

LEGISLATIVE ASSEMBLY OF SASKATCHEWAN
Fifth Session - Sixteenth Legislature
6th Day

Tuesday, February 23, 1971

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

WELCOME TO STUDENTS

MR. SPEAKER: — Before we enter into the day's proceedings I wish to introduce to all Hon. Members the following groups of students in the galleries of the Legislature. From the constituency of Saskatoon City Park-University represented by Mr. Charlebois, 74 students from King Edward School under the direction of their teachers, Mr. Reddicapp, Miss Hope, Mr. Frank and Mrs. Beichart; from the constituency of Watrous represented by Mr. Schmeiser, 51 students from Cudworth School under the direction of their teacher, Mrs. Jeanne Zacharais; from the constituency of Regina North East represented by Mr. Smishek, 31 students from the Dover School, under the direction of their teacher, Mr. Bartel; from the constituency of Moose Jaw South represented by Mr. Davies, 26 students from the Empire School, under the direction of their teacher, Mrs. Gardner; and from the constituency of Regina North East again represented by Mr. Smishek, 31 students from the M.J. Coldwell School, under the direction of their teacher, Mr. Dolman; again from the constituency of Saskatoon City Park-University represented by Mr. Charlebois, 51 students from the Holy Family School, under the direction of their teachers, Mr. Stemaschuk, Mr. Hackle and Mr. Hnateck.

I am sure all Hon. Members will wish to join with me in extending an extremely warm welcome to this fine group of students. I always get a great deal of pleasure out of looking up into the galleries and seeing so many students there and know that someday they will have the responsibility of filling the seats in this Legislature and perhaps sitting on the floor themselves.

HON. MEMBERS: Hear, hear!

STATEMENT

MANITOBA PULP MILL

HON. W.R. THATCHER (Premier): — Mr. Speaker, during the Throne Debate, Sir, the Leader of the Opposition (Mr. Blakeney) made what I consider some very unfair remarks about Karl Landegger, President of Parsons and Whittemore. Among other descriptions he called him a promoter, using that term in its most disparaging sense.

MR. SPEAKER: — Order! The Leader of the Opposition on a point of order. Now let's hear the point of order.

MR. A.E. BLAKENEY (Leader of the Opposition): — The point of order is that the Premier is entitled to quote me but not entitled to say in what context I used a particular word. He may quote my words, he may not put his interpretation on them.

SOME HON. MEMBERS: Hear, hear!

MR. THATCHER: — When I replied in the Throne Debate, I took exception to his remarks. I posed the question that if Mr. Landegger was such a notorious character, why was the Manitoba Government negotiating with his company to take over the pulp mill mess at The Pas. My remarks evoked various comments from the people involved. According to the Member for Kelsey (Mr. Messer), Mr. Landegger is quoted by the press as follows:

Mr. Landegger interviewed by telephone from New York agreed with Mr. Schreyer. He said Manitoba's Premier had not been calling him. I don't want to get into a hassle with Mr. Thatcher if he made the remark, but it is not true, he said.

Now I contacted Parsons and Whittemore this morning in connection with the purported statement, and, Mr. Speaker, I should like to read a wire which I subsequently received from Mr. Landegger:

Newspaper reports are incorrect which quote me as saying there have been no negotiations between Manitoba Government and Parsons and Whittemore regarding the pulp mill at The Pas. In fact we have been discussing the project with the Manitoba Government over the past year and discussions are expected to continue.

SOME HON. MEMBERS: Hear, hear!

MR. THATCHER:

I have been informed that our Mr. J.F. Condon, vice-president of Parsons and Whittemore mentioned to Premier Thatcher that we have made a proposal which is being considered by the Manitoba Government for Parsons and Whittemore to acquire the Manitoba mill.

Now that wire is signed by Karl E. Landegger and I shall table the telegram, a copy of the telegram.

Now in passing, I note another Canadian Press dispatch carried by the Leader-Post this morning and I quote again:

Mr. Landegger was quoted as saying he had discussions with Mr. Schreyer a year ago in Regina and I told him there was no use talking seriously until the mill was completed.

I ask you to note also, Sir, that Premier Schreyer in his press conference mentioned that the two had briefly discussed the matter in New York shortly after he became Premier. Now on February 20th, 1971, the Winnipeg Free Press carried the following story and I quote from the Free Press:

Mr. Schreyer said that the Province had made no inquiries to Parsons and Whittemore.

I am sure that Mr. Schreyer didn't mean that statement as it was printed. I am sure he must have been quoted out of context. Mr. Speaker, I won't mention personal or telephone conversations today, but I wish to table copies of recent correspondence between Parsons and Whittemore and Premier Schreyer.

SOME HON. MEMBERS: Hear, hear!

MR. THATCHER: — This first letter, Sir, written to the Hon. Ed. Schreyer by Mr. Joseph Condon of Parsons and Whittemore, the vice-president:

Dear Mr. Premier:

Re: Churchill Forest Industries Project.

Pursuant to our today's telephone conversation I should like to confirm that we would be pleased to consider assisting you and your Government in making this project a more viable enterprise. You may recall at our brief meeting in New York last year that Parsons and Whittemore is in the business of constructing and operating turnkey pulp and paper mills.

There is one paragraph of technical details that I won't read but I will table. I'll go on with the next paragraph:

Our general philosophy of management would indicate a preference towards acquiring or having a major interest in the mill rather than assuming the management and marketing functions alone. Of course without knowing the actual conditions of the mill it is really not possible to make an intelligent proposal to you. In order to do this we would need detailed information on the design of the mill and its equipment, financial data as to the cost and financial obligations and we would have to examine the present plans for supply of raw materials and the marketing of the finished product. Therefore I suggest that we meet with you at your earliest convenience to discuss the matter further and to proceed with the preliminary inspection of the mill.

That letter, Sir, was written by Mr. Condon to Mr. Schreyer. This letter, Sir, is from the Premier of Manitoba, written on February 2nd to Mr. J.F. Condon, vice-president of Parsons and Whittemore.

Dear Mr. Condon:

I wish to acknowledge your letter of the 19th of January in which you offer the services of your company in making the Churchill Forest Industries project a more viable enterprise. I was interested to receive your letter together with attachments. There are one or two points on which I would like some clarification.

This is the man who is not interested, Sir, in Parsons and Whittemore:

First could you indicate to me the standard type of management fee that your company has particularly for plants of a given size equivalent to the one in The Pas. On the marketing side I would appreciate having similar indication for marketing fees and whether they are calculated per unit or on the value of the volume handled by the marketing organization.

Yours sincerely, Ed. Schreyer.

February 23, 1971

Then I should like to read one more letter, Sir. This one is on February 22nd, written to Mr. Schreyer from Mr. Condon, vice-president of Parsons and Whittemore:

I hesitate to reply to your question on a management fee because we believe that for our project of this magnitude and complexity you would be better off with professional management which has a vital stake in the enterprise. Parsons and Whittemore does manage smaller mills for a fee but we believe in the case of the Churchill Forest Industries it would be far more effective if we were to participate in the project than if we were to be simply hired as management for the mill. We would therefore propose managing the mill as we do the Prince Albert pulp mill, the St. Anne-Nackawic Pulp and Paper mills where we provide professional management without charging any fee above our costs. Our compensation is in the form of a long-term equity in the company. Now regarding marketing again we undertake marketing of the pulp for both of the above mills on a three per cent sales basis. We would be pleased to meet with you at your convenience to discuss these matters in more detail and to make a proposal to your Government to make the project a more valuable enterprise. In order to make such a proposal our Chief Engineer would have to inspect the plant and we would need more information regarding costs of raw materials, marketing plans and financial obligation of the mill. We would then be in a position to make a proposal to meet your requirements. This would of course involve our participation in the project and a recommendation of the changes to be made in the project and the financing required to make it a profitable operation. Mr. Landegger, our chairman of the board, Mr. Boyhan, our Chief Engineer and I will be pleased to meet with you over the next two or three weeks.

Mr. Speaker, in the light of the documents that I have just tabled here today, surely it is clear that there have been negotiations and discussions over the past year between Parsons and Whittemore and the Government of Manitoba.

I have one other document I wish to table, Mr. Speaker. Here is what the Member for Kelsey (Mr. Messer) said. He said this apparently last Friday according to the Winnipeg Free Press:

If the Manitoba Government was looking for someone to operate the CFI development, it would be done in the best interests of the people of Manitoba rather than relying on a capitalist company.

SOME HON. MEMBERS: Hear, hear!

MR. THATCHER: — I have a letter here from one of the largest banks in New York and in North America, Loeb, Rhodes and Company. This letter was written to the Hon. Ed. Schreyer, Premier of Manitoba.

Dear Mr. Schreyer:

Thank you very much for your letter of January 19th. The client I referred to is Parsons and Whittemore who as you know are active in Saskatchewan. I understand that

subsequent to my own letter to you that they have been in touch with you direct regarding the Churchill Forest Project. This being the case I think that further discussion should proceed on a direct level between them and the Government. Nevertheless we would be quite happy to extend our services and facilities to the Government in connection with this project should you deem it appropriate.

Signed, Phillip Berard, vice-president.

This is one of the institutions, Sir, that the NDP seemed to have such an aversion for. Yet when Mr. Schreyer is looking for money to bail the Manitoba Mill out, it is to companies like Loeb, Rhodes in New York that he goes.

Mr. Speaker, Friday last and yesterday when I was not in the House, the Member for Kelsey (Mr. Messer) made several statements. Here is one of them, and I ask Hon. Members to listen to it in view of the letters I have just tabled:

The facts are that there have been absolutely no contact from the Manitoba Government with Parsons and Whittemore. Absolutely no contact. The Member also said that my statements were highly dubious and probably fictitious.

SOME HON. MEMBERS: Hear, hear!

MR. THATCHER: — Mr. Speaker, in the light of the facts that I have disclosed here today, I leave it to Members and the people of Saskatchewan to conclude whose statements are dubious and fictitious.

SOME HON. MEMBERS: Hear, hear!

MR. THATCHER: — Now that they know the true facts, I hope the Hon. Leader of the Opposition (Mr. Blakeney) and the Hon. Member for Kelsey (Mr. Messer) will withdraw their allegations and apologize to the House.

SOME HON. MEMBERS: Hear, hear!

MR. THATCHER: — Mr. Speaker, the fact is that once again the NDP are trying to create a red herring. The Government has obtained one pulp mill for Prince Albert and we are on the verge of obtaining a second pulp mill at Meadow Lake. We have succeeded where they have failed.

SOME HON. MEMBERS: Hear, hear!

MR. THATCHER: — Because of that failure the NDP are always rankled when we talk about the mills. Hence their efforts today to harass and discourage the Meadow Lake project.

SOME HON. MEMBERS: Hear, hear!

MR. BLAKENEY: — Mr. Speaker, I am delighted to have an opportunity to reply to the Premier's speech and I ask you and all Members of

the House to accord to me the same breadth of interpretation of the rules of this House that he has just taken.

SOME HON. MEMBERS: Hear, hear!

MR. BLAKENEY: — I am replying to the Premier's statement. The Premier (Mr. Thatcher) attempted to justify his statement in this House last Friday and I want to repeat what he said. He said and I want to quote:

I ask the people of Saskatchewan that if Mr. Karl Landegger was the type of citizen why is it that Schreyer is begging him to take over the Manitoba mill.

SOME HON. MEMBERS: Hear, hear!

MR. BLAKENEY:

Day after day and week after week Premier Schreyer has been on the telephone, sent Ministers down there or officials begging them to take over the pulp mill that they had made such a mess of.

Now, that is the statement that the Premier must justify and anything short of that is just the usual wiffle-waffle, fiddle-faddle. What has he established? He has not established one telephone call. He has established that Parsons and Whittemore called Schreyer, what is Schreyer to do . . .

SOME HON. MEMBERS: Hear, hear!

MR. BLAKENEY: — Mr. Speaker, may I ask that they refrain from interrupting me as we refrained from interrupting the Premier.

MR. A. THIBAUT (Kinistino): — Mr. Speaker, we listened gently while the Premier spoke, we should like to be accorded the same respect.

MR. SPEAKER: — I think up until this part of the proceedings the cheers and jeers were emanating in almost equal volume from either side. However, I should ask all Members on both sides of the House to listen with a degree of respect and quiet in order that we may hear all the words that the Member has to say.

MR. BLAKENEY: — Now let us see what the Premier has established by his facts. One, that there was a contact at a cocktail party a year or so ago in New York. That there was a contact at a cocktail party a year or so ago in Regina. That's what the Winnipeg Free Press says and if you deny it that is all right. There was a telephone call emanating from Parsons and Whittemore to the Schreyer Government. It certainly doesn't say that Schreyer 'phoned anybody. The next fact is that Parsons and Whittemore wrote to Schreyer. The next fact is that Schreyer answered the letter asking for technical information. Now there is not one suggestion that any Manitoba Cabinet Minister other than Schreyer had any contact. There is not one suggestion that there was any other telephone conversation except the one referred to in the letter which I say originated from Parsons and Whittemore and there was not one suggestion that there was

any official talking to Parsons and Whittemore, and there is not one suggestion that there was any letter, any correspondence except the one read by the Premier. So what have we got? We've got two mild contacts at cocktail parties a year ago, long before the Manitoba Government owned the mill or there was any suggestion of take-over. No telephone conversations emanating from Manitoba. No ministers contacting anyone from Parsons and Whittemore . . .

SOME HON. MEMBERS: Hear, hear!

MR. BLAKENEY: — On the basis of those facts marshalled by the Premier over the weekend and yesterday and getting his wires all lined up, wires which are signed by people so says the Premier - I have never seen a wire signed by anyone in my life but the Premier just tabled one - on the basis of that information for which he has used all the resources of the Saskatchewan Government to marshall, he says he is justified in making the statement which says, "Why is Schreyer begging them to take over, day after day and week after week Schreyer has been on the telephone, sending ministers down there and officials." I wish he had told us just one minister that went down. He hasn't told us who, he hasn't told us when, because there aren't any. He has not told us of any contacts emanating from the Government of Saskatchewan, except one letter, one letter in answer to any inquiry from Parsons and Whittemore. Now I am saying to you, Mr. Speaker, that this type of misrepresentation of what the Premier of Manitoba is saying and doing, is a breach of the usual courtesies which exist between friendly provincial governments and unless withdrawn or repudiated by this Legislature could tend to lessen the present good will which exists between Manitoba and Saskatchewan. I don't think in the history of this country one premier has stood up in his Legislature and said and commented freely on what was going on in another Legislature between a premier and a private company in another province. This, Mr. Speaker, I suggest is a breach of all of the relationships which have existed. If this sort of thing continues, it will be of extreme importance in lessening the ability of prairie premiers and prairie governments to take a united front in defence of the prairie interests.

In order to score what I say are some cheap political points, the Premier of this Province is breaking all the rules of courtesy which have obtained between the provinces and in doing so he is weakening the ability of the three prairie provinces to fight for prairie people and their interests.

Mr. Speaker, whatever the facts may be - and I do not accept those that are submitted by the Premier - but whatever the facts may be, I suggest that the Premier of this Province ought to accept the denial of the Premier of Manitoba that he had made those statements,. And if he won't we shall know that he puts what I say are cheap politics ahead of the interests of people. Because, Mr. Speaker, he has not shown that anyone has begged anyone. There wasn't a single request from Mr. Schreyer let alone begging. There wasn't any suggestion that day after day or week after week Mr. Schreyer was on the telephone. With one telephone call it's a little difficult to be telephoning day after day and week after week. Once!

AN HON. MEMBER: — Letters . . .

