

LEGISLATIVE ASSEMBLY OF SASKATCHEWAN

Fifth Session — Sixteenth Legislature

5th Day

Monday, February 22, 1971.

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

WELCOME TO STUDENTS

MR. SPEAKER: — I should like to introduce the following groups of students seated in the galleries to the Members: from the constituency of Regina North East represented by Mr. Smishek, 33 students from the Glen Elm School under the direction of their teacher, Mr. Fraser; from the constituency of The Battlefords represented by Mr. Kramer, 80 students from Cairns School from North Battleford under the direction of Mr. Popoff; from the constituency of Lumsden represented by the Attorney General (Mr. Heald), 15 students from Ranch-Ehrlo under the direction of their teachers, Mr. Stewart and Mr. Aziz.

I am sure all Members will wish to join with me in extending to each and everyone of these students and their teachers an extremely warm welcome to the Legislative Assembly of the Province of Saskatchewan and express the wish that their stay here will be informative and pleasant and that they will all have a safe trip home.

HON. MEMBERS: Hear, hear!

QUESTIONS

FEDERAL-PROVINCIAL CONFERENCE

MR. R. ROMANOW (Saskatoon-Riversdale): — Mr. Speaker, before the Orders of the Day, I wonder if I might ask a question of the Government? I intended to ask it of the Premier (Mr. Thatcher) and the Treasurer (Mr. Steuart) but they are not with us today. It is getting to be like Ottawa with the rotation of Cabinet Ministers but I shall direct it to the Hon. Attorney General (Mr. Heald). As House Leader would the Hon. the Attorney General indicate to the House if we shall have an opportunity to debate the proceedings taking place in the last Federal-Provincial Conference in Ottawa and the subsequent one respecting Saskatchewan's position? I understand there is a conference coming in June.

HON. D.V. HEALD (Attorney General): — Mr. Speaker, I think the Hon. Member knows the procedure by which he can ensure that these proceedings will be debated. I'll take it into consideration, perhaps I could have a word with you about it. We can do it many ways, we can do it by way

of a resolution, perhaps there are other ways but certainly we should welcome dialogue and discussion. Perhaps I could have a word with the Hon. Member for Riversdale about the procedure.

MOTIONS FOR RETURNS DEBATABLE

MR. A.E. BLAKENEY (Leader of the Opposition): — Mr. Speaker, I wonder if I could ask the Government a question procedurally? Is it the intention of the Government to proceed with the Motions for Returns debatable after the close of the special order today?

MR. HEALD: — No, Mr. Speaker. I had in mind that we would proceed with the Motions for Returns not debatable and the questions, of course, but not the Motions for Returns debatable.

FEDERAL PUBLIC WORKS' PROJECTS

MR. ROMANOW: — Mr. Speaker, just one more final question if I can before the Orders of the Day, again of the Hon. Attorney General. The press reports indicate that the amount of money that is to be spent with respect to Federal Public Works' projects in Saskatchewan totals only \$150,000. Is any representation being made by this Government to the federal authorities to increase the public works' expenditures expected for the Province of Saskatchewan this year?

MR. HEALD: — Yes, the Premier has made such representation.

DISCONTINUATION OF CANCER RESEARCH

MR. W.S. LLOYD (Biggar): — Mr. Speaker, I should like to direct a question to the Minister of Health (Mr. Grant) and I do so because of the very widespread public interest and a very considerable amount of questioning which has followed the discontinuation of cancer research at the University of Saskatchewan. This is a matter of great public interest and I was hoping the Minister might make a statement on the situation in regard to that work and the possibilities of it being resumed.

HON. G.B. GRANT (Minister of Health): — Mr. Speaker, I am not sure whether I got the question correctly, is the Hon. Member asking what the possibilities are of this research being reinstated? Is that the question?

MR. LLOYD: — Yes, a general question with regard to the position of research on cancer at the University of Saskatchewan which has been largely discontinued and as to the possibility of it being

taken up again.

MR. GRANT: — Mr. Speaker, as the Hon. Member knows cancer research at the University has been carried on under the auspices of the National Cancer Institute and it was the main supplier of funds to that national research undertaking. It is not a program of the Government or the Department of Health. It has been changed in its direction and will be continued on with individual researchers working but not with a unit such as they had in the past. I am hoping that the National Cancer Research Institute will be successful in recruiting the type of personnel they require for a complete unit.

MR. LLOYD: — Then I take it from what the Minister has said that the Government is not considering supplying funds out of its own sources that would enable the research to continue.

MR. GRANT: — It is not practical to do this because all cancer research in Canada is co-ordinated through the National Cancer Institute and it receives funds largely through the Canadian Cancer Society. While availability of funds is very important, availability of people is even more important and I think it would be most unwise for the Government to get involved in the supplying of funds for this purpose to some degree, probably involving some disruption of the program of concentrating and co-ordinating research through the National Cancer Institute.

MOTION

INFORMATION GIVEN TO THE HOUSE NOT IN ACCORDANCE WITH FACTS

MR. BLAKENEY: — Mr. Speaker, I move pursuant to Standing Order No. 17 for leave to move that the Assembly give priority of debate to a definite matter of urgent public importance. In so moving I regret the inability to give the two-hour prior notice referred to in paragraph 2 thereof and ask your honour's waiver of that notice. The matter of public importance is as follows and I have handed a written statement to you, your honour. This matter is as follows:

Whereas from statements subsequently appearing it is clear that information given to this House by the Premier is not in accordance with the facts in that he has alleged that the Premier of Manitoba has begged Karl Landegger to take over the Churchill Forest Industries pulp mill complex at or near The Pas, Manitoba, and whereas press statements by Premier Schreyer of Manitoba and Mr. Karl F. Landegger, Parsons and Whittemore Incorporated as reported in the Winnipeg Free Press of Saturday, February 20, 1971, established the fact that the said statement is not true, that this Assembly give

priority of debate to the following Resolution:

That this Assembly forthwith consider appropriate action to be taken by reason of the false information given to this Legislature on Friday, February 19th, 1971 by the Premier when he wrongly alleged that Premier Schreyer had so begged Mr. Karl F. Landegger.

I so move, Mr. Speaker.

SOME HON. MEMBERS: Hear, hear!

MR. SPEAKER: — The Leader of the Opposition has asked leave to make a motion for priority of debate under Rule No. 17. He also asked that I should waive notice under subsection 1. I shall read the rules to the Legislature in order that all the Members will be well aware of what the situation is. I quote:

Leave to make a motion asking priority of debate for the purpose of discussing a definite matter of urgent public importance must be asked after the ordinary daily routine of business has been concluded and before the Orders of the Day are entered upon.

Subsection 2: Written notice of intention to move that a matter be given priority of debate under Rule No. 17 must be submitted to the Clerk of the Legislature at least two hours prior to the sitting of the Assembly. Such notice is to contain a statement of the matter proposed to be discussed. Notwithstanding the foregoing (and the foregoing meaning the two hours notice required) Mr. Speaker shall have the right to waive notice.

And I want to emphasize the last sentence, "Notwithstanding the foregoing, Mr. Speaker shall have the right to waive notice." I think that at the time this was discussed in the committee which sat to discuss and consider changes in the rules that sentence was inserted in the rules in order to give the Speaker an opportunity to waive notice thus granting him the right to do so if anything of an extremely emergent nature arose right on the spur of the moment in the House during the time the House was in session. I couldn't say that the particular subject that the Hon. Member has raised was an emergency of this nature because, if I recall correctly, it was raised in the Legislature by question or by statement, I forget which, on Friday last. I think that the rules of the Legislature as presently existing, that is the new rules, are those which should be followed as closely as possible. I feel that two hours notice might very well have been given of this particular motion. I don't think that would have been too much to ask for in order that the Speaker could have delivered a proper considered written ruling in regard to its admissibility. Therefore, I don't propose to waive notice of this motion and accordingly I rule it out of order.

QUESTION

NOISE IN LEGISLATIVE ASSEMBLY

MR. G.T. SNYDER (Moose Jaw North): — Mr. Speaker, I wonder if the Minister of Public Works (Mr. Coderre) could give us some kind of an indication as to whether we are going to be subject to the infernal din of that jack hammer all afternoon during debate. Is there any indication as to how long this is going to go on? Sometimes debates in this Legislature are tough enough to listen to without that kind of an accompaniment.

HON. L.P. CODERRE (Minister of Public Works): — If the Hon. Member is really disturbed we shall try to make an effort to have the noise stopped. I thought that this Legislature might put up with a little extra discomfort this Session to provide employment for the Saskatchewan people.

POINT OF ORDER

SPEAKER'S RULING

MR. J.E. BROCKELBANK (Saskatoon Mayfair): — This is on a point of order dealing with your ruling and I should like you to expand on it. I don't understand when you said that the motion was out of order; do I understand you to say that it is out of order because the two-hour notice was not given therefore the matter could arise at a later date?

MR. SPEAKER: — I shall try to be very explicit about this because we are now operating under new rules and I am sure it is the hope of every Member of this Legislature that they operate well as indeed they were intended to. I will be very explicit and say that I have ruled the motion out of order because the required two-hour notice was not given. Period. If this matter should arise again then the Chair will deal with it when it arises and as it arises.

MR. B.D. GALLAGHER (Yorkton): — The matter that I was going to bring to your attention has been brought to your attention by the Member from Moose Jaw North (Mr. Snyder). I hope that the Minister has gone down to rectify this situation. It is pretty disturbing for anybody to listen to the debate with that jack hammer going. I thought that maybe this was what the Leader of the Opposition (Mr. Blakeney) was going to bring to our attention.

MR. SPEAKER: — I think that somebody is going to control the jack hammer.

ADJOURNED DEBATE

ADDRESS-IN-REPLY

The Assembly resumed the adjourned debate on the proposed motion of Mr. Mitchell (Bengough) and the amendment thereto by Mr. Blakeney (Leader of the Opposition).

MR. J. MESSER (Kelsey): — Mr. Speaker, before debate was adjourned Friday last I had brought to this Legislature's attention and hopefully to the Province of Saskatchewan some statements that the Premier (Mr. Thatcher) had made in regard to the Manitoba government seeking the operation of a pulp mill in that province. It is unfortunate that we did not have time this afternoon to give the two-hours notice before moving our motion. I, however, should like in capsule form again to bring to this Legislature's attention and to the Province of Saskatchewan the content of that statement made Friday last. Mr. Thatcher had left the impression not only in this Legislature but to the people of Saskatchewan via radio and by newspaper Thursday and Friday that the Manitoba government was begging the Parsons and Whittemore Company to take over the Churchill Forest Industries and their products. He stated that he would not retract that statement and that if Mr. Schreyer wanted to deny the truth he could go ahead and deny it, when I told him that Mr. Schreyer had indeed said there was no fact in those statements. I should like to bring to the attention of this Legislature and the people of Saskatchewan a statement made in the February 20th Winnipeg Free Press. It states and I quote, Mr. Speaker:

Mr. Landegger, interviewed by telephone from New York agreed with Mr. Schreyer. He said, 'Manitoba's Premier had not in anyway been calling him'

SOME HON. MEMBERS: Hear, hear!

MR. MESSER: — He further went on, Mr. Speaker, and I quote Mr. Landegger:

I don't want to get into a hassle with Mr. Thatcher if he made the remark, but it is not true.

SOME HON. MEMBERS: Hear, hear!

MR. MESSER: — Now, Mr. Speaker, that is a very serious statement which, I think, was made intentionally to mislead not only this Legislature but the people of Saskatchewan and it certainly gives evidence not only to the Members to the right of you, Mr. Speaker, but the people of Saskatchewan exactly what the credibility of the Premier and the Government opposite is.

SOME HON. MEMBERS: Hear, hear!

MR. MESSER: — I assure you, Mr. Speaker, that this Legislature at a later date will be debating that matter to a much greater extent.

SOME HON. MEMBERS: Hear, hear!

MR. MESSER: — Well, they don't like the truth that's the point, Mr. Speaker, and the fact is they are going to have to take it because it is going to be brought not only to their attention but to the attention of the people of Saskatchewan.

Mr. Speaker, when the debate was adjourned on Friday last, I said that I wanted to make some detailed remarks in regard to the field of agriculture and the Throne Speech and I should now like to pursue that.

The Government at times recognizes farming as it should be, Saskatchewan's number one industry, but it fails to take action to lift it from the grips of economic depression. This Government and its counterpart in Ottawa continue to sell farmers short by non-recognition of the real problems, by over-propagandizing the shortsighted policies that they support and by their continued efforts to keep farmers in constant turmoil and conflict instead of creating a united voice for their concern. This Government has promoted a cloak and dagger campaign against the Canadian Wheat Board and Orderly Marketing of Farm Produce and have attempted to remove themselves from the policies of the Federal Government which they cannot do because they are Liberal allies.

A brief review of their policies over the past years, shows monotonous repetition of meaningless legislation. Year after year the best this Government has been able to do is advocate outmoded and outdated promises that are no longer saleable to the populace of this province. They have until just recently, continuously bombarded the farmer with propaganda showing how wealthy the farming industry in Saskatchewan is. In 1967 the Minister of Agriculture was boasting how proud he was of the Liberal Government's performance and that Saskatchewan's basic industry, farming, was a billion dollar industry. He was also congratulating the Federal Government at every opportunity for pegging the price per bushel of wheat at \$1.95 and 1/2, which I might say, Mr. Speaker, was not the \$2 per bushel which had been promised for many years to farmers by that Federal Liberal party. The basic price of \$1.95 and 1/2 was at any rate long overdue. Later in 1967 we find that the billion dollar industry had dropped to below that level, that farming was not as prosperous as it had been in years previous. In 1969 by this Government's figures, farming income had dropped to \$725 million or 20 per cent reduction from the year previous, which meant, again by the Government's figures, a 30 per cent reduction in net income.

If we were to take into account, the increased cash advances

to farmers in that year, net income had dropped far more than the 30 per cent which the Government admits to. If one would take into consideration, which we have to, the increased rise in the cost of operating and the inputs to farmers, the true realized net income for farmers in Saskatchewan is indeed a very, very sorry picture.

