction. That's duplication. That's waste. This will mean that the Canadian Pacific Railways must be nationalized. Our position in that area is clear.

Now the Premier's solution is to wish that this corporation, the CPR and other corporations, would voluntarily, somehow, agree not to gouge the Westerner by high freight rates. Respectfully I say to Mr. Premier, you're dreaming. As an avowed private enterpriser he surely believes that corporations should take profits and take profits when they can within the law. It is an accident of geography that we are victimized that way, but that is the essence of the private enterprise philosophy and they are now making profits off us. I would like to agree with the Premier. It may not be necessary to nationalize. Oh, if it were only true that corporations would sit down and listen to reasonable argument and voluntarily reduce prices, to cut back on the high tariff freight rates. But never that I know of in the history of the railways in Canada since Confederation have they ever voluntarily taken that action upon themselves, and they won't so long as there is a private enterprise railway in existence, setting the structure, setting the pace for all the other railways of Canada. The duplication and the waste are costing Canadians millions and millions of dollars, not in freight rates alone, in subsidies and in other inefficient methods of practice.

I say again, Saskatchewan must ask the Hon. Premier why he didn't propose last Friday something positive with respect to nationalizing the CPR. Why didn't he propose something positive with respect to the entire railway program, as I have said, one integrated railway unit? The Liberals have refused to take these actions. They have refused to make this railway program a modern and efficient one. And I say again, the Premier has turned a blind eye to the need to modernize the very important institution of Canada. Not one positive suggestion was made by the Hon. Premier to cure this problem of high freight rates. He simply contented himself to suggest that companies might voluntarily reduce the rates and we know the benefit of his suggestion was the announcement that rates were going to go up again on March 1st, coming up in a couple of days. That suggestion has fallen on deaf ears as only those of us who have said it privately and say now expected it would. It is another example, Mr. Speaker, of the failure of private enterprise, the failure, Mr. Minister of Public Works (Mr. Guy), of that system which is supposed to work on the theory that the most efficient and most fair system

of economic service at the best price can be obtained only through competition. It has been a sham. It has been a failure. It has cost us many millions of dollars and it has created the problem of Western alienation that the Premier talks about. And I say the Government at Ottawa should solve this crisis if it wants to commit itself to working within the framework of this country. Again, I say there is no need for Western separatism, no need to solve our Western Canadian problem by negative actions and thoughts. We need positive government that is not afraid to use Confederation to eradicate high freight rates. It must not be a government that is simply content to sit idly by and watch these problems mount one on top of the other, caused by the independent and private sector of our society, to go uncontrolled and unchallenged by our Government. Saskatchewan residents must conclude that the Premier really didn't mean what he said about high freight rates last Friday, or if he did he doesn't have the political fortitude or philosophy to promote and implement the action that he has spoken about and urges colleagues in Ottawa to do it.

I say that Saskatchewan must note that the reason for Western alienation is really the Liberal party of the Premier's that has promoted, encouraged, aided and abetted the railway companies to prosper at the expense of Canada.

I also want to note, before passing this area, that the Premier didn't make any mention whatsoever about the proposed CNR Master Agency Plan that has been announced to be going into effect. Mr. Speaker, this plan will once again put millions of miles, already discontinued for Western Canadians and for the Province of Saskatchewan, out of use. It will mean station agents closing up and losing jobs. It will mean that the very life line of many of Saskatchewan's small communities is going to be taken away from them. It means a strong, strong problem for the Western Canadian small town. Another service has been taken away and we have heard nothing whatsoever said by the Premier in this area. Not one mention of these persons who were affected. He talked rather about aid to potash companies when it comes to high freight rates. That's important, Mr. Premier, but no mention of any need to overhaul this program by eliminating the profiteering that I have talked about.

Now, Mr. Speaker, the fourth reason for Western alienation was stated by the Premier to be the head offices of corporations that are located out of Saskatchewan and that they spend money. But you notice and be careful what the Premier said here, spend money with respect to the administration of the office in parts outside of Canada. He says that was a source of great Western alienation. Well, here I say that the Premier was true to his convictions. His only reason for alienation in this area was that these corporations used profits in administering their own head offices outside of Saskatchewan, but he said nothing whatsoever about the fact that these very same corporations take millions of dollars of profits out of Saskatchewan and Western Canada and distribute them to shareholders often outside of this province and worse, outside of the Dominion of Canada, in foreign countries.

Some Hon. Members: — Hear, hear!

Mr. Romanow: — If he was so concerned about the head office situation I am sure he has had many opportunities when he promotes industry

for the Province of Saskatchewan to do something about it by urging these companies that there are certain conditions and guide lines that they must follow when they come in. Take Parsons and Whittemore, there is a company that we are told and led to believe has been financed to a large extent by the people of Saskatchewan. It is doing a lot of business for the people of Saskatchewan. Did the Premier suggest that any substantial sub-branch or office or head office – perhaps that's impractical – or any office for administration ought to be put down right here in the Province of Saskatchewan. It would benefit the Hon. Treasurer's (Mr. Steuart) constituency, I am sure, immeasurably. I don't know, maybe he did. If he did, it wasn't successful but it is a very small point. I don't care where the office is located, in Prince Albert, if as the Treasurer says it is there. Whether it is located in Regina, that's not the problem as far as corporations are concerned. The reason given by the Premier, by the administration of that office, Mr. Treasurer, is a phony reason because the amount of expense that really is involved in the administering of head offices is not the complaint of Western Canadians. What we are complaining about, Mr. Treasurer, is this Government's give-away of natural resources, the ability of reaping profits for the corporations without the people of Saskatchewan benefiting one iota.

Some Hon. Members: — Hear, hear!

Mr. Romanow: — What we say, Mr. Treasurer, is that we complain with your permission of indiscriminate corporate rule of Canada and the Province of Saskatchewan. That's really what we are arguing about, your inability to get a planned and rational program of utilization of natural resources for the benefit of all of Saskatchewan and not just a few corporation friends of my friends opposite. Now, I say, Mr. Speaker, that a strong and united Canada governed by a modern-day party, Mr. Treasurer, could solve some of the problems of legislating responsible corporate citizenship. Legislation should be passed so that profits of these corporations can be properly distributed among all Canadians.

Now I say, Mr. Speaker, that the fifth reason advocated by the Premier, that of closing of military bases by Ottawa and Saskatchewan is, respectfully, Mr. Premier, laughable. He said that a source of Western alienation in Saskatchewan and Western Canada is the fact that we don't have as many military bases as we ought to have in Saskatchewan. We are going to have lots of tanks and lots of military men roaming around the Province of Saskatchewan and Western Canada and, if we don't have it, we are going to be alienated from the rest of Canada. Well, I say, rightfully, Mr. Premier, that there should be a cut back in military expenditure, because modern-day weaponry involved much more expense and much more sophistication than it ever has before and it has all but ruled out Canada's involvement in the traditional, old-styled military sense that the Premier seems to be dreaming about. We want to maintain a peace-keeping force for Canada, not a force that is armed to the hilt in any aggressive sense. We don't want to perpetuate a myth of the by-gone era of Colonel Blimp that I think the Hon. Premier has perpetuated with that suggestion. I say, Mr. Premier, that your suggestion in this area of military bases illustrates precisely what I am saying when I say that people are alienated with the Liberals and not with Confederation because it is an impractical and nonsensical suggestion that you have made.

Well, other reasons were given by the Hon. Premier but time does not permit me to give those reasons at length. However, I do want to say that it is my contention today that these reasons are reasons that show it is the fault of the men who have controlled the system of Canada and not Canada itself. Westerners want them corrected, Mr. Premier. However, we do not want to destroy the nation in the process. We do not want to destroy the nation in what would be a senseless exercise. We say the remedy is to change the men, as I have said, who have caused that alienation. Ed Schreyer's election in Manitoba, I think proves the commitment of Canadians and Western Canadians to Canada because that was the central issue in that provincial election. And I say to the Premier that if you want to make this an election issue in the Province of Saskatchewan you'll be shown that the people of Saskatchewan are committed to one united Canada and not to some talk of separatism.

Lots have been said about the Press and how they report matters. I think above all we must stand committed to the principle of freedom of speech and I suppose all MLAs think that their topics of address are most important. But I firmly feel, like the Hon. Premier, this question of Western alienation in Canada is probably one of the greatest debates of Canada and Canada's future. I say that the Press has a duty to report positively and equally with prominence the arguments for Canada as it does the arguments against Canada. When the Press reports on a front-page story the Premier's arguments for separatism with little or no mention of his arguments against, the Press has done a disservice to this country. As a responsible Press, I call on it to give some solid and strong reason for the maintenance of this great country of ours and not for the negative. The Hon. Attorney General (Mr. Heald) talks about us joining the construction gang and not the wrecking gang. We are not the ones who are trying to wreck Canada with speeches like the ones made last Friday by the Hon. Premier. We are on the construction gang when we talk about using the structures of Canada positively and not the Attorney General and the Government opposite.

Mr. Speaker, the speech of the Premier concluded with a few brief words about the virtues of this great country. It appeared to me that a great debate was raging within the Premier's mind when he was delivering his talk and just in the nick of time he rejected Western separatism for the time being. His parting words were that the White Paper's implementation could be the straw that breaks the camel's back. If that is the case and if the White Paper does become law of this country, Saskatchewan is entitled to know whether the Liberal Government opposite and Premier Thatcher are advocating that Saskatchewan and Western Canada separate from this country. The Premier has said that the White Paper must go into the ash can. He said on a radio interview, and he said at the Canadian Petroleum Association last night, that he would have to reconsider his own personal position within the Liberal party if it becomes law. He has been smiling lately when he looks over to our side and I'm beginning to worry when he says he has to reconsider the Liberal party. That's one suggestion I don't think we will take the Premier up on. But the Premier has, Mr. Deputy Speaker, by implication and expressly told Saskatchewan and Canada that his position is that he cannot live with the White Paper if it becomes law. He says the White Paper will be the straw that breaks the camel's back and he talks about separatism in Western Canada and Saskatchewan. I say to the Premier and the Government: would the implementation of the White Paper be the straw

that breaks his commitment to Canada? The Liberals of this province have left separatism open as an escape for them from Canada and, Mr. Speaker, that is bad news for Saskatchewan and Canada. Our hope lies in a strong central government, totally committed, not leaving escape doors gaping open to separatism as the Premier has done. The remedy for Western agriculture does not lie in acquiring the problems of another country, as would be the inevitable by-product, sooner or later of a Western Canadian state. To me, that speech Friday was the most backhanded compliment that Canada has ever received by any head of Government in this country. That speech did more to fan the flames of separatism than it did to quell those flames. That speech did more to give reasons to separate in advancing them than in rebutting them and defeating them. That speech was misleading and erroneous in its analysis of Western Canada and the people that are in Western Canada. I say, Mr. Deputy Speaker, that that speech by the Premier was not and will never be the voice of the people of the Province of Saskatchewan under any circumstances.