MR. BLAKENEY: — There was no evidence . . .

HON. D.G. STEUART (Provincial Treasurer): — How are you going to vote on the Bill?

MR. BLAKENEY: — The Member for Prince Albert is raising total irrelevancies about whether or not I am going to vote on a Bill which isn't even before this House and when this Government has the courage to lay before this House the facts.

I am now referring to the statement that the Government of Manitoba sent ministers down there. Has there been one shred of evidence of that? There has been no evidence of a begging or even a request to take over the business, nor any suggestion in any of the correspondence that anybody wanted to take over the pulp mill but Parsons and Whittemore. Those I think are the facts. On the basis of one letter in reply to a letter from Mr. Schreyer to Parsons and Whittemore, Members opposite are saying that the Premier (Mr. Thatcher) has established that someone has begged, someone has been on the telephone day after day, that ministers have gone down, that officials have gone down and that these ministers and officials have begged, that they have begged Parsons and Whittemore to take over a pulp mill. And there is not one shred of evidence to support those statements. And because these statements have been denied by the Premier of Manitoba, I ask the Premier of this Province in common decency to withdraw them.

MR. THATCHER: — Mr. Speaker, just in reply, I can't go against the facts. I suggest the Hon. Leader of the Opposition and particularly the Member for Kelsey (Mr. Messer) most assuredly have demonstrated their facts were not true.

MR. BLAKENEY: — I rise on a Point of Order!

MR. SPEAKER: — Order, order, order! Prior to this sitting of the House at the correct time, in fact a half an hour before the time called for in the Standing Rules of the Legislature, the Leader of the Opposition handed me notice ruling for an adjournment and emergency debate. Does he wish to proceed. Leader of the Opposition.

MR. BLAKENEY: — The fact that the Premier has made his statement indicates the problems which arise when notice is given.

MR. SPEAKER: — Order, order! We can't have a speech for debate. All I am asking you is: you gave proper and due notice, now do you wish to proceed or don't you, one way or the other?

MR. BLAKENEY: — I gave notice, I propose to proceed.

SOME HON. MEMBERS: Hear, hear!

AN HON. MEMBER: — Got to get to the bottom of this!

MR. BLAKENEY: — And the notice I gave is, "Take notice that I intend to move the matter be given priority of debate under Rule 17, on Tuesday, February 23." The statement to be discussed is as follows:

The statement made by the Hon. Member for Morse, Premier Thatcher, in the Assembly, Thursday, September 18, 1971. The Hon. Member is stated in Debates and Proceedings (unrevised) for Thursday as saying:

I ask the people of Saskatchewan that if Karl Landegger was this type of citizen why is it that Schreyer is begging him to take over the Manitoba mill. Day after day, week after week, Premier Schreyer has been on the telephone sent ministers down there or officials, begging them to take over the pulp mill that they had made a mess of.

My statement continues:

The statements which the Premier alleged to be facts have been denied by both Premier Schreyer and Mr. Landegger according to press reports contained in the Winnipeg Free Press of Saturday, February 20, 1971. In view of the denials of the accuracy of the statement by Premier Schreyer and Mr. Landegger the statement is a breach of the usual courtesies which exist between friendly provincial governments and unless withdrawn or repudiated by the Legislature could tend to weaken the goodwill and friendliness between our two neighboring provinces, which friendliness is of extreme importance in pressing forward the claims of the prairie region of Canada for fairer consideration on many issues vital to the welfare of the people of Saskatchewan.

That, Mr. Speaker, is my notice. I give it pursuant to Standing Order 17. Due notice has been given and I ask you to rule pursuant to the order that it is a definite matter of urgent public importance.

SOME HON. MEMBERS: Hear, hear!

MR. SPEAKER: — The Leader of the Opposition has asked leave to make a motion for priority of debate for the purpose of discussing a definite matter of urgent public importance under Rule No. 17. Rule No. 17, Subsection (2) requires that, I quote:

Written notice of intention to move that amendment be given priority debate under Rule No. 17 must be submitted to the Clerk of the Legislative Assembly at least two hours prior to the sitting of the Assembly.

The Hon. Member has given due and proper notice, for which I thank him. The motion asks that the Legislature give priority for debate as a matter of urgency to a certain statement. The statement to which the Member has referred and on which he has based his request for priority of debate was made in this House on Thursday last in the Throne Speech debate which is still in progress. The fundamental principle underlining Rule No. 17 is to provide an opportunity within a proper framework of parliamentary procedure where none otherwise existed for the immediate discussion of any matter deemed to be of such urgency and importance, that all normal and special business of the House should be put to one side in order to provide complete right of

way to discussion of one particular, specific subject. In order to draw the attention of all Hon. Members to certain definite procedural rules which govern situations of this nature, I wish to quote from Erskine May's Parliamentary Practice, 17th Edition, page 365, Subsection (c), and I quote, "a motion has been refused when an ordinary parliamentary opportunity will occur shortly or in time." Inasmuch as an ordinary parliamentary opportunity for the discussion of this subject has indeed been available, since the statement referred to was made on Thursday last, and is still available today at this very moment, I do not consider that it is a subject to which Rule 17 applies. For the reasons aforesaid I must rule the motion out of order.

MR. W.J. BEREZOWSKY (Prince Albert East-Cumberland): — Thank you for your ruling, but it seems to me the Premier is deliberately misleading or lying to this House . . . he just refuses . . .

MR. SPEAKER: — Order! I ask the Hon. Member to withdraw the allegation that anybody was lying to this House and apologize immediately. We're not going to have that kind of scummy statement made in this Legislature. Let me lecture you all a little. The collective honor and integrity of this Legislature is the individual responsibility of every single individual Member. The honor and the dignity of the whole Legislature, all of it, is the responsibility of every Member inside this Legislature. If you impugn the honor and the dignity of one, you impugn the honor and the dignity of all. I can tell you right here and now that Members of this Legislature, all of them, don't like this kind of conduct, don't like this style of behavior, and I am sure that the people of the Province of Saskatchewan are sick to the teeth with it. And I therefore ask the Hon. Member to withdraw and to apologize.

MR. BEREZOWSKY: — I don't intend to whitewash what I consider an untruth.

MR. SPEAKER: — Then I will have to name the Hon. Member herewith. No one Member is going to call another Member a liar in this House while I occupy this Chair.

MR. BLAKENEY: — Mr. Speaker, may I challenge your ruling of naming?

MR. SPEAKER: — I beg your pardon?

MR. BLAKENEY: — Is it open to me to challenge your ruling of naming the Hon. Member?

MR. SPEAKER: — I didn't get around to naming him in the House. I said I would have to name him and then the House would have to deal with him. The Hon. Member has disappeared out of the House knowing full well that he was guilty. Anybody who is innocent would stay here and defend himself.

MR. BLAKENEY: — Mr. Speaker, as the Hon. Member (Mr. Berezowsky) is not in the House, I would ask all Hon. Members, including yourself, Sir, not to suggest whether or not any Member is guilty in

his absence. I have asked my colleague to go and ask the Member to come in. I should request all Hon. Members, including yourself, Your Honour, not to make any prejudgments in such a way.

MR. SPEAKER: — All I asked the Hon. Member to do and I ask him to do it again now that he has seen fit to return, is to apologize for calling another Hon. Member a liar - and I don't know which one it was because I didn't hear - and withdraw the statement of lying in this House for the reasons that I mentioned before. I ask the Hon. Member in all sincerity to do this, for the honor of this House, for the dignity of this House, the honor of himself; he is one of the senior Members of this House and I have always held him in the highest regard and the greatest respect and I ask him to do this.

MR. BEREZOWSKY: — Mr. Speaker, I have to withdraw but it is not consistent with the truth . . .

MR. SPEAKER: — I have to ask the Hon. Member again. He's called another Member a liar and I wish to draw your attention to some of the rules of parliamentary procedure.

It has frequently been ruled (and I quote from Bourinot) by Speakers in the Canadian House of Commons that a statement made by an Hon. Member respecting himself and peculiar within his own knowledge must be accepted. It is not unparliamentary to criticize statements made by a member as being contrary to the facts but no imputation of intentional falsehood is permissible.

There was a direct imputation of intentional falsehood. Now I place the matter before the House. I want the House to deal with this as it sees fit.

MR. E.I. WOOD (Swift Current): — Mr. Speaker, on a point of order, as nearly as I could hear - I won't claim that my hearing is entirely perfect - but I understood the Hon. Member to say that some things had been said that were not consistent with the truth. This is a far cry from calling a person a liar. A person can say things - I undoubtedly say things from time to time that are not consistent with the truth, I may now know it but for the person who says things that are not consistent with the truth and knows that they are not consistent with the truth - now this is said in this House, this is calling that man a liar but I did not hear the Hon. Member from Prince Albert-East Cumberland say those. I heard him say something about a statement being not consistent with the truth and we have those day by day but that's not calling a person a liar.

MR. THATCHER: — Mr. Speaker, I . . .

MR. SPEAKER: — Now when the first statement was made I distinctly heard the word "liar" which brought me to my feet as it usually does. I would presume the record would show the words that were used.

MR. F.A. DEWHURST (Wadena): — Mr. Speaker, just before the Hon. Member (Mr. Berezowsky) left the Chamber this last time, with deep motion, maybe you

didn't hear him. He said that he would withdraw the statement. Maybe you did not hear that statement because his voice was so full of emotion and it was very difficult for his voice to travel but he did say he was withdrawing the statement.

MR. SPEAKER: — I apologize if I did not hear what he said and I am prepared to accept the word of the Member for Wadena (Mr. Dewhurst) that it was said.

MR. DEWHURST: — He did . . . with his voice full of emotion.

MR. THATCHER: — The decision is yours but as far as I am concerned - and I think I was the Member he was referring to - I realize that the Hon. Member has been very sick and I am quite willing to let the matter drop.

MR. SPEAKER: — I am willing to accept the statement of the Member for Wadena on behalf of the Member for Prince Albert East Cumberland. Quite honestly if this was said I didn't hear it and I am prepared to accept the statement of the Member for Wadena.

MR. W.E. SMISHEK (Regina North East): — Mr. Speaker, as the Hon. Member's seat mate, I do concur the statement was made of saying that he would withdraw the statement. I can vouch for that.

MR. SPEAKER: — I am prepared to accept the statement as outlined to the House by the two Hon. Members, if the rest of the House agrees.

ADJOURNED DEBATES

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. KOWALCHUK (Melville): — Mr. Speaker, never in my memory has any Premier in any province been so mistreated in absentia and so misquoted as has the Premier of Manitoba. This Premier, our Premier, who should be a model of courtesy, has shown that he has not the leadership qualities that we expect in a leader, Mr. Speaker.

SOME HON. MEMBERS: Hear, hear!

MR. KOWALCHUK: — I want to say, Mr. Speaker, that I want to give thanks to the Hon. Woodrow Lloyd who has given up his time so as to give me a few minutes to speak.

SOME HON. MEMBERS: Hear, hear!

MR. KOWALCHUK: — Last week you heard our dynamic Allan Blakeney, our Leader, not only analyse correctly the Throne Speech failings, Mr. Speaker, a Throne Speech that did not come to grips with

the realities of our provincial problems. But also, Mr. Speaker, our Leader presented in this House concrete suggestions and positive programs for progress that is going to lead the New Democratic Party to victory in the next election.

SOME HON. MEMBERS: Hear, hear!

MR. KOWALCHUK: — I want to congratulate the mover and the seconder to the Throne Speech, both of whom painted a rather dismal picture of the troubled Saskatchewan and who in no way related possible solutions to these problems.

Mr. Speaker, what has the Throne Speech to offer for the preservation of the viable family farm? Nothing, Mr. Speaker. Not one word regarding the most critical situation of thousands of three-quarter section and one section farmers. Farmers who had for a time looked to the Federal Liberal Government for help and answers to alleviate their difficulties but to no avail, Mr. Speaker. In spite of petitions and direct protest the answer has come loud and clear. Two-thirds of you farmers must go. You are no longer needed. Some still had hope for Provincial Government support but none came and the Speech from the Throne indicates that no help will be forthcoming, Mr. Speaker. Not one word from the Premier and his Liberals on the Task Force recommendations. Not one word on the possible assistance to aid the small farmers. Not one word on the exodus of the people from the farm and other people from the province.

Mr. Speaker, this Liberal Government along with our Federal Liberal Government has indeed a sorry record of performance.

SOME HON. MEMBERS: Hear, hear!

MR. KOWALCHUK: — From a high net farm income of \$450 million in 1964 to a low of \$150 million in 1970 - a loss of two-thirds of the farm income to the farmers during the Liberal term of office in Saskatchewan. Mr. Speaker, what a terrible catastrophe to the communities of Saskatchewan. The Prime Minister has the audacity to say, what have I to do with the selling of your wheat. The Liberal Premier of Saskatchewan says that he wants it publicly known that Trudeau is the right man for the right job today. Yes, Mr. Speaker, Mr. Trudeau and Mr. Thatcher are both of a kind. There is no doubt about that.

Mr. Speaker, the Melville constituency as well as the whole Parkland Region is one whose villages and towns and cities depend almost entirely on the mixed farmers. These people have through the years pioneered this land, have broken it and hauled away the rocks, have made a home for themselves and their families. They have not selfishly acquired land for the sake of business or the acquisition of wealth, but simply, Mr. Deputy Speaker, to make a home to build a church and a community hall, to raise a family, to educate their children, and just simply to be worthwhile community members. But, Mr. Speaker, it seems all these simple and worthwhile things are not to be retained, that the eradication of the small viable family farm is an acceptable fact for the Liberal Government, as well as the Government at Ottawa. Along with the disappearance of the family farm will go the villages, the towns, the hospitals and the schools, all because no real attempts are being made to reverse this kind of disastrous trend.

Mr. Speaker, we all realize that technology has made changes necessary, changes in all walks of life, changes that are dramatic in nature, but the Task Force Report on agriculture, a report produced not by farmers, but by theorists, computers and office pencil pushers, is deliberately weighted in favor of the abandonment of small farms.

SOME HON. MEMBERS: Hear, hear!

MR. KOWALCHUK: — As that comes about, Mr. Speaker, there will be easy pickings for the big monopolistic land grabbers.

Mr. Speaker, in view of the world's population explosion, we should bend all our resources and energies in research or study to maintain and strengthen our rural community life and rural environment. Even in terms of economics it would be far better to maintain people on viable farms than add to the welfare rolls and slums in the cities. We waste millions on planes that never leave the draftboard, ships that never sail, and other wasteful extravagances. Surely, Mr. Speaker, any such amount of money would be worthwhile to preserve our community life as we know it today. Mr. Speaker, the time is now to turn away from this insanity of piling humanity together in cities in astronomical numbers and to maintain our smaller centres.

We of the New Democratic Party are committed to the full to help in the preservation of the viable family farm. Our policy states very clearly that we will establish a land bank commission which will purchase land voluntarily on the market at competitive prices and lease this land, guaranteeing tenure with option to buy.

SOME HON. MEMBERS: Hear, hear!

MR. KOWALCHUK: — The object of course, Mr. Speaker, is to keep the number of viable family farms operating. The object is not to socialize farm lands as stated by the Minister of Agriculture, yesterday, but the object is to protect the small land owner, and provide assistance for the small farm unit to increase its holdings and to give incentives to young farmers wanting to start farming. The object also, Mr. Speaker, is to stop the trend to large corporate farms, many of them controlled from outside our country.

SOME HON. MEMBERS: Hear, hear!