According to the Dominion Bureau of Statistics, net income of farmers in Saskatchewan in 1964 was \$450,883,000; in 1967 it was \$483,775,000; in 1969 that net income had plunged to \$194,500,000. Therefore, the 1969 farmer's income was 43 per cent of the 1964 level, only 40 per cent of the 1967 level. It is also evident that the net income for 1970 will be much lower than 1969, which represents a most intolerable return for farmers to operate with. I ask the Premier (Mr. Thatcher) and the Minister of Agriculture (Mr. McFarlane) and his colleagues what has happened to that billion dollar economy that they at one time bragged about? I ask the Minister of Agriculture if he is still proud of the performance of his Government, for if he is, I can assure him that the general public, particularly the farmers of Saskatchewan, are not.

SOME HON. MEMBERS: Hear, hear!

MR. MESSER: — Admittedly, there have certainly been problem areas over which government has very little control, but their continuing absence of legislation that could help resolve Saskatchewan's basic problems are inexcusable.

SOME HON. MEMBERS: Hear, hear!

MR. MESSER: — For they and their federal counterparts alone have to accept the responsibility of this continuing crisis, and no amount of super salesmanship or artfully acted disassociation from the Federal Government will improve their image in the eyes of the farmers today.

The farmers of Saskatchewan, because of these dire circumstances, are seeking something more than a fly-by-night, high pressure sales pitch that leaves an inferior product. That inferior product being the Government of the day in Saskatchewan.

SOME HON. MEMBERS: Hear, hear!

MR. MESSER: — The farmer is seeking a policy that will have foresight and legal authority to correct the problems he is unable to correct as an individual.

SOME HON. MEMBERS: Hear, hear!

MR. MESSER: — I say, Mr. Speaker, he is seeking a new deal for

people.

SOME HON. MEMBERS: Hear, hear!

MR. MESSER: — He has found a new deal for people and that is the New Democratic policy in Saskatchewan.

SOME HON. MEMBERS: Hear, hear!

MR. MESSER: — If this Government sees fit to, or has guts enough, to call an election in the near future, they will, I am sure after an election, realize, when they are sitting to your left, Mr. Speaker, that the people of Saskatchewan cannot be bought by a Government advocating false prosperity.

SOME HON. MEMBERS: Hear, hear!

MR. MESSER: — They will have realized by that time that the images which they have been trying to build in regard to the farming industry were not accepted by the people of this province. The Minister of Agriculture (Mr. McFarlane) and his colleagues will have found out that despite their advocating increased spending in agriculture, there have been under-expenditures which falsify the amount that was originally budgeted for. They will have found out that the farmers in Saskatchewan know that in 1964 the then CCF government of the day made available 4.5 per cent of the provincial budget for agriculture.

In 1970, the Liberal Government of the day, the Members to your right, Mr. Speaker, spent only 3.8 per cent of that total budget.

SOME HON. MEMBERS: Hear, hear!

MR. MESSER: — It is a time, with the exception of the thirties, Mr. Speaker, when farmers have not been in a more difficult squeeze. This Government that has professed to be the friend of the farmers has seen fit during this farming crisis, to reduce the spending on agriculture by more than one per cent of the total budget. I assure you that the super-vendors of propaganda and distorted figures will be not be able to sweet talk support for themselves from the people of Saskatchewan again.

SOME HON. MEMBERS: Hear, hear!

MR. MESSER: — No wonder the Minister of Agriculture is not aggressively voicing his praise for the Federal Government for its wheat pricing policies now. He knows better than to talk prices now, because the fact of the matter is, the farmers are no longer receiving the final payment on wheat which they delivered.

They are no longer delivering the quantities of wheat they delivered in the past. They are not receiving the price for wheat which they were receiving in the past.

SOME HON. MEMBERS: Hear, hear!

MR. MESSER: — The farmer received on an average, \$1.81 and 3/4 per bushel for No. 1 Northern Wheat in 1966-67 crop year. He now, under the pricing of the current crop year, received \$1.32 and 1/2. As it most unlikely that there will be a final wheat payment, the \$1.32 and 1/2 figure will be the total received per bushel. This means a drop of 49 and 1/2 cents per bushel in a period of four years.

AN HON. MEMBER: — Thanks to the Liberals.

MR. MESSER: — A period of four years under the Liberal Government. A reduction in excess of 27 per cent under a Liberal Government. The reduction, Mr. Speaker, for the information of the Members to your right, that is consistent in all grades of wheat. A similar situation applies to barley, with reductions in that four-year period, being 39 cents per bushel. In that same four-year period, oats dropped 16 cents per bushel.

I especially want to express to the Members opposite, that during the time of these most serious price reductions, the cost of operating for farmers in Saskatchewan, continued to escalate. Their response, if indeed there was a response, went unnoticed.

Admittedly, we are now moving more feed grains that we were several years ago. This is especially true in the case of barley. But the facts of the matter are that the prices are much reduced to what they were in the past, and therefore do not allow an equitable return in comparison to cost of production. No matter how much grain is sold, there is no profit in it, volumes of grain sold does nothing but worsen the situation.

SOME HON. MEMBERS: Hear, hear!

MR. MESSER: — The meagre oats and barley payments of 9.7 and 2.6 cents respectively fail to bring the price of feed grain to a level of reasonable return in relation to cost of production.

Mr. Speaker, if one was to choose two agricultural programs in Saskatchewan, one that the Government talks about a good deal, the other not quite as much, these two programs would have to be diversification and crop insurance.

In the case of crop insurance, the Government opposite has stressed the advance and progress being made in the Saskatchewan crop insurance program. The facts of the matter are in spite of this Government being in power since 1964, by the 1968-69 crop year, they had only expanded the crop insurance program to

cover a total of 12,838 farmers. Out of 65,000 farmers in Saskatchewan, the best this Government can do is to insure less than 20 per cent of them. Comparing this program to the all-risk program of Alberta where virtually all grain crops are covered and all farmers are eligible for insurance, including specialty crops such as green peas and rapeseed, Saskatchewan's program of insurance leaves a lot to be desired by the farmers in this province. Further, let us compare it to Manitoba, where the program covers all crops and specialty crops such as sunflower, rapeseed and yellow mustard, and which was extended last year to include hail insurance which virtually makes it an all-risk crop insurance program. Such a program pays indemnities on an individual field bases and the crop insurance corporation premium rates show an average reduction of about 30 per cent compared to the premiums for other hail insurance companies presently available in the province.

The Minister of Agriculture (Mr. McFarlane) and his Government in Saskatchewan should hang their heads in shame for making such little progress in providing such a limited program for crop insurance for the leading agricultural province in Canada.

The other area which the Government has continually promoted is diversification. In the changing picture of agriculture in the world today, particularly in the Province of Saskatchewan, where we have for some years enjoyed some prosperity through the production of grains, mainly wheat, there is certainly room for diversification. We, in the New Democratic party, are not against diversification, as the Government of Saskatchewan is trying to make believe we are.

SOME HON. MEMBERS: Hear, hear!

MR. MESSER: — We have, I believe, with a great deal of justification, been critical of the Government in its diversification plans in many areas. That criticism has always been of a constructive nature in the hopes that the Government would see the shortcomings of its diversification program. The solution of the economic farming problems of today is not entirely in the field of diversification. We have believed and now believe with a great deal of evidence that show the present Government has put all its eggs in one basket with the diversification program. Certainly considerable sums of money have been made available to farmers of Saskatchewan, encouraging primarily diversification in the hog and cattle industry. But to make grants and loans available for construction of new and expansion of established livestock enterprises without any obligation or responsibilities for the future of that industry is foolhardy.

In spite of the Minister of Agriculture's (Mr. McFarlane) claims that the expanded hog industry in Saskatchewan contributes very little to the overall increase of hogs in North America, this does not remove him or his Government from assuming responsibility towards continuing to add to the increased hog numbers.

SOME HON. MEMBERS: Hear, hear!

MR. MESSER: — I say this due to the fact that the prices of hogs are now at the lowest that they have been in a decade. It is now approximately \$22 per hundredweight, compared to \$40 per hundredweight a year to a year and a half ago.

I have here, Mr. Speaker, a cheque that a gentleman in Spalding received for the sale of a boar. I know that they don't bring a lot of money, but when he shipped this boar, weighing 350 pounds, his return was \$2.44. Now one would think that was the kind of cheques that our fathers or grandfathers would produce as remembrance of the thirties. But that is not the case. This cheque is dated January 12, 1971. \$2.44 return, Mr. Speaker.

These reduction in prices reflect undisputable hardships for a great many Saskatchewan farmers. Our criticism of the Provincial Government is that they did not, and do not show responsibility in their actions which helped bring about the hardships which hog producers are confronted with today.

These programs can be logically argued as being somewhat responsible for the inflated cost of replacement cattle. Even with the price of beef being buoyant, the margin of profit is small due to the cost of feeders and cows.

We, in the New Democratic Party, were and are critical, because we see these programs of Government not assisting or alleviating the economic problems of people of Saskatchewan but contributing to them.

We therefore say now as we have in the past, that there should be some means of protection, one of those being a floor or base price so that the primary producers net return would not fall below the net cost of production.

SOME HON. MEMBERS: Hear, hear!

MR. MESSER: — Quality incentives are good when prices are buoyant, but as they do not keep pace with the net return and cost of production, they are unable to replace drastic price reductions.

I can assure you, I and my colleagues will be saying more about this neglected situation throughout this Session.

Now if I may, Mr. Speaker, because of the drastic changes we have seen take place in Saskatchewan agriculture in the last year, and because the Federal Liberal Government has been involved and is making a great many recommendations for more future changes, I want to talk about the recommendations of the Task Force, the Lang proposals and the new grains policy.

I first of all want to reiterate the stand of my colleagues and myself in regard to the LIFT Program introduced last year. Even though we advocated an injection of cash to the prairie economy and the LIFT Program provided that, we did not agree with the guidelines of eligibility.

SOME HON. MEMBERS: Hear, hear!

MR. MESSER: — We did not, nor do we now agree with payments for non-production. We did not, nor do we now agree with restrictive ways the quota system was administered in regard to eligibility for the delivery of wheat being related directly to summer fallow acreage. The evidence shows that not only did the Federal Government act in a totally detrimental way with the legislation, it did not make available to the prairie economy the amounts of money that it initially suggested it would. And it also made available the least assistance for those who were in the greatest need.

Due to the fact that a similar attitude is carried out in the recommendations of the Task Force, which would result in the ultimate removal of a great many farmers in Saskatchewan, I think that, first of all, not only we as farmers in Western Canada, but all of us who are involved with the farming industry, especially politicians,. Have to ask some questions of ourselves and the Task Force and its proposed and related programs.

SOME HON. MEMBERS: Hear, hear!

MR. MESSER: — 1. Have the farmers and farm organizations in Western Canada really been able to research adequately the broad implications of these proposals? If so, is it correct to assume that the general consensus of farmers in Western Canada is that they have serious reservations in accepting many of these proposals?

SOME HON. MEMBERS: Hear, hear!

MR. MESSER: — 2. If it is a fact that their recommendations are for a reduction, are for a 2/3 reduction of population in rural Canada, will this answer or create more problems for society in total?

SOME HON. MEMBERS: — More problems, more problems.

MR. MESSER: — 3. Does the answer to agricultural problems today lie in increased farm size? 4. Is it logical to have planned production cutbacks when many in our society are not receiving adequate diets and a good percentage of the world is hungry?

AN HON. MEMBER: — Hear, hear!

MR. MESSER: — 5. Can farming problems be solved by transferring more financial responsibility to the farmers for overall economic stability? 6. Is it realistic and economically wise to try to produce only what can be sold in a given year? 7. Does the Federal Government's grain stabilization plan really provide a long term financial commitment to the western grain farmers?

AN HON. MEMBER: — No, no way. Liberal votes.

MR. MESSER: — These seven questions, Mr. Speaker, open seven areas of vital concern to the future of western farmers.

SOME HON. MEMBERS: Hear, hear!

MR. MESSER: — Observing the reaction of western farmers as to whether they fully comprehend the Task Force and its varied follow-up proposals, I think it can be safely said that many areas of the report have created confusion and uncertainty as to what would actually be the development of agriculture in the future. However, many of the proposals have been projected and the result of these projections are unfavorable to western farmers.

SOME HON. MEMBERS: Hear, hear!

MR. MESSER: — Therefore, the Federal and Provincial Governments should be cautious in accepting and adopting proposals that the farmers are suspicious of, and in disagreement with. Governments should furthermore be most hesitant in accepting proposals from the non-farming sector which is where these proposals have come from.

SOME HON. MEMBERS: Hear, hear!

MR. MESSER: — I believe it is becoming more evident that decreasing farm population is not the answer in providing for a viable farm industry.

SOME HON. MEMBERS: Hear, hear!

MR. MESSER: — Nor will it provide for an economic and viable urban industry. Nor will it provide for a balanced structure of rural and urban societies. The present unemployment situation in Canada today exemplifies the shortsightedness of the recommendations for shifting some of the rural population to urban centres. Given today's circumstances it would only shift the rural poor to the slums of the urban unfortunate. Surely in this day and age and with the knowledge that we have, we can see that the continual drive for increased population in concentrated areas only adds to the problems of society.

Larger cities are not only unable to handle the numerous pollution problems but they are also encountering increasing difficulty in finding room for and providing housing and service to the residents of these cities.

Jobs are not available; social problems arise in regard to family life, and increased rates of crime. If we want evidence of these problems one only has to look at the cities of the United States and the problems they have in them. The United States government unfortunately, realizing too late that their cities had grown too large, are now involved in a program that is making available hundreds of millions of dollars in an attempt to decentralize their larger cities.

The Province of Saskatchewan, I believe, would serve as a prime example of the serious repercussions of mass depopulation in rural Saskatchewan. Rural depopulation would undoubtedly mean serious depopulation of the province as a whole. Significant reduction in rural population and increased farm sizes would mean closures of many of the servicing businesses of agriculture. It would mean closures to rural society of services such as hospitals and schools, to mention only a few. This would inevitably mean the complete disappearance of many communities in the Province of Saskatchewan.

It could well mean that it would be virtually impossible for any provincial government to provide those who were left in this province with services that society requires. Services such as highways, grid roads, power, telephone, natural gas, medicare and education. I think it is obvious to us all that because of the vast agricultural area in Saskatchewan, that significant reductions in population in that vast area would create a situation whereby those who would remain would be unable to bear the costs that are needed for those services.