Some Hon. Members: — Hear, hear!

Mr. Romanow: — I urge the MLA backbenchers, who are sitting back there with that speech hanging as a cloud over their heads, those doubts being cast about this country, the country that some of them defended so honorably and proudly in two World Wars and elsewhere and still stand for it, and rightfully so - and we commend them for that - to look at their own consciences when they examine that speech by the Premier. I urge the young people of the Province of Saskatchewan to reject the Liberal party of Saskatchewan and the Premier because that party has rejected Canada and the youth by that speech. Saskatchewan will not accept a Rene Levesque. It will not accept Gilles Gregoire and it will not accept a Ross Thatcher advocating separatism.

Some Hon. Members: — Hear, hear!

Mr. Romanow: — To my mind, Mr. Speaker, I must draw the conclusion from all the inferences of that speech that this Government is devoted to Western secession and really is a Western Separatist party. I regret the Premier devoted so much time in his speech to reasons to separate, without stating the real reasons why to preserve Canada. I say to the Premier that Western Canadians will participate in Canada and they will not withdraw from it. They'll explore new economic reforms. They won't back away from the challenge. They'll set out social priorities and objectives. They won't pull back from that idea of challenge. They'll fight for economic and social justice within Canada in good times and bad and not without Canada as the Premier has indicated. We say to the people of Saskatchewan - make no mistake, where the New Democratic party in Saskatchewan stands when it comes to the institutions of this country and this country - we are within Confederation and with Canada. With all the troubles, Quebec separatism such as it is, with all of the economic ills, with far too many Liberals, we'll take Canada good and bad. We won't look for solutions elsewhere. We say to the people of Saskatchewan that you have every reason to be upset with the Premier and the Liberals. You have every reason to feel that they have betrayed you when they talk of Western Canadian separatism. You have every reason to believe that they have failed to make Canada work for you and me. You have every reason to look for radical solution, but you must reject the Premier's version of sand-box separatism, and that is exactly

what he advocated. Sand-box separatism is what is being said in this Saskatchewan Legislature. The Hon. Attorney General (Mr. Heald) talks about leadership of Western Canada. That's the type of leadership that nobody wants.

Now, Mr. Speaker, I conclude by saying this: the threshold of the 1970s is now the time for economic and social planning. It's a time to redefine our economic and social priorities. It's a time to affirm our faith in Canada and to cast aside despair and defeatism. It's a time now for a new and strong nation and time for a new and strong government in Canada and in Regina. And, we say, Mr. Speaker, that Canada can be the best place in the world to live if all Canadians act together to restore justice to our economic and social dealings. To Saskatchewan and Western Canada we say this about Western alienation and separatism, reject it. You'll find your trust and confidence in Canada with us, the Members of the New Democratic party.

I cannot support the Speech from the Throne with its lack of progressive and visionary ideas for the decade ahead or a Government that looks back on Canada and not to the future of this great country.

Some Hon. Members: — Hear, hear!

Hon. Mr. Grant (Minister of Public Health): — Mr. Speaker, I am sorely disappointed in the Hon. Member from Saskatoon-Riversdale (Mr. Romanow) because I felt that with his advancement to the Front Bench that we would really be hearing something different than we have heard in the last couple of years. But the only difference is more of it and no improvement in quality — just more quantity. I was a little concerned about his time, and I trust that he didn't rush too much to allow me my full time, because he certainly was watching the clock but I really feel that it wouldn't have made much difference if he had cut it out about 15 minutes sooner.

First of all I must join with others who have conveyed their congratulations to our new Lieutenant Governor, the Hon. Stephen Worobetz. His is an important post and the selection of a medical person for this position has not occurred too frequently in Saskatchewan, or in Canada, and I know the profession, while generally under some criticism these days, will appreciate the recognition they receive and it gives a tremendous feeling of pride to the ethnic group which he represents.

I have personally known all the Lieutenant Governors from the days of Archie McNab and I deem it a real privilege to have become so well acquainted with our most recent Lieutenant Governor, Dinny Hanbidge as fine a gentleman and public figure as anyone could ask for.

I would also like to welcome a new Member, the Member from Kelvington. I would suggest that the Hon. Member from Saskatoon-Riversdale had better watch out, because after his opening remarks the other day, I would say that he is pretty good material for the Front Bench to take the Member's place from Riversdale. I know that he will find these sessions interesting, and at times provocative, and I want to congratulate him on the remarks that he made the other day. I thought they were well put for his first effort in the House.

I can't miss this opportunity to say a few words about the finest constituency in Saskatchewan, namely, Regina South. I think it is generally agreed that it is the finest constituency because everybody seems to envy my holding that seat and I think this is an indication that it is a good constituency. I think they are a fine group of people, they certainly don't present the same variety of problems that many of our constituents do in other rural areas particularly. I deem it a real pleasure to represent them in this House.

Mr. Speaker, the mover of the Throne Speech, the Hon. Member from Hanley (Mr. Heggie) made reference to this Government having a firm hand on health. The Leader of the Opposition (Mr. Lloyd) suggested that he might more correctly have said, "a tight hand". Mr. Speaker, if the Members opposite had exercised a firm hand on health when they were the Government, we would have fewer difficulties today. They were the ones with the tight hand, but not a firm hand and I'll demonstrate this later on this afternoon.

The Canadian health picture seems to be a panorama of problems and troubles, mainly centred around the fact that there seemed to be insufficient funds to meet all the demands being made and insufficient funds to keep pace with the rapidly escalating costs of our existing programs. While Saskatchewan has its problems, they become accentuated year by year because of developments in other provinces. Lack of coordination as between provinces generates untold competition for scarce professional levels, placing more stress and demand on our economy, particularly under the present conditions.

Federal-Provincial relations are going through rapid change, affecting both the Provincial programmes and the Provincial Health Budget. The movement of the Federal Government into medicare has brought about a cutback or withdrawal from many other programs, which we in Saskatchewan in most cases must continue even though there is no fiscal aid from Ottawa. I refer particularly to hospital construction grants and national health grants which have been cut back recently. The withdrawal of the Federal Government from national health grants meant \$496,000 last year to the Provincial Budget and in the remaining years to 1972 will total \$1,250,000. As of April 1st this year hospital construction grants will be discontinued by Ottawa, and this means in excess of \$1 million a year to our Budget.

While prices and costs have been going up in all sectors, it appears that in the health field they have been rising at an even more rapid rate. While this problem has been brewing for a number of years, it is only recently that the issues have begun to crystallize largely because of the limits to which inflationary trends can be allowed to go, and the action of Ottawa in withdrawing from certain fields. It was brought into sharp focus more than a year ago when, at the request of the Provincial and Federal Health Ministers, a group of Task Force studies was established to determine what could possibly be done to restrain the rapid escalation of health costs. The central issue that emerged, of course, is that, unless the rate of increase of cost can be slowed down, we have no alternative but to inject more dollars into our health plans or see an impairment of the quality of the present services. While the easy solution to the politician might be to inject more money into the scheme, I feel that nothing could be worse than spending additional funds to simply

duplicate or multiply the arrangements we now have and worsen our deficiencies.

I am told that there is an ancient Cornish test for insanity. It consists of placing a bucket under a tap of running water and telling a person being tested to empty the bucket with a ladle. If the subject of the test continues to bail water from the bucket without stopping the flow into it, he is judged mentally incompetent. Similarly, any society that attempts to provide more and larger buckets to contain its problems without a simultaneous attempt to reduce the flow, might be equally suspect of insanity.

It seems quite evident that the people of Canada are now aware of the necessity of tackling the problems of escalating costs and are making a sincere effort to bring them more in line with the general rise in the economy of our country. Looking at our own Saskatchewan picture, after 22 years in the hospitalization field, we find that the escalation is currently at the rate of \$7 million plus, which equals the original cost of the scheme. During the past five years the average rate of increase of hospital costs has been about 10 per cent and during the past year indications are that this trend will be closer to 11.3 per cent which in both cases is considerably in excess of the economy generally. Based on projections of our experience in the last five years, it appears that by 1974 these costs will be approximately \$123 million compared to \$7 million 22 years earlier, or compared to \$77 million in 1969.

In the current year some hospitals have requested budgets calling for increases as high as 18 to 25 per cent. The average requested by all hospitals was 16 per cent. If one projects the 16 per cent average over the next four years, the cost projected by 1974 looks more like \$140 million than the figure suggested earlier. Even without fiscal pressures I feel that a major assessment and review must be made of our hospitalization scheme since it has been in force almost a quarter of a century. Our one and only objective should be to provide quality within our fiscal limitations in the most efficient way possible.

It is not good enough to continue and extend outmoded systems, we must reduce outdated facilities, methods and duplications. We must introduce and develop the desire to improve and possibly inject incentives and penalties to bring about this improvement. We must break down our resistance to change and our dependency on past methods. We must overcome our fear of the untried.

It is somewhat regrettable that so much attention is given to the discontinuance of some outmoded facilities, and in many cases unnecessary facilities, and so little notice taken of what has transpired in Saskatchewan during the 1960s. During this period some 46 new hospital facilities were constructed. Many, many other hospitals were updated. During the period of 1960-63 the previous Administration spent \$7.3 million on new construction and renovation. The period 1964-69 our Administration has spent \$8.6 million, and in addition to that has set aside \$11.8 million for the South Saskatchewan Hospital Centre and the extension to the University Hospital, a total of \$20 million as compared to \$7 million under the former Government.

Some Hon. Members: — Hear, hear!

Hon. Mr. Grant: — Generally speaking it can be said that the more important

hospitals in Saskatchewan are housed in excellent physical buildings. There may be the odd exception — I recognize them — but I can assure this House that they are currently receiving consideration. It is no longer acceptable that we live with facilities developed for conditions existing prior to 1950, when such conditions have changed so materially in the 1960s and will be even more subject to change in the 1970s. I refer to significant shifts in the population of this province over the last 20 years.