MR. KOWALCHUK: — As to the Minister's statement that the New Democratic Party intends to control production, Mr. Speaker, all I can say is that it is hardly possible to have more control than we have today, but if more controls are needed to benefit the farmer, I say let's have them. It is the mortgage and loan companies and the loan sharks and the farm credit corporation, not the old bogey man who says socialization of land, as the Liberals would have you believe that the farmers are afraid of, Mr. Speaker, it is these others they are afraid of.

Mr. Speaker, the exercising of price controls too would have curbed inflation and the farming industry would have been in good shape today. So would have been the pensioner, and the small businessman if the Federal Government had had the courage to implement them.

Mr. Speaker, the Premier in his speech the other day sneeringly made reference to something that the NDP called viable family farms. The Premier doesn't seem to care or want to understand what the family farm means. Let me tell the Premier that every person in the Melville constituency knows what the family farm is, the town and city people know what a viable farm is, they also know what the family farm means to their business - the grocery business, the garage business, the hardware business. They know and realize, Mr. Speaker, that viability for the farmer to stay alive means viability and life for themselves.

SOME HON. MEMBERS: Hear, hear!

MR. KOWALCHUK: — All these people, regardless of whether they live in towns or in the cities - rail workers, mechanics, teachers, clerks - know full well that their income is the result of their stake in the viable family farms in their constituency and in the province, Mr. Speaker.

I want the Premier to know that the people of Melville constituency as well as the people of Saskatchewan will let you know decisively, Mr. Speaker, what the family farm means to them when the next election rolls around.

SOME HON. MEMBERS: Hear, hear!

MR. KOWALCHUK: — Now, Mr. Speaker, the Premier after the last election had a lot to say about the Melville constituency and how it was lost and how it will be won. The people of Melville constituency will decide that, Mr. Speaker, no one else. I believe that they will see through the subterfuge and the smoke screen that is being made by the Liberals.

Yes, Mr. Speaker, political strings are being pulled, they have gerrymandered the constituency in the most devious hatchet manner possible, it won't help, Mr. Speaker, the people of Melville don't believe this Government and they don't trust it.

SOME HON. MEMBERS: Hear, hear!

MR. KOWALCHUK: — Well do they remember the controversy of the public building in Melville when you, Mr. Premier, stood on the platform and shouted, "Why, I can think of a hundred things more important than Melville's public building." Yes, Mr. Speaker, it was only when this contradiction of Gardiner's "Yes" and Thatcher's "No" was placed squarely in the Melville local newspaper, by the Melville New Democratic Party, was there enough influence brought to bear on this ludicrous situation so that the building was built. But you, Mr. Premier, and the Liberals will get no credit.

You know, Mr. Speaker, this Government under this Leader doesn't seem to realize that the people of Saskatchewan place a great deal of importance on simple honesty and truth.

SOME HON. MEMBERS: Hear, hear!

MR. KOWALCHUK: — The promise by the Liberals in 1964 and 1967 of tax deductions with improved services, the promise not to close community hospitals, the promise to reimburse capital costs of power installations, the promise of 80,000 jobs for our young

people of Saskatchewan, the promise to stop the exodus of people leaving the farms in the Province, Mr. Speaker, and many other promises were broken one by one. Is it any wonder that the people of Saskatchewan have lost trust and faith in this Liberal Government, Mr. Speaker?

Let us turn to the record of taxation in this province. During the first five years of Liberal administration and particularly in the area of school taxes, taxes were raised to a breaking point. During the last five years of CCF administration from 1959 - 1964, the average unit tax increase for Saskatchewan was 2.5 mills, Mr. Speaker. In the Melville Unit and the Canora Unit, there was no increase for that period of time. Mr. Speaker, let's look at the Liberal's first five years of administration. The average increase was 12.4 mills, a fantastic increase! Today that burden is still there and in nearly every municipality in Saskatchewan tax arrears have risen to awesome proportions, some as much as \$20,000, \$30,000 and \$40,000 and more, this last year alone. The New Democratic Party says it is time for a halt, that . . .

SOME HON. MEMBERS: Hear, hear!

MR. KOWALCHUK: — . . . that our policy position is to sharply reduce the property tax mill rates on farms, homes and small businesses.

SOME HON. MEMBERS: Hear, hear!

MR. KOWALCHUK: — We realize that there will have to be more money available but we believe that the time is long past due in looking for other sources of revenue, by taking a good look at the tax base on natural resources, Sir.

Yes, Mr. Speaker, it is amazing that this Liberal Government is hoping to invest and stand guarantee for millions of dollars of people's money in foreign owned pulp mills. Yes, this Government is very free in promoting free enterprise for big business and big corporations with your money and mine, even using socialistic principles to achieve this. There it all ends, Sir, the benefits are not for you and me, it is a guaranteed income for the foreign multi-millionaires.

Mr. Speaker, we are told that for every job created in the pulp mill, \$80,000 has to be invested. In the critical economic situation Saskatchewan was in last year and again this year, I wonder if it wouldn't have been better if that money expended by the Province for pulp mills and fancy highways, were used to better advantage to help the small businessman . . .

SOME HON. MEMBERS: Hear, hear!

MR. KOWALCHUK: — . . . and other small industries in the province which are in trouble. That money applied as \$10,000 or \$20,000 loans could have tided them over their financial difficulties and thus help in aiding and building the smaller communities. What a wonderful salvation this would have been for these small businesses and their employees if an injection of \$5,000, \$10,000 or \$20,000 had been used by this Government to help the people already deeply involved in our communities.

You know, Mr. Speaker, that in the radius of some 150 miles of east central Saskatchewan eight machinery sales companies went broke last fall. We might have used some of this money to assist them. Incidentally, one of these, Mr. Speaker, was a large garage and implement business in Balcarres in my constituency.

AN HON. MEMBER: — It went broke!

MR. KOWALCHUK: — It went broke!

Some money there, would have given livelihood to some 25 breadwinners in Balcarres who today are without work, their homes for sale. Mr. Speaker, one day I got a call from these owners at Balcarres to come and see them. This I did. I visited them for a couple of hours and finally asked them, "Gentleman," I said, "How come you let yourselves in so deep in these financial deals?" You know what their answer was, Mr. Speaker? Why, we were told that the economy was good, that this bit of recession was temporary, that the future was bright! I am quoting the Hon. Treasurer all the time. They had been listening to Liberal propaganda and had taken it for truth, Mr. Speaker.

Mr. Speaker, there are ever so many other areas that I should like to have covered, the Indian and Metis people whom I consider my friends, whom this Government, in my opinion, has failed basically because of talking down to them from above, instead of consulting with them. The remark the Premier made the other day about the NDP giving liquor to the Indians on election day is a deep insult to the Indian and Metis people. It was totally unwarranted, totally untrue, a falsehood, Mr. Speaker. After that remark by the Premier, I got a phone call from one of my Indian friends - and I have lots of them, Mr. Speaker - and do you know what he said to me? "Don't you worry about that stupid remark, John, we Indian people know what political party tries to influence our vote . . . "

SOME HON. MEMBERS: Hear, hear!

MR. KOWALCHUK: — . . . "and it isn't the New Democratic Party!"

I wanted to say something, Mr. Speaker, with reference to other people - the renter, the consumer, the working man, the pensioner, the student - but time will not permit me, Sir. To the people of Saskatchewan, I want to proudly say that the New Democratic Party of Saskatchewan has a program for progress, a new deal for Saskatchewan people. It is based on the needs of people, it is a program that will put Saskatchewan back to its rightful place of progress and stability . . .

SOME HON. MEMBERS: Hear, hear!

MR. KOWALCHUK: — . . . a position that Saskatchewan once enjoyed under the CCF.

Mr. Speaker, there is only one way to show the Federal Liberals at Ottawa and the Saskatchewan Liberals in Regina that the family farm is important, that the people are more important than systems, that man must be a builder, and not a destroyer and an exploiter of all resources, including their fellowmen. I say to the people of Saskatchewan, that you can achieve a

great advance toward this goal by decisively defeating the Liberal Government in the next election.

SOME HON. MEMBERS: Hear, hear!

MR. KOWALCHUK: — Having done this, we will together with our sister province, Manitoba, work and fight for what we know is important - people. Mr. Speaker, I will not support the motion, but I will support the amendment.

SOME HON. MEMBERS: Hear, hear!

HON. A.C. CAMERON (Minister of Mineral Resources): — Mr. Speaker, because of the time element, I am not going to take any time in formalities, as much as I should like to pass around a few congratulations. But I think it would be well if I came right to the subject that I hope to speak about this afternoon. I should like to talk about foreign ownership and foreign control in the resource industries in Saskatchewan.

I think we must speak about foreign ownership because the people of this Province are going to be called upon before too long to make a decision. Do they want foreign money to come in and develop our resources or do they not? Are we to support a position of encouraging capital to come in, or shall we join ranks with those who are determined to drive it out? I listened with great interest to the Leader of the Opposition hoping he would inform the Assembly as to whether he supports the position that foreign capital come in, or whether he supports those who are determined to keep it out. Typical of the Leader of the Opposition's performance we listened in vain, because he chose not to place his position on the record in this House.

SOME HON. MEMBERS: Hear, hear!

MR. CAMERON: — He did state, however, that the NDP believes the time has come for new and bold steps. That opportunity to reveal that bold step he had in mind was not long in coming. The very day he spoke an announcement was made of an American company undertaking a vast resource development in the form of \$117 million pulp mill. While this announcement gave the Leader of the Opposition a first rate opportunity to take that bold step, what did he do? Did he state categorically whether he approves this American invasion into our resources, or whether he is determined to oppose it. He did neither. In substance his comment was, "We are keeping our options open."

He had a great deal to say about potash. I want to take a moment or two to deal with potash, because he and his cohorts have more to say about potash, uncomplimentary things about potash, than anyone else in the Province of Saskatchewan. Here again he would have us believe according to his speech in the House, that big American companies in the potash industry were doing nothing more than raiding our resources and milking the taxpayer to enrich the pockets of American profiteers.

We thought we saw something of his new approach in the NDP platform. As we read it in the newspaper, we thought that it meant that he would socialize the potash industry, now that plank, if not new, was at least bold. The Leader of the Opposition

got up in the House and he protested. He said, "No, no you misread what I meant." He said, "it isn't really that bold, we are bold, but not quite that bold." Do you know what he said? "We did not state the potash mines would come under public ownership, but we have no hesitation in considering the matter." That has been the Leader of the Opposition's stance in this House since the Session opened, procrastination! Standing on one foot, standing on the other foot, like a hen in the snow, the same we saw this afternoon. First he is for one, then he is against it. Then he is for the other and then he is against it. He reminds me of a little boy, sitting with a flower, picking the petals with the potash industry and the oil industry. He is saying, "I love you, I love you not, I love you, I love you not." he hasn't made up his mind.

SOME HON. MEMBERS: Hear, hear!

MR. CAMERON: — Mr. Speaker, this procrastination is just not good enough!

We call on him to take the occasion to make his position known. I don't know of any industry that has been more maligned by the NDP than the potash industry. If it showed success it was due to a sell-out of our resources to American profiteers. If it was less than successful it was because the Government has sacrificed the industry in order that the producers in Carlsbad could enjoy fat profits. When we were successful in securing lower freight rates in order that we could better penetrate into the Asiatic markets and the markets of the world, what did the Leader of the Opposition say? It was designed by the Government to put fatter profits into the hands of the potash companies or to give cheaper potash to Japan and China. The other day, you know, he was very busy hanging crepe on the potash industry. He indicated that sales had dried up, massive numbers of employees were laid off, potash towns like Lanigan, Esterhazy and Rocanville were dying on the vine. Having painted this picture of despair, he offered no alternative.

But you know we have had some interesting suggestions from Members of the NDP and their labor alliance. Here is one that I want to bring before the House. It has been suggested that the companies be permitted to produce flat-out, turn the mills wide open, produce all the potash they are capable of producing and what they cannot sell, let the Federal Government purchase and stockpile. They said have the Federal Government give 25 per cent of it to foreign countries. This, it is claimed, would create jobs and result in thriving communities.

Mr. Speaker, today we have about 2,800 - 2,900 employed in the potash industry. Reliable statistics we have gathered from the potash industry indicates that even if we permitted full production it would only increase the work force by about 10 per cent. In other words it would create jobs for 280 people. But what is the price we should be asked to pay? Our plants are capable of producing 8.3 million tons of K₂O (potassium oxide) yearly. Current sales are running at about 3.8 million tons of K₂O. So the Government would be asked to purchase from the industry 4.5 million tons. At current prices, do you know what that would cost the taxpayer of Canada? \$160 million!

MR. MacDONALD: — Each year!

MR. CAMERON: — Yes, each year. When the government gives 25 per cent of what it purchased it would still have to store the rest and in order to store this amount of potash it would have to build storage bins. Those bins would cost \$145 million a year. We should be asking the Federal and Provincial Governments to buy this tonnage of potash which would cost the taxpayers of Canada \$300 million per year. I say, Mr. Speaker, if the Federal Government is going to be called upon to spend \$300 million a year to help an industry in Saskatchewan, let it be the agriculture industry of Saskatchewan.

SOME HON. MEMBERS: Hear, hear!

MR. CAMERON: — Then the Leader of the Opposition (Mr. Blakeney) made some other charges. He said that prorationing and government restrictions are strangling the potash industry.

MR. BLAKENEY: — Mr. Speaker, on a Point of Order. The Member is saying that I had made other charges indicating that I had made the earlier one which is in no way mentioned in my speech.

MR. CAMERON: — He is standing on the other foot now. I want to take a moment to answer these charges made by the Leader of the Opposition that prorationing has ruined the potash industry. In 1969 there was no prorationing. The industry could sell all the potash they could produce and yet they found sales for 3 million tons of K₂O. They sold this tonnage at \$10.00 to \$12.00 per ton. That is less than the cost of production and they brought home \$74 million. In 1970, with prorationing they sold slightly above but they doubled the price, amounting to \$110 million.

This year every indication is that they would be able to sell approximately 4 million tons - the highest ever sold in Saskatchewan.

SOME HON. MEMBERS: Hear, hear!

MR. CAMERON: — Sales will not net \$74 million, it will net \$145 million to the potash industry.

SOME HON. MEMBERS: Hear, hear!

MR. CAMERON: — These increased sales will provide jobs for an additional 65 to 75 men at the mine. This year, Mr. Speaker, the potash industry which was so maligned by the NDP will pump \$200 million into the Provincial economy.

SOME HON. MEMBERS: Hear, hear!

MR. CAMERON: — The industry will pay \$2.5 million to the Provincial Treasurer in royalties. It will pay another \$2.5 million to the rural municipalities in taxes. And of great importance, it will provide jobs for 2,800 to 2,900 Saskatchewan people at the mine with pay envelopes totalling \$23 million.

SOME HON. MEMBERS: Hear, hear!

MR. CAMERON: — I say to you, Mr. Speaker, prorationing is successful. It has brought order out of chaos. It has guaranteed the future of the potash industry. The only threat to the potash industry in this province today is the threat of socialization.

SOME HON. MEMBERS: Hear, hear!

MR. CAMERON: — Now I want to turn for a moment to oil. Socialization is likewise held over the head of the oil industry. Let's have a look at the contribution which the oil industry is making to this province. In July we produced our first millionth barrel of oil. We produced one billion barrels because these capitalistic foreign countries with foreign capital poured in \$2 billion into the ground in Saskatchewan in search for and development of this oil. Even today after producing a billion barrels it hasn't brought them back as much as they poured in and they are still in a deficit position.