Not only would there be a loss of rural way of life, but also highly probably that those who remained would have very little representation or voice in or with Government in regard to their affairs. It would seem far more practical that rather than contriving ways of moving people off their farms, governments of the day should consider providing means of establishing more farmers with acceptable rural living standards.

SOME HON. MEMBERS: Hear, hear!

MR. MESSER: — In order to do this, provincial and federal governments should be working towards and stressing adjustment within the farming industry rather than seeking adjustment outside of it, thereby not only strengthening agriculture in total, but making for more prosperous prairie provinces.

The Task Force's wholesale proposals for production cutbacks seems a heavy price to pay in the search for efficiency, especially when we consider the fact that not only are people in our country underfed but a great deal of the world is hungry.

February 22, 1971

The projections of the Task Force emphatically point out that we need less farmers and reduced production for the immediate future of some agricultural products, with a net reduction of wheat by the 1980s.

There is certainly some logic in these recommendations, but at the same time there is a great deal of room for thought in regard to how accurate they may be in their predictions of the 1980s. If one was to compare the analysis of the Task Force of agricultural needs in the 1980s to a four-year study entitled 'Indicative World Plan' of the Food and Agriculture Organization of the United Nations, there are certainly areas of great discrepancies. The 'Indicative World Plan' or 'IWP' states that by the mid 1980s there will be a billion more mouths to feed in poor countries. They further state that food demand in developing countries will be nearly 2 and 1/2 times the level of 1962, which was the base year of the Plan's analysis.

If food production in developing countries continues to grow at 2.7 per cent annual rate as it did between 1965-66, with demands projected to grow at an annual rate of 3.9 per cent, the IWP concludes that the gap between supply and demand in 1985 would require 26 billion dollars in food imports. In 1962 actual food imports to underdeveloped countries were about \$3 billion.

I cannot say that these predictions are any more accurate than I can say that the predictions of the Task Force are totally inaccurate, but because of the vast differences in projections, I would say there is more than just reason, for great concern in accepting the Task Force proposals of production, as this is the real key to our agriculture problems.

It would seem logical to assume that if the IWP predictions were anywhere near accurate, it would certainly mean that we should be maintaining or increasing the numbers of farmers rather than increasing the size of farms and decreasing the number of farmers.

Under present conditions it is totally illogical to assume that farmers can gain economic stability by carrying more of the costs. Especially under present conditions where farmer income is at an all time low, it is virtually impossible for them to underwrite the income reductions due to over production along with reduction in sales and in prices.

It may well be that it is time to overhaul or replace the temporary Wheat Reserves Act, but it should only be done with a commitment from the Federal Government to finance normal carry-over of all grains. Producers believe that it is in the national interest to have a surplus of grain on hand for domestic and export use. This is of particular importance now in order to provide feed for our growing livestock industry in the case of a crop failure. It is further necessary to have commitments from the Federal Government to bear any losses of the

pooling of crops; to allow the losses to be carried forward on pools could virtually bankrupt farmers if a decision to dump grain was undertaken. The idea that farmers can go it alone and be better off for it, is a fallacy which the farmers resent, and the Provincial and Federal Governments should be made aware of this

SOME HON. MEMBERS: Hear, hear!

MR. MESSER: — This is especially true when we look at the policies of this Government and the unlimited give-away program it advocates to attract industries, when it is questionable as to whether they would be of any real value in providing jobs or increasing revenue to this province. It is further becoming more evident that the natural resources that these industries are harvesting, is in many instances being done in an attitude of short-term production with high net returns, rather than long-term production with a continuing stable economic climate.

On the Federal level, when the Government of Canada buys a 45 per cent interest in Panartic Oil and divides the Canadian petroleum market by drawing an arbitrary line through the Ottawa Valley, builds through the CNR an \$86 million railway through northern Alberta in order to enable the CPR Company to exploit lead and zinc ore near Pine Point, when the Department of Regional Economic Expansion spent \$200 million per year to assist private companies to establish themselves in designated areas of the country — we seriously question the validity of forcing farmers into a farming industry where they are economically isolated from similar aid.

SOME HON. MEMBERS: Hear, hear!

MR. MESSER: — The proposals of the Task Force and the Federal Government for limiting production to what can be sold in a given year is indeed a most short sighted policy. Of all industries in Canada, farming is really the only one where you cannot logically control production. Aside from the risk of accepting Government recommendations unquestionably, and then paying the consequences if they are inaccurate with either over-production or under-production, other uncontrollable factors such as climate, crop disease, place further burdens on the farmer.

Any recommendations to drastically curb production can only be considered as ignorance in regard to the problems of farming today. And that would seem to be what many of the recommendations of the Task Force displays in its recommendations. Ignorance and misinformation as to what day to day farming and its needs and problems are.

Mr. Lang's proposal of a prairie cash receipts stabilization program, which leaves the impression of income stability to

farmers is not really the case. I remind the Members to your right, Mr. Speaker, that this program apparently will come into effect at the cost of long standing government support programs such as the temporary Wheat Reserves Act.

This program actually is a transfer of monies from existing programs, through their elimination to a proposed stabilization program. Under the present economic circumstances which the farmers find themselves, the three per cent contribution that farmers have to make is unacceptable and unrealistic. Due to the fact that the Plan is based on total marketing of all prairie grains, it could well create tremendous pressure on the Canadian Wheat Board, during depressed years, to sacrifice large quantities of grain at reduced prices. Their reasoning for this may be justifiable when applied to marketing sense but the results would obviously be disastrous to the net income position of prairie farmers.

The degree to which a farm unit may participate depends on his total marketings up to a \$10,000 limit. In our present over supply situation with sales of grain depending on quotas, and new quotas depending on acreage, it would appear that the situation could well develop whereby farmers would be pressed to increase the size of their farms in order to reach a quota level that would allow them \$10,000 in grain sales.

This may well create an undesirable situation similar to that of the lending programs of the Farm Credit Corporation, which contributed significantly to spiralling land prices. However, this would be much more serious in our present situation because our farm economy is in a depressed state in comparison to an affluent one where land prices were last inflated.

Combining all these facts it appears impossible logically to estimate with any degree of accuracy the cost of this program on a short or long term basis. It is therefore impossible to predict whether there will be any real benefits gained from it.

Finally, because the plan of production is based on total receipts of grain sold and does not take into consideration nor do anything to correct the increasing cost of production, it is evident that the farmer will still be subjected to the ever-increasing cost-price squeeze.

Mr. Speaker, I have other detailed remarks to make in regard to some of the items in the Throne Speech, but I see that my time is running out. I should, however, like to say in closing that it is obvious from the remarks that I have already made that I will not be supporting the main motion but will be supporting the amendment.

SOME HON. MEMBERS: Hear, hear!

MR. W.A. FORSYTH (Saskatoon Nutana South): — Mr. Speaker, when I looked

at the order of the speakers for the day and found that I was to follow the Member from Kelsey (Mr. Messer) who is presumably the agricultural critic for the Opposition, I must say that I felt just a little out of place, but having listened to 45 minutes of the most unenthusiastic, most negative presentation that I have heard in this House, I don't really feel so badly and I would recommend to Members opposite that they consider finding a seat for that Member from Regina South East (Mr. Baker), the former Mayor of Regina. I think that he might make a much better agricultural critic than the gentleman who just spoke.

SOME HON. MEMBERS: Hear, hear!

MR. FORSYTH: — All the way through that 45 minutes of presentation and in a very dull and uninteresting way, we heard nothing but negative — no, no, no; I don't agree, I don't like this; I don't like that.

MR. MESSER: — If the Hon. Member would . . .

MR. FORSYTH: — If the Hon. Member would have shown that much enthusiasm during his speech I shouldn't have probably mentioned his remarks.

SOME HON. MEMBERS: Hear, hear!

MR. FORSYTH: — We heard a very dismal picture of the situation in agriculture today, and I don't think that there is a Member in this House who thinks or feels that our agricultural industry is flourishing. We are worrying about that, but we are not going to get anywhere by sitting back and talking about things that should have been done. I should like to hear one answer from the agricultural critic and from his vocal friend from Shellbrook (Mr. Bowerman) about what can be done in this situation, not what can't be done.

There were seven questions without one answer at one stage in that speech.

MR. MESSER: — On a point of order!

MR. FORSYTH: — Sit down!

MR. MESSER: — Would the Hon. Member permit a question?

MR. FORSYTH: — There were some vague phrases about adjustments within the agricultural industry being the answer, but there was not one thing said in that speech about what those adjustments should be. It might just be that the Hon. Member from Kelsey doesn't approve of some of the adjustments that the Waffle wing in his party has

suggested that should be made.

I should like to say a few words about what I thought was going to be my main topic and those words I should like to use in talking about the Winter Games which have just concluded in Saskatoon. Now this happened to be a positive program and I am sure that the Members opposite won't mind listening to this, although they seem to have a horror of positive programs.

I should like to say a few words about these Games, because from the opening ceremony, which was a beautiful and moving pageant, to the closing event presided over by His Excellency the Governor General, last night, these Games have presented a remarkable achievement by the citizens of this province.

SOME HON. MEMBERS: Hear, hear!

MR. FORSYTH: — In paying tribute to my seatmate, the Member from City Park University (Mr. Charlebois) who is president of the Winter Games Society, I also pay tribute to the thousands of citizens of Saskatoon who were directly involved in the planning and the execution of this project.

SOME HON. MEMBERS: Hear, hear!

MR. FORSYTH: — Perhaps no one in the House knows better than I, the hundreds and hundreds of hours which Jeff Charlebois has dedicated to these Canada Games.

SOME HON. MEMBERS: Hear, hear!

MR. FORSYTH: — I know that all Members of the House will join in welcoming him back to his seat tomorrow, when his official functions are finished. He has done a great job for Saskatchewan and a great job for Canada.

SOME HON. MEMBERS: Hear, hear!

MR. FORSYTH: — It is true that neither he nor his multitude of volunteer helpers have received any monetary reward for their efforts, but I know that in the years ahead they will treasure the memory of a job well done, of an incredible display of ingenuity, and of an almost overwhelmingly enthusiastic community of athletes and workers. These are rewards that money cannot buy.

The Winter Games' example of co-operation between the three levels of Government in working for the good of the youth of Canada is something that should never be forgotten. The Federal Department of Health and Welfare under John Munro, the Provincial Youth Agency headed by its Minister, Cy MacDonald, and the city of Saskatoon, led by our genial mayor, Sid Buckwold,

have all co-operated to make the past week a memorable event in the lives of over 2,000 young Canadian athletes and thousands of spectators.

When the people of Saskatoon said, "We're going to build a mountain", they really meant it just as they mean it when last week they opened their homes and their hearts to the youth of Canada.

SOME HON. MEMBERS: Hear, hear!

MR. FORSYTH: — I observe the laughter from the benches opposite and observe from where it came.

Speaking with enthusiasm of the vibrant and beautiful city of Saskatoon is really no effort for me. I only regret that the Members from Riversdale (Mr. Romanow) and Mayfair (Mr. Brockelbank) don't always seem to share that enthusiasm.

In the dull and anaemic speech . . .

MR. J.E. BROCKELBANK (Saskatoon Mayfair): — On a point of personal privilege, he hasn't had a chance to speak yet.

MR. FORSYTH: — I am going on past performance. In the dull and anaemic speech which was the Leader of the Opposition's (Mr. Blakeney) contribution to this debate, he seemed to take delight in advising us that the "pow" city is really taking it on the chin. Isn't that a great attitude from the Leader of a provincial party. We are no longer the fastest growing city in Canada but there are some of us who would not really welcome the problems which would be attendant upon a continuation of the fantastic rate of growth that Saskatoon has enjoyed during the past decade.

SOME HON. MEMBERS: Hear, hear!

MR. FORSYTH: — I don't know where Mr. Blakeney got his figures indicating a declining population in Saskatoon but they certainly don't agree with the statistics supplied by the City Health Officer and neither do they agree with the increasing apartment occupancy noted by the district manager of CMHC.

AN HON. MEMBER: — Check your figures!

MR. FORSYTH: — Even at this early stage in the debate, I have heard a couple of variations by Members opposite of that old Socialist song that the Liberals don't care about people. This, of course, is nonsense, Mr. Speaker, and every observant citizen in the City of Saskatoon knows that it is nonsense. During the past

year the Liberal Government has once more moved ahead in planning and providing improved social services for the people of Saskatoon and all Northern Saskatchewan. Let me give you some examples of this program for social betterment.

Last fall I had the pleasure of being present at the opening of Elmwood Lodge, located on Arlington Avenue, which is a facility designed to care for handicapped young adults. The building has already commenced, or at least contracts have been let for a new nursing wing on Mount Royal Lodge and for a new Kilburn Hall.

In the past year the Saskatoon Campus of the University has seen the opening of a new College of Education building, the near completion of a large addition to the Medical School, and the commencement of work on a major addition to the Murray Memorial Library. Plans have also been announced for a very major addition to the University Hospital.

Very recently this Government made available a \$750,000 grant to ensure the construction of a new home for the Western Development Museum in Saskatoon. When completed this building will provide space to display the priceless collections of the museum in suitable surroundings and the new facilities will be both a tribute to our pioneers and a contribution to the social history of our Province.

Mr. Speaker, I don't bring these developments to your attention to try to show how much Government money Saskatoon has been able to corner. Rather I want to display them as physical evidence of the social values and priorities of our Liberal Government. Looking at this evidence, can anyone doubt that ours is a party that cares for people?

SOME HON. MEMBERS: Hear, hear!

MR. FORSYTH: — One of the things that shocks me most, Mr. Speaker, about the party to your left is the relish with which they twist and distort the facts concerning employment in Saskatchewan. An unemployed person who wants to work is not just a statistic, he is not just a figure on a chart, but he is a human being whose needs society has failed to meet. To suggest that any change in government is the answer to his needs is a cruel and cold-blooded hoax.

The report of Canada Manpower's provincial office concerning employment in this Province during the months of January, 1971 is confusing to say the least and before this Session is finished I am sure that we shall see it being interpreted in very many ways. As I read the report, it says, in essence, that the number of people employed in Saskatchewan has increased but that the number desiring employment has also increased. In other words, more of our people are saying that they want to work and while we have increased the supply of jobs in the

non-agricultural sector, so that more people are working, we haven't kept up with the new demand. Consequently our unemployment figures are higher than we can tolerate but they are still the lowest in Canada.