In summary, in 1951 398,000 of our people lived in rural municipalities, as compared to 187,000 in our cities, whereas in 1969 this had almost reversed. We now have 396,000 in our cities and the rural population has dropped to 283,000.

While the Task Force and other authorities look to minimum-sized hospitals of 50 to 100 beds, with travel distances of 50 to 75 miles, I recognize that these figures are not practical here in Saskatchewan, but I would say that I would be content in the 1970s to see our minimum some 30 to 35 beds, and some 25 or 30 miles travel distance. I state this as a requirement if our hospital plan is to see a much needed improvement in quality of care. It is important that units be of a size to attract skilled professional help. It is just not good enough for Saskatchewan to only have 28 accredited hospitals out of 130. Recognizing that this problem must be faced up to and not continually swept under the rug, as was done in bygone days, on the suggestion of the Saskatchewan Hospital Association at the Municipal-Provincial Conference last year, I am pleased to announce that we have set up an Advisory Committee to the Minister of Public Health to study and deal with the problem of the smaller hospitals. This Committee will be under the chairmanship of Mr. Charles Wilkie of Milestone and will consist of two other members, one to be named by the Saskatchewan Hospital Association, and one by the Saskatchewan Association of Rural Municipalities.

Some Hon. Members: — Hear, hear!

Hon. Mr. Grant: — It is felt that this Advisory Board will serve a purpose in assessing the role that smaller hospitals will play in our hospital plan and will advise on the desirability of replacement or renovation and distribution. This Committee will be effective from April 1st and after a period of familiarization with the problem will consider individual referrals and make recommendations to me.

I would like to deal briefly with the procedure to be followed in the review of the Federal Task Force studies. This Government has attached urgency to the problem covered by these studies and high priority has been given to the evaluation of the reports. A committee of four Cabinet Ministers has been formed to deal with the recommendations when received and with those contained in the report and those that may be submitted by others. In addition to this, more than 35 health care associations and organizations representing suppliers and consumers of health services in the Province have been invited to present their comments and evaluations. Hopefully these will be submitted by March 15th of this year. In addition, the Department established a steering committee which meets weekly to study the Task Force report and make appropriate recommendations to the Cabinet committee when the outside assessments are received.

Mr. Speaker, I can assure this House that those recommendations that appear as having possibilities of proving useful

in the control of costs with the maintenance of quality will be implemented as early as possible. The Federal Minister of Health, the Hon. John Munro, has indicated that an interim assessment of the report will be discussed with the Provincial Ministers next month. It is my sincere hope that by the time the conference is called, we in Saskatchewan will be well equipped to make recommendations as well as consider those made by others.

As mentioned earlier – I see the Leader of the Opposition in the House now – when speaking in the Throne Debate, the Hon. Leader of the Opposition commented that the Member from Hanley (Mr. Heggie) made reference in his remarks to the Government exercising a firm hand on health, whereas he might better have said a tight hand on health. It is strange, Mr. Speaker, that the Members opposite so often seem to feel the only solution to health and education is to pump unlimited dollars in. Let us take a look at 1960–63 compared to 1966–69. Let us look at those who claim we are tight-fisted and by inference they were generous. Take the hospitals. The overall operation increase from 1960–63 was 20 per cent or \$7 million; 1966–69 comparable figures, 34 per cent - \$28.8 million.

Some Hon. Members: — Hear, hear!

Hon. Mr. Grant: — Now who was exercising a tight hand? Salaries, 1960–63 – they were really generous in this area – 20 per cent increase during that period representing \$5 million; 1966–69 under the present Government, 32 per cent for \$13.3 million.

Some Hon. Members: — Hear, hear!

Hon. Mr. Grant: — Let us just take a minute and look at the average wages and the average percentage increase during that period. While in 1961 there were 8,800 employees in the hospital system of this province, the payroll was \$26.5 million and the average was \$3,012. This was an increase of \$109 over the previous year for each employee. The average increase was \$109. In 1966 under the present Administration we had 10,283 employees, the payroll was \$40 million and the increase that year over 1964 was \$325. 1962, \$170; 1967, \$230; 1963 – that was a bad year just before the election – they gave them the magnanimous sum of \$83 for each of their employees in the hospitals, a 2.6 per cent increase, whereas in 1968 we gave a 7.8 per cent increase, an \$312 average increase.

Some Hon. Members: — Hear, hear!

Hon. Mr. Grant: — I think it is interesting to note that the number of people employed in the hospitals has grown in that period from 8,700 to the figure today of 11,111 and we are faced with a payroll bill today of \$53 million in this area.

In summary, the percentage increase in 1960–64 was 17 per cent; 1965–69, 34 per cent.

Your Government is alert to the changing needs of our people, both as to geographical requirements and levels of care under ever-changing conditions. Good progress is being made in the program of the care of the mentally ill in the community, rather than in the large institutions. It is interesting to note that since 1964 in the Yorkton area not a single new patient developing

mental trouble has had to be sent out of the area. The Yorkton-based teams of psychiatrists, social workers, nurses and private doctors have been able to deal with every case. The new Prince Albert centre is moving in that same direction. 1970 will see work start on out-patient facilities in the North Battleford Mental Hospital to better support community-care in that area.

The Hon. Member from Moose Jaw North (Mr. Snyder) has drawn his usual old chestnuts from the fire in attacking mental health programs and suggesting that there was a sort of golden age of the program under the previous Government. Perhaps it may have been the golden age of propaganda but that is all. Ten years ago we had the highest number of patients in mental hospitals in relation to our population of any province in the country. I tabled an answer the other day to an inquiry from the Member of The Battledowns (Mr. Kramer) and, if reference is made to that, you will find in 1960 in the North Battleford institution 1,865 patients were housed in facilities that were planned for not more than 1,100. It was nothing less than shameful and disgraceful that they allowed these conditions to exist. Now they are suggesting that we are the ones . . .

An Hon. Member: — Shameful, shameful!

Hon. Mr. Grant: — Another thing, the number of deaths in mental hospitals used to run 300 to 400 annually, a very, very high figure compared to the other provinces. This has been reduced to 100, and it can be easily shown that this reduction is not simply due to the smaller number of patients in mental hospitals. Many of the deaths that occurred, occurred in the elderly recent admissions rather than in the long-term chronic care type of people.

The Hon. Member referred to the exporting of psychiatric personnel. I have a feeling, my own conclusion is, that he does our psychiatric program more harm than any single individual in this province. Certainly the turnover of medical staff has been a problem in this province for many years. He knows as well as we do that they exported quite a few medical people back in 1962. It has taken us years to overcome this, we are just holding our own. But the problem, however, has not grown greater under the present Administration. Rather there has been some reduction over the past two years.

Perhaps, however, he means to imply that the medical staff are less well qualified than they were a few years ago. What are the facts? In 1962 out of a total of some 60 positions, there were only 16 that had psychiatric specialist qualifications, only 16 out of 60. In 1963 it had risen to 17. What is the picture today? This number has risen to 35 and has remained around this level with very few fluctuations since 1968. We have increased expenditures on the psychiatric program over the past six years despite the fact that the number of patients in hospitals has decreased too, markedly. The 1964-65 appropriation was \$12.7 million. By 1969-70 this had jumped to \$16.6 million. An increase of over 30 per cent. In addition to this, we have spent the sum of \$4.5 million on capital expenditures over the past six years. This included the construction of a modern psychiatric centre at Prince Albert which was opened last July. It is important to note that, although the number of patients in mental hospitals had declined to almost one-third of what it was in 1963, we have not significantly reduced staffing in the hospitals and in the programs. In 1964-65 the permanent establishment was 2,111. In 1969-70 it is 2,058. Staffing ratios in the

two mental hospitals have improved very considerably and also have the physical standards of care. The number of staff working in the community has been vastly increase, thus making possible a much better follow-up of psychiatric patients after they leave the hospital, and thereby accounting largely for the reduction of the death rate in these institutions.

There are many other points that I could mention but I do not wish to belabor them unduly. The Hon. Member has presented not fact but fiction. The mental health program is stronger than it ever was before and the reason for this is that we are not afraid to open it up for study or to act where changes are obviously desirable. No other province has passed us.

One of the health programs that Saskatchewan pioneered and of which we are all very proud is the cancer program administered by the Cancer Commission and operating clinics at Regina and Saskatoon. This program resulted from the interest of the medical profession and through the dedicated work of pioneer physicians and was introduced into this House in January, 1930. The Act was passed I believe in May of that year. You note that this was not an NDP program. It was introduced before they came into power. While this program has had a remarkable history and is envied by other countries, the Cancer Commission – and I agree – feels the time has arrived to review the progress achieved since its inception 40 years ago. It is time to assess its successes and shortcomings and determine if we might do a still better job in the future. To this end I have pleasure in announcing the appointment of a Cancer Program Assessment Committee under the chairmanship of Mr. Justice Fred Johnson of Regina. He will be ably assisted by professional and lay persons who are experts in their fields.

Some Hon. Members: — Hear, hear!

Hon. Mr. Grant: — This is a Minister's Committee and will report to the Minister of Health. I am confident that the findings of this study, along with the new Betatron on order, will move Saskatchewan further into the lead in the field of cancer care, treatment and research.

During the 1970s there will undoubtedly be continued improvement in the hospital facilities in this province. However, as hospital facilities become more costly to operate, it is inevitable that use of active treatment hospitals will become more selective. As our population ages, greater emphasis will be required in the provision of long-term or chronic care. In some cases this may mean facilities removed from the active treatment hospital scene. In other cases a ward or wards of general hospitals may be converted to this type of care.

Health care is a spectrum and costs grow rapidly as you move from one extreme of education, through health maintenance, preventive medicine, ambulatory care, home care, acute and finally intensive care, the most costly of all. A concerted effort must be directed toward treating the patient in the lowest level of care which is consistent with restoring him to health expeditiously. As you move across this bank of care more and more costly staff are required. It appears to me that the 1970s will see marked changes in traditional methods of caring for patients. We must be assured that by the cooperation of all health care personnel the patient is being treated

economically, that only those tests necessary to establish the diagnosis are ordered, that x-ray examinations are not sought indiscriminately, that when a decision is made about therapy it is reasonable, that diseased tonsils are not removed until a fair trial of more conservative therapy has failed.