In the course of this development do you know what the oil industry has paid to the Provincial Treasurer and indirectly to the people of Saskatchewan in taxes and royalties and other benefits - \$390 million. It paid \$21 million in taxes to the rural municipalities. It paid another \$100 million to the farmers who owned mineral rights.

You know, I was interested to read the other day where economists had stated that the population of Western Canada would be one million less if it were without the petroleum industry. In spite of the contribution of these resource industries to the Saskatchewan economy there are those - and they are growing in numbers - who would close the gate to this activity. There is a rising voice, Mr. Speaker, within the NDP, demanding that this very thing be done. I am going to say this to the Leader of the Opposition. Try as he might, he will not keep submerged the growing militant left within his party who are demanding this. Members who last night read the Leader-Post, saw a news item from Quebec. Let me remind you what it said. The NDP have disbanded the Quebec wing of the party. The purpose, they claim, is to fight on the Federal level for self determination for Quebec; in other words, to support the separatist cause in Quebec.

They elected a new leader in Ontario. They elected a young man, Stephen Lewis. The new NDP leader in Ontario, what is he doing? He called an emergency meeting of the top party officials to warn them of the danger of the militant left wing within the Ontario party.

SOME HON. MEMBERS: Hear, hear!

MR. CAMERON: — He warned them that if this continued the NDP in Ontario will be driven into oblivion. So says Stephen Lewis.

AN HON. MEMBER: — What about Saskatchewan?

MR. CAMERON: — What about David Lewis - David Lewis, the father, the man who is running for the leadership of the national party? As reported in the same paper, do you know what David Lewis said? He said, "I express grave fears about the left wing element

at the upcoming national convention." He is going about trying to find it there are any right wing members within the NDPs who will join their forces to defeat the left wing.

SOME HON. MEMBERS: Hear, hear!

MR. CAMERON: — You know this is fine. They have problems. But you know the interesting part may come into Saskatchewan. You know they are very bold, bolder than the Leader of the Opposition. Mr. Laxer, the professor from a university down East somewhere, was asked, "How do you think our new leader, Mr. Blakeney is going to do?" This is what he said! "I'm going to tell you frankly that unless Mr. Blakeney leads his party to the left wing he is going to be defeated in Saskatchewan."

SOME HON. MEMBERS: Hear, hear!

MR. CAMERON: — These leaders, Mr. Speaker, have cause for fear. The militant left wing have set their compass. They know where they are going. They have vowed to drive foreign capital out of Saskatchewan and out of Canada. They are determined that nothing will evade their socialist net, not even the farmers of Saskatchewan.

SOME HON. MEMBERS: Hear, hear!

MR. CAMERON: — The number of Members opposite who continue to mouth that we have sold out our resources leads me to believe, Mr. Speaker, that the militant left wing has more adherents across the way than we thought possible only a few months ago. You know I want to recall to the Leader of the Opposition . . .

MR. ROMANOW: — Have you checked under the desk?

MR. CAMERON: — Oh yes, last year I understand when this Member who just now commented so brightly was moved to the front benches. Someone asked him, "What do you think of it all." "Well," he says, "you know we are not so frightened about what we see in front of us, it is what is behind that scares the hell out of us."

SOME HON. MEMBERS: Hear, hear!

MR. CAMERON: — It is what is behind them that is causing them the worry. Yes.

SOME HON. MEMBERS: Hear, hear!

MR. CAMERON: — If they ask, "Do you have foreign ownership in our resource industries?" The answer is, "Yes, we do have." If you ask, "Do we have foreign control in our resource industry?" The answer is a definite, "No." I would invite anyone who questions this to obtain a copy of the form of lease these companies sign from my Department of Mineral Resources. Let me tell you what is in this lease. You will find the lease provides that the lessee - that is the company - shall abide by all obligations and all conditions imposed upon the holder not at the

date the lease is written but as changed by the Government from time to time. This clause gives the Government the right to change the terms of the lease at any time. If the Government feels it is not getting a big enough bite, it can increase it. It can impose any condition, any restriction it wishes on the company regarding any phase of the operation, including pollution. Under this lease in Saskatchewan the Government holds all the trump cards. What would happen if the companies failed to live up to the change of ground rules? The lease would be subject to cancellation. If they are not happy, if they don't want to play these new games, can they pick up their marbles and go home? No, they can't. No, they can't pick up the oil field and go back to the United States. They can't pick up potash and run across the border. When an oil lease is cancelled every producing well on that lease becomes the property of the Crown of Saskatchewan. Every time that a potash lease is cancelled the mine proper becomes the property of the Crown of Saskatchewan. So I say to you, Mr. Speaker, when the Government owns the mineral resources like it does in Saskatchewan, when it has control of the tax policy, when it may change the rules at any time to increase the taxes as it so sees fit, when it can level any condition on the industry for good mining, for pollution or otherwise, then I say there is no foreign control in the resource industries of this province. Foreign ownership, yes; foreign control, no. And you know, I wonder sometimes why a foreign investor knowing the conditions under which he has to operate would invest in some of these areas. The greatest fear to investment and the greatest deterrent to investment in Saskatchewan today is the NDP and the left wing element who is hell bent on socializing everything in sight.

I began, Mr. Speaker, and I want to repeat, that the people will be given a choice. Do they choose to support the continued foreign investment for the benefit it brings to the people as I have been speaking about here or do they choose to join the ranks of the militant left who are determined to drive it out? Mr. Speaker, we have no fear of the decision the people will make.

SOME HON. MEMBERS: Hear, hear!

HON. L.P. CODERRE (Minister of Public Works): — Mr. Speaker, I will dispense with the normal formalities that take place in this Debate. I am sorry that the Hon. Member for Biggar (Mr. Lloyd) did not have an opportunity to sing his swan song in this House and in this particular debate. Everyone knows that he is a forceful speaker. He will be missed by this House.

Mr. Speaker, the people of the province know that the Government and Premier Thatcher always put the welfare of the entire province ahead of its popularity and will continue to do so.

SOME HON. MEMBERS: Hear, hear!

MR. CODERRE: — Mr. Speaker, this party does not sit back and wait. We are a party of action and we shall continue to fight unemployment until we bring it to heel. I shall show to this House what we have done thus far and what more will be done later on to fight unemployment, Mr. Speaker. I believe that we have

given this province good government and we shall continue to provide good government this year, the next year and the year after. Although some of the things that we have done at times, Mr. Speaker, have not been the most popular, they have always been in the best interest of the people of Saskatchewan.

SOME HON. MEMBERS: Hear, hear!

MR. CODERRE: — Mr. Speaker, the Liberal Government is a government of common sense. It is not a government of give-away. It is a government that watches the expenditures with care and is not afraid to spend money when it is necessary. It is a government, Mr. Speaker, that recognizes that people are its most important asset and we shall continue to provide programs that take the welfare of our people into consideration first. What we ask of the people of Saskatchewan, Mr. Speaker, and what I ask of this Legislature is for confidence in the economy of this province. What we ask is faith in the ability of the Government to conduct the affairs of the Province on a sound business-like basis. I can promise to this Legislature, Mr. Speaker, and to everyone in the province that their faith will be well rewarded. All of us know that unemployment is a blot on our land and we shall combat it. "Give us the tools," as Churchill said, "and we shall do the job." I will illustrate to this Legislature that my Socialist friends, when they were the Government did nothing to assist or combat unemployment. My Socialist friends will today, tomorrow, next week, endlessly try to impress us with the unemployed statistics. I tell you, Mr. Speaker, that statistics are no consolation for a person who is unemployed. We have the lowest unemployment rate in Canada. However, whether it is the lowest or not there should be no unemployment and this is why the Government of Saskatchewan has embarked on a special accelerated \$17 million Public Works Program which has and will create job opportunities for Saskatchewan residents who would otherwise be totally unemployed.

I shall illustrate later on, what some of these projects are, Mr. Speaker, and the number of man hours involved in each.

I should like to make it quite clear at this time that this Government cares and is concerned about the possibilities of rising unemployment, and by its actions and programs, is doing something to alleviate this blight on society. I shall indicate to this House, Mr. Speaker, that this Government has done more to assist in this area than the Socialists have ever done in the past, and the records of this House do indicate that. I shall show you that when the Socialists were in power and yet when they had the highest unemployment rate ever experienced in this Province they sat on their big fat hands and did nothing about it.

I was rather amused the other day to see my good friend, Bill Davies from Moose Jaw, who is now the executive secretary of some neo-political organization in this Province, saying that unemployment in Saskatchewan is higher than figures show. I wonder what the Hon. Member went by when he said this? Is the Hon. Member up to his old tricks trying to manipulate statistics to suit himself? To confuse the picture? Or, is it politics before people?

I was rather surprised, Mr. Speaker, to see the noble knights in shining armour, the Socialist Caucus, some of the

Wafflers, some of the Socialists - call them what you wish, Mr. Speaker - gathered here in Regina some time in January. As quoted in the Leader-Post of January 19th they urged that public works projects be started to combat unemployment. Where were they, what were they doing, when the mass of accelerated public works programs was announced in this Province? Over \$17 million of it, three times the amount that they have ever spent in any three or four year period in their history.

Most important, Mr. Speaker, where were those Wafflers, those Socialists, these political links, a few missing links, in 1962 when according to figures of the Dominion Bureau of Statistics, the unemployment rate in this province at that time was 7.3 per cent. I wanted to find out, Mr. Speaker, what they had done when they had such a high unemployment rate, insofar as their public works program was concerned. It was a pitiful program, that's right, Mr. Speaker, it was a niggardly program. They had allocated the total amount of \$2 million in their public works program when the unemployment rate was 7.3 per cent. Do you know, Mr. Speaker, that the Socialists when they were in power that year had a total of 26,000 people unemployed in December, 27,000 in January and 28,236 in February. At that time our Socialist friends had a grand total public works budget of \$2 million, and they only spent \$1.7 million to help alleviate unemployment at that time. Mr. Speaker, it wouldn't even scratch a flea off of a dog's back. Socialists talk big, but when the chips are down, nothing, now they have all the answers, Mr. Speaker. Where were those great Socialists in 1961 when they should have been doing some planning. They seem to want to forget.

Mr. Speaker, I want this House to know that a good Liberal Government is doing something to stimulate employment and that my Socialist friends did not do anything when they faced similar situations. I think it is quite obvious to this House, Mr. Speaker, and to the people of Saskatchewan, that this Government cares, that this Government has geared itself with its public works program in having been able to maintain the lowest unemployment figures in Canada. This is a figure that is better than at any time during the Socialist years. Let's not talk percentages at the moment, let us compare.

Bill Davies let's compare, because I believe you were the Minister of Public Works at that time. I say, let us compare because my Socialist friends are trying to confuse the issue, the situation that now exists in this Province. I have heard little Allan mention on several occasions that it was no wonder that our unemployment figure is so low because the people are leaving. How ridiculous. Here are the facts. Take November of last year, and compare with December 1970 figures. According to Dominion Bureau of Statistics (No. 71-001), I note that in November, Socialist Manitoba had 381,000 people in the labor force. In December 1970, it had 378,000 in the labor force. It appears to me, Mr. Speaker, that at this point they dropped a few thousand. Alberta had 643,000 in the labor force in November, in December it had 629,000. Saskatchewan had 344,000 and dropped to 338,000. In all cases, Mr. Speaker, the drop in the labor force takes place on about the same proportionate basis. This is only a normal seasonal adjustment, but it is very easy for my Socialist friends to cause confusion and confuse the issue.

I deny the statement, Mr. Speaker, that we are not concerned

about unemployment. We are doing something about it. Now here is the proof. One year ago, our employment rate was a little higher in Saskatchewan than today. Today it is lower. Why? Because of our accelerated programs. According to Dominion Bureau of Statistics of February 11, in January of last year, Manitoba had 16,000 people unemployed, for an unemployment rate of 4.4 per cent. In Saskatchewan, last year, we had 18,000 people unemployed for an unemployment rate of 5.5 per cent. In Alberta they had 26,000 people unemployed for an unemployment rate of 4.2 per cent. We were not satisfied with these high unemployment figures, so we proceeded to do something about it, by getting more of our public works programs going. Today I am happy to say that our public works accelerated program has definitely lowered the unemployment rate below the two neighboring provinces.

SOME HON. MEMBERS: Hear, hear!

MR. CODERRE: — The degree of success of our public works program is indicated. I find in January of 1971, this year now, that Manitoba has 24,000 unemployed, 6.5 per cent in that great Socialist province. 6.5 per cent and they do nothing about it! Saskatchewan has 21,000 people unemployed for 6.2 per cent, much too high, Mr. Speaker, but we are doing something about it. We are knocking it down; it is lower than anywhere in Canada. If you look at the percentages, Mr. Speaker, this is positive proof that the accelerated public works program in Saskatchewan has had a definite effect on reducing unemployment. People before politics.

SOME HON. MEMBERS: Hear, hear!

MR. CODERRE: — I indicated a moment ago, Mr. Speaker, that in Manitoba 1970, they had an increase of unemployment by 50 per cent over last year, in Alberta by 50 per cent over last year, in Saskatchewan by 10 per cent. Our public works program is working!

SOME HON. MEMBERS: Hear, hear!

MR. CODERRE: — Now that 20 per cent increase is still too high, Mr. Speaker, still too high an increase from what we have had. But it is indicative that the Public Works program in which the Government is involved, both directly and indirectly, has had the effect of holding down the unemployment rate, to a figure that is possibly more acceptable, though not completely acceptable. We are going to continue to expand our program in order to provide as much work as possible. People before politics!

A few days ago the announcement of a \$117 million pulp mill was announced. This will provide a great many jobs for our unemployed, and put them to work soon. My Socialist friends never could provide a pulp mill. Let's get on with the job, Mr. Speaker, let's get on with the job, let's get this Bill in the House, let's get this pulp mill built.

Mr. Speaker, I repeat that the total unemployment figure in January and February of 1962, when the Socialists were the Government had reached the highest for this Province in 25 years, 7.3 per cent. Now they have the audacity to tell us that they

have all the answers. 28,296 people with pockets empty, when my Socialist friends were the Government. I am not going to deny that we haven't got unemployment in this Province, but we are doing something about it to the tune of over \$70 million in public works.

We in Saskatchewan, Mr. Speaker, have achieved the distinction of being the only province which has accelerated public works programs and has arrested the rise of unemployment. Our objective for now and the future is to lower unemployment. This we will do and the Throne Speech so indicated. The Throne Speech indicates, Mr. Speaker, people before politics.

First, Mr. Speaker, why have we embarked on this program, this accelerated program? As Minister of Public Works I was very pleased when Premier Thatcher announced that the Saskatchewan Liberal Government had approved the speed-up of more than \$17 million in public works programs to help alleviate the unemployment situation this winter. Most this House knows, Mr. Speaker, that some of these projects were in the planning list for up to three years from now, others were not on the list at all. Because of Premier Thatcher's concern over rising unemployment, he requested all Departments to take out of mothballs any projects that could accelerate our public works program. The fact that all of us in the various departments have been able to come up with such an impressive number of projects should be a source of satisfaction to us in this House, and to the people of Saskatchewan. But I should add that this is not a reason to sit back and congratulate ourselves. Now, with the announcement of the new pulp mill, all of Saskatchewan looks for more job opportunities. The efforts by Premier Thatcher to encourage industries in this Province to create more employment so that we do not have the highs and lows of employment and unemployment, are part of the general plan of this Government to provide more employment. After all, the Government is involved in these projects and it is a public works program of value to all the people of Saskatchewan. I am sure that when this House goes into committee and that when my estimates come up we shall note with great satisfaction again a vastly expanded public works program. People before politics.

SOME HON. MEMBERS: Hear, hear!