With the ever-increasing mechanical efficiency of our methods of production, one is tempted to philosophize about the validity of the work ethic which we have inherited from our forefathers. Nevertheless in a relatively undeveloped economy such as Saskatchewan's it seems possible that we can approach full employment through the development of our natural resources.

The same result could also be achieved by lowering the mechanical component of our productive machinery. If we converted our agricultural industry to a hoe and sickle operation, thereby turning our farmers into peasants, we should soon be begging workers to come and share our back-breaking labor. Of course if we wanted to make our products competitive on the world markets under these conditions our workers would be pitifully paid and subject to very marked seasonal layoffs. However, under these circumstances we could certainly say that we had licked the unemployment problem.

Mr. Speaker, this alternative of a return to primitive methods of production is, of course, put forward with tongue-in-cheek but it is no more ridiculous than the NDP objection to resource development which they have put forward not only with tongue-in-cheek but with a foot-in-mouth.

SOME HON. MEMBERS: Hear, hear!

MR. FORSYTH: — With major industrial developments such as the Meadow Lake pulp mill and the Wollaston area mines ahead of us, we are assured of thousands of new jobs in construction and operation plus hundreds of new opportunities for supporting services. I assure you that this evidence of hard work — and believe me it was hard work — by men like Ross Thatcher and Dave Steuart, is greeted with approval by most residents of Saskatchewan.

SOME HON. MEMBERS: Hear, hear!

MR. FORSYTH: — If the NDP Members opposite could just put people before politics in the interests of a better Saskatchewan, they would be the first to congratulate our Government on these achievements.

SOME HON. MEMBERS: Hear, hear!

MR. FORSYTH: — Surely you old timers across the way have not forgotten the days when the CCF was a farm-oriented party and if you remember those golden days, surely you remember how hard your ministers worked to get a pulp mill for Saskatchewan and how disappointed we all were when they failed.

The Leader of the Opposition (Mr. Blakeney) was right in one thing when he called for new plans to meet the crisis of unemployment. What he failed to realize is the fact that our Government is providing these new plans. As a short term measure we are speeding up the construction of public works projects and embarking on an imaginative program of summer employment for students. In the long term we are stabilizing our agricultural industry through incentives to diversification and I was glad to hear the agriculture critic in the Opposition say he wasn't opposed to diversification. That's the only thing he wasn't opposed to.

As I have already noted, we are broadening the base of our labor force by encouraging new industry.

Mr. Blakeney's bold new plan is to dust off some old Socialist propaganda, to consider the nationalization of the potash industry, and to restore some mythical entity known as a family farm by imposing government dictated restrictions on the sale of agricultural lands. What a plan and what an imagination!

Almost a year ago in the debate on the Speech from the Throne, I spent most of my time on the subject of our environment and the hazards which it faces. The Member from Biggar (Mr. Lloyd) also made some remarks on this topic but as I recall it there was no other mention of the subject during the debate. What a difference there is in this Session — everybody wants to get in on the act. And while I welcome this increased concern over the possible effects of man's action on his environment, I hope that we keep our cool and don't make the mistake of some legislators in other parts of the continent who are recommending and even passing legislation on subjects which have not yet been properly researched.

For this reason I was particularly pleased to hear the Premier announce the Government's intention to create a Clean Environment Authority. Given sufficient technical staff and co-ordinating powers, such an authority can do much to rationalize the whole field of pollution control and conservation.

If I may at this time I should like to offer a couple of suggestions to the Leader of the Opposition (Mr. Blakeney) regarding this field of environmental control. First I should like to recommend that he get a more knowledgeable speech writer in the area of water pollution. I don't think a Devil's Advocate is quite enough in this field.

SOME HON. MEMBERS: Hear, hear!

MR. FORSYTH: — The other day you know he kept damning the Prince Albert pulp mill because of the coliform bacteria count which its effluent showed.

MR. BLAKENEY: — That's right!

MR. FORSYTH: — Now coliform bacteria to our understanding and the understanding of bacteriologists I have consulted, are inhabitants of animal fecal material and as such they certainly could be produced by employees of a plant but again as I understand it, there is no possibility of them being a product of the pulp mill operation itself.

SOME HON. MEMBERS: Hear, hear!

MR. FORSYTH: — This is the sort of thing and the sort of mistake that some students who are training for a career in science have made. I think that I have seen the report from which he was quoting, or from which his speech writer was quoting, but I really wish that he would get some more reliable researchers before he expects us to take his pronouncements seriously.

My other suggestion to the Leader of the Opposition is that he consider calling off his boys from the job of infiltrating organizations devoted to the betterment of our environment. This has happened on numerous occasions and it has rendered almost meaningless the concern of citizens grouped together to take an honest look at their surroundings. Many worthwhile members of such organizations cease to attend meetings and show no further interest if they feel they are being used for political purposes. Obviously all of the pronouncements of such groups becomes suspect, if even a few of their recommendations are wrapped about with a philosophy that is political in origin.

In some future debate I hope to devote a good deal of time to the question of pollution and environmental controls. For the present, however, I shall content myself by pleading with all Members not to seek cheap political advantage by exploiting the legitimate concern of the public in an area which is so vital to the future of the human race.

SOME HON. MEMBERS: Hear, hear!

MR. FORSYTH: — There are a number of other items on the Speech from the Throne that are most attractive to me. For instance, the provision of larger provincial grants to education in order to reduce the load on property taxes and the provision of larger pensions for teachers retiring prior to 1963. Then there is a proposal for a broadly-based special committee on scholarships and bursaries and there are suggestions for increases in the minimum wage and in payments made under the Workmen's Compensation Act. Not least in importance is a proposal to provide improved special facilities for the aged and the infirm.

The Throne Speech, Mr. Speaker, contains no pie-in-the-sky proposals but it does offer a well-considered and entirely feasible program for improving the quality of life in Saskatchewan. Accordingly, it will give me great pleasure to record my vote for its adoption.

SOME HON. MEMBERS: Hear, hear!

HON. D.T. McFARLANE (Minister of Agriculture): — Mr. Speaker, the Throne Speech indicates that this Government is again not hesitant in coming to grips with economic problems besetting our province. It indicates that we are continuing to introduce programs and policies for the benefit of all. New programs for the further development of our resources and diversification of our industries for the benefit of everyone here in Saskatchewan.

I am sure, Mr. Speaker, that you are aware, as the people of Saskatchewan are aware, after the Leader of the Opposition (Mr. Blakeney) has spoken and now after other Opposition Members have spoken, they have absolutely nothing to offer but carping criticism of Government programs and an obsolete version of the old Regina Manifesto as their new deal.

SOME HON. MEMBERS: Hear, hear!

MR. McFARLANE: — Mr. Speaker, it was ludicrous then but it is ridiculous now. Were this Waffle Manifesto ever to be implemented it would be the greatest disaster to have hit this province ever and I am sure the people of Saskatchewan in their wisdom will have absolutely no part of it.

What does it mean to the agricultural industry?

AN HON. MEMBER: — Prosperity!

MR. McFARLANE: — In short, absolute bureaucratic control, nationalization of our farms, controls on production and marketing of our farm products, state owned and run farm service centres and then setting up an organization of Socialist bureaucrats to advise the operators of these state businesses. Also, Mr. Speaker, they propose the removal of Bill 2. They would remove the only protection our farmers have from the never-ending series of strikes, and the Member from Riversdale (Mr. Romanow) says, "hear, hear". These strikes have done more to wreck the agricultural industry in this country than all the forces of nature combined.

The Opposition Leader (Mr. Blakeney) proposes price controls and farm production and marketing controls but the one control that benefits our farmers and provides some security, they want to refuse, the Essential Services Emergency Act. But what is certain in this "kooky" new deal is that there is no evidence whatsoever of any practical programs to develop our natural resources and to help our farming industry.

If the Leader of the Opposition is concerned with the increasing costs of farm machinery, why isn't he using his

political influence now with the steelworkers' union? There is a threatened industry-wide strike this fall and so prices will advance and to meet these extra pay demands the farmers again will have to pay extra for their new implements and for repairs.

He says the farmer is paying more for automobiles. Sure, Mr. Speaker, the United Auto Workers fresh from a 14-week General Motor strike which has increased the prices of cars and trucks, have zeroed in on the farm equipment industry. The union has been authorized by its workers to call a strike at one of our major Canadian machinery plants in Toronto if and when it considers it necessary. The result of course will be an increase in farm machinery prices. I am sure that the Leader of the Opposition hasn't intervened on this occasion to save our family farms. Forty thousand United States' manufacturing workers walked off their jobs a month ago in International Harvester plants for pay increases. This will mean an increase in machinery prices. Did the Leader of the Opposition contact the union bosses on behalf of the farmers in Saskatchewan? I am sure the answer is No. Our farmers will never forget that every strike that has ever occurred inevitably ends with them having to pay a higher price for the goods and the services required for production. They remember that in the past the movement of grain has been tied up and sales have been lost by railway strikes, seaway strikes, dockworkers' strikes, strikes at the terminals, etc. they will never forget that never once have the NDP ever tried to use their influence with their political bedfellows, the political union bosses, to prevent these strikes.

SOME HON. MEMBERS: Hear, hear!

MR. McFARLANE: — The Leader of the Opposition (Mr. Blakeney) stated this Government didn't hold down the prices on farm machinery. We remember the CCF-NDP government holding inquiries on farm machinery prices during the session of 1952, purely for propaganda purposes. They never reduced the price of machinery in this province one cent. They never gave the farmer one bit of protection. They gave no protection whatsoever to the implement dealers in this province. It wasn't until the session a year ago that the implement dealers were given the protection they needed to provide the services for a viable farming industry in Saskatchewan.

SOME HON. MEMBERS: Hear, hear!

MR. McFARLANE: — Mr. Speaker, the farmers in this province will never forget the loss of income that resulted from strikes affecting the movement of grain. They realize that this crop year we are faced with the largest movement of grain in history, over 700,000 bushels. They are extremely concerned when they hear of the possibility of a railroad strike and a potential strike of grainhandlers about the time that navigation opens. Not only

would these ruin the economy this year but as in the past could tie up the whole system in the year ahead and again result in financial hardship and lost sales. Saskatchewan farmers, Mr. Speaker, are in no mood for any more of these strikes. Is the Leader of the Opposition (Mr. Blakeney) using his political influence in this situation on behalf of the union bosses or is he using his influence on behalf of the Saskatchewan farmers?

Mr. Speaker, the NDP can call their new program the "old deal", the "new deal", the "kooky deal" or the "raw deal" but it represents a document of disaster for the agriculture industry and the family farm in this province.

SOME HON. MEMBERS: Hear, hear!

MR. McFARLANE: — But, Mr. Speaker, perhaps it is little wonder. How could we expect the sensible approach to agriculture? How could we expect the farmers' interests to be considered in a strike? After all, three of the four candidates for leadership in the Socialist party in this Province were labor lawyers.

The fourth, Mr. Speaker, was a Waffler. In the Federal party the next leader is likely to be a labor lawyer and the present Leader of the Opposition (Mr. Blakeney) and his noisy deputy (Mr. Romanow) are both labor lawyers.

SOME HON. MEMBERS: Hear, hear!

MR. McFARLANE: — The Leader of the Opposition says that we are losing farm units. Now, Mr. Speaker, when he was a Member of an NDP Government, the Provincial Treasurer, we saw over 2,000 farm units disappear a year; nearly 50,000 in total during their term of office and if each of these represented a family of four, Mr. Speaker, this would mean 200,000 people. He did nothing then to arrest the situation and our farmers are not impressed by his belated professed concern. And, Saskatchewan people are not impressed with his deathbed repentance about saving our small towns, our villages and our hamlets. They were abandoned by his Government as far as services were concerned. They were told — and by Cass-Beggs — that it was not economic to provide any further installation of natural gas. They were written off for water and sewer facilities and practically no provision was made for street improvements. Mr. Speaker, they did nothing.

MR. G. R. BOWERMAN (Shellbrook): — Baloney!

MR. McFARLANE: — For the benefit of the smoke-jumper from Shellbrook, up to and including the fiscal year 1964-64, a grand total of one village and four hamlets had installed community systems with the assistance from the Family Farm Improvement Branch.

But now since we have had direction of the program, this puny accomplishment has increased to 97 small communities assisted with water systems and 46 with the installation of sewage systems.

SOME HON. MEMBERS: Hear, hear!

MR. McFARLANE: — Now, Mr. Speaker, it is obvious that the Liberals act to save the small communities instead of just talk. After seven years of a Liberal administration, let us look at some of the results compared to 20 years under the Socialists. Mr. Speaker, 1969 and 1970 were the two low years of receipts from farm products since we took office. The total receipts from the sale of farm products amounted to \$722 million in each of these years. This was only exceeded once during the years the Socialists were in power and that was away back in 1953. However, it is below the record of our first five years in office. Our record exceeds by far the other 19 years under the Socialists. This indicates, Mr. Speaker, that the farmers in this province could never again afford a Socialist government.

SOME HON. MEMBERS: Hear, hear!

MR. McFARLANE: — Since taking office the Liberal Government has placed a major emphasis on diversification of our agricultural industry. That this is paying off is illustrated by the fact that since 1964 total income of livestock and livestock products every year has exceeded the \$200 million mark. Not once in the 20 years of Socialist government did it ever approach this figure.

This success has been achieved because many of the programs aimed at increasing the livestock numbers in our province and because incentives to provide facilities to protect our farmers' investment in his livestock has been formulated. These programs have been bitterly criticized by Members of the Opposition. But they have never come up with one constructive alternative nor did they do anything in their 20 years of government that would even compare with this record of achievement.

Mr. Speaker, not only did they lack programs to build the livestock industry, they did absolutely nothing to increase the return to the farmer in the sale of his livestock. For instance, Mr. Speaker, they complain — as the Member for Kelsey (Mr. Messer) did today — that the increase in hog numbers in Saskatchewan has ruined the whole price structure in North America. Well, I remind the Leader of the Opposition (Mr. Blakeney) that although the price of hogs is down to \$22 per hundredweight in Saskatchewan today our average price for the whole of 1970 was still \$30 per hundredweight. Only once in their 20 years in power did the price reach our 1970 average. Only once in 20 years.

SOME HON. MEMBERS: Hear, hear!

MR. McFARLANE: — Since 1964 our average price was over \$30 per hundredweight per year and I remind you, Mr. Speaker, that in seven different years under the CCF-NDP the yearly average price was even less than the price at Winnipeg today and they did absolutely nothing to remedy the situation.