During the coming year the Health Department will move in the direction of encouraging boards to exercise their responsibility as set forth in Section 62 of Schedule A of the Regulations. I quote:

The Board shall have full administrative control of the hospital including the medial, surgical, obstetrical, and dental staff thereof.

Some consideration must be given to a point system whereby hospital reimbursement varies directly with the standard of care rendered.

What is being done in Saskatchewan to solve these problem areas? First, levels of care are being carefully developed. At one end of the spectrum we now have several excellent intensive-care units in our larger hospitals. Merely to visit one of these centres as a spectator gives you a feeling of complete confidence in the competence of the staff and the sufficiency of the equipment. As we move along the spectrum from intensive care we now see many new self-care units, including the most recent innovation at the University Hospital, hostel-type care. This accommodation, located on one floor of the former nurses' residence, consists of 20 single rooms where patients are housed with only one nurse in charge. The patients look after their own bed-making, if they so desire, and move by foot to various parts of the hospital for meals, tests, etc. I believe it is unique in Canada and in chatting with some of the patients it appears it is being well accepted. Only patients who would normally be admitted to acute beds are eligible for this unit. We are moving into a larger number of geriatric-type beds to relieve acute beds and to lessen the load on nursing-home beds. The former Prince Albert Victoria Union Hospital now provides 33 geriatric and chronic-care beds. Our next extension of this field will be in Saskatoon where this type of bed is in short supply. Work will proceed this year with conversion of a portion of the Weyburn Mental Hospital to the chronic-care level. Very substantial progress has been made in the establishment of a rehabilitation centre in the Wascana Hospital. This hospital was formerly largely a terminal-care centre and many of you will recall that in 1964, I believe, there was a waiting list of some 400 people. When the Hon. Members opposite ask questions about the waiting list at the Grey Nuns' and the Regina General, they should use their powers of recollection and recall that the only way you got out of that hospital was when you reached the end of life's road. The change in the last two years can be described as phenomenal. Now there are 111 beds there that are used exclusively for the purpose of rehabilitating patients between acute hospitals and normal life or a lesser level of care such as the nursing home.

Mr. Speaker, the Members opposite rant and rave in their endeavor to lead the citizens of Saskatchewan to believe that they and only they had and have all the ideas and solutions and that everything this Government does is downgrading health programs. If that is the case why didn't they have the fortitude to move on the 1961 Hospital Report. They asked for the report and the

Hon. Minister of Health of the day kept it under his desk. They believe in quantity not quality. Give, give, give! Why didn't they implement the Saskatchewan plan in psychiatric services? All talk but little action, except to overbuild at Yorkton, five buildings and 150 beds. What has been the need since 1964? Two buildings and 40 beds. Let's refer back to the hospital capital construction that I made mention of. 1960 to 1963 - \$7.3 million; 1964 to 1969 - spent \$8.6 million; set aside for projects currently under way - \$11.8 or a total of \$20 million.

Mr. Speaker, this Government has given and is giving the highest priority to health. The Throne Speech recognizes the areas of our economy requiring an injection of funds. It voices action in areas requiring action. It points out that this Government is alert to the needs of our people and is prepared to act.

Mr. Speaker, I will support the motion.

Some Hon. Members: — Hear, hear!

Mr. Davies (Moose Jaw South) — Mr. Speaker, in joining the Debate this afternoon I would first of all like to associate myself with the remarks of others in extending congratulations to our new Lieutenant Governor and to the new Member for Kelvington, Mr. Neil Byers. I want to say with respect to the speech of the Member for Kelvington that it was, I think, the best maiden speech that I have ever heard in this House during the years that I have been a Member.

I would also like to make a few observations with respect to the remarks of the last speaker, the Minister of Health (Mr. Grant). I note first of all that he has had some rather unkind things to say about my colleague, the Member for Moose Jaw North (Mr. Snyder), especially with respect to the treatment of the mentally ill. I want to point out to the Minister of Health, Mr. Speaker, that it was the remarks of the health critic, the Member for Moose Jaw North and other Members of our party, that prompted the Frazier Report which in turn proved to the hilt the charges that were made by the Members on this side of the House. I point out also that all of the Report upholds the observations that were made by Members on this side of the House, including the Member for Moose Jaw North.

I note that the Minister of Health talks about the number of deaths in mental hospitals under the CCF Administration and under this Administration. Mr. Speaker, how ridiculous can he get. If the number of deaths was higher it was because of the fact that we inherited the thousands of mentally ill patients that were put in mental hospitals under the Liberal Administration for whom nothing was done, who stayed in those institutions year after year, after year, without any effective care from doctors, without a program. This, of course, gave us an aged population of mentally ill patients. No wonder there was a high death rate in those years, Mr. Speaker. I note that the Minister of Health has lauded the attempts of this Government with respect to the payment of the hospital employees' wages. He has spoken about the fact that there was a 20 per cent increase in salary during 1960 to 1963 under the former NDP Government, whereas he said this figure was 32 per cent in another three-year period under his Liberal Administration.

Mr. Speaker, has the Minister of Health not heard about inflation? Has he not heard that most of this inflation has taken place under a Liberal Government in this province and a Liberal Government at Ottawa? The fact of the matter is that in 1961 hospital employees in this province occupied the fourth place among the provinces in Canada in terms of rates of wages. In 1967, Mr. Speaker, hospital workers – the non-professional workers – of this province had slid down to ninth place. Only little Prince Edward Island was worse off than the hospital workers in the Province of Saskatchewan. So, Mr. Speaker, let not the Minister of Health try and tell us about how much his Government has done for hospital workers. At least, Mr. Speaker, there was never a strike of hospital workers in this province under the CCF. It took this Government to force the hospital workers of this province out on strike.

Some Hon. Members: — Hear, hear!

Mr. Davies — I am glad to hear, however, Mr. Speaker, that there is some belated recognition of the need to take an objective look at health services and in relation to health costs because one can only describe this Liberal Government's approach to the problem of health-care costs in the past five years as punitive. It was punish the patient, punish the hospital board, punish the hospital worker and punish the taxpayer. In this whole period of time none of the suggestions that were made by the Members on this side of the House were taken. These were positive and constructive suggestions which if adopted could have headed off the kind of action taken by the Minister of Health (Mr. Grant) and his colleagues – deterrent fees against the poor of this province. What is the Task Force on the Cost of Health Services in Canada saying, Mr. Speaker, and Mr. Minister? It is saying precisely the kind of thing that was urged by the Members on this side of the House when he took the action to implement deterrent fees in hospitals and for medical care. If our advice had been taken two or three years ago it would not have been necessary to institute deterrent fees. It should have been possible in my opinion to have given better health services at reduced cost.

The whole field of home care, preventive services, group medical practice, of alternative arrangements, of better administration, of bulk buying, all of these suggestions are now being made in the draft report of the Task Force on the Cost of Health Services. They were suggested at that time by Members on this side of the House and were not taken by the Minister of Health and by other Members of his party.

The Minister of Health has the temerity to talk about “sweeping the problem under the rug”, of “injecting incentives and penalties”. Well, Mr. Speaker, until now all that we have had from the Minister of Health and his colleagues are the penalties. We would welcome any incentives that may appear in the near future. But so far as can be seen from the main policy statements that he has been making this afternoon, we have a prediction of change, we have his statement that two new committees will be created – one of them advisory and one only partly formed as yet. This is a big gap between deeds and statements, Mr. Speaker. I say at this time that we have received nothing new from the Minister, nothing new that can point the way to what I think could have been done in this province to provide a better field for improved medical care

and at the same time economies in the cost of health services.

Mr. Speaker, I have this afternoon a limited time. I don't want to intrude on the time of other speakers who want to enter into this Debate. I would, however, like to briefly say something about my own constituency. First of all I want to say this with respect to constituency boundaries. News stories have appeared in the Moose Jaw Times Herald which are credited to some powerful figure in the Government, suggesting that the Cabinet intends to butcher and dismember the boundary lines in Moose Jaw in a wholly reprehensible way in yet another frantic effort to win seats by distorting and contorting boundaries that were recognizably valid and fair when we had two Members elected in one constituency. I want to warn the Government, as I did before the last Provincial election, that this kind of action will be repudiated again by Moose Jaw electors when they next have the opportunity of going to the polls. I say once more that Moose Jaw voters want to select, they want the privilege of selecting, two on the one ballot because the interest of their whole city area should be represented in this way. The Moose Jaw voters say that the Liberal Government's action of dividing the city into two constituencies was prejudiced and unjust because this Government in trying to elect at least one Liberal in one of the constituencies put 8,000 voters in the one constituency and 12,000 in another. If this Government wants to insist on two constituencies in Moose Jaw, let them be divided on the basis of equality of votes in the boundaries in each of these two constituencies.

Mr. Speaker, I had hoped to see in the Speech from the Throne some direct reference of help to Moose Jaw. I note that the Government wants the Federal Designated Area legislation to apply to the whole of the province. Some people may see in this, Mr. Speaker, a significant commentary on Liberal policies over the last few years, that the whole of the province needs to be included in the purview of this legislation. But leaving this aspect aside, I would hope that we would now be able to devise – and I ask this of the Government – to devise a program which would make this new aid, possible in the Federal scheme, used so that Moose Jaw would get the maximum advantages in new productive enterprises to replace those that were lost because of the march of technology. The Premier who is a self-styled hometown boy of Moose Jaw indicated that new incentives would be supplied to smaller communities. Well I am glad that this will be the case. I do want to suggest, however, that the communities with the greatest need, the communities that have had the greatest amount of difficulties over the years, deserve the first consideration. I observe that the Government has announced a Highways and Agriculture building for Moose Jaw. I welcome this. This is in line with the suggestions that I made for several years when I spoke in this House. I hope, however, that consideration could be given to starting construction of the Provincial office building which was cancelled by a Liberal Government in 1964.

Mr. Speaker, one aspect of the Federal legislation which I think is notably deficient has to do with the fact that service industry isn't covered by the new Federal Designated Area legislation. Because of the surge of technology, employment in the goods-producing industry hasn't increased nearly proportionately to the vastly increased volume in production. The main gains in employment since World War II have been in the service-producing industry. About two-thirds of our wage and salary earning force in Saskatchewan are in this group. I think that

the Saskatchewan Liberal Government should strongly recommend to the Trudeau Administration that aid should be extended to the service-producing area. This would sharply increase and expand our opportunities in Moose Jaw to attract projects that could bring new life to the community.