MR. CODERRE: — Now the task facing us is to get on with the work and get these programs going. We have spread the winter works projects throughout the province in order to create more employment everywhere and I think that we have been reasonably successful. At least the feedback that I am getting from many centres indicate enthusiastic support for our crash program. All except the Socialists, who are trying to belittle the effort. While the pockets of the unemployed were empty in 1961-62, they did nothing, they sat their fiddling, and now they don't know what tune to play, because they have to try and find something wrong with what has been done. I have heard three or four days of debate from that side of the House and not one constructive word has come out. A project which I should like to mention which has been delayed for political reasons by a former Socialist Minister, that's the Public Works Building in Yorkton. What my Socialist friends do at all times is try to hinder and hold back projects that the people can get to work on.

Now, as I have indicated before, Mr. Speaker, we have at

present more than \$17 million in capital projects which we are directly or indirectly involved in are proceeding with and have been advanced to this year. To name a few, Mr. Speaker: The School for the Deaf, Saskatoon, 2nd floor - \$160,000 worth of labor, 34,000 man hours; the Moose Jaw Court House - which was not in the program - \$60,000, 11,000 man hours, for my good friends in Moose Jaw; Dietary Renovations; Legislative Building, 39,000 man hours; the out-patient clinic at North Battleford for 37,000 man hours; Souris Valley Hospital, Weyburn, 73,000 man hours. There is also the Western Development Museum, \$750,000 which couldn't have been built because they didn't have the money; also the Health Science Building - which was just announced this morning - and then some make-work programs to help the unemployed. My Socialist friends sat there and whistled when they should have been doing something when the unemployment rate was highest in the province. We think of people, they think of politics. I could name quite a few more, Mr. Speaker. There is the North and Central Wing renovation for the School for the Deaf, 56,700 man hours; the money in labor alone is over \$209,000. Another project, the school at Pine House, 28,000 man hours. We could continue this very impressive list, Mr. Speaker, amounting to over \$17 million of public works programs that have been accelerated.

Mr. Speaker, another project which the Government is directly involved in but which is a part of the \$17 million of the Department of Public Works, is the Regina College West, Regina Campus, for a total of \$6 million. Money for this has been provided directly or indirectly from the Provincial Treasury.

We could go on and on, Mr. Speaker, in mentioning a great number of projects that are on tap at this moment, an accelerated program, proceeding according to the plans of the Department. So, Mr. Speaker, you will note that this is an impressive list and I am sure that my Socialist friends will in some way or the other try to discredit these programs. Why are these programs being accelerated? To provide jobs for the unemployed.

Many of these capital projects noted below could be considered as government make-work programs. I am referring to these projects where the Government has given the license to build, such as senior citizens' homes; where there are grants involved where the Central Mortgage and Housing Corporation is involved, given a license to proceed. Projects by the Saskatchewan Power Corporation, Saskatchewan Government Telecommunications, Saskatchewan Government Insurance Office and many others, are providing additional jobs. People before politics. Under public health, there is hospital construction going on at this moment totalling \$21 million. People before politics.

And there are other projects, totalling \$4 million which will be operative early in 1971. These, Mr. Speaker, are again part of the overall work program. But, Mr. Speaker, the preachers of gloom would not want to see this province pushed to new or brighter horizons. And this is probably one reason why they will continuously try to criticize, to hold back, and to obstruct the work of this Legislature.

Without referring, Mr. Speaker, to the inept programs that they had established during their term when the unemployment rate was the highest in Canada, I hope I have shown to this House what a niggardly sum they spent at that time. Only those

who are blind and don't want to see cannot see and those across the way, Mr. Speaker, just don't want to see, they just don't want to listen. I should remind you, Mr. Speaker, that the unemployment rate was worse in Saskatchewan at that time by far. But this, of course, shows a complete lack of care for our then unemployed by the Socialists and lack of planning by them, and they called themselves the big planners. And now they have many other plans, Mr. Speaker. Now they have plans when they are the Opposition. They can do all kinds of things. But when the chips were down they weren't doing a thing. They couldn't perform, Mr. Speaker. Yes, when it was time to plan they had nothing to offer. When it was time to produce they didn't. It must hurt them to see that a good Liberal Government is building something, is moving ahead to provide jobs and employment. When it is time to give non-constructive gobbledegook, my Socialist friends excel.

Now here in this province under the leadership of the Premier is a government to encourage the private sector, the public sector, everyone to get going and get the economy rolling again. This can only be done by co-operation and not by throwing crowbars in the spokes like my Socialists friends across the way have been attempting to do to discredit programs that provide employment. The Member for Kelsey (Mr. Messer) did a fine job today, the Leader of the Opposition (Mr. Blakeney) did a fine job as well in trying to discredit the Government but not one constructive word came from them, Mr. Speaker. However, our Government at present is directly or indirectly involved in make-work programs in excess of \$70 million. These programs include public health expenditures made by other departments such as the presently extended highway program and special-care home construction. All of these programs, Mr. Speaker, are doing their share in keeping our unemployment rate the lowest in Canada.

Mr. Speaker, we believe in people before politics. Before I sit down, Mr. Speaker, I should like to tell this House, and I would be remiss in my duties if I did not, that I must pay tribute to members of my Department and staff for the extra heavy work that they have been doing because of the accelerated program of the Government. Many members of my staff have been working overtime in order to catch up with this work and are still working overtime to get the ball rolling. I am sure that this House, Mr. Speaker, and the people of the province, and I know particularly myself would like to show my appreciation by saying, "Thank you," to them. I forgot to congratulate the Hon. Mr. Blakeney a moment ago on being elected as the Leader of the Party as well as the Leader of the Opposition. I wish him many years of success in that capacity. He seems to fit very well in the Opposition. I should hate to see what would happen should he ever form a government. It would be a disaster to Saskatchewan. The pulp mills that we may get, we would never get them, and this is a great danger because look at the foul-up job that they are doing in Manitoba. Socialists have a tendency to do this.

So, Mr. Speaker, we must all keep working to bring our unemployment down even more. When this House votes me the funds for carrying out these accelerated public works programs and for additional projects to be later announced we should be proud of what has happened to date and what will be continued in the future. We shall not be judged for lip service only but we shall be judged by our actions.

February 23, 1971

I will not support the amendment, I will support the motion.

SOME HON. MEMBERS: Hear, hear!

MR. W.G. DAVIES (Moose Jaw South): — Mr. Speaker, before the Minister takes his place may I ask him a question? I didn't want to interrupt his varietal discourse but about his own department, and the \$17 million that he first referred to. Would he table today, a list of those projects with the number of man hours and the amounts of money, vocation, etc. that he gave us in part this afternoon?

MR. CODERRE: — Mr. Speaker, I have only one list with the projects.

MR. DAVIES: — Mr. Speaker, I don't want to put the Minister to any more bother. I should like him to give us as thorough a list as he can and I suppose that all he has to do is to Xerox the list that he has.

MR. CODERRE: — I will do that.

MR. SPEAKER: — Before the speaker enters the debate, I draw your attention to the fact that if the House does sit after supper, there will be no meals available in the cafeteria due to the fact that the manageress needs a little more notice than she has had because of the different situation in which she is operating down there now, different equipment, and she cannot pre-thaw some meat unless she receives some notice in advance. I give you this information now in order that you may telephone your wives and tell them to put the soup pot on in time for supper.

SOME HON. MEMBERS: Hear, hear!

MR. F. MEAKES (Touchwood): — Mr. Speaker, my first words are to my Leader who happens to be out of the House at this moment. I just want to state publicly to this Legislature to say how proud I am to serve under him. Having worked with him for 10 years in caucus and Cabinet I know his ability and his integrity, his sincerity and his great leadership qualities. I know that he will follow the tradition of Tommy Douglas and Woodrow Lloyd.

SOME HON. MEMBERS: Hear, hear!

MR. MEAKES: — It was a privilege to have served under the three and I know that he is going to be the next Premier of Saskatchewan.

SOME HON. MEMBERS: Hear, hear!

MR. MEAKES: — I am also proud of our new Deputy Leader. He is a young man who I know has already left and will leave a mark on the history of this province.

SOME HON. MEMBERS: Hear, hear!

MR. MEAKES: — I turn to my friend the ex-leader and maybe what I am going to say is easier because he is not here, my emotions

might get worked up. It has been a rare privilege to have served under him and in my opinion he is the greatest living Canadian.

SOME HON. MEMBERS: Hear, hear!

MR. MEAKES: — My friends can laugh about it. This is my opinion. As a new Member I remember when he was a Cabinet Minister he was always ready to advise me. I remember him for his patience with me as a new Cabinet Minister. He is known all across Canada as a great educationist. He is also known as a great humanist.

Mr. Lloyd will be remembered for a lot of things but I think the two great ones are the improvements that came to education while he was Minister of Education, the improvements in the education of our rural children in particular. The second thing that he will be remembered for is medicare and the fight for justice for ordinary people at that very trying time. He left a great mark on our province. The people of Saskatchewan owe him a debt of gratitude which never can be paid.

SOME HON. MEMBERS: Hear, hear!

MR. MEAKES: — History will show that he was a great public servant. Those who worked under him knew his greatness. We all know that he will continue his life's work of trying to improve the lot of his fellowmen. We wish him the best and we say, "Thank you for your great work."

SOME HON. MEMBERS: Hear, hear!

MR. MEAKES: — My congratulations go to the mover and the seconder who had a hard job of trying to defend a sterile and unproductive document. I like to think of it as the last will and testament of a dying government.

SOME HON. MEMBERS: Hear, hear!

MR. MEAKES: — Our new leader did a masterful job of showing the defects and shortcomings of that speech. He put forth in clear fashion the alternatives of the New Democratic platform, a new deal for people.

You know it is noticeable that those across the way have been talking about the fact that we have two lawyers at the head of our party. Well you know, they have two storekeepers. I don't know about their party, but I can say this about our party. We don't worry about what profession a man is, we worry about what kind of people our leaders are. We are proud of both of these men whether they are lawyers or any other profession.

SOME HON. MEMBERS: Hear, hear!

MR. MEAKES: — When you look at the Speech from the Throne, I think it is very notable that the prime importance of what is happening in Saskatchewan according to the Speech from the Throne, is Homecoming '71 and the Canada Winter Games. When you study the document there was plenty for industry but nothing for the farmer. There was plenty for mining companies, nothing for the

unemployed. Sanctimonious words about property taxes after six years of letting them rise to their present heights. There is really no meaningful program for our native people. It is a document that will go down in history as one of the worst Speeches from the Throne in the history of this province.

It was very noticeable that the Premier in his address spent nearly 20 minutes on the Socialist Government of Manitoba and Ed Schreyer. You couldn't help but wonder why he didn't talk about Saskatchewan. Well I can tell you why unless he is scared of the influence especially in the Eastern part of Saskatchewan. The people there are beginning to realize that things are going ahead in Manitoba.

SOME HON. MEMBERS: Hear, hear!

MR. MEAKES: — He is scared of what will come out of the Churchill Forest Products in Manitoba. He is afraid that the good government of Manitoba will come across into Saskatchewan. I say that the Premier has plenty of reason to be scared.

Coming to the two speakers on the other side of the House this afternoon. The Hon. Member for Maple Creek (Mr. Cameron) spent a great deal of time, in fact they both did, on the NDP. I wonder why. They know that they are running scared. They know that they are going to get defeated. He went on with his usual crescendo of a jumble of words, dragging red herrings all over the place. But I noticed that neither one of these men mentioned the real crisis that is facing Saskatchewan today and that is the crisis in agriculture.

SOME HON. MEMBERS: Hear, hear!

MR. MEAKES: — I was amazed that the Minister of Public Works (Mr. Coderre) talked about the lowest unemployment in Canada that Saskatchewan has the lowest unemployment in Canada. I couldn't help but think of the sign last summer on No. 1 Highway approaching Calgary which said, "Saskatchewan Labor go Home, We Don't Need You." Workers are all leaving this province.

SOME HON. MEMBERS: Hear, hear!

MR. MEAKES: — People of Alberta knew that a lot of Saskatchewan people and workers were leaving this province because there was unemployment and no jobs. You know the Premier, I am amused, he always refers to the Premier of Manitoba as 'Old Ed' and I noticed that the Minister of Public Works referred to our leader as 'Little Allan'. Well I like to think of my leader as being David. You know he was the 'guy' who took on Goliath and defeated him and this is what is going to happen to them.

I've said many times before in this House, Touchwood constituency is a rural constituency, the largest town being Ituna with a population of about 1,300. As agriculture fares so do all the people of Touchwood. Everyone is dependent on the well being of the farmer, whether they be farmers, businessmen in the towns and villages, the teachers, the mechanics, the laborers or any other vocation you wish to mention. For a number of years and in particular since 1964, the agricultural economy of my constituency in the Province of Saskatchewan has

been slipping down hill. But the last two years it has been an avalanche. There are only two words that I can think of to describe the neglect, the callous disregard, the downright destructive attitudes of this Liberal here and another Liberal Government in Ottawa. Those words are criminal and heartless.

The complete callousness of this Liberal Government that I now face is indicative of its complete lack of feeling for people and their needs and their aspirations. Nearly every action and every policy is bringing economic and social hardship to the people of this province. The Premier and his flock of sheep bow down and worship the shrine of corporate enterprise and capitalists. When capitalism says jump the Premier not only jumps but he cheers. Practically every policy brought in by the Department of Agriculture will bring agriculture closer to the time when corporate monopolies will dominate control and direct agriculture in this province.

Let us look at some of those actions and policies. When one follows the actions of this Government and the Government in Ottawa it cannot be by chance but that it is planned degradation for the farmers and the family farm. The LIFT program, the Task Force Report and Mr. Lang's proposed program for 1971 has one main aim and that is to reduce the number of farms and get rid of the small farmer. The Minister of Agriculture (Mr. McFarlane) referred to the fact that 50,000 farmers left the farm between 1944 and 1964. The figures that I have are that close to 40,000 farmers have left in the period 1964 to 1970.

But first may I deal with Operation LIFT. It was designed to reduce the wheat surplus with no thought of assisting those most in need - the small farmer. For instance, when it did away with the unit quota the people hurt were the small farmers. It was a program designed to destroy the small farmer. It was a program thoughtlessly drawn up with no real thought for the producer. It did not encourage the growing of barley, yet by July 31, there was a crying need for barley on the world's market. The enemies of the Wheat Board tried to blame the world market. The fact is that the Government of Canada was to blame and this Government of Saskatchewan supported it. The Premier last winter said in this House that although it wasn't perfect he guessed it was the best under the circumstances.

Let us look at the Task Force on Agriculture Report. Very clearly it spells what is to happen to the small farmer. I am going to take a few quotes out of the Report. Number one quote:

Young non-viable farmers should be moved out of farming, through temporary programs of welfare, education and provision of jobs from the other sectors of the economy. Older farmers should be given assistance to assure that they have at least a 'liveable' standard of living.

There is another quote:

There will be a substantial reduction in the number of commercial farms. Some will be family farms but all will be rationally managed, profit oriented businesses. Farm mergers and consolidations will result in much larger units but not primarily for increased production efficiency but to structure units that are large enough to afford better management. Farm organizations, marketing boards,

co-operatives and similar organizations will be much larger, more professionally managed and users of more sophisticated management, data processing, research and planned techniques.

Another quotation:

Because of the drastic reduction in farm population probably to about three to four per cent of the population, the balance of power among farmers, consumers and taxpayers will change substantially. The Government will become less involved in agriculture, farm subsidies will be cut in the entire private sector and the agricultural system will be required to accept a much greater degree of independence. As governments encourage agriculture to rationalize its management processes and organizational structure, a clear-cut separation of welfare and commercial farm policy programs will emerge. Some form of guaranteed annual income will be taken for granted.