SOME HON. MEMBERS: Hear, hear!

MR. McFARLANE: — Mr. Speaker, because of the growing world demands for red meats and in line with our program of diversification, in 1967 we embarked on an imaginative program of assisting farmers to construct modern hog-rearing facilities. Grants of up to \$4,000 per farm were offered. By the end of this fiscal year 700 barns capable of turning out an average of 350 hogs each per year will have been built.

In a period of three years Saskatchewan's swine industry has made major strides in catching up with the rest of Canada. The swine population has increased from 508,000 in June, 1968 to 985,000 in June, 1970 — almost 100 per cent.

Marketing in 1970 were 868,000 head — up 300,000 from a year ago and most important of all, Mr. Speaker, farm cash income from the sale of hogs is estimated to have exceeded \$50 million in 1970 — the highest return on record except for one year during the last war. It is significant that our last year of heavy marketings was in 1959 — and I want you to remember this — when 908,000 hogs were sold. In the year of the CCF, 1959, the total cash income from hogs at that time was \$32 million as compared to \$50 million this year.

The expanding market for meats is clearly demonstrated by the total Canadian slaughter of 8.5 million hogs in 1959, at an average price of \$22 per hundredweight and 1970 sales — last year's sales — of 8.6 million at an average price of \$30 per hundredweight in round figurers. A significant different, Mr. Speaker. Absolutely no help for the producers by a Socialist provincial government was undertaken at that time.

Mr. Speaker, changed circumstances require new policies.

SOME HON. MEMBERS: Hear, hear!

MR. McFARLANE: — Therefore, accordingly we has discontinued assistance on the construction of hog barns. Instead of this most successful policy aimed at modernizing and expanding our hog industry, we propose the next fiscal year to offer to producers a payment for the production of quality hogs. In the more competitive market that we are now in, quality becomes of increasing importance and to encourage the production of meat type hogs with learner carcasses, we will offer a cash premium of \$2 per hog carcass grading 103 index or higher.

SOME HON. MEMBERS: Hear, hear!

MR. McFARLANE: — This throughout the fiscal year of 1971-72. It will also be real and welcome added income to the hog producer during this period of lower prices. With our ample feed grains and suitable climate we are convinced that Saskatchewan should hold a larger share of the hog market and that it can be a very profitable business for many of our farmers here.

To further strengthen the hog industry, Mr. Speaker, legislation will be introduced this Session that will permit hog producers the same opportunity to carry out market development and research that is now available to the cattle producers by virtue of legislation enacted last session.

Members of the Legislature will have read of the problems facing the mink industry. Due, at least in part, to the general recession both in North America and in Western Europe, prices received for mink pelts have fallen substantially below the cost of production. The mink ranching industry not only produces a considerable amount of cash income but also contributes to other industries through the purchase of feed wastes from fish filleting, packing plants and poultry dressing stations. Breeder female numbers have decreased from an estimated 23,800 in 1969-70 to an estimated 14,000 breeder females in 1971-72. We have built up over the years some of the finest mink breeding stock in the world and it would be most unfortunate to see any further reductions. Mr. Speaker, in order to give some measure of assistance to this industry which is in obvious difficulty at the moment, I am pleased to announce that this Government will make a payment to ranch mink producers of \$2 per breeding mink on the ranch as of April 1, 1971.

SOME HON. MEMBERS: Hear, hear!

MR. McFARLANE: — About 15 months ago we set a precedent in Canada extending credit to farmers. Of course I am referring to the establishment of a program to assist them to expand their livestock herds through livestock loans. The figures to date indicate farmers have borrowed over \$27,691,000 for a total of 7,483 loans. It is gratifying indeed to record that farmers in this province were not slow to grasp the opportunity of taking part in the expanding market for livestock and meats in North America.

I may also point out, Mr. Speaker, that we have already processed grants to 762 borrowers totalling \$60,083 as the first grant to hold the interest at seven per cent. The results of this comprehensive program are encouraging and indicates another first for Saskatchewan.

The slight decline in total cattle numbers registered in 1967 and 1968 has been arrested and we anticipate by June of

this year we should establish a record cattle population in our province. During the course of this Session we shall be introducing programs to provide better service to protect the farmers' investment in livestock.

As further protection to the livestock industry last year we doubled the grants available to veterinary service districts. This year a further grant to assist in the construction of veterinary clinics will be made available.

SOME HON. MEMBERS: Hear, hear!

MR. McFARLANE: — Inspection of livestock auction markets on a voluntary basis will also be offered. I am pleased to be in a position to announce to the Hon. Members that negotiations with the Federal Government regarding the establishment of a crop development centre at the University of Saskatchewan have made good progress during the year. These negotiations are to a point where we fully expect conclusion and commencement of construction this spring. This is a key project in our diversification programs. We have every reason to believe that such a centre can make much progress in improving existing crops, particularly barley, and in improving others such as sunflowers and peas and that our farmers can produce more diversified crops for more markets than we are able to do now.

We are well aware of the important contributions made in the past by a very limited staff in the plant Science Department. We also recognize the very good work done by the Department of Agriculture staff at Brandon and at Winnipeg. But we do know that many of the varieties that they produced, such as regent, redman and selkirk wheat, were better adapted to Manitoba than to Saskatchewan conditions. This will provide for the first time an adequate facility with adequate staff to produce varieties under Saskatchewan conditions for Saskatchewan farmers.

Mr. Speaker, in this period of rapid change and development it is important that our farmers have the best available advisory services. We have increased and are further increasing our staff of agricultural specialists especially in the areas of livestock and farm management. These services have also been decentralized so they will be more available to our farmers. This winter in co-operation with the Federal Department of Manpower and our own Department of Education, there will be 46 three and six-week courses in Farm Management held accommodating 1,000 farmers. This is in addition to our regular programs.

The first Outlook conference in the history of the province will be held towards the end of this month here in Regina.

The past seven years, Mr. Speaker, have been eventful years for the agricultural industry in Saskatchewan. For instance they have seen the largest wheat crop in history in 1966,

the highest per-acre yield of wheat in history in 1969, the highest per-acre yield of oats in 1970, the largest and highest yield per acre of barley in the history of the province in 1970, the largest and highest per-acre yield of flax in 1970, the highest per-acre yield of rapeseed in 1968 and the largest rapeseed crop in 1970.

These past seven years have seen higher average prices for beef and higher average prices for pork than any other comparable period in the history of this province. In these seven years this Government has directed special attention and assistance to this basic industry. As a result of new and imaginative programs our agriculture is better able to face increasing competition in the world grain market and to meet competition in North American markets for beef and for pork. May I remind you of just a few items, a few accomplishments. The completion of the Western Veterinary College at a cost of about \$8 million; construction of our modern Veterinary Diagnostic Laboratories at Regina at a cost of \$750,000; establishment of soil and feed testing laboratories at the University of Saskatchewan at a combined cost of \$211,000; through the Livestock Guarantee Act, \$28 million has been made available to increase or improve our breeding livestock; more than \$1 million towards helping modernize our swine industry; more than \$10 million in construction of a modern irrigation system using water from the Gardiner Dam, works are essentially complete to irrigate 40,000 acres. Last year a modern potato storage building was constructed at a cost, with equipment, of \$250,000, and over 800 acres of potatoes produced; backflood irrigation projects to spring flood more than 10,000 acres have been constructed; 43 grants for individual irrigation projects have been paid; almost \$1 million has been paid as incentive grants for seeding more than 360,000 acres of land to forage; grants have been paid on 800 fodder shelters; 4,000 tons of hay have been placed under storage as a reserve supply in case of a major drought in our province; acreage in community pastures has been increased from 425,000 to 625,000 and the improved acreage nearly tripled from 70,000 to over 200,000 acres. This will interest the Leader of the Opposition (Mr. Blakeney), six sheep pastures have been constructed; Co-operative Grazing Associations have been expanded by 50,000 acres and almost \$500,000 paid out in earned assistance to these groups.

Mr. Speaker, these are just the highlights in an overall agricultural program of which we are justly proud.

SOME HON. MEMBERS: Hear, hear!

MR. McFARLANE: — We are unique in Saskatchewan; we can consume in this province less than 200,000 head of cattle, but market three times this amount. We can consume less than 400,000 hogs and last year we marketed twice that amount. We use less than the equivalent of 400,000 bushels of edible vegetable oil seeds and last year produced 36 million bushels. We can consume perhaps

as much as 3 million bushels of wheat and even last year with less than half our normal acreage planted, we grew more than seven times that amount. In other words, not less than three-quarters of our acreage, three-quarters of our farms are producing products that are sold in other provinces or in other countries. And the fact is that our producers have to compete in those markets with other producers.

Our swine producers marketing pork in Montreal or Toronto have to compete with producers in Ontario and Quebec and when entering American and Japanese markets have even more intensive production to compete with. The same applies to cattle. Our grain producers have to compete with other efficient producers in the United States, Australia and Russia and with heavily-subsidized producers in other countries. Now, Mr. Speaker, we recognize this fact. We believe that the Saskatchewan farmer must be given as much freedom as possible and as much encouragement as possible to do whatever may be necessary to develop his production as to scale or intensity or efficiency so that he can compete on as favorable terms as possible with these other countries. This, within the limits of provincial finances we have attempted to do. We are convinced that it cannot be done through strait-jacketing the industry, through regimentation or through artificial controls.

It is most interesting, Mr. Speaker, to listen to the speeches of the Members opposite in their efforts to criticize the agricultural policy of this Government. It is particularly interesting when we recall that their party formed the government for 20 long years and had every opportunity to put into effect what they talk about today. In fact, it is only seven years since they were finally kicked out by a fed-up public. I have already referred to the tremendous decline in farm numbers and farm population under the NDP when the now Leader of the Opposition was a member of the Treasury Benches.

The trend toward large farms started many years ago. Did you or did your government do anything about it? No, you didn't do a thing! Now they profess great alarm when the Federal Task Force suggests that the trend towards fewer farms is likely to continue. The major emphasis in that report was not placed on Saskatchewan or Western Canada, the major emphasis as far as that statement was concerned was in regard to the Maritimes, Quebec and to Ontario.

The trend, Mr. Speaker, was already established in Saskatchewan and was well in evidence more than 15 years ago when they were the government in power. What did you do about it? As I previously mentioned, in 1952 they appointed a Select Special Committee of the Saskatchewan Legislature. The Committee worked hard and faithfully holding meetings and examining witnesses. What did your committee report? That leading implement companies had shown contempt for the Legislature in not providing the Committee with the information requested of them. Now, Mr. Speaker, those companies all do business and did do business in Saskatchewan. Mr. Speaker, they, the NDP, some of

whose members are still sitting on those benches, did absolutely nothing with this report, the price of farm machinery never went down one cent. Then I find one other accomplishment that your government made during those 20 years in office. In 1952 again they appointed a Royal Commission on Agriculture and Rural Life. This is interesting, Mr. Speaker, because you can remember this. They had six commissioners, a secretariat, research analysts, and editorial assistants, they literally gave them the works. I think they had a bureaucracy of about 56 members. They labored hard and they labored arduously, and typical of Socialists, almost five years later finished a fourteen volume report. What came of it while you were in office? Not one significant policy, not one program that had any real or lasting effect on agriculture in this province. Big deal! Now they say, the Leader of the Opposition (Mr. Blakeney) says, we will impose price controls.

MR. BLAKENEY: — Not at all!

MR. McFARLANE: — Not at all he says now. The old flip flop, one thing today, another thing tomorrow. Your whole program is just a conglomeration of contradictions that you are trying to place before the people of this province.

SOME HON. MEMBERS: Hear, hear!

MR. McFARLANE: — Now I suggest, Mr. Speaker, if price controls are needed now, were they not needed in the 1950s when farm cash income fell to levels below ten years earlier even in the 1940s.

Now, Mr. Speaker, the Hon. Member for Kelsey (Mr. Messer) informs us that in 1964 our farms were large enough, that farm numbers should not be allowed to drop any further. Well, Mr. Speaker, we still had even in 1966 more than 25,000 quarter and half-section farms in this province. Apparently he is prepared to slough them off. Is he telling us these are large enough to maintain a family today? Why even he I think should know better than that. We hear a lot of talk about stopping the trend to larger farms from the Members opposite. Mr. Speaker, I challenge the Leader of the Opposition, I challenge every Member on that side of the House to tell the people and the farmers of this province exactly how they propose to do this. What controls will they introduce on land ownership? What bureaucracy will they establish to decide who is going to be allowed to farm? The people of this province and especially the farmers have a right to know.

Again, Mr. Speaker, as in previous years I want to thank the Premier for his support and real concern for the agricultural industry and the families engaged in it; I want to thank the Provincial Treasurer, the Hon. D.G. Steuart, for providing the necessary budgets; I want to thank my colleagues for their support in helping to develop these policies and these programs; I want to thank the staff of my department in carrying out these

programs; and especially to thank our Saskatchewan farmers and their families who have accomplished these fantastic achievements. I will support the motion, but not the amendment.

SOME HON. MEMBERS: Hear, hear!

MR. G.T. SNYDER (Moose Jaw North): — Mr. Speaker, today we heard another of those anti-labor tirades from the Minister of Agriculture who once again attempted to blame all of the ills of the agricultural industry on working men and women of Saskatchewan and of Canada. It is another indication, Mr. Speaker, I believe, of the bankruptcy of this Government in terms of ideas to solve the problems of the Saskatchewan farmer. It is an old, old game, Mr. Speaker, one which Liberals have been playing for decades. They place the blame on one sector of the economy, Mr. Speaker, is an attempt to divide and expect to conquer, while the third party escapes in the Canadian situation with \$5 billion annually in net profits, the real drain of the Canadian economy which Liberals choose to ignore and ignore completely. Saskatchewan people, Mr. Speaker, are not going to be fooled by this kind of political manoeuvring, and the Minister of Agriculture again has done a disservice to Saskatchewan and Canadian working men and women and has done a disservice to this Legislature.

Initially, Mr. Speaker, I want to join with others on both sides of the House who have offered congratulations to our new Leader and our new deputy leader. I had the good fortune to enter this House in 1960, the same time as our new Leader was elected. During that period of time he has established beyond all question of doubt the fact that he has those qualities of leadership which we have been fortunate to have also in those men who have led our party in the past.