Tourist dollars, for example, especially tourist dollars from the United States, could be substantially expanded and enlarged by doing something with the present Moose Jaw Regional Wild Animal Park and transforming it into a public Saskatchewan Zoological Park and Historical Museum. I want to suggest that the expenditure of say some \$3 million on a program of this kind could buy us several hundred new jobs in Moose Jaw and a continuing income not only to the Friendly City but to Saskatchewan as a whole.

I remind the Government of what it is probably well aware that many industries today require enormous concentrations of capital that in the end only produce very few jobs; such is the effect of modern-day automation and technology. \$10 or \$15 million often brings only 10 or 15 jobs in certain industries such as the oil industry. The kind of project that I am talking about could result in hundreds of jobs in Moose Jaw and in the province.

I would like also at this time, Mr. Speaker, to applaud the excellent investigation in local pollution aspects that were made last year by the Moose Jaw and District Labor Council. The present Government, I think, is well aware of the findings, which shocked and disturbed many citizens of the extent to which land, air and water are contaminated. I would appeal to the Government to take all possible practical and immediate steps, in combination where necessary with local authorities, to help solve the problems that have been brought to light by the Moose Jaw Labor Council survey. Three main factors, I think, have been brought to light. One is the danger to health and the distasteful presence of pollution. Another is the great damage to a Moose Jaw river and valley which have a natural beauty of their own and tremendous possibilities for improvement for human purposes. The third is the fact that the presence of local pollution inhibits the entry of new industry and new people to the Band City.

Mr. Speaker, my colleagues on this side of the House have already commented on the fact that the Speech from the Throne does not in its entire length so much as mention the word unemployment. We know that just prior to this Session's beginning and shortly afterwards, the Government suddenly realized the position it was in. It had almost completely ignored the serious developing jobless problem in Saskatchewan and it knew it would now be called to account. Therefore, we began to note a number of pronouncements about employment projects in the province. The speech of the Premier on February 20th, as a matter of fact, did suggest a program that he said would provide some jobs. We shall see as time goes on just what reality and how much substance this plan contains. The fact is, however, that the Government has left the whole problem so late that it will be months before any really beneficial reflection of an employment-making program can be realized.

If the Government had attended to its proper responsibilities, if the Government had been alive to the situation, instead of spending its time forcing hospital workers into compulsory arbitration, it should have been possible at least six months ago to have devised a program which would now be in operation,

alleviating to a very large extent unemployment in our province. We know that the last figures on unemployment show that there are at least 18,000 jobless people in this province. This does not include farming people who would be looking for jobs if they thought that work was there. But even taking this DBS figure of 18,000 unemployed in Saskatchewan, a jobless rate, as my colleagues have pointed out, of 7.5 per cent of the wage and salary-earning population in Saskatchewan exists. This is the highest figure on the Prairies. Alberta, with almost twice as many people in its labor force as Saskatchewan has only 8,000 additional unemployed. Manitoba with a labor force of 57,000 more than Saskatchewan has some 2,000 less unemployed than the Province of Saskatchewan. Yet our Government in the midst of this situation dillied, dallied and failed to make the kind of effective plans that could have alleviated jobless conditions which are obviously among the worst of any of the provinces of Canada.

The other day I heard the Minister of Welfare (Mr. MacDonald) say that we had larger unemployed numbers in 1961. Remember, Mr. Speaker, that that was one of the worst years in the last 20 for unemployment conditions in Canada. I want to point out, however, at that time the conditions of unemployment in Saskatchewan were relatively the most favorable in the Prairies. Today the situation is that Saskatchewan jobless numbers are the worst on the Prairies.

The Premier says that our jobless conditions, which are two and one-half times worse than the rate considered to be safe by the Economic Council of Canada, occur because of the agricultural depression in Saskatchewan. It is plain that the bad conditions for agriculture have had a distinct effect on employment. But a large amount of our unemployment in the province comes about in the construction and building trades. Many of the workers in these straits were previously occupied in construction operations which were only very remotely associated, if at all, with agriculture. Mr. Eric Denhoff, in the Star-Phoenix of January 17th last, tells of his survey in the Saskatoon area. He found that there were jobless members of construction unions in that area running as high as 50 per cent of the membership. He quotes Mr. Gus Gerecke of the Brotherhood of Electrical Workers as saying that many workers are leaving the province to find work in the United States, Alberta and British Columbia. Mr. Gerecke also said that he did not expect any improvement in the coming year.

Mr. Speaker, it is easy to go on with many references informing us about the deepening depression in industry and the employment of labor. It has become increasingly apparent that the farm crisis of Saskatchewan has been allowed to develop because of failures in both the initiative and leadership of Liberal Administrations in Ottawa and Regina. Equally, it has become plain as mid-day that unemployment in Saskatchewan has become ignored, has been hidden and completely disregarded by the Government on your right. Its action and its lack of action have been responsible for the plunge into real hardship for thousands of Saskatchewan workers. Mr. Speaker, I say that this Government could have foreseen and should have foreseen these conditions. I say that the Government could have planned to avoid or offset these conditions. I say that the Government swept the problem under the rug until the time of this Session when it was forced to take belated action to cover up the worst of its sins of omission and commission.

Even four months ago, Mr. Speaker, if leadership and

government assistance had been forthcoming, if government building had been announced – and there is much needed construction – the building industry would have responded and Saskatchewan business would have responded. Instead precious time was lost, initiative was allowed to run down. As a results Saskatchewan citizens everywhere are suffering the unfortunate consequences.

This Government must accept the onus. Its policy on unemployment can only be termed one of outright neglect and abandonment. Its general labor policy is a complete disaster for both workers concerned and for the province as a whole.

Mr. Speaker, in 1969 there was an average of 11,000 unemployed persons for every day of the year. Now, if you assume an average weekly wage of \$110 a week - and that is about the figure at this time – it means that we lost \$63 million in wages for that year. There would, of course be another loss to consider and that is the loss in production. Since wages run about 25 per cent of the average of the cost of products this would mean that we lost last year conservatively at least \$187 million in lost production. If you add the two figures together, in 1969 we lost, by lost wages and lost production, something in the order of \$250 million in this province. Had this very large increased value and purchasing power been injected into the Saskatchewan economy, it would have had a significant effect on the improvement of business and life generally for the people of this province. But again the lack of enterprise on the part of this Liberal Provincial Government resulted in the loss of enormous sums of the total economy.

The labor policy of this Provincial Liberal Government has had adverse effects in other ways. One of these concerns the actual wages received by Saskatchewan workers. From July of 1964 to July of 1969 average weekly wages and salaries for Saskatchewan workmen dropped to the bottom of the list for British Columbia, Ontario, Alberta, Quebec and Manitoba. Saskatchewan increases in wages during this period were \$5.17 a week less than the Canadian average increase of \$32 a week. The 270,000 persons who make up the wage and salary-earning force of Saskatchewan are at least today \$10 a week behind the Canada-wide average wage. Mr. Speaker, what this means is this: that there is a total Saskatchewan loss in annual purchasing power of some \$140 million in the last 12-month period. So if, Mr. Speaker, we consider the losses to the whole Saskatchewan economy because of unemployment, because of lost production, plus the loss of \$140 million yearly due to the fact that Saskatchewan wage rates are depressed so far behind the national average, we have a combined total loss of \$390 million a year to the Province of Saskatchewan.

Just reflect on that. That is more than \$1 million of loss for every day of last year. So there is just no doubt in my mind, nor should there be in the mind of any reasonable person, that the labor policy of this Saskatchewan Liberal Government is responsible for this huge erosion in Saskatchewan buying power.

I said, Mr. Speaker, that the Liberal labor policy is misguided and disastrous. It has worsened the living standards of Saskatchewan employees. It has caused bitterness, resentment and has badly damaged morale among working people. It has lost thousands of good citizens to other provinces and to the United States. But more than that, it has prevented production, it has reduced purchasing power and it has hurt independent business

and the general economic health of this province.

Mr. Speaker, this Government has not served as a good example to other employers. It has been a bad employer. It has not promoted and assisted the cause of genuine collective bargaining. Rather it has impeded and obstructed it. With its own employees it has misused its powers and aggravated relationships. There has been a loss of many good public employees and a blow to the good morale of thousands of others. The action of the Government for example, in denying the payment of increments virtually guaranteed under custom and the union agreement is a glaring example of dragging its feet. The provision of conciliation services is just another.

Mr. Speaker, the Government hasn't been interested in good will and impartial means of preventing labor disputes. This Liberal Government, as I have pointed out previously, has used specious, phony issues affecting labor people and unions in continuous attempts to attack, not the causes of labor disputes but the unions themselves. This device is of course designed to get people's minds off real solutions to low farm prices, to inflation, to unemployment, by trying to blame and make a scapegoat of a single group in society. But it serves to avoid the honest responsibility that every honest government should be prepared to accept.

The focus of the failure of this Government to adopt positive and human labor policy was seen in the hospital workers' dispute only recently — just another victim of Bill No. 2. Mr. Speaker, non-professional hospital workers are among the lowest paid in the province. They receive a little better than half of the earnings of the Saskatchewan worker at average income. The hospital workers have been patient and long-suffering. The extra money they were asking was not an enormous sum in the aggregate. It was only after a year or more of bargaining that the St. Joseph Hospital employees struck and another strike took place earlier, as we all know, at the Prince Albert Victoria Union Hospital. Mr. Speaker, these strikes should never have taken place if the Government had not played a cat-and-mouse game with both the employees and the hospital boards concerned.

Some Hon. Members: — Hear, hear!

Mr. Davies — They would never have taken place if the Government had undertaken to finance a fair settlement which would still have left the employees far, far behind the wage and salary-earning employees in this province and elsewhere. Mr. Speaker, we know that the St. Joseph Hospital employees were on the picket line for three months; we know that the Prince Albert Victoria Union Hospital employees were there for a somewhat lesser period before settlement was imposed by Bill No. 2. Nothing could be more illustrative of the failure of the forced settlement procedure, Mr. Speaker, than the results in these cases. And what is the result? Hospital employees are angry and frustrated. They feel they have had to accept conditions under the mandate of Government compulsion. They feel that collective bargaining processes which provide an element of real employee participation have been rudely trampled upon. Mr. Speaker, The Essential Services Emergency Act, or Bill No. 2, as it is widely known has cast a pall over the entire management-labor arena in this province. It pollutes and permeates the collective bargaining scene. It expresses the attitude of the Government to collective bargaining.