One more quote, my last one:

As a high and rising proportion of farm workers become employees working for salaries and wages, farm employee unions may emerge and become a factor in the bargaining process.

Mr. Speaker, these statements make crystal clear that Liberal governments have decided to do away with the family farm. They have decided to allow the non-viable farmer to be pushed out. They will allow these people to become the victims of corporate enterprise, to go onto welfare, without any thought of human suffering or spiritual destruction.

A year ago, the Minister of Agriculture rose in this House boasting of his diversification program, encouraging farmers to borrow money to go into hogs in a big way. Members of the Opposition at that time, including myself, warned him that the price of pork would be forced down. The Minister, with his usual torrent of words, proceeded to ridicule all of us who warned him. Everything, according to him would be rosy, the farmer would get out of debt, and he, the Minister, would be the hero incarnate.

Surely, I don't have to tell this House and the Minister what has happened to his ill-conceived plan and what it has done to many farmers. Because of his publicity in encouraging pigs, and because many farmers had extra grain, many of them went into pigs. Weanlings were selling last Spring as high as \$22 each. Many of those same pigs were selling when they went to market at less than \$35 each. Bred sows were going as high as \$100 a year ago. Last week at the Leross Auction Mart, I saw them selling at \$30 each and even lower. Farmers fed their barley, being told there was no sale for barley. By August, there was a great demand for barley on the world's market, but many farmers had little or none left. They lost on the pigs they fed, and took a beating on the pigs they sold. Now after these farmers have taken this kind of a beating the Minister offers the \$2 premium.

I consider the results of the Minister's diversification program of hogs again as criminal and heartless. All one had to do was to drive through this province and talk to farmers last March and April to know that the pig population was exploding.

The farmer who normally had one sow, now had five. Those who had five sows, now had 10, 15, and 20. Common sense made clear that pork would slump when the young pigs of March and April hit the market in September and October.

In the last three months, I have attended the Auction Mart regularly. I have talked to hundreds of farmers. The great majority have only one hope and that is that this Government will call an election soon, so that they can vote it out. Again, and again, the people are saying, "When is the election going to be? We want to show the Minister of Agriculture what we think of him, we want to boot him out."

The Minister isn't in his seat but I would invite the Minister to come out to Touchwood, and tell the farmers that his diversification program is a good one. On second thought, I don't want to see him hurt, or tarred and feathered, so he had better stay here at home. If it wasn't so bad, Mr. Speaker, it would be funny.

The Premier has said that the next election will be fought on labor issues. I say the people of Saskatchewan will decide what those issues will be. I have travelled the length and breadth of Touchwood and other parts of the province and wherever I go people are telling me that the issues will be the blundering and fumbling of Federal and Provincial agricultural policies.

There is much more that I could say in regard to the economic mess that the Liberals have got their farmers into, but our agricultural critic, the Member for Kelsey (Mr. Messer) did a terrific job in spelling out first of all the problems and then our program to solve those problems. Certainly in my mind the main issue that will defeat this Government is its agricultural policy or its lack of one.

I should like now to turn to the cattle industry. This is the only area that has been relatively good in recent years. In fact the only thing that has kept many of the farmers in Touchwood from going broke is their cattle herds. But here again the Liberal Government in Ottawa is not acting in the best interest of the primary producer. They have allowed and continue to allow meat to be imported into Canada at alarming rates. I should like to quote from a recent issue of the "Cattleman". An article headed, "Beef imports - they kept coming." I should like to quote quite extensively from it. At the top is a chart of the meat imported from Australia, New Zealand and all countries:

Up to the end of September imports of boneless frozen beef from Australia, New Zealand and United States totalled about 108 million pounds. Note the relevant insignificance of imports from the United States compared to those from Oceania. Total imports from Australia and New Zealand to the end of September, 1970, was 228 per cent higher than those from Australia and New Zealand and United States for the same period in 1969.

Another feature of the chart gives cause for concern. We all recall agreements between Canada, Australia and New Zealand reached on July 14, 1970, whereby the exportation of beef would be temporarily suspended pending an immediate review of the supply situation in Canada.

This suspension of shipping was to be enforced until September 10th, 1970. In the light of this agreement it is disturbing to note that the importation of beef was heaviest during the third quarter, July to September. It amounted essentially to the sum of the first two quarters. To the end of September total imports from Australia and New Zealand amounted to 105 million pounds of boneless beef. This is the equivalent to 150 million pounds of carcass beef. Since average per capital consumption equals about 87 pounds per year this works out to 65 pounds for the first three quarters. Assuming a population of 22 million people, simple arithmetic, mathematics, tells us that beef imports are now equivalent to 10.5 per cent per capita.

Further on it says:

The Americans are concerned about the volume of Canadian beef exports and we should not disregard this concern at a time when many sectors of the American economy are in an increasingly protective mood. We have successfully argued in the past that Canadian and American beef economies are part of one North American beef economy. We can advance this argument convincingly only if we have equal controls over imports from low-cost countries. The Canadian Government of course has created problems for itself. Canada alone, among major nations, clings to the concept of free trade among nations. Who would deny that this is an admirable goal, of course it is. However, to adopt this stance when other countries are moving the other way is foolishly naive. The net effect is that the Canadian farm industry is forced to swim upstream against a strong current indeed.

Let's look at the record. As mentioned the United States is now in a protective mood and since 1964 imposed quotas on beef from Oceania. The European Common Market has since its inception imposed rigorous quotas, tariffs and variable levies against all manner of agricultural products including beef. Japan imposes a quota plus a tariff of 25 per cent of the value of beef. Finally the United Kingdom recently announced a system of variable levies on many agricultural products including beef to go into effect April 1st, 1971. Thus Canada stands alone, unprotected in any way from world markets. What a ripe target. Therefore the position of the Federal Government is at best naive and at worst suicidal to primary industry. At times like these we must have rational, flexible policies designed to cope with modern realities. Nowhere is this need more in evidence in the current situation in respect to beef imports.

Certainly this article shows the danger that our cattlemen are in. It also shows how little Liberal Governments care what happens to our primary producer.

You know, Mr. Speaker, a year ago, the Premier was attacking in this House and out of the House the Prime Minister and Mr. Lang. At that time I suggested in this House that he was like Don Quixote attacking the windmills. It is very interesting that last week those two men were out here. What is the Premier's attitude now? Let me quote from the Leader-Post of April 15, 1971:

Thatcher says Trudeau the right man for the job. Premier Thatcher told nearly 1,200 people at a Liberal banquet that 'I am convinced that no man can hold this country together if it is not Pierre Trudeau. I am convinced that he is the right man, at the right time in Canadian history'.

He even praised Finance Minister Benson, the author of the White Paper on taxation which the Premier has criticized for so long. I won't read the whole article. He said, speaking to the meeting:

I am delighted to see a few Conservatives here. We haven't got enough Liberals in this province to defeat the NDP without them.

Confession is good for the soul.

I even see a few former CCFers.

Not NDPers. Of course I presume he had a mirror in front of him, and was looking at himself for one. He looked around and he saw Hazen Argue, he looked around and he saw Walter Erb and . . .

SOME HON. MEMBERS: Hear, hear!

MR. MEAKES: — . . . the Member for Regina South West or is it going to be Lakeview (Mr. McPherson). Then it goes on to say:

After the dinner and the speeches Mr. Trudeau left the main ballroom for three smaller rooms and a hotel hallway filled with an overflow of 1,200 diners. Here the dinner organizer, Don McPherson, MLA for Regina South West briskly headed in to one of the rooms. Then he stopped, turned, and there the Prime Minister wasn't. Mr. Trudeau was still in the hallway smiling, signing autographs and kissing. An RCMP officer advised Mr. McPherson just to take the Prime Minister's arm and steer him along. One woman who was kissed was so excited that it took her a couple of minutes to tell a report what her name was.

I won't use her name.

AN HON. MEMBER: — Oh, go ahead!

MR. MEAKES: — Well then, really the top of it all was the last paragraph and I am awfully curious about this:

According to a hotel spokesman, one Regina department store delivered \$100 worth of pink linen to the Prime Minister's suite.

Well, I say this, Mr. Speaker, let me tell this House, the farmers don't think that the Prime Minister is the right man for the job and I wonder why \$100 worth of pink linen was delivered to his room.

I should now like to turn and talk for a few minutes about what is happening to our forests in the North. A few months ago the MLAs were invited on a tour of the forest activities of the Saskatchewan Pulpwood Company. You know, this was an extremely interesting and an enjoyable day. That evening at dinner I made the statement that it was the best organized tour

that I had ever been on. It was the first tour that I had ever seen which was ahead of schedule at every stop. Our comfort was well taken care of. We were well fed and watered. Our guides were friendly and efficient. Modern machinery for felling the trees and moving them, piling them and loading the big trucks certainly were impressive. We were shown the logged-out areas that had been scarified. We were taken to an area that had been resown with spruce plants. All and all an impressive demonstration of an apparently efficient industry. Mr. Speaker, it impressed me that it was too efficient, too impressive and too well organized. I could not help but remember the quotation, "Beware the Greeks when they carry gifts."

Those who were on the tour will remember I carried a camera and I took a number of pictures. The more I thought of that tour the more I wondered. I am sure that all Members of this House will agree that I am a simple, unsuspecting person who normally is prepared to accept people as they are and also accept that they say as gospel truth. I am not in any way a suspicious person. I have always found that the great majority of people, if used right, will be honest and forthright with you. Yet, after the tour, somehow I felt uncomfortable, somehow it seemed too good to be true. You know I had the feeling Mr. Speaker, that I had been taken. It seemed to me that there must be more than meets the eye.

For a whole week this feeling grew and grew on me and the following Sunday I found myself again heading for Prince Albert and again I carried my camera with me. Exactly one week later on Monday morning I headed into the forest area, armed with my camera, led by a friend of mine who lives in Prince Albert and who knows the area well. It was what I might call a fact-finding tour, not nearly as well organized as the other day, but certainly it was a good fact-finding day. I cannot remember a day when I found as much information, and as much good evidence of the duplicity of people, as I did that day. Indeed, Mr. Speaker, it shook my faith in humanity, and in particular my faith in the Provincial Treasurer. I was really hurt, I began to feel that a week before I had had the wool pulled over my eyes. In fact I covered some of the harvested area that had not been shown to the MLAs and I also returned to certain areas that we had seen the week before. It was too bad that the press had not been with me on the second trip. But I did take pictures that I would be happy to show some evening to anyone who cared to see them.

Let me tell this House some of the things I saw. I went into the Anglin Lake area where there is a large area of harvested forest. This area was not included in the first trip and for good reason. Here is the clear evidence of capitalistic waste of our Saskatchewan heritage. What a sickening sight I saw, acres and acres of beautiful birch trees lying flat on the ground, rotting. Many of these trees are from ten to fifteen inches at the base. Here were once beautiful trees, cut down two years ago, cut and left there so that the spruce that was growing among them might be harvested. Apparently the only thing that worries this Government is to keep the pulp mill running, no worry if our natural resources are destroyed along with this supposed great achievement.

Another thing I noticed in this area. The forest was cut right down to the water's edge which as I understand it is contrary to an agreement signed between the Government and the

Company. Seeing this devastated area reminded me of the saying, "Only God can make a tree." I say that only a fool will wantonly destroy a tree.

What I saw in this area made me suspicious as well of that well organized tour a week before. So I headed North on No. 2 Highway. Those MLAs that were on the tour will remember that we were taken to the Montreal Lake area where we were shown a tree planting project. Here we were led to an area with small spruce with red ribbons tied to them so that they could be easily found. At that time, I was a little suspicious. Everything was too pat. Our guide waved his hand and intimated that the whole area was re-treed. My friend and I spent some time on our hands and knees examining the immediate area around those same twenty little trees, still with their red ribbons waving in the wind. What did we find? Not one tree without a ribbon. Not one tree planted except those that we had been shown. Just enough trees planted for the photographers to get photos for their papers. Mr. Speaker, the whole dreary episode was an out and out hoax, put on by a government in its dying spasms, trying to stay alive . . .

SOME HON. MEMBERS: Hear, hear!

MR. MEAKES: — . . . a government that will go down to defeat like another Liberal government did in 1944, whenever they get up the courage to go to the country.

More and more people are becoming worried about the ecology of this space ship called earth. When I saw, as all of us saw, beautiful forests, once beautiful forests and the terrible scar that man has put on the face of the earth, I shuddered. I'm old enough that I may not be around to see it, but I see the day when the next generation will damn us for our actions.

I read recently an article on lumbering in the Scandinavian countries. They have been harvesting lumber for hundreds of years. There, lumber companies must plant a tree for every tree they cut down. Here there are hundreds of square miles cut down and practically none sown. I think the amount reforested is 900 acres. This is a crime, a sacrilege and a disgrace that will be on the shoulders of this Liberal Government down through the pages of Saskatchewan history.

I only wish the Premier and his Cabinet and indeed all those Liberal Members across the way would take the dollar signs out of their eyes for awhile, and think about our heritage and our responsibility to those that come after us.

Let us learn from history. In many areas of the world man has come in and raped the earth, only to leave devastation behind him. I won't forget driving through the redwoods of California and seeing the scars of the money grabbers who cut down those beautiful forests. If it hadn't been for a few dedicated men who thought these beautiful things of nature should be saved, there wouldn't be any left. There were a number of men and women who fought the United States Government for years to get the area recognized as a National Park.

You know, Mr. Speaker, an Indian once told me that a white man was like a wolverine. He wants to destroy everything he can get his paws on, even down to his own nest.

Over the Christmas holiday I spent two weeks in the Los Angeles area. I came back more and more convinced that mankind is going to have to act and act right now, if our grandchildren are to live on this earth and live a normal life. I was there for 14 days, on every one of those days the sun shone, except for one day. I could have stood and looked at the sun for hours at a time, it was only a red dull ball, creeping through the smog. Only one day was I able to see the mountains that surround the city. For 14 days my eyes burned, and my nose stung from breathing the smog, and Los Angeles is only one such city.

All one has to do is stand down stream from the pulp mill at Prince Albert and see the color of the water, or watch the raw sewage going into our rivers to see the wolverine destroying all around it. As we go to the great industrial centres and see the belches of smog pouring into our air, actually burning up our oxygen in this space ship called earth, we see the wolverine destroying everything. As we see our land having the trees torn off it, to produce wheat, or other cereals, or lumber, we are seeing the wolverine destroying our heritage. As we see our rivers already polluted, rushing to the sea we are polluting it and killing the sea. Cities like Vancouver pouring 96 per cent of its sewage into the sea. Think of all the cities on the sea shore around the world all adding up to the fact that the wolverine is out for destruction.

Ecologists say that over half of the carbon dioxide that is changed back to oxygen is by the plankton life of the sea. They are arguing whether it will take 10 years or 50 for our seas to be dead. Like the lemming, man rushes on to his own destruction, all in the name of progress and profits. We can spend billions in weapons of destruction, but there isn't enough money to save and protect our environment. There isn't enough money to feed and clothe the underprivileged of the world. There isn't enough money to bring a better way of life to all the people in our society.

No, we must let corporate enterprise, monopoly enterprise, and international cartels have their profits and their power. Power to control every human being's life, to control how they are born, how they live, and how they die.

Those across the floor talk of free enterprise. What we have is the opposite. It is not free for the sick, for the old, for the young, for our native people. They are only free to struggle to survive in a society that gives only a very few people any hope for security. It is a society, in which only a privileged few will be the powerful ones. Only a few that will be able to enjoy this beautiful wonderful earth we live on.