SOME HON. MEMBERS: Hear, hear!

MR. SNYDER: — I know of no other political party, Mr. Speaker, that can boast the kind of brilliant and dedicated leadership that we in our party have enjoyed over the years and I count myself as privileged to have had the opportunity to serve with three of these men.

We are equally proud, Mr. Speaker, of our new deputy leader, a man who has distinguished himself already as a very able and dynamic person and a skilled debater. We are fortunate indeed to have this calibre of person in the New Democratic Party and I want to publicly express my congratulations to him also at this time.

SOME HON. MEMBERS: Hear, hear!

MR. SNYDER: — The mover and seconder of the Address-in-Reply, Mr. Speaker, are also to be congratulated on their presentation.

I would wager, Mr. Speaker, that they completed writing their speeches without even a look at the document which we are presently debating. It really matters very little, because, Mr. Speaker, the Speech from the Throne offers little or nothing that would tend to stir the imagination. Under those circumstances I think the mover and the seconder are indeed to be congratulated and I think they performed their task well and in a very able manner.

I should also like to join with others, Mr. Speaker, in acknowledging the presence of a new Member on the Treasury benches, the Member for Last Mountain (Mr. MacLennan) who has assumed the Labour portfolio since this House last met. Being the charitable person that I am, Mr. Speaker, I must admit that I struggled for some time in an effort to conjure up some kind of plausible reason to justify the appointment to such an important and sensitive post during these critical times. In total, Mr. Speaker, it would appear that the principal qualifications that the Member for Last Mountain brings with him to this portfolio is his faithful service as a staff member of the Provincial Liberal party, as well as his rather impressive experience in adjusting constituency boundaries in subsequent unconscionable transactions in the gerrymandering process in Saskatchewan. I am sure that all Members will want to join with me in expressing the wish that he may exhibit a greater degree of integrity and justice in the performance of his new duties than have been in evidence in the past.

I want to begin my remarks today, Mr. Speaker, with reference to the city in the constituency which I represent in this House. I don't intend to recall the numerous industrial closures that have plagued the city of Moose Jaw in recent years and the reduction of employment in other industries, particularly of the transportation industry. I expect that some of the past events of recent years were inevitable in the light of present day technology. However, Mr. Speaker, I do want to comment at some length on two industries which have occupied the news over the past year. Members will recall the closure of the Robin Hood Flour Mills in Moose Jaw in September of 1966, and the subsequent closure of the Oat Mill a few months later, resulting in the loss of about 160 jobs at that time. The loss of this industry to the city after over half a century of operation, Mr. Speaker, was a blow which required considerable adjustment by employees in particular, but also by the community in terms of lost purchasing power and the outward migration of many, many of these workers who were unable to find one of those 80,000 new jobs that were supposed to appear by virtue of this Government's imagination and initiative.

Mr. Speaker, the Robin Hood property has remained unused for the period of time since closure four years ago. Then on November 4, 1970, the Premier, Chairman of the Saskatchewan Economic Development Corporation, announced that SEDCO had acquired the property. The release in the Moose Jaw Times Herald which reports the transaction quotes the Premier as

declaring that the Government will pay no taxes on the property until such time as it is put to use. The report goes on to say that the Premier was quick to point out that there were no immediate industrial prospects in sight. Quite simply, Mr. Speaker, this means that this transaction has cost the city of Moose Jaw \$45,000 a year in lost taxes, every year that this property remains unused. I would be the first to acknowledge the value of having this property at the disposal of SEDCO as an industrial site but it seems totally incredible to me, that the Government opposite could see fit to free the Robin Hood Flour Mills of their obligation of paying taxes to the city of Moose Jaw, thus placing this additional burden of taxes upon the shoulders of hard-pressed ratepayers in the city which I represent. I hope, Mr. Speaker, that this property will be the subject for future growth and industrial development in the near future. In the meantime, I suggest this Government has an obligation to provide a grant in lieu of taxes after acquiring this property for free which is alleged to have an assessed value of \$150,000, Mr. Speaker. Failing this it just simply means that an American company having used Canadian manpower and Canadian resources to their advantage for over half a century, has departed the scene at a moment which was convenient to them. With the blessings of this Saskatchewan Government, Mr. Speaker, this company has divested itself of any obligation to contribute to the tax base of the city. It's a matter, Mr. Speaker, that deserves the attention of this Government and I hope that the new Minister will take the opportunity to acquaint himself with this situation and I hope that he will take it into consideration in terms of providing a grant in lieu of taxes for this property now that they have freed the Robin Hood Mills of any obligation of paying further taxes.

Let me say a few words too, Mr. Speaker, with reference to another major industry which is in the process of reducing its operations to only a fraction of its present capacity. Gulf Oil, as Members will know, is undergoing a transition, from that of a gas refinery to that of an asphalt producer which will employ only a skeleton staff. I am convinced, Mr. Speaker, and my views are shared by many others who are close to the Gulf Oil operation, that this is an industry which the Government opposite could have saved for Moose Jaw and for the Province of Saskatchewan if it had shown the proper initiative. Gulf Oil has never suggested at any time that their operation was something less than profitable. Gulf Oil, as a matter of fact, has suggest that their reason for relocating is because they can increase their profits by centralizing their operations in the city of Edmonton and also at the East and West coasts. Well, the Premier will recall very well, I am sure, that when Gulf made its intentions clear he was implored at that time to take a firm stand and dictate certain conditions to Gulf Oil in the event of their closure. The suggestion involved the undertaking that the Government of Saskatchewan should forbid the retailing of Gulf products in Saskatchewan if they chose to close down their refinery operating in this province. The Premier replied to me that he considered the suggestions impractical, for a

number of reasons and he implied that Gulf was considering a smelting operation at Wollaston Lake and he said that if he got tough with them that we might tend to frighten them away. Well, Mr. Speaker, Gulf proceeded with their conversion plans with hardly a murmur of protest from the Government opposite. Perhaps the suggestion to forbid the sale of Gulf products in the Province of Saskatchewan may have been a rather stringent one. It is unlikely that such action would have been necessary, Mr. Speaker, if the Government had taken a firm stand. I think it is worthwhile to point out, Mr. Speaker, that similar tactics have been employed by governments elsewhere. I think it is a pretty sad state of affairs, Mr. Speaker, when we have to look to a Conservative Government in Ontario to see evidence of the kind of action which might have saved this industry for the Province of Saskatchewan.

Some months ago Members may recall the Roberts' government made it clear to the mining interests in the Province of Ontario that ore which was mined in the Province of Ontario must be smelted and refined in the Province of Ontario in order to provide jobs in Canada . . .

SOME HON. MEMBERS: Hear, hear!

MR. SNYDER: — . . . rather than allowing those jobs to escape to south of the 49th parallel. The alternative was to leave the order in the ground and the mining interests complied with the regulations laid down by that Conservative government in Ontario.

I understand also, Mr. Speaker, and this is an interesting sidelight too, that Ontario wineries have been directed by the Government of Ontario to use Ontario grapes otherwise they will not be allowed to sell their wine in government liquor stores.

SOME HON. MEMBERS: Hear, hear!

MR. SNYDER: — Now surely, Mr. Speaker, this kind of positive action can be justified in the interests of the people of Saskatchewan at a time when people are leaving this province at a rate not contemplated since the depression years of the 1930s. Surely, Mr. Speaker, the kind of subtle pressures that have been suggested would have been understood by Saskatchewan people in an effort to retain 160 odd jobs in this one particular industry and, rather than lose the market for their product, Mr. Speaker, I am sure that Gulf Oil would have continued production in the city of Moose Jaw this year, next year and for many years to come. But instead, Mr. Speaker, as a result of Gulf's conversion to asphalt production, the Husky Oil Refinery has now also been placed in jeopardy in the city of Moose Jaw. Husky's operation is almost exclusively that of an asphalt producer and recently that refinery has given an indication of its intentions to close its refinery operation in Moose Jaw. However, Mr. Speaker, at the eleventh hour the Premier rode in on his

white steed and finally asserted himself and demanded that Husky delay its closing. I ask you how much better would it have been if the appropriate action could have been taken before this chain of events began which made the closing of the second Moose Jaw refinery a virtual certainty. I believe, Mr. Speaker, that Saskatchewan people are entitled to something better than the cap-in-hand approach which the Premier used in the Gulf Oil situation in Moose Jaw.

SOME HON. MEMBERS: Hear, hear!

MR. SNYDER: — Certainly, Mr. Speaker, the Moose Jaw story is not new or is it unique. The history of Liberal governments here in Saskatchewan and across the country represents a shameful story of patronage, of resource give-aways and subservience to their private enterprise gods.

SOME HON. MEMBERS: Hear, hear!

MR. SNYDER: — During the last week of January of this year, Mr. Speaker, less than a month ago, the Premier appeared on television complaining bitterly about the overproduction and price-cutting in the sodium sulphate industry. He forecast shut-downs and he forecast lost employment if the industry didn't apply some self-discipline. He suggested that his Government might have to interfere if the companies didn't bring about some stability to the industry. It is significant, I think, Mr. Speaker, that the Premier now complains about the very situation that he is responsible for creating. The sale of sodium sulphate reserves by this Government, Mr. Speaker, to their free enterprise friends is a matter of record.

SOME HON. MEMBERS: Hear, hear!

MR. SNYDER: — At a time, Mr. Speaker, when the demand for sodium sulphate was increasing sharply this Government sold reserves at Alsask and Snake Hole Lake thus encouraging private industry to go into the sulphate mining operation in direct competition with the Crown-owned sulphate industry.

SOME HON. MEMBERS: Hear, hear!

MR. SNYDER: — The terms of the sale should be recalled at this time, Mr. Speaker, 2,200,000 tons of sodium sulphate reserves sold for \$22,000 or one cent a ton. If the industry is in trouble then the Premier doesn't need to look any further for the cause. He and his Government fostered and incubated the problem when they offered this Saskatchewan resource to their friends at fire-sale prices.

Mr. Speaker, it's little wonder that people across the

entire country are looking with real suspicion at the Parsons and Whittemore pulp operation in Prince Albert.

SOME HON. MEMBERS: Hear, hear!

MR. SNYDER: — The Premier at one point declared several years ago that his Government would do almost anything to get a pulp mill for Saskatchewan. It may very well be, Mr. Speaker, that the taxpayers of Saskatchewan may soon discover that another typical Liberal arrangement has been negotiated to the detriment of the taxpaying public of Saskatchewan. Whatever the terms of the contract may be — and there are a great many unknown quantities as yet — Liberal spokesmen here in Saskatchewan have been attempting desperately to show that a Liberal Government here in Saskatchewan made a much better deal with Parsons and Whittemore than a Conservative government in Manitoba made with Churchill Forest Industries at The Pas. With each passing day, Mr. Speaker, the credibility gap widens. Until this Government is prepared to supply this Legislature and the people of Saskatchewan with information concerning the entire operation, they will be inclined to look with real suspicion at this very strange operation. However, Mr. Speaker, it would appear that there are certain similarities and certain outstanding facts that apply to both of these operations. In each instance there was a free enterprise promoter on one side and a free enterprise government on the other. Both operations had the earmarks of deals that have strewn the path of history down through the years with which Members opposite I am sure are also familiar.

The plan is quite simple. The promoter puts up little or no money, Mr. Speaker, little or no cash, he receives access to the natural resources of the Province. He receives credit or grants or long-term loans from the Government. He organizes subsidiary companies and often subsidiaries involving the very same people, intermingled with stock options and construction contracts, all making handsome profits before the enterprise turns a wheel.

SOME HON. MEMBERS: Hear, hear!

MR. SNYDER: — If it succeeds, Mr. Speaker, the promoter makes more money and if it fails it falls into the lap of the Government and ultimately into the lap of the taxpaying citizens. Another DOSCO or another Canadian National Railway.

Maclean's Magazine of February, 1969, Mr. Speaker, carried an article by Walter Stewart entitled, "John Doyle's gamble with millions. Heads he wins, tails you lose." I think a few quotations from that article might be very appropriate under present-day circumstances in Saskatchewan. The quotation goes something like this and it's referring to Doyle. It says:

He is also chairman of the executive committee of

Canadian Javelin Limited, a Newfoundland corporation described by a U.S. Government lawyer who studied it for years, as the most mysterious company known to man. Doyle is president of Melville Pulp and Paper Limited, a subsidiary of a subsidiary of Canadian Javelin. The project will cost \$143.6 million of which Doyle's company will have spent only \$12 million and promised \$16.8 million. If it succeeds Melville will wind up with an asset worth \$143.6 million obtained largely on government credit and while it may have to share the losses, the government will not be able to share in the profits. The deal has been arranged in such a way that even Newfoundland which owns a majority of Canadian Javelin shares cannot make a profit on them. This is because the preferred shares that the Province hold pay no dividends and are redeemable at 10 cents each, for a total of \$530,000 no matter how much Canadian Javelin common stock becomes worth. At present it is listed at \$14.50 a share, up from \$9.50 last February 29th, for a paper gain to Doyle of \$6,255,560 on his holdings.

Well, when these facts became known, Mr. Speaker, Premier Joey Smallwood merely states, and to quote Smallwood:

A promoter becomes respectable after he has made his fortune. Whoever became a millionaire teaching Sunday school.

"Whoever became a millionaire teaching Sunday school," so said Joey Smallwood.

Now, Mr. Speaker, I don't think that this is a matter that should be treated with that degree of levity and I believe that when resources belonging to the people of the country are given away and millionaires are created in the process, it is inevitable that the ordinary taxpaying citizen is not getting a square deal in the way of resource development.

SOME HON. MEMBERS: Hear, hear!

MR. SNYDER: — The problems of inflation, Mr. Speaker, of excessive taxation and unemployment are all a part of the warp and woof of the Canadian free enterprise system. The Federal Liberal Government and the Provincial Liberal Government apparently hope to cure the outstanding problems which we face today without paying attention to the cause. I suggest again that the largest contributing factor to the inflationary spiral can be related directly to the \$5 billion that is being drained out of our Canadian economy annually for the last number of years.

Free enterprise Liberals in Ottawa and here in Saskatchewan conveniently ignore excessive profits and resource give-aways which have contributed in their own way to the depressed condition of the Canadian and the Saskatchewan economy. Here in

Saskatchewan this Government has been making a token effort to halt the inflationary spiral by applying its own wage guidelines.