The feelings of the vast majority of organized employees are rightly disturbed and riled because of it.

My basic objection to the legislation is that it runs counter to the whole principle of collective bargaining. It inhibits these processes and is therefore opposed to the philosophy of management-labor relations that has been built up in the English-speaking world and indeed far beyond that. But coupled with this is my concern that this Government has not attempted to construct a fair system of mediation and conciliation for its own employees or the ones its purse strings affect. Surely, Mr. Speaker, a common sense policy would suggest that, when conciliation or mediation is sought by a group of employees, government should be the first to agree, and the first to want to assure, that the process should be one of undoubted independence, knowledge and impartiality.

Bill 2, apart from its very principle is rendered more sinister through the fact that it gives this Government the right to appoint two members to the Board of Compulsory Arbitration, the right to liquidate unions without recourse to any authority, and the right to determine if there has been a violation of the law itself. The Bill is wrong-headed in both penalties and one-sided restrictions. There is no appeal; individual union members can be fined up to \$1,000 per day. Moreover, an employer concerned is allowed to alter wages and working conditions when a compulsory arbitration finding has been made, but the union affected on the other hand is prohibited from resorting to strike action for a year after the declaration of Bill 2. The whole legislation is a sham pretence and a blot on fair labor legislation.

Mr. Speaker, it is a fact that compulsion can only frustrate and transfer to a much more serious level grievances, real or felt, that lead to disagreement in the first instance. I want to point out to the Government what the Hon. Bryce Mackasay said just a year or two ago when he was speaking in the House of Commons:

Compulsory arbitration is a dictatorial solution that is no solution at all.

He said on September 19, 1968, speaking in the House of Commons:

I think too few people understand and appreciate the collective bargaining process; too many people fail to distinguish between labor and management in assessing blame for a strike. On those rare occasions when we have found it necessary in this country to introduce ad hoc restrictive labor legislation, that legislation inevitably has worked against the best interests of labor and has come down on the side of management. That's not the type of action that I, as Minister of Labour, intend to prescribe to my colleagues.

Mr. Speaker, this is a statement that the Provincial Cabinet, the Members of the Government opposite us, should take to heart. They would do well to study the remarks of Mr. Mackasey on this and other occasions. I would also like to point out what he said in the same debate with respect to the strike of the Lakehead workers. On that occasion he said – and I am quoting him again and I am making this statement at this time because it meets the remarks of some other Members from the Government side

during this debate.

I have been able to establish to my satisfaction if not necessarily to the Opposition's that not one single grain sale was lost as a result of the strike. Not one market was jeopardized or one commitment not honored. Our commitments to existing customers were filled.

Mr. Speaker, the Federal Task Force on Labor Relations, the Woods Commission, recently declared itself as being against any prior determination that the disputants in industrial sectors such as those covered by The Saskatchewan Essential Services Emergencies Act should be automatic candidates for compulsory arbitration.

I want to again point out to the Government what this Commission said. This Commission made a report that was the result of over two years' investigation that had at least 100 well known Canadians engaged in the survey. The Commission Report strongly recommended that each case of labor dispute should be dealt with on its own merits. It downgraded compulsory arbitration as a method of dispute-settlement. It itemized many other prior non-compulsory methods such as conciliation, mediation, non-binding arbitration, voluntary binding arbitration and special industrial inquiries, that included fact-finding and recommendations, that should be considered before any form of compulsion in a public interest dispute is envisaged. I say, Mr. Speaker, to this Liberal Saskatchewan Government that the Bill 2 legislation it promulgated in 1966 has done more to sour labor relationships than any other factor I can think of. I would appeal to the Government to study the kinds of recommendations that are embodied in the Woods Commission Report. I would appeal to this Government to repeal Bill 2. Its existence will do nothing to assist management-labor relations in Saskatchewan. It poisons and paralyses collective bargaining. It should go and it must go.

Some Hon. Members: — Hear, hear!

Mr. Davies — Mr. Speaker, I had some other comments that I wanted to make with respect to The Saskatchewan Trade Union Act but in the interests of time I shall defer those remarks to another time. I do want, however, to suggest that a revamped labor policy in this province means a great deal more to Saskatchewan than just security to the workmen affected. It is also bound up with the good of the province as a whole. Mr. Speaker, developments that have been fostered by this Government in the last four years can be summed up as follows: low wages, a discriminatory government policy, oral and written attacks against labor, unemployment and reduced opportunities for employment.

We are losing people to other areas of Canada and the United States, Mr. Speaker, not simply because there is unemployment in Saskatchewan, we are losing skilled and semi-skilled workers because of the indifferent or hostile attitude of the present Saskatchewan Government. What workman wants to stay in a province where wages are relatively low in comparison to other parts of Canada? What employee can remain indifferent to the kind of statements that are made against labor union organization almost weekly by Members of the Liberal party in office? No, Mr. Speaker, this Government is going to have to create a better climate for labor in Saskatchewan if we are not to lose thousands of additional employees. The Premier likes to talk about creating a good climate for industry. He must understand that a good

climate must also be a good one for those who turn out the goods, run the lathes and keep the wheels of industry turning. He cannot expect to keep employees with a torrent of constant abuse and reproach such as has assailed the working force of this province.

I want, Mr. Speaker, before sitting down to say that something must be done immediately about raising the minimum wage in this province. The raise to \$1.25 per hour took place after all other provinces had acted. It has come belatedly. Other Prairie provinces have acted so that our Saskatchewan rate is now or shortly will become the lowest. The Manitoba minimum wage is \$1.35 per hour. The Alberta minimum wage will go up to \$1.55 per hour by mid-year so that we have a situation where our minimum wage is again at the bottom of the heap on the Prairies.

There is no doubt in my mind that an increased minimum wage would be an effective addition to provincial purchasing power, not simply to help low paid workmen but to help the small business as well. Even in 1944, Mr. Speaker, the minimum wage was 55 per cent of the average weekly wage in Saskatchewan. This proportion has declined so that it is now about 42 or 43 per cent. We would need at least 25 cents per hour in addition just to restore the kind of differential that existed in 1944.

One of the trenchant reasons for increasing the minimum wage is to help the employees of the service industry who, as I say, have average wages that are about half that of the average wage earner in the province. I say it is inconsistent and unfair that industries that largely profit off the disposable income of highly-paid workers should not themselves have a minimum wage which reflects the kind of profit that they are able to make off that disposable income.

I would also like to say with respect to the part-time employees that something must be done to restore the differential that was formerly obtained. Because with the removal of the differential in wages, in minimum wages so that the part-time employee now makes the same per hour as a full-time employee, we have a great temptation on the part of some employers to hire more part-time employees than are necessary. The differential is one that results in a payment of 20 or 25 per cent less because fringe benefits alone for full-time employees are 20 or 25 per cent greater than that which would be paid normally to the part-time employee. I would suggest therefore, Mr. Speaker, that a part-time rate be set in the minimum wage regulations at least 20 per cent higher than the rate that would be obtained for the full-time employee.

Mr. Speaker, I have a number of other topics that I would like to deal with but, since what I have covered already has taken more time than I had intended, I'll terminate my remarks at this time in hopes that I can discuss these matters on some future occasion.

Mr. Speaker, there are some tidbits in the Throne Speech, sugar to coat the bitter pill that underlies the essential message, but apart from all else that might be said, the Throne Speech is devoid of any answers to unemployment. Nor can we trust the belated assurances regarding works programs that are conveyed by the Premier. The Speech contains no hope that the Government's cynical, retrograde and deliberate use of anti-labor forms and policies will be changed in favor of modern, realistic and humanistic policies and mechanisms. Mr. Speaker, I cannot therefore support the main motion.

Some Hon. Members: — Hear, hear!

Mr. McIvor (Arm River): — Mr. Speaker, it gives me great pleasure to take part in this Throne Debate. I would first like to compliment the mover and the seconder of the Address-in-Reply to the Throne Speech on their wide coverage of our present-day crisis and their many suggested solutions to some of our most difficult problems. To date we have listened to nothing but criticism from the Opposition and no alternatives.

I would also like to join with others in congratulating our new Lieutenant Governor, Dr. Worobetz, and do hope he is able to enjoy this high position. When we get a new appointment we lose someone. I feel many of us will miss the former Lieutenant Governor, Mr. Hanbidge. His dedication to duty, his ever-ready wit, and his friendly approach to matters will always be remembered by all who worked with him. May he enjoy many years of good health and happiness.

Turning to the Kelvington by-election, it is hard to believe the electors of this constituency should be so willing to be taken in by a party who had a Member sitting in this House from 1938 to 1964, who did nothing for them, and then turn against Mr. Bjarnason, a man who did so much for them in the four short years he represented them. I was amazed at the farms with outside plumbing, no telephones, the lack of electric power, after having been served by two CCF-NDP candidates all through the 26 years, while other areas of this province progressed especially when they were the Government for 20 of those years. When one looks at the new Member's program that appeared in the Foam Lake Review June 18, 1969, it is hard to believe that on Monday last he would loudly denounce and indicate that he would vote against the Throne Speech. Mr. Speaker, his number one item states and I quote: "Understanding and help in times of financial difficulty."

Now that he is elected he is going to vote against new agricultural programs of assistance to the farmers, larger educational grants, student representation on University Senate, increase in teachers' pensions, larger sewer and water programs for municipalities, municipal police assistance, the increase in homeowner grants, new construction grants, larger civil servants' pensions, against the provisions of The Coming of Age Act as well as many others that I have not listed. His second plank, No. 2, which states and I quote: "Cash deficiency payments of 20 cents per bushel on wheat, oats or barley." Note the 'or barley'. This one really intrigued me. Well, I have checked with the farmers in Kelvington constituency and they haven't been able to come up with anyone who has received this payment to date and I know full well I haven't received mine. Moving on to the next four planks of his program, promises which in no way could be filled by winning a by-election and which point up to his concern for people the old saying, "Tell them anything, get elected and forget them." Mr. Speaker, it didn't take him long to become part of the tired old group, a group who would vote against mother love if it didn't happen to be their plan or idea.

Some Hon. Members: — Hear, hear!