This Liberal Government of Saskatchewan is giving nothing except lip service to all these things that I have mentioned. It defends and assists the wolverines of our society. This is just one more reason that it will be rejected by the people of this province whenever they are forced to call an election.

I should like to turn for just a few minutes to highways. This is one place that a New Democratic Government will be able to cut the fat out of government spending, namely in the Highways budget. We on this side of the House are convinced that there is great extravagance and waste. In my opinion, it runs into the millions of dollars.

Wherever I travel in this Province, people are citing cases of waste, of roads built and rebuilt, of roads that should have been rebuilt before oiling, but no, they are oiled and re-oiled. A perfect example is No. 310 joining Ituna to Balcarres. This was one of the first grid roads built back in 1956. We were glad when it was taken into the highway system. But this Government has done nothing but patch it since. This fall the Department sent out two graders, which scratched around for a few days and then started slapping oil on it. Ask any of the residents who live along it, regardless of politics, all are saying that the oil surface just won't last. Here is the Department pouring good money after bad. The only real reason that they are doing it now, is because they think there will be an election this spring.

The program of four-lane highways out of the larger centres is good, but I see no earthly reason for a four-lane highway all the way from Moose Jaw to Swift Current. Of course it was to be expected that the Premier would want a super highway to his ranch but I fail to see the necessity of it all the way. I see no urgency for a four-lane highway from Findlater to Kenaston at this time either. We should all like super highways wherever we live; they are good. But until our farmers have all weather roads, to all occupied farms, I suggest that the four lane program should be cut back. I have hundreds of constituents who have to plow the roads after every snow storm, and in summer drag their cars with a tractor after every big rain. A four-lane highway, Mr. Speaker, 100 miles from them doesn't do them any good.

I am convinced that we could cut back highway expenditures by 25 per cent and still build as many highways of like quality. I know the Minister is liable to blow a blood vessel when I refer to a question I asked in this House last year, Sessional Paper 171. The question that was asked was: All provincial highway capital projects with an estimated grid value exceeding \$100,000 finalized in the year 1965-66 for which total final payments made prior to February 1, 1970, exceeded the estimated bid by 10 per cent. I wanted (a) the names of contractors; (b) the date on which the contract was awarded; (c) the estimated bid price of each contract; (d) the total final payment; (e) the section of provincial highway in which the contracted work was performed. I am not going to read all these figures to the House, but take, for example, a road between Maple Creek to Junction Highway No. 21 where the estimated bid price was \$225,633. The final payment was \$314,864, an overexpenditure of 19.5 per cent. Well, here is another one, Junction No. 2 to West of Gravelbourg to Rockglen estimated bid price was \$131,000, the total final payment was \$158,118 an overexpenditure of 20.7 per cent. Another from Young to Junction No. 14, estimated bid was \$386,000, final payment was \$482,649, a 25 per cent overexpenditure. The next one which I give is smaller, I'll admit. It was two miles in Saskatoon to Preston Avenue, estimated bid \$105,000, final payment \$172,914, an overexpenditure of 63.7 per cent. Let us take the highway from Asquith to Perdue where the original bid was \$354,300, total final payment \$382,537, an overexpenditure of \$28,000. There is another one, Junction Highway No. 47, West to Lemberg, the estimated bid was \$100,400, the final payment \$146,319, an overexpenditure of 45.7 per cent. When you total all the figures that are given above the Government overspent \$828,530 on 13 projects.

I want to make it clear that I am not attacking the staff of

the Department of Highways, when I talk of these things. I am saying that the policies which the Minister makes and which the poor staff have to carry out are policies that are sloppy, slipshod and expensive; expensive for the people of Saskatchewan. A New Democratic Government will be looking into this mess.

I should like now to turn for a few moments to our native people and the Department of Indian and Metis. Two years ago when the Government brought in the Bill to form the Department for Indian and Metis, I supported it. But I stated that I did this with some reservations. At the time I said that unless there was consultation with, and acceptance of the Department by native people, and unless it was to be staffed by Indian people that the Department would fail. I also said that plans should be laid to gradually dissolve the Department after a few years of its life.

After watching the department operate for two years, I am less certain that it is serving a useful purpose. I have talked to many Indians, and I have yet had one say it is serving them adequately, or even at all. I find a distrust of the department among them. This distrust may or may not be real. I think part of it is the fact they are afraid that any transfer of Federal obligations to the Provincial Government will endanger their historic Treaty rights.

The other possible reason is that the Department is headed and in many cases manned by the white man. Whether we in the white society like it or not the fact remains that our native people distrust the white man. There is good reason for this. For centuries the white man has done the thinking for the natives, and never really taken them into consultation. When governments did take them into consultation it has been to do it the white man's way afterwards.

I have said it many times, and I say it again, that until the native people are given the opportunity to make their own decisions in their own way we shall have little success improving their lot. There must be a personal motivation and a personal initiative. There must be a willingness for them to try, and sometimes fail, then encouragement for them to try again. Again and again I have heard these people say, let us decide for ourselves what we need, and what we do. Let us make mistakes so that we may learn from them. But no, the white man has never learned. It is the same whether it is with our native people, or the negro in the ghetto, in Africa, or in any other place where the white has practised discrimination both racial and economic on native people.

I am reminded of that great Indian Chief, Joseph of the United States, who in 1879 stated in a review that he gave, and I should like to quote in part:

Let me be a free man, free to travel, free to stop, free to work, free to trade where I choose, free to choose my own teachers, free to follow the religion of my fathers, free to think and talk and act for myself. Give me that freedom and I will obey every law, or submit to the penalty.

Mr. Speaker, many of these things have not been given to the Indian. Instead Federal and Provincial Governments continue

to pass the buck, to refuse to recognize basic human rights, to use them as second or third class citizens. I'm not just talking about this province or even just Canada, but if we are to avoid the riots and the ghettos, the protest marches, the confrontation of the law, then our society must act and act fast. Many of these people will begin to lose any belief that they have in the democratic process. Through the years they were told the way to win recognition of their complaints and their needs was to cast their ballot for the candidate of their choice. They did this but little or nothing has happened to satisfy them.

People of my age are less prone to the idea of violence. Perhaps the word to describe this is placid. This attitude is the same in older natives. But our youth are different. They have better educations, they are more mobile through television, they see how the other half of the world lives. And they become disillusioned and hostile. I personally cannot blame them.

Our society has not much time to act. If we do not act to right the wrong, cure the ills, we shall see violence, we shall see strife, and then we shall suffer the consequences.

To come back to the Indian and Metis Department. If it is to be a useful weapon in combatting the ills of our society, then I believe it must be restructured completely. It must belong to the people it serves. It must serve the needs of our native people in the way they see best and not to satisfy the conscience of the white man.

For the last two years I have each year placed before this Government several requests from the different reserves in Touchwood constituency. Each year nothing has really happened. The Government has not listened. Nevertheless I will once more suggest to them again.

The Indians of the Standing Buffalo Reserve in the Qu'Appelle Valley have been asking that the stretch of Highway from the Sioux Bridge along the north side of Echo Lake to Highway 35 be oiled. In the summer this road is very heavily travelled, lying as it does in the valley there is seldom any breeze to take away the dust. Dust conditions are extremely hazardous. Many of the Indians have to walk this road. At night especially, conditions are terrible. As I understand it from the chief, the band was promised by the Government in August of 1967 that this would be done. It hasn't been. Again the white man's promise was broken.

There is only one pay phone on the reserve down in the Valley, but none on the top of the hill, where the largest part of the band lives. I understand they have asked for at least one pay phone on the hill. Again no action. I urge the Minister of Telephones to act on this as soon as possible.

For a number of years the Muskoquan Band at Lestock has been asking for assistance for a band hall and meeting place. Year after year they have been put off and neglected. This is another project that the Department should act on.

On behalf of the Gordon's Band I ask the Minister of Education to come down on the side of the Indian people, and say that the comprehensive school that Touchwood Indians want should be built at Punnichy. After all, the Federal grant is to assist in the school serving the Indians of the area, and

Punnichy is centrally located for the four reserves. These people are in great need of this type of school, close at hand.

I now have two more reserves in my constituency due to the infamous gerrymander of 1970. I welcome them to my constituency. Many of them I've known for years and it is my pleasure to try to serve them. Indeed one of the highlights of my public life is the friends of Indian origin that I have made.

In reading the Speech from the Throne there is not very much for our native people. The financing of livestock on reserves is good, if workable. There has been such a program for Indians, through the Federal Indian Affairs for many years. I hope that this can be done on an individual basis. I note the Speech from the Throne says, "Indian Bands."

I also note that there is no mention of assistance for the Metis organization. This group of people need individual assistance as well. In some ways they are in a worse position than the Indians. Many times they are rejected by both cultures.

The Premier said in this debate that our native people were satisfied with the Provincial Department of Indian and Metis Affairs. I challenge him to come with me to my reserves and listen for once to what they are saying instead of shouting at them. Better yet, call an election, and we shall see whom they vote for.

I say again, if the Department is to be a useful instrument in helping our native community, then it must be restructured so that it will meet the needs and wishes of the people it was set up to serve. Only then may we hope that fair play, equal opportunity, and mutual regard can be a reality in our province, our country and wherever else people meet and communicate.

Mr. Speaker, because of the many things which I have said, I am dissatisfied with the Speech from the Throne and the actions of this Government. I shall be supporting the amendment and opposing the motion.

SOME HON. MEMBERS: Hear, hear!

MR. E. WHELAN (Regina North West): — Mr. Speaker, first I should like to congratulate the mover and the seconder on their efforts, and also the Hon. Don MacLennan who has been promoted to the job of Minister of Labour. All three, I am sure, have made or will make an attempt to justify Liberal policies. Mr. Speaker, I want to congratulate Allan Blakeney on his election as Leader of the New Democratic Party, and Roy Romanow on his selection as Deputy Leader.

SOME HON. MEMBERS: Hear, hear!

MR. WHELAN: — Mr. Speaker, there will be attempts by the Government opposite to criticize, not policies, but to deal in personalities regarding both these very able young men.

SOME HON. MEMBERS: Hear, hear!

MR. WHELAN: — Allan Blakeney's contribution to the Debate on the Speech from the Throne predicted, with supporting evidence, that the

Liberal Party is in for a rough time.

SOME HON. MEMBERS: Hear, hear!

MR. WHELAN: — Mr. Speaker, his contribution in this Debate was about the issues, yet at the same time he proposed policies, so effectively that it left the Premier making the same speech I heard when I first came to this Assembly 11 years ago.

SOME HON. MEMBERS: Hear, hear!

MR. WHELAN: — May I say, with reference to the Hon. Premier, that he made the same speech, with the same enthusiasm, the same tone of voice, with the same adjectives and the same inaccuracies. At that time, Mr. Speaker, people were inclined to give him the benefit of the doubt. Today, what are the facts, Mr. Speaker? All around him are problems that he has created: the problems of unemployment, the problems of inadequate coverage under Medicare, the problem of low prices for farm products, the high cost of highway construction, the low average wage for employees, the general labor discontent, and the wholesale headlong flight of thousands of people from this Province.

SOME HON. MEMBERS: Hear, hear!

MR. WHELAN: — Mr. Speaker, let's look at the foolishness of his name-calling tactics; let's just take two instances; let's hold up these two so that we can see them. The Hon. Premier of this Province calls Ed. Schreyer 'Old Ed'. Well, Mr. Speaker, even I'm younger than our Hon. Premier. But Ed. Schreyer is 20 years younger than the Premier. And not only is he much younger by actual age, Ed. Schreyer is progressive, he is accurate, he speaks five languages, he is leading the Manitoba Government so effectively that he is the envy of the President of the Liberal Party of Alberta who says, "We must be progressive like Ed. Schreyer."

SOME HON. MEMBERS: Hear, hear!

MR. WHELAN: — We are going to move to the left like Ed. Schreyer. Well you couldn't move any further to the right of these people. Mr. Speaker, to call Ed. Schreyer 'Old' is to be most inaccurate; to attempt to poke fun at him, with the economic circumstances that exist in this Province, is a cruel hoax.

Mr. Speaker, let's look at one other example of the Hon. Premier's name-calling. In this case I think he is accurate. He says that we are Socialists and so we are, Mr. Speaker. We are Democratic Socialists.

SOME HON. MEMBERS: Hear, hear!

MR. WHELAN: — What is Socialism? It is the people working together for the common good, working together to provide pensions. Yes, to provide the Hon. Premier with a pension, a Socialist pension; to provide the Hon. Premier with a car; with an airplane. A Socialist car and a Socialist airplane, Mr. Speaker. To provide the Premier with a Socialist telephone; to provide the

Premier with a Socialist electrical system; to provide the Premier with a Socialist sodium sulphate plant in his riding, Mr. Speaker.

When the Premier writes a letter it is mailed through a Socialist post office. And how does he advertise his so-called free enterprise political party? He uses the funds of the Socialist Power Corporation, Mr. Speaker; the Socialist Saskatchewan Government Telephones; the Socialist Government Insurance, to advertise his so-called free enterprise policy.

But, Mr. Speaker, unadulterated gall reached a new low level when he used Socialist money to send mail through a Socialist post office - so that the free enterprise Young Liberals could mail their notice of meeting.

SOME HON. MEMBERS: Hear, hear!

MR. WHELAN: — Mr. Speaker, the name 'Socialist' is one that in the New Democratic Party are proud of, while one who operates from the position of the Hon. Premier must be described not as a Socialist, not as a free enterpriser, but as an adherent of hypocrisy.

SOME HON. MEMBERS: Hear, hear!

MR. WHELAN: — Mr. Speaker, the Premier has said that there will be a new pulp mill. The Premier says that we are going to spend \$150 million, a small percentage from the Federal Government, but mostly Saskatchewan money, Mr. Speaker. This is development of an industry, development of the pulp and paper industry in Northern Saskatchewan, within all probability, concessions for timber, to construct roads, for electrical power, for tax cuts, all at the expense of the people of Saskatchewan.

Mr. Speaker, let's look at this new industry which is being built by an American, by a person from outside of Canada and if it operates successfully, will take millions of dollars out of the Saskatchewan economy - perhaps a million dollars every 20 days once it begins to operate. If it provides employment, if it helps industry, if it develops industry, if it is in the best interests of the people of Saskatchewan, fine, Mr. Speaker.

Well, there is another industry that needs \$150 million assistance now and that industry is the farm industry of Saskatchewan.

SOME HON. MEMBERS: Hear, hear!

MR. WHELAN: — The Premier says, "See the Federal Government." The Federal Government is prepared to put up \$12 million. Will he put up the rest of the \$150 million to help the farmers of this Province? Will he?

SOME HON. MEMBERS: Hear, hear!

MR. WHELAN: — Mr. Speaker, let's look at another industry - the retail industry. Will the Hon. Premier help the small businessman? Will he put this kind of money into secondary industry, small industry? He hasn't, he doesn't and apparently he won't.

HON. D.V. HEALD (Attorney General): — Mr. Speaker, the Hon. Member was good enough to indicate that I might be allowed to break into his speech to go to the questions and the non debatable motions so that we can clean them up before 5:30.

MR. WHELAN: — Mr. Speaker, may I call it 5:30.

The Assembly recessed from 5:30 p.m. until 7:00 p.m.