Saskatchewan Liberals, Mr. Speaker, seem to be content to ignore the giant gaping holes that are draining the Canadian economy. At the same time they seek to apply their own stringent controls on vital services. Education is suffering in Saskatchewan as a result of the application of a stringent pupil-teacher ratio. Many of Saskatchewan's teachers have departed this province. Health services have been downgraded in this province. Wholesale closure of small hospitals has been the rule under this Government. Our mental health program, Mr. Speaker, suffered such neglect that outside authorities had to be brought to the Province of Saskatchewan in 1967 in order to investigate and recommend measures to save our mental health program from complete collapse. And one could go on and on, Mr. Speaker, to relate examples where this Government has been niggardly with one sector of the economy and generous in the extreme with another.

SOME HON. MEMBERS: Hear, hear!

MR. SNYDER: — Saskatchewan hospital workers, Mr. Speaker, remain on a wage level which is one close to abject poverty in the province and this is a group for whose plight this Provincial Government must bear direct responsibility.

I believe, Mr. Speaker, that it is generally acknowledged that this 1971 Session will be the final session of the 16th Legislature prior to a general election. There has been considerable speculation over the last number of months that the Premier might seize an opportunity to call an election before his normal four-year term expires. It will be remembered that the Premier on a number of occasions has claimed he would call a general election when he was confident that his Liberal party could win it. I think it is significant, Mr. Speaker, that the Premier and his Government have not yet seen fit to place their record of office before the people of Saskatchewan and be judged on their performance. Time is running out, Mr. Speaker, and this Government is painfully aware of the fact that those governments who overstayed their welcome over the four-year term suffered the indignity of going down to a humiliating defeat. This Government, Mr. Speaker, is fearful of an aroused electorate who rejected the Liberal party almost totally in a Federal election of 1968 and similarly rejected the Thatcher Liberals in the by-election in Kelvington only 18 months ago.

SOME HON. MEMBERS: Hear, hear!

MR. SNYDER: — I think these two events explain quite clearly, Mr. Speaker, the fearful antics of the Government opposite over the past 12 months in an attempt to create a phony election issue with the hope that Saskatchewan people might lose sight

of the real issues that face our province today.

I think it should be remembered, Mr. Speaker, that early in the fall of 1970 the Premier bullied his way into contract negotiations between the teaching profession and the school trustees. Agreements had been consummated or all but consummated in four areas in Prince Albert, Lloydminster, North Battleford and Saskatoon. However the Premier and the Minister of Education (Mr. McIsaac) bullied their way into the contract negotiations and demonstrated quite clearly that locally-agreed-to contracts are a thing of the past in the Province of Saskatchewan while this Government remains in office.

In the words of the Secretary of the Saskatchewan Teachers' Federation:

The Minister insists on using inflated figures allowing increment increases for teachers who aren't even here any more to arrive at fictitious percentages.

It appears, Mr. Speaker, that long months of negotiation then were thrown into the discard because of the intervention by the Premier and his Minister of Education, for the purpose, Mr. Speaker, in the words of the Secretary of the Saskatchewan Teachers' Federation:

To ensure turmoil in the educational system for the sake of political gain.

Under these circumstances, Mr. Speaker, I think the teachers showed remarkable restraint, probably a less temperate group would have withdrawn their services en masse. This effort by the Premier and his Liberal colleagues to incite a strike and to create a phony election issue, received a serious blow when the teachers returned to work in the fall of the year and resumed their work in their classrooms with negotiations still in progress. And by returning to work, Mr. Speaker, they robbed the Premier of the issue he was counting on so desperately to propel him into a general election.

However, Mr. Speaker, another opportunity presented itself, one not quite so good perhaps but the work stoppage at the Prince Albert pulp mill presented itself as another opportunity. So with a significant amount of shouting and arm-waving from a number of platforms in the Province of Saskatchewan, the Premier made his decision to call this Legislature together to settle that dispute. At that point, Mr. Speaker, the disputants were so close together that it was expected that an agreement would be reached the following Monday. But in typical Ross Thatcher fashion, Mr. Speaker, he called the Legislature together and set his own deadline at midnight, Friday, September 4th for the settlement of the dispute. And once again, Mr. Speaker, the Premier's plans went astray on him because an agreement was reached prior to that time with another opportunity to precipitate an election lost to the Premier.

I think the question will occur to a good many people, Mr. Speaker, a couple of questions perhaps. First, why does the Premier and his Government go to such lengths to create a phony election issue. Secondly, what is this bitterness, this contempt that the Premier seems to have for wage and salary earners in the Province of Saskatchewan. To attempt to answer the second question first, Mr. Speaker, I should expect that the Premier's contempt for the worker's point of view relates to the fact that his association with this group and his understanding of their problems is almost non-existent. If the Premier were here he might correct me, but I believe that his only personal involvement as a wage earner, except in the family complex, would be during that period of time when he carried a lantern in his chubby hand as an employee of the Canadian Pacific Railway performing an essential service with that company during the dark days of World War II.

Well, Mr. Speaker, it is generally quite evident that the Premier has no basic sympathy whatsoever for an employer-employee relationship where the employee has any rights or any basic privileges. It is evident, Mr. Speaker, that the Premier is in accord with those who favor a plan where the employee comes with his cap in his hand to his employer, all matters concerning wages and working conditions are the prerogative of the management.

The history, Mr. Speaker, of this Government over the past seven years has been one of erosion of worker's rights and the weakening of the entire collective bargaining process that has been slowly and painstakingly developed over the years. It is little wonder, Mr. Speaker, that the Member for Elrose (Mr. Leith) has been moved by his conscience to remark that the Liberal Party is beginning to have an "unfortunate anti-labor bias." This, Mr. Speaker, is stating the case very, very mildly.

The other question, Mr. Speaker, that I thought might occur to other Saskatchewan people was, why should the Premier and his Government go to such lengths to create a phony election issue. Well, Mr. Speaker, as the time draws nigh to the moment that Saskatchewan Liberals become more and more aware of the impossible situation that they face if they are obliged to fight this election on the basis of its record in office, I think that it would be worthwhile to have just another brief glimpse of that record, Mr. Speaker.

I think that it must be agreed that the people of Saskatchewan have been subjected to a cruel exhibition, Mr. Speaker, of extremes in governments since this Liberal Government came into power in 1964, but more particularly since its election in 1967. Never in the history of our province have we seen such extravagance in highway spending at a time when education suffered accordingly. These Liberal years will be recorded as a period unparalleled in resource giveaways to corporate interests while Saskatchewan's people who were sick were penalized if they were obliged to seek medical or hospital

services.

SOME HON. MEMBERS: Hear, hear!

MR. SNYDER: — Perhaps, Mr. Speaker, the most outstanding failure of this Government has to do with the ruthless increase in taxes which Saskatchewan people have had to bear from a government who gave their solemn pledge to reduce taxes if they were elected to power. Little wonder, Mr. Speaker, that this Government will go to any lengths to create an issue to direct attention from the sorry record of this Government in almost every conceivable field.

Liberal tax increases deserve to be remembered as we prepare to fight the next general election. Just to recount some of the 1968 tax increases, we remember sales tax up 25 per cent; gasoline tax up 13 per cent; operator's licences up 100 per cent; vehicle taxes up 33 per cent; tobacco tax up 60 per cent and cigars up 100 per cent; pari-mutuel tax up 100 per cent; new taxes were imposed on automobile insurance premiums; the sales tax was applied on meals, on hotdogs, hotel rooms, telephones, telegrams; the price of liquor has been increased substantially; university tuition fees have increased sharply; local government board fees were increased; liquor permit and liquor outlet fees have been increased and the entrance fees to Provincial parks have been increased, and numerous others.

I believe, Mr. Speaker, that deterrent charges on the sick of our province represents the most horrendous of the tax impositions which will contribute in large measure to the demise of this Government when it gains the courage to call an election.

Consider for just a moment, Mr. Speaker, the case of an elderly gentleman who has a stroke and is partly paralyzed on one side. He gets physiotherapy five times a week at \$1.50 a visit, \$7.50 a week or \$30 a month and he pays for this entirely out of his old age pension cheque as the result of the generosity of a Federal-Liberal Government which has given him a recent 42 cents a month increase. I encouraged this gentleman to seek some additional financial help and he replied to me that he had been on relief in 1937 and 1938 and he said that he would never be beholden to anyone again.

These are the people, Mr. Speaker, who have been wronged and abused by this Government and this Government will be called upon to answer for their indiscretion when election day arrives.

SOME HON. MEMBERS: Hear, hear!

MR. SNYDER: — It would be a gross understatement, Mr. Speaker, to suggest that our province is in an economically depressed state. Hardly an indicator can be found that gives us any reason for optimism. Business closures and vacant store fronts are in

evidence anywhere. There will be no difficulty in finding committee rooms for this forthcoming general election. There are store fronts open everywhere, Mr. Speaker. Unemployment has reached emergency proportions and would be more critical, as we all know, if a large number of our population had not left our province in search of work.

Here, Mr. Speaker, are just a few testimonials to the kind of Liberal prosperity that Saskatchewan is enjoying at the present. "Saskatchewan population, the lowest since 1963", says the Leader-Post of December 22, 1970. "Regina grows but not Saskatoon." The Dominion Bureau of Statistics — and this on January 26, 1971: "Regina's increase represented .7 per cent, the lowest of any city except two which recorded no change." Saskatoon was the only one of 19 metropolitan areas across Canada to lose population in that period. "Regina's building — the lowest in 10 years in 1970", according to the January 5th issue of the Regina Leader-Post, 1971. Another one that says, "Student jobs are hard to find", and this is the understatement of the week. "Decrease in retail sales", is recorded in the Times Herald of December 10th. "Saskatchewan loses 20,000 people", says the Leader-Post of February 13th, 1971. "Drastic tax arrears should cause concern", says Commissioner Mel Shelly in the Moose Jaw Times Herald, here is another that says: "Ten per cent decrease in retail sales", and on and on, Mr. Speaker.

About three months ago, Mr. Speaker, a friend of mine drew my attention to a news story in the Moose Jaw Times Herald of November 27, 1970. It reported a meeting of the Moose Jaw Liberals which was addressed by the Provincial Treasurer (Mr. Steuart). According to the bold headlines, Mr. Steuart told his audience and I quote: "Saskatchewan residents are among the most blessed in the world." "Among the most blessed in the world," he said.

My friend asked me what I thought of this quotation by the Provincial Treasurer and I suggested that under present circumstances either the Provincial Treasurer was trying to keep up a bold front or else he had taken leave of his senses and had lost some of his marbles. However, Mr. Speaker, my friend, who incidentally is also a clergyman, disagreed with me and he suggested that Mr. Steuart's remarks resulted from Davey having seen the light. He suggested that Davey may have undergone some kind of religious conversion and that his remarks must relate to the Holy Scriptures and he quoted to me Acts, Chapter 20, verse 25, which says that it is more blessed to give than to receive.

SOME HON. MEMBERS: Hear, hear!

MR. SNYDER: — Using this criterion, Mr. Speaker, I believe that Saskatchewan people under a Liberal Government are indeed among the most blessed in the entire world. They are giving more and receiving less than at any time in living memory, Mr. Speaker.

SOME HON. MEMBERS: Hear, hear!

MR. SNYDER: — More health costs, Mr. Speaker, increased taxes, increased sales tax, less services as a result of deterrent charges which they are paying; higher premiums for Government Insurance and less coverage. Saskatchewan people, Mr. Speaker, are giving more and more of their substance than at any time in history. They are giving more in sales tax on a host of new items, more in gasoline tax, more in licence fees, more in tobacco and liquor taxes, more in tuition fees, more for telephone services, more for consumer goods generally, and certainly much, much more in sky-rocketing municipal taxes.

Within the terms of reference, Mr. Speaker, suggested by my ecclesiastical friend, the Provincial Treasurer was right as rain. If, indeed, it is more blessed to give than to receive, then Saskatchewan people are, as he suggests, among the most blessed in the entire world.

Mr. Speaker, the Members opposite know that the inevitable rejection or sanction by the people of Saskatchewan is not too far away. An election is on our doorstep. Its dismal record has left dark clouds hanging over their heads; a sunshine budget or a homecoming circus isn't going to fool the electorate who will be going to the polls to register their disapproval.

SOME HON. MEMBERS: Hear, hear!

MR. SNYDER: — They will be going to the polls to register their disapproval of the neglect and the maltreatment for the vast majority of Saskatchewan pensioners, students, wage earners and farmers — those people on the lower rungs of the economic ladder. The electorate will at the same time register their disapproval of the present Liberal Government's special treatment of vested interests in our province, those people at the top of the economic ladder, by marking their ballots for the New Democratic Party candidate in their respective constituencies.

During seven years of maladministration, Mr. Speaker, clumsy or intentional, Saskatchewan people have had their eyes opened wide. This also happens to sheep when you shear them. The wool is removed from their eyes. The failure is on the doorstep of this Liberal Government, Mr. Speaker, a Liberal government both Federal and Provincial and they can't blame the Socialists this time around in either category.

People power, Mr. Speaker, is going to be the power that re-arranges the seating plan in this Assembly and it will place the reins of government in the hands of people who believe that people and resources are both elements which are not to be exploited. It is a party that believes that the welfare of all humanity deserves priority. To many people, Mr. Speaker, the initials NDP have come to mean a New Deal for People.

When this Government opposite, Mr. Speaker, has the courage to call another election, we on this side of the House, are ready, willing and able.

The synthetic optimism which the Throne Speech attempts to radiate fades into oblivion when Saskatchewan people are surrounded by evidence of a depressed condition in agriculture, unemployment of the skilled as well as the unskilled, diminishing services, increased taxation, and an unacceptable order of priorities in Government spending.

Because the Speech from the Throne offers no genuine or concrete hope for the future, I will be voting against the motion and supporting the amendment.

SOME HON. MEMBERS: Hear, hear!

MR. W.S. LLOYD (Biggar): — Mr. Speaker, I recall that 22 years ago yesterday I spoke in the Throne Speech Debate in this Legislature. I don't recall what the speech was but I do recall some of the events which happened at the same time. I recall those events because while I was speaking my oldest son was born.

I have no expectations, Mr. Speaker, that my labor today will be either as long nor as productive as on that occasion.