Mr. McIvor: — Mr. Speaker, the Member for Regina North West (Mr. Whelan) pointed out in his recent tiring recital to this House

that I had better be careful because of my 34 majority. I am very proud of that majority. After all it was over the Leader of the Conservative party, a man who had been sitting in this House. However, I was supported in many cases by the Conservatives because the people of Arm River in no way want to be represented in Regina by a NDP Member . . .

Some Hon. Members: — Hear, hear!

Mr. McIvor: — . . . a Member of a party that goes hand in hand with the trade unions, especially the unions who have clobbered us farmers, every time we have our product ready to move to the markets and to the needy population of Europe and the Far East. Should he think he is so popular, I invite him up there to run against me in the next election, then we will see who should be careful.

Some Hon. Members: — Hear, hear!

Mr. McIvor: — Mr. Speaker, the results of the election of the Schreyer Government to the power in Manitoba has already proved costly. They now have several new taxes and of course they've got Cass-Beggs. They are about to lose one of their major manufacturing plants. This is understandable as this company would either have to stay and pay the unfair tax load or move out. The latter they are choosing while they are still a young company and still able to move. However, many Manitoba people will be left unemployed as the results of action taken by a government that is supposed to put people ahead of dollars. What people? Everyone isn't a Cass-Beggs.

Some Hon. Members: — Hear, hear!

Mr. McIvor: — Mr. Speaker, it was interesting to note that when the grain loading came to halt at the West Coast, as indicated to us by an item in the Western Producer on February 12, 1970, how very mute our Opposition and Provincial Government in Manitoba became. Just another case of where the trade unions' cause comes ahead of the grain farmers of the Prairies. The people whom they are supposed to represent here in this House and at Winnipeg were forgotten again.

Mr. Speaker, may I make it very clear at all times I have advocated and supported the Wheat Board. However, this does not in my mind put me in such a position that I should not be critical of its shortcomings and lack of good administration. The loss of sales in many cases in the last two years has been due to their arrogant views, lack of salesmanship and continuing bungling of the handling of our wheat, oats and barley. No Board with such a vital responsibility should be allowed to adopt the attitude that they have displayed today. For too long they have sat back in their plush offices and done nothing but wait on the purchaser to come to them. I support the views of many of my colleagues that these positions should be up for periodic review and new replacements should be made with a very wide farming background, people who know what is going on today in the farming communities, men who are able to keep in touch with the farmers and also act as first-class salesmen of their product.

Mr. Speaker, in my area alone, three towns had room for a

one-bushel quota in early October and by November had room for two-bushel quotas, which was continually denied. In mid-December we were granted a one-bushel quota. However, farmers had their bins full, grain on the ground and bills to meet throughout this entire time. Actions like this do not make sense. Mr. Speaker, until the Wheat Board has displayed their talents beyond reproach on the handling and selling of wheat, oats and barley, I would think it would be very foolish for us to support their idea of them handling our rape or flaxseed. One has only to pick up the daily paper to be made aware that the producers – and I mean the actual producers of flax or rapeseed – are not having a major problem. With the appointment of The Hon. Otto Lang the Prairie MP as the Minister in charge of the Wheat Board, I anticipate he will be able to sort out this sorry mess, get grain moving very soon. And it is to be hoped when this becomes a reality that he will be faced with no more future strikes. Today his program was announced and we already in the question period had it criticized by one of the Members of the Opposition. Our Provincial Government has endeavored in all ways possible to come to the aid of the farmers during this recession. It has . . .

Some Hon. Members: — Hear, hear!

Mr. McIvor: — . . . made repeated requests and suggestions to the Federal Government. We have refunded the education and hospital tax on structures built and used for grain storage. We have promoted diversification, not only this year, but every year since we became the Government. We have authorized the guaranteeing of loans for purchase of female breeding stock this fall, a program thoroughly criticized by the Member from Touchwood (Mr. Meakes), but who offered no alternative other than the same old worn-out phrase of the cash injection. Cash injection for what or how? Handouts such as these are the only first steps towards welfare state. We had enough of that during the 20 years of their type of government.

Some Hon. Members: — Hear, hear!

Mr. McIvor: — Grants for education are on the increase again, up each year and every year since we took office. Our assistance to municipalities is a program we are proud of. One only need to compare it to the last Budget of the CCF-NDP and realize the great strides that were taken to assist these people. The adjustment of equalization grants, programs such as sewer and water, airstrip grants, gravelling, homeowner grants, and this year police assistance. The Coming of Age Act which is very popular among the youth in my constituency and to date has been very well received by the older citizens something they felt the younger people were entitled to. Speaking of lotteries. I also regret that this was bypassed. Being a farmer one must gamble on nearly every element, so a little side gambling that could also benefit municipalities, hospitals and other community projects would certainly receive my full support. Mr. Speaker, in trying times such as we have today, I think this is a noteworthy Throne Speech, one which I will only be too happy to support.

Some Hon. Members: — Hear, hear!

Mr. Gardner (Moosomin): — Mr. Speaker, I would first like to welcome the new Member for Kelvington (Mr. Byers) and although I probably

sympathize with him more than some of the others because I too came into this House in a by-election. I am sure I know how he feels. While on the subject I would also like to congratulate those Members opposite who made the Front Benches. I think everyone has been aware of the vicious and bitter power struggle which has been raging within ranks of the NDP, and I am sure that the shift opposite is evidence of this struggle. However, there is one question that bothers me a little bit. In this case I am wondering which came first, the chicken or the egg. Are those Members moving to the back benches because they are quitting or are they quitting because they were moved to the back benches.

Mr. Speaker, the results of the Kelvington by-election were naturally a disappointment to the rural people of this province, but we must be philosophical about this. You know, Mr. Speaker, Socialists are like wild oats. They seem to come on strong and are a substantial nuisance when conditions are favorable to them. The wheat situation became an issue in Kelvington and they were lucky there. Mr. Weir neglected the usual control measures and they are now the major problem in Manitoba.

However, Mr. Bennett like a good farmer took adequate control measures and almost eradicated them completely, much as Mr. Trudeau eradicated them federally in 1968. I suppose, Mr. Speaker, that the Socialists, like wild oats, will bother us for some time but the chance of either of them taking over in Saskatchewan are pretty slim.

Another surprise of the past summer was the stand taken by the Leader of the Opposition at the NDP Convention. You know we were amazed to see that he allied himself with the radical, university hippy, anti-U.S. element. We really thought he was in favor of U.S. capital, after all, Mr. Speaker, when he was Premier he ran to the New York money market so often that when the Government changed in 1964 the United States bond holders owned 92 per cent of our Power Corporation. I was surprised, Mr. Speaker, to hear the Member from Saskatoon-Riversdale (Mr. Romanow) spend so much time on the railroads. You know we hear a lot of talk about rail line abandonment and he spent 15 minutes going over this today. I would like to remind him that the only railroads that were abandoned or taken out of this province occurred while the NDP were the Government in Regina and the Conservatives were the Government in Ottawa. I know because I live on one of the longest lines that were abandoned.

Mr. Speaker, I had planned to say something about the wheat situation. However, it has been covered rather completely. The Minister of Highways (Mr. Boldt) made a very good speech the other day. I am sure that the Wheat Board deserves some criticism but I think that we really should try to be constructive. I have several suggestions that I would like to make. First of all I think that quotas should be opened sooner or make more use of space when it is available. The usual procedure now is for all elevator agents to jointly ask for a quota, often the agent with the least space because he doesn't want to lose business, holds up the quota to the detriment of farmers and this seems like a poor thing.

The new block system of boxcar allocation, I think, is going to have to be closely watched to prevent elevator companies from using the system for their own benefit and to the detriment of farmers. For example, a company could now push a larger share of cars into a point where it had tough opposition and losing

business or a point that it wished to close eventually, and perhaps has only one elevator, could be starved for cars to discourage farmers from taking their books out there. I would think, Mr. Speaker, that new regulations regarding the Wheat Board should be implemented immediately to replace some of the ridiculous rules we now have, and each permit holder should be sent a copy of these regulations and told that he is expected to abide by them.

The committee set up to review the quota system can hardly be considered unbiased. The Wheat Pool and the UGG represent elevator companies which have done a good job but which receive a large share of the \$100 million paid annually for storage. The third member of this group was a Wheat Board official and this left the farmers not represented. Surely, Mr. Speaker, farmers should be represented and consulted about matters which concern them so vitally.

Mr. Speaker, I would like to emphasize that I am in favor of the idea of a Wheat Board. I believe that Mr. Lang is seriously trying to solve the current problems and I believe that in the long run he will solve them. But in the meantime we would be remiss in our duty if we did not offer constructive criticism and suggestions. The details of the acreage plans announced this morning are not completely clear to us yet, but it appears that it is a good plan and will be welcomed by Western farmers. It seems that there is a pretty severe deterrent, Mr. Speaker, for growing wheat this year but that is perhaps necessary. I do hope that some flexibility will be allowed in the planting of forage crops. Perhaps for this year oats should be allowed as a forage crop because of the scarcity and the high cost of grass seed. Generally I commend the Federal Government for this plan. You know, when the Member for Kelsey (Mr. Messer) got up and made his little speech that he had all prepared, during the question period, I could see that he was having a hard time to hide his disappointment. It is a good plan and he knows it. But he also knows that the NDP are only popular when the farmers are in trouble and so they are anxious to keep them in trouble.

Some Hon. Members: — Hear, hear!

Mr. Gardner: — Mr. Speaker, we have heard a great deal about the grain surplus problem. I would like to bring to your attention an associated problem of a local nature. Mr. Weatherald, the Member for Cannington, referred to this previously but I feel that it is important enough to mention here again. In Southeastern Saskatchewan we have a unique geological formation known as the Moose Mountains. It is a highly forested area of about 150 square miles with a paved road through the centre and several beautiful lakes provide all types of recreation. It is a veritable oasis in the surrounding prairie and tourists come from hundreds of miles to utilize the Provincial park.

A part of this area is an Indian Reserve and this includes much of the heavier forested area. Tourists and local people were dismayed recently to note that bulldozers had moved into beautiful stands of birch, ash and poplar, and were ruthlessly knocking down and burning thousands of acres of previous forest, the only forest, Mr. Speaker, for hundreds of miles.