I rise also today, Mr. Speaker, to speak for the first time in the position of a Member other than a Member of the Cabinet or the Leader of a political party. I must say that I am enjoying the view and the experience from that vantage. I think I can describe myself at this particular point as being something of a Baptist in politics and my colleague the Leader of the Opposition (Mr. Blakeney) will know what I mean by a Baptist in politics. It is possible for me to be immersed somewhat in it, without being entirely drowned in it. As a result I can speak in a more detached manner. It is my intention in this Debate to talk somewhat generally although to some extent about some of the items included or not included in the Speech from the Throne.

May I join with those who have extended congratulations to the mover and the seconder of the amendment. As always I listened to the mover and the seconder's speech made with proper pride and understandable dedication to their topic and to their position. I wish that I could say that I felt that the Government felt as sensitively and as keenly about the matter of care of our environment as the Member from Watrous (Mr. Schmeiser) in those very well put words of his on that particular topic.

I want also to add my congratulations to those who have congratulated our new Leader of the Opposition (Mr. Blakeney). It was his first address in that capacity obviously. It was, I suggest, a memorable address which will be remembered by all of us for some time.

SOME HON. MEMBERS: Hear, hear!

MR. LLOYD: — Its effectiveness could be measured in two ways. Its effectiveness could be measured by listening to what he said. Its effectiveness could also be measured by taking a reading of the blood pressure of the Government front benches, and that perhaps was the most notable way in which its effectiveness was indicated during his address which he made the other day.

Unfortunately I was unable to be present in the House on Friday when the Premier was speaking so I had to deny myself of the intellectual and emotional response of listening to the Premier's address on that occasion.

I think that looking over the Speech from the Throne and listening to some of the comment since, it is in order also to congratulate the Government. I think that it is in order to congratulate them on their continued conversion to some of the ideas which we have presented in this House over the last several years and I want to make reference to some of the conversion which is evident because of what is represented in the Speech from the Throne.

First, Mr. Speaker, we may recall that several years ago on this side of the House we advanced, on more than one occasion, arguments in favor of student participation in the university administration. While that was advanced and documented and argued by those on this side of the House, the idea was rejected by the Government. Last year it saw fit, however, to grant representation on the Senate. This year the Speech from the Throne indicates that it is going to accept further urging that we advanced at that time, representation on the Board of Governors.

I should like to raise with them, while they are in this mood, Mr. Speaker, one question and that is the question of why not, and when we may expect, representation of the faculty on the Board of Governors. This, too, is overdue and I hope that they will be converted to that point of view before too long also.

SOME HON. MEMBERS: Hear, hear!

MR. LLOYD: — Secondly, it may be recalled that last year we urged that there be set up an overall Provincial agency to look after the continually increasing problems of pollution. That we urged and that they rejected. This year I understand that the Government is projecting some action in this direction as well. I hope it will neither be too long delayed or too weak.

Thirdly, for the last several years we have urged more bursaries for students and this has been consistently rejected by the Government. This year, it appears that bursaries may come about and I shall have more to say about that later on.

The fourth item of possible conversion rests with the fact that the Government has used the sledge hammer pupil-teacher ratio. This we opposed and regardless of that the Government swung the sledge hammer. This year it was suggested that there be some change in that respect in the future as well.

Fifthly, we argued against the unfairness of the six per cent guideline and the arbitrary manner in which it has been used with respect to low-paid employees particularly. We opposed that. It was insisted on by the Government, and this year, I understand, from what the Premier said the other day, this is to be done away with.

Sixthly, let's look at the so-called crash program to create employment. This was urged from this side of the House at least two years ago. It was rejected by the Government at that time. Indeed it was not only rejected, but the Government of that time went into reverse and created unemployment rather than employment. Well, a little progress here possibly! One year ago the Government announced a crash program, nothing happened. Some time ago, money was voted in the budget. We heard there was going to be a program in the latter days of the year, we're still waiting for that one. And now the other day, we hear still more crash programs supposedly being introduced in that regard. We won't hold our breath, but we shall await them with interest.

The seventh point has to do with the sale of potash to China. This was a possibility which we urged should be seriously considered and acted on by the Government several years ago. It was rejected by the Liberal Government of that time, as unrealistic and possibly even bad. I read now that it is being considered by the Premier as a possibility.

Well, the list can be extended, but that's enough to indicate a very considerable conversion of the Government, in some ways at least. That, Mr. Speaker, should make it plain, however, something of what this province needs — a government that can think for itself and act on its own thinking, and doesn't need to be continually pushed and prodded in almost every detail of necessary action. This province can't afford a government that automatically rejects good ideas, and then several years and much damage later, acts in a rather half-hearted fashion. And while, Mr. Speaker, we shall welcome the conversion of the Government on this side of the House even if it's a little bit late, frequently too little, I think we should remind them that conversion doesn't necessarily guarantee redemption and doesn't necessarily guarantee salvation so it may be a bit too late.

It's rather a gloomy picture if one adds the Saskatchewan Liberals to the Ottawa Liberals and contemplates the answer that gives. Because when I look at the recent actions of these two Governments, and when I look at the proposals which their recent statements project, I get a feeling that they are defeatists about the future of Canada. I get a feeling that their

actions and their proposals indicate a lack of faith in the ability of Canada and Canadians. I get a feeling that their actions and their proposals indicate a lack of conviction for the rights of Canadian people. I get a feeling that there is a lack of objectives held by these Governments to recognize reasonable hopes and attainable rights of Canadian people.

Let me summarize some of the objectives, some of the warrantable hopes which these two Governments say we can't afford or we can't accomplish in Canada. According to Liberal belief in Canada, we can't afford enough quality education for all people. We can't afford, according to their formula, adequate measures to provide good health services for all people. It is interesting to notice, for example, the lack of any reference in the Throne Speech or its Debate to a drug program which was talked so much about by people on the opposite side of this House. We can't afford, according to Liberal belief in Canada, satisfactory pensions for elderly citizens. We can't afford the kind of pensions that guarantee freedom from fear and freedom from want. The best they can do is afford an increase of 42 cents a month effective as of January 1st this year.

We can't afford to provide employment in Canada, and we have the worst unemployment situation we've had, except in the depths of the depression, at a time when Canada is supposedly affluent. We can't afford the kind of construction development and activity to keep people in the Province of Saskatchewan. My colleague from Moose Jaw was talking about the willingness of Saskatchewan to give. He overlooked one aspect of it. We are willing to give even of our sons and daughters because we've given them in great, huge numbers, as you know, to other provinces in Canada. We can't afford to do those things which made it possible to maintain family owned and operated farms according to Liberal policy structures. We can't afford good housing for all Canadians. Perhaps, while I mention it last it is certainly not least, and perhaps most important of all, we can't afford, according to the Liberal Government, to own our own country.

This Liberal formula, whether taken separately within the province or jointly between the Province and the Federal Liberals, fails to harness the hopes and the energies of Canadian people to do the job Canadian people would like to do. It spurns rather than spurs the creative energy of our people. What we need in this country and in this province is a Government with greater hopes for people, with greater belief in our people and our country, with a greater dedication to the function of government as the most responsible and representative agency of the people. Mr. Speaker, I suggest that those hopes are represented by the people who sit on this side of the House and the policies they propose.

SOME HON. MEMBERS: Hear, hear!

MR. LLOYD: — I want to make one specific

mention of one specific policy which is half announced in the Throne Speech, and that is the reference to bursaries for students. This is a reference which is welcome, it is overdue, and certainly the idea will receive very concrete and complete support from Members on this side of the House. But I think we need to note the statement of the Speech from the Throne with regard to bursaries. Because the statement is not to provide bursaries. The promise in the Speech from the Throne is to establish a committee to oversee the granting of bursaries. And when we look at this promise, to set up a committee, when we consider the need for action with regard to bursaries, then certainly this is a promise that is chicken soup made from the shadow of a starving pigeon.

SOME HON. MEMBERS: Hear, hear!

MR. LLOYD: — The earlier promise of the Government or of those on the Government side, just a few months ago, was for bursaries, not a committee, but for bursaries. It was a promise of bucks for students now, not many bucks, admittedly, but real bucks, not a committee to possibly recommend that something be done about it sometime in the future. I noted, according to newspaper reports, that the Premier has said there was to be a committee established after legislation was passed. It is a proper question to ask why this delay, why further holdup waiting for legislation? Because there is no need, absolutely no need, Mr. Speaker, for any legislation other than that now on the statute books of this province and that has been there for many years. There is no need to delay. And I say that while the chicken soup needs fortifying, it doesn't improve with fortifying with artificial political manoeuvres of this kind. The proposal of legislation is simply an excuse on the part of the Government to delay this necessary action for an even longer period of time. The present legislation gives all the authority needed. The present legislation even provides a source for some of these funds. It would have provided an even greater source if, in order to balance the budget a couple of years ago, this Government hadn't robbed the student aid fund of some \$2 million at that time.

SOME HON. MEMBERS: Hear, hear!

MR. LLOYD: — The need for assistance in addition to the Canada Student Loan Plan is well documented. It is recognized in other provinces. It was recognized in an earlier Liberal promise by Federal Liberals in an election campaign of a few years ago. You may recall a promise at that time to provide tens of millions of dollars to tens of thousands of students, not as loans, but as money to assist them without them having to repay it. This has been forgotten. In fact it has been denied, and I hope that the Government will take every opportunity to push this point of view on their Liberal candidates at Ottawa. It is one way in which the Federal Government could invest in education and in

Canada's future.

The aid that I suggested has been documented by a great many different studies which I don't intend to quote or even refer to at this time, but the most recent one does deserve reference. Something of the increasing need is documented in the study entitled, "Who Doesn't Get to University and Why." This was undertaken by the Association of Universities and Colleges in Canada. I refer very briefly to Table A(6) with regard to the Canada Student Loans Plan experience to indicate the need for some assistance to our students in this province. In 1964-65 in Saskatchewan, some 3,000 of the 12,300 students enrolled in post secondary institutions borrowed from the Canada Student Loan Plan. And they borrowed about \$2 million. This is roughly one out of every four students in our post secondary institutions borrowed money and they borrowed on the average of \$660 each. Three years later, 1967-68, 7,400 of 15,500 students borrowed \$6 million. Instead of out of every four borrowing, very close to one out of every two students borrowed three years later and they borrowed not \$660 but \$860 on the average. In other words the number borrowing was more than doubled, the amount borrowed in total was three times as great and the amount borrowed individually considerably greater. Unfortunately, the borrowings from the Canada Student Loan Plan don't tell the entire story. I have seen other studies which suggest, for all of Canada this time, that private borrowings by students from other sources approximately equal the amount also borrowed from the Canada Student Loan Plan.

Now the reasons for the increase in borrowing are obvious. More students, yes. Increased fees here and in other universities, increased costs of board and room, the decreasing financial ability of parents because of the farm situation or unemployment, the decreasing of summer work, all add up to the obvious result that more students simply need more money to continue their studies.

The result too, is obvious in another way. The result here is that more public assistance is necessary or else more of our students aren't going to be able to advance. Unfortunately, the people who will be denied education first because of this lack of funds, are those who have already been denied a fair share of the dividends of alleged affluence. This perpetuates some of the divisions in our society. This is one more discrimination between young people on the basis of the wealth of their parents. The bursary program has a big job to do, and I urge the Government to think big when it is assessing an amount of money for this program. When I say think big, it must think in terms much larger than the \$300,000 which was being bandied around just a few months ago.

There are some people who might still argue that loans will do the job. Loans do a worthwhile job, but we need to remember that they have some economic and psychological drawbacks. Frequently those who need help most, have to borrow the most

and that means that those people coming from already rather difficult circumstances, start their employed life with the largest handicap. Public policy should, if not remove that handicap, try to equalize the handicap.

Secondly, there are a number of people who still reject the idea of going into debt even for something which they consider to be as worthwhile as education. And this opportunity may well be rejected by many of those who deserve education most and most need the help to get it.

So, the point I want to stress to the Government is that large amounts of non-repayable assistance are needed. The Government has let this way of assisting students go by default entirely since it was elected, and I hope this present plan will be something to remedy that deficiency. Those on this side of the Legislature, Mr. Speaker, will accept the bursary procedure, that is, the procedure of assistance based on need. When I say that, I realize something of the very real problems which those who administer this program of aid based on need are going to face. There is a very real problem, and a very great difficulty in doing it well. May I ask the Government that they consider the introduction of appeal procedures for those who may be turned down in the first instance. I think we can't stress too much how important it is that there be some means of appeal against the first decision with respect to the bursary disbursement. And I trust the Government will turn its attention to that.

There is one further danger which I want to mention. That is, the temptation to governments who, having taken one step of this kind, think they have walked a mile and finished the race. I trust the amount that is going to be provided will be adequate. We hope that it will be in time to help students make decisions for 1971, and that means that the bursaries have to be available in the very near future. I hope, and I understand this is the case, that it will include technical institute students as well as the university, and I hope the Government will make the availability of the bursaries known. I hope they will put as much energy into advertising this as they do into advertising some of the other programs at public cost which they shouldn't be paying for out of public cost right now.

SOME HON. MEMBERS: Hear, hear!

MR. LLOYD: — Having said all of that, I think it's worthwhile to remind ourselves as legislators of one other fact. It's essential to remember that equality of opportunity for university or technical institute can't begin and doesn't begin at the door of the university or at the doors of the technical institute. Equality of opportunity for that kind of education begins and goes back to high school opportunity. It goes back certainly beyond that to primary school opportunity, and I suggest that we need to consider whether we shouldn't put much more emphasis than we have done on that latter area of education. It goes

February 22, 1971

back, of course, beyond and outside the school. It goes back to community resources of playgrounds, libraries, museums, and galleries. It goes back to adequate housing. And until society sees fit to do what has to be done about such things as housing, as community resources, and as elementary and high schools, then, of course, we are never going to have equality of opportunity at the university or technical institute regardless of how adequate our bursaries may be. And I trust, too, that with the provision of bursaries the Government and all political parties will not as a result, deter further planning which will eventually make our higher educational opportunities fully and freely accessible to all the young people in this province.

SOME HON. MEMBERS: Hear, hear!

MR. LLOYD: — Mr. Speaker, I have some more to add on some other topics, it is almost 5:30 and I ask the right to adjourn debate.

Debate adjourned.

The Assembly adjourned at 5:27 o'clock p.m.