Apparently a huge pasture was being created by Federal Indian

Affairs and Agriculture people. Mr. Speaker, I believe this is one of the most flagrant examples of bureaucratic inefficiency ever seen in this province. Other Federal departments are desperately trying to solve the grain surplus problem by getting land out of production. There are hundreds of thousands of cultivated acres within a few miles of this area that could be seeded down with grass and would be more suitable for pasture. Much of this open land could be purchased for less than it costs to clear the forest land.

Mr. Speaker, there are several detrimental effects that I would like to bring to your attention. 1. This is a very hilly region with light soil and only a thin humus cover. Even if grass can be established, erosion will be a serious problem. 2. Snow-fed lakes in the recreation area will certainly be affected and as the pasture in some areas comes right up to the lakes, pollution will be a problem. 3. Traditional Indian hunting areas have been destroyed. This was one of the few havens for wildlife of all kinds in that part of the province. Birds and animals displaced have literally no place to go. 4. Tourists coming up No. 9 Highway from the South and points in the United States will now see a scarred and barren landscape instead of a beautiful forest. 5. I am informed that the PFRA officials are going to keep trees and scrub from regrowing by massive applications of 2-4D and 2-4-5T. Because of recent information on the use of these chemicals we can well imagine the pollution involved. 6. Almost no benefit will accrue to local Indian bands. Over \$1/4 million of taxpayers' money is being wasted to cause the damage mentioned above. If this money had been invested for the Indians at 8 per cent they would get far more revenue than they will ever get from the pasture. The pasture, Mr. Speaker, is not for Indian cattle but for the cattle of white farmers. Work is being done by outside white contractors so no employment is being provided for Indians. If nearby white farmers do use this pasture it will release land of their own at home for grain production and add to the surplus burden we have.

Mr. Speaker, this may sound to you like a local problem but in reality it is a serious problem which affects us all. It is an example of how a governmental bureaucratic juggernaut can crush everything in its path and may eventually destroy us. Attempts by myself and the Member for Cannington to have this project stopped have come to no avail. Federal Indian Affairs people disclaim responsibility and say the agreement is between the local Indian band and the PFRA. Local Indians feel they were talked into this project seven or eight years ago without adequate information and are not now in favor of it.

PFRA seems determined to go ahead with this destruction come hell or high water for the simple reason that it is already started. Mr. Speaker, it is almost too late but not quite. Over 5,000 acres have been destroyed and more is planned. I can only hope that the people involved will come to their senses before it is too late.

Mr. Speaker, perhaps if we could get some publicity on this we could see if the power of the Press is greater than the power of a couple of back bench MLAs.

Mr. Speaker, I didn't intend to talk at any length today on education as I planned on speaking in a later debate. However, the Member for Cutknife (Mr. Kwasnica) made some statements on education the other day which shouldn't go unchallenged. I have

in my hand a record of the grants paid to the school units in my area and also the pupil-teacher ratios from 1964 to 1969 and I would like to give you very briefly a sample of this information.

In the Moosomin school unit, for example, in 1964 when we became the Government the unit was getting an operational grant of about \$424,000. In 1969 it was almost \$600,000. And the pupil-teacher ratio, Mr. Speaker, that we hear so much about and which was 26.5 to 1, now it is 21.2 to 1. I have several here, Mr. Speaker. The Arcola unit that I live in, for example, in 1964 was getting a grant of \$443,600. In 1969 it got a grant of \$700,000. The pupil-teacher ratio under the NDP in 1964 was 27.6 to 1, now it is under 24 in the Arcola unit. I have the Oxbow unit. I have the Estevan unit. Mr. Speaker, I would suggest that Members should get this information for their own area. The information is readily available. I would suggest that the Member for Cutknife (Mr. Kwasnica) and others should ask the teachers and his school board if they would like to go back to the grants that they got in 1964, if they would like to go back to the pupil-teacher ratio, if the teachers would like to go back to the average salary that they got only six years ago under the NDP.

Mr. Speaker, no other Government in this province has ever done so much for education.

Some Hon. Members: — Hear, hear!

Mr. Gardner: — No other Government in Canada is presently doing more for education. Figures are readily available to anyone to bear this out. Mr. Speaker, I will support the motion.

Some Hon. Members: — Hear, hear!

Mr. Brockelbank (Saskatoon Mayfair): — Mr. Speaker, in rising to take part in this Debate I find myself in a very enviable position of being the last person to be debating the Throne Speech this year and of not having enough time to cover the multitude of sins that this Government has put before the people of Saskatchewan.

At the beginning of my remarks I want to echo the sentiments and feelings that have been voiced with regard to the retiring Lieutenant Governor and our new Lieutenant Governor. I also want to endorse the remarks that have been made mostly on this side of the House with regard to the New Member in the constituency of Kelvington.

I mention, Mr. Speaker, the sins of this Government and the multitude of them. I can only present a list at this time as I don't have enough time to discuss them. But look at the list, Mr. Speaker: unemployment increased, health care plans unbalanced, education plans shelved, taxes increased and more increases coming, resource development squandered and mismanaged, business failures increasing, farm failures increasing, bankruptcy increasing. That, Mr. Speaker, is only a part of the list.

I had intended to deal with the potash situation in the Province of Saskatchewan and the mess that this Government has got us into on that particular resource development. I noticed in the

Premier's remarks on this Debate that he had said that several years ago the potash industry in Saskatchewan was healthy and progressive. I have to agree with the Premier here. I don't get very much opportunity to agree with him but I do agree with him here. We had a New Democratic Government in Saskatchewan and the potash industry was healthy and progressive.

Some Hon. Members: — Hear, hear!

Mr. Brockelbank: — One thing our Government realized was that we must have intelligence and care when we are extracting this mineral from the wealth of mineral that is below the prairies of Saskatchewan. A few years ago when the Liberals came into power they adopted a push, push political priority behind the development of potash. I think that the priority they established in line with their philosophy could easily be summed up in 'Open house boys, come and get it.'

The Financial Post carried some interesting Saskatchewan Government advertisements and I have a few of them here.

If you believe in the principle of free enterprise and are looking for a growth business climate, Saskatchewan talks your language.

And also a similar advertisement from the Saskatchewan Business Journal.

In the Premier's remarks, as well as healthy and progressive industry several years ago when referring to potash, he stated that at this point the potash industry had brought itself to its knees. He said that there was overproduction, chaotic pricing and a virulent competitive situation.

This "virulent competitive situation" which was of the Premier's and the Government's making, was an interesting thing for the people of Saskatchewan to witness. They witnessed, Mr. Speaker, the master of the "virulent competitive situation" stooping over to extend government intervention to the industry which seemingly brought itself to its own knees, in the words of the Premier. The Premier said:

The Leader of the Opposition and his colleagues should note this statement.

All companies, all companies unanimously went on record as to the need for some action to end the marketing chaos. Because of United States anti-trust laws the American companies indicated that they couldn't do anything but, boy, we wish you would.

It has been noted, Mr. Premier, and consequently I would like to say to you that, if I were one of the companies which you brought to their knees by your "virulent competitive situation", I could easily agree that there was a need for some action as was suggested in the quotation from your speech. And furthermore, if I was a United States-controlled potash company operating in Saskatchewan and the United States, and was similarly a victim of this "virulent competitive situation" of the Saskatchewan Liberal strain, I could easily agree to that same Government protecting me from any United States anti-trust action and at the same time, Mr. Speaker, I could take the best of the worst possible situation.

1. I could force my non-United States competitors to idle their Saskatchewan operations. 2. This would allow me to mine out my declining United States holdings under a price umbrella established by the Premier.

Little wonder, Mr. Speaker, that the Governor of New Mexico was so elated that he proclaimed, and I quote:

I don't think there could have been any solution for this thing that worked out better for the Carlsbad area.

These comments were made in Santa Fe, New Mexico, the capital, and they were quoted in the Star-Phoenix on January 28, 1970. However, Mr. Speaker, I can't understand what possessed one Alexander C. Cameron, Minister of Mineral Resources, to announce to the world through the New York Times, November 27, 1969:

The move Saskatchewan is taking now will be the salvation of New Mexico's potash industry.

I can only anticipate that he intends to have these words printed on a banner and run it up on a Liberal masthead in the next Saskatchewan election. Personally, I believe he could easily get himself elected in New Mexico. What does the magazine Canadian Chemical Processing say about pricing, in its December 1969 issue? I want to quote:

The industry has neither welcomed nor condemned the plan, although many spokesmen said the fixed floor price was unrealistic. U.S. producers say \$15 to \$16 a ton will make them happy.

I can still hear the United States operators of potash companies chuckling as Governor Cargo stated,

I think Thatcher did a tremendous job in putting this together. His cooperation was extremely good.

Mr. Speaker, I want to say a couple of words about what should be done in the potash industry at this time. I want to say that rather than attempting to make some political capital this Government should confide in the Ottawa Liberals that they had made serious misjudgments about the development of the potash industry in Saskatchewan and they should seek Ottawa's assistance in developing markets other than United States markets. Recommendations have been made that trade and aid assistance should be advanced through the Government of Canada to spread information about potash use and establish new markets. As you can see, Mr. Speaker, I will not be supporting this weak, grey, Government document when we could have and we should have a strong, helpful and resourceful document to place before this House, with some good long-term plans for the Province of Saskatchewan.

Some Hon. Members: — Hear, hear!

Motion agreed to on the following recorded division:

Yeas — 32

Thatcher
Howes
McFarlane

MacDougall
Grant
Laroche

Radloff
Weatherald
Mitchell

Boldt
Cameron
Steuart
Heald
McIsaac
Guy
Barrie
Loken

MacDonald
Estey
Hooker
Gallagher
MacLennan
Heggie
Breker
Leith

Gardner
Coupland
McPherson
Charlebois
Forsyth
McIvor
Schmeiser

Nays — 23

Lloyd
Bowerman
Messer
Blakeney
Davies
Romanow
Dewhurst
Meakes

Berezowsky
Smishek
Thibault
Whelan
Snyder
Michayluk
Brockelbank
Baker

Pepper
Matsalla
Wooff
Willis
Kwasnica
Kowalchuk
Byers

Hon. Mr. Heald (Attorney General): — Mr. Speaker, I move, seconded by the Hon. Minister of Education (Mr. McIsaac):

That said Address be engrossed and presented to His Honour the Lieutenant Governor by such Members of the Assembly as are of the Executive Council.

Motion agreed to.

The Assembly adjourned at 5:31 o'clock p.m.