MR. WHELAN: — Mr. Speaker, when we called it 5:30 I was discussing the new proposed mill for Northern Saskatchewan and I asked the House what does it add up to — \$150 million for an American investor, developer or whatever he's called. What is it but a complete denial to the people who live here. It is a complete refusal to put this kind of money on a short-term basis, on a long-term basis, on any kind of basis, into their hands to develop and stabilize farming, the retail trade, secondary industry, to develop and stabilize industrial training.

If we don't have enough money and we have to make a decision on priorities then I say, Mr. Speaker, that the people of Saskatchewan who are in trouble, who are in economic trouble, who can't pay their taxes, who can't pay their light bills, who can't meet their mortgage payments, are more entitled, more justified in receiving \$150 million in funds. For this Province doesn't belong to the promoter or developer, it belongs to the farmer who is in trouble, to the small businessman who is going bankrupt . . .

SOME HON. MEMBERS: Hear, hear!

MR. WHELAN: — . . . to the unemployed people who are unable to get a job, to the student who can't continue his education.

Mr. Speaker, let's look at the past record. Did we have to give an American company \$5 million worth of roads to facilitate the construction of a mill? \$5 million worth of roads of every kind! Would it not have been better to give \$5 million to the school system as educational grants, to the farmer who built this Province rather than to the developer who makes — according to the Premier — \$1 million in 23 days?

In his desperate fright, in his inability to solve the problems of Saskatchewan, the Premier sets up straw men and screams, "It's the big international unions, it's these people who cause all the trouble." Well, Mr. Speaker, every plumber, every electrician in the city of Regina knows — and I am sure the Premier knows — there were dozens of these people unemployed long before there was a labor dispute because there wasn't enough work to go around and many of them had fled seeking work, to Manitoba, to Alberta, to British Columbia. But they, Mr. Speaker, got the blame for unemployment.

The people who take profits beyond all reason, who force up the cost of living so that the working man cannot live decently, quietly escapes the ire and the criticism of the Premier. He criticizes when the real issues are jobs. The real issue is a loss of population. The real issue is low farm income. The Minister of Agriculture (Mr. McFarlane) runs

around talking about big union bosses. He knows all about them. He's an expert on them. He's an authority on them. The Premier too. They both say let me take care of labor unions and you switch your agricultural operations to hog production. We shall build you the barns and we shall put up the money you need. You don't need a marketing board to market your products. Anyone who opposes marketing boards, we shall finance him. We don't want farmers bargaining for any stability for the price of hogs, we are opposed to people who want to bargain collectively. This is what they have been saying, Mr. Speaker.

What I want to say to the Premier and what I want to say to the Minister of Agriculture is: you fellows may think you know everything about labor. In my estimation you know nothing about labor.

SOME HON. MEMBERS: Hear, hear!

MR. WHELAN: — The only thing you know is how to bait labor. Well, I'll tell you this — there isn't a hog farmer who thinks that either the Premier or the Minister of Agriculture knows a cotton-picking thing about the price of pork. I say further to the Premier and to the Minister of Agriculture — you don't know anything about labor problems and it has been proven beyond the shadow of a doubt that you don't know anything about the problems of agriculture. If you think I'm kidding, ask a hog producer, ask a grain farmer, ask any of them and ask the small businessman in the towns who has to depend on our farmers and their income in order to operate, in order to exist, Mr. Speaker.

SOME HON. MEMBERS: Hear, hear!

MR. WHELAN: — Mr. Speaker, in my constituency six people in one block moved out almost simultaneously. Their homes have been occupied by three retired farmers and by three people who moved in from small towns. Before the first people left I asked them, "Don't you think beings might get better?" The day before one of them left I went to them with an announcement, an announcement that appeared in the Leader-Post on December 14, 1970. As a matter of fact, the Hon. Minister of Public Works (Mr. Coderre) made a speech about that announcement this afternoon. This announcement talks about cutting brush and million dollar projects that were to start in February. To start in February for people who had been out of work since July. Brush was going to be cut. Two nursing homes were going to be replaced and then it said in the announcement, "Locations to be determined later." A million dollars worth and locations were going to be announced later. When they asked the Hon. Provincial Treasurer (Mr. Steuart) why these projects had not been announced earlier, when the tradesmen were out of work, say in July, he said. "We've been planning them since July." They had been planning them since July. These 24 projects including renovations, alterations and some new buildings and included — as I said — brush cutting. They had been planning brush cutting in community pastures. Brush cutting since July! Mr. Speaker, it took them from July to December to sharpen an axe to cut brush. Most of the other projects announced on December 14th aren't really going to start before February 1st.

Mr. Speaker, I promise you that before the Session is over, we will ask about every item that was announced and re-announced

and announced and re-announced all over again and find out how much actual money has been spent in each area.

Mr. Speaker, the pay-off is that they are going to replace these two nursing homes. These two nursing homes! These two nursing homes that they have been planning since July and in December they still don't know which nursing homes they are going to replace. And as I repeat — they have been planning them, they have been planning them since last July. They are really interested in providing work for the unemployed.

When I talked to one of my neighbors, who was going to Winnipeg, about the December 14th announcement he said to me as he lifted another piece of furniture on to the truck and shook his head:

I was born and raised here; this province spent thousands of dollars educating me and my family. I like it here . . .

MR. STEUART: — What's his name?

MR. WHELAN: —

. . . but my unemployment insurance benefits are going to run out. If you want us to come back, you will have to get rid of the Liberals.

SOME HON. MEMBERS: Hear, hear!

MR. WHELAN: — Mr. Speaker, this is the word from the young people who can't pay tuition fees. This is the word from the unemployed. This is the word from the thousands of people on welfare. This is the word from farmers who can't pay their taxes or their gas bills or their electricity bills. "For heaven's sake, get rid of the Liberals."

Mr. Speaker, these people are clutching office, fear-stricken to a point where they damage democracy itself. On that day in June 1969 when the people of Saskatchewan slaughtered them in Kelvington and the people of Manitoba elected a Socialist Government, they became so fear-stricken that they have drawn the boundaries of constituencies in this Province in such a manner that those of us who believe in democracy are hard-pressed to explain what they have done.

SOME HON. MEMBERS: Hear, hear!

MR. WHELAN: — Mr. Speaker, in my city in an area where there are now more empty suites and where there are the most empty houses, where there is little or no construction and where there is no evidence to suggest that there is an expansion in population and where the civic voters' list shows apparently 4,000 people, they say they are entitled to an MLA and the explanation is, it's an area that is expanding, Mr. Speaker.

Mr. Speaker, look at a constituency like Regina Centre or Regina North West where there will be close to 18,000 voters in the next election. That is, four times as many people will be entitled to one MLA. Four times as many voters to elect an MLA. The people of Regina Centre, Regina North East or Regina North West are looked upon as fourth-class citizens. They need four

votes to elect a member while in the other, one vote elects a member in Regina Albert Park.

Mr. Speaker, is it democratic? Is it democratic? Is it right? Can it be explained? The answer, Mr. Speaker, is "No" in every case.

Mr. Speaker, when we talk about unemployment, when we talk about people leaving who fault is it? When we talk about gerrymander and its effect on the young people who question democracy, whose fault is it? I say in this House and in this Session that it is time to pinpoint, Mr. Speaker, where the fault lies. Not in some wild-eyed revolutionary in Quebec, not some international labor union boss, not in an arrogant Prime Minister, who may be all of that, not in an Opposition political platform. The fault, Mr. Speaker, is the errors in judgment and the mismanagement of this Province's resources and its people, the responsibility rests squarely on the shoulders of the treasury benches, on the MLAs opposite and on the Premier himself.

SOME HON. MEMBERS: Hear, hear!

MR. WHELAN: — Mr. Speaker, they say, "Oh, there's a world depression." when they run out of labor bosses and when they run out of people in Manitoba or when they run out of Federal Government departments, then they shrug their shoulders and they say, "Well, you know this is a world situation." Mr. Speaker, a person with nothing more than that to offer should call an election and relieve the people of this Province quickly of the bad management that is hampering, hindering and curtailing its development and its very economic existence.

SOME HON. MEMBERS: Hear, hear!

MR. WHELAN: — Mr. Speaker, I listened on the radio the other day to the Hon. Member from Regina South West (Mr. McPherson) but I heard nothing from him that would solve the problems of the unemployed in my area. To the problems of the people who are about to move out, to the people who don't know where their next meal is coming from, to people on welfare, to senior citizens hard-pressed to stretch their finances to people who can't meet the payments on their homes, Mr. Speaker, I said to myself, "Where are the promises the Liberals made to them in election campaigns in 1964 and 1967."

AN HON. MEMBER: — Gone with the wind!

MR. WHELAN: — Well, Mr. Speaker, let's have a look at some of them. Mr. Speaker, the Liberals were elected in 1964 on a promise to reduce the cost of living by removing, and I quote:

The five per cent sales tax from childrens' clothing and shoes.

I say to the Hon. Member for Regina South West: what are you waiting for? Or, didn't you really mean it, were you only kidding? They were going to reduce immediately the sales tax from 5 per cent to 4 per cent on all other commodities. Well, you did but you welched on the deal and you had the able

assistance of the Hon. Provincial Treasurer (Mr. Steuart), when you raised the sales tax to 5 per cent shortly after you were elected in 1967 — and you even put it on soup and crackers. Then you were going to reduce the Regina mill rate by providing from provincial funds 50 per cent of all education costs. Fifty per cent of all education costs! That's a dandy. Would you believe it? Right at the present time this amounts to less than 30 per cent and it is now seven years later, seven years to keep a commitment that still hasn't been kept. It's no wonder that the Hon. Member for Regina South West talks about everything else but the platform that the Liberals were elected on. I can assure him the people of Regina would appreciate implementation of this plank in his platform immediately.

SOME HON. MEMBERS: Hear, hear!

MR. WHELAN: — Here's another one, Mr. Speaker, here's a dandy.

Provide an equitable share of gasoline tax revenues for Regina road construction and maintenance.

Mr. Speaker, the total revenue from gasoline tax according to the Provincial Estimates for 1970-71 amounts to \$51 million. There are now 143,000 residents in Regina who pay approximately \$55 per capita of the gasoline tax. But they receive \$3.50 per capita for road construction and maintenance. What would an "equitable share" of the gasoline tax be? Surely \$10, \$15, \$25 or \$30 per capita. I heard the giant figures regarding urban assistance quoted by the Hon. Member but that kind of money has never been spent in Regina since they became the government. They were elected on this. It isn't the case of what anyone else did before. It is why these people opposite were elected. Regina citizens pay about \$55 per capita and we get back about \$3.50 and Regina has to match dollar for dollar before we get that. But I suppose for the Hon. Member for Regina South West this is a Liberal version of an equitable share of gasoline tax revenues.

He was also going to exempt city purchases from the Provincial sales tax. We have never heard anything about that. They just don't mention it.

In 1964 they were going to proceed immediately to correct the critical hospital bed shortage by the construction and erection of a general hospital. Mr. Speaker, the Liberals acted immediately by building the foundation of a hospital seven years later. That is "immediately" in Liberal terms, Mr. Speaker. Then they said they were going to have immediate provision of a 600-bed geriatric centre. Immediate provision, we don't even have the seven year schedule on this one. It means that they will announce it again just before the next election.

Mr. Speaker, the dandy of them all is to create new opportunity and jobs in a revitalized industrial development program to keep our population gainfully employed. I say to the Hon. Member for Regina South West, what population? Those who left and went to Alberta and to Manitoba. Gainfully employed! There are people in my constituency who had been gainfully employed for 25 years who are in a state of shock because they can't even find a job as a caretaker or digging ditches. There aren't just a few, Mr. Speaker, there are hundreds of them.

Their unemployment insurance benefits are running out. They will be on the welfare rolls, Mr. Speaker.

And the last promise from 1964, take a look at this one, I quote:

Absorb our most costly export, namely, educated youth and return for the benefit of Regina our most valuable asset.

Isn't that a pompous one. That's a dandy. Absorb them. Where? Working part time on a farm? If they don't stop raising the tuition fees there won't even be an educated youth. It's getting so they can't even afford an education. Liberal promises, Mr. Speaker, are election bait and Liberal governments are the authors of economic depression. The people who believe in this platform now say with absolute conviction, Mr. Speaker, that Liberal times are hard times.

SOME HON. MEMBERS: Hear, hear!

MR. WHELAN: — But the final message in the pamphlet will give you a jolt, and make even the most enthusiastic Liberal hang his head in shame with the situation as it is today. Liberal candidates in Regina promised leadership and ended up by blaming someone else for all their problems. Efficiency, you know, is like Cabinet Ministers riding in an ambulance plane for 35 cents a mile, while a sick person pays 85 cents if he needs a nurse. Reliability, and you can't even rely on their platform, Mr. Speaker. And aggressiveness, Mr. Speaker, they are aggressive only when they blame someone else for their mistakes. And loyalty, their loyalty to their federal counterparts is truly overwhelming, Mr. Speaker. This loyalty has gotten us, I'm sure, many concession from the Prime Minister.

SOME HON. MEMBERS: Hear, hear!

MR. WHELAN: — The usual statement, Mr. Speaker, regarding Government Insurance has been made by the Minister in charge. Semantically he is correct, the rates may not have gone up. I suggest to the Hon. Minister, that the cost of insurance has gone up, it has gone up like an Apollo Rocket. In 1964, vehicle owners paid \$12 million for their compulsory insurance coverage, an average, we'll say, of about \$25, \$26, \$27 per vehicle. At the end of 1969, and this figure will probably be higher by the end of '70 I expect, premiums paid totalled \$24.9 million, an average of \$53 per vehicle.

SOME HON. MEMBERS: Hear, hear!

MR. WHELAN: — The total amount in premiums increased more than 100 per cent. The average cost per vehicle is just doubled, but of course, Mr. Speaker, the rates haven't gone up. Just 100 per cent increase in the premiums paid, but the rates haven't gone up. But what has happened, Mr. Speaker? Well there are taxes, you know: 3 per cent on compulsory insurance premiums and 3 per cent on extension policies, and this costs the vehicle owners of this province a cool million dollars. A levy of \$2 on drivers, 25 and under and (frankly, there is no justification and no statistics to justify a level of \$2 on female drivers in

this age group) that's \$300,000. The surcharge introduced by this Government took from the vehicle owners another \$700,000, and another \$300,000 to the Treasury Branch for issuing premium insurance. A total of \$2.3 million from the vehicle owners of this province in taxes and charges; extra added taxes and charges of \$2.3 million.

SOME HON. MEMBERS: Hear, hear!

MR. WHELAN: — In addition, the cost of insurance to a vehicle owner with an older car is absolutely astounding. His rates haven't gone up in the last three years. But the value of the car has dropped, and as a result, he is paying an outrageous rate for his protection. Let's look at the facts. In 1964, a 119-inch wheel base car insured for \$2,800 (\$3,000 less \$200 deductible) cost the driver \$48. In 1970, the same vehicle (this is a 1964 car) insured for \$300 (it is valued at \$500 less \$200 deductible) cost the driver \$63. Cost him \$63! In making this comparison, I'm well aware of the charges, certain charges for accidents, for injury, for property damage to other cars. I know that these charges are pretty well fixed. But 40 per cent of the insurance is used to repair the vehicle owner's car in case of an accident. This insurance cost has certainly increased. In 1964, insurance on a \$3,000 vehicle cost \$48. In 1970, the same vehicle worth \$500, cost \$63 to insure. Therefore, the insurance coverage in each case was \$2,800 and \$300. If you take the rate, and figure out the cost of the coverage per hundred you find that in 1964, the insurance cost was \$1.71 per hundred. In 1970 it cost the same operator \$21 per hundred for the coverage — \$21 per hundred. He's got \$300 worth of vehicle and he's paying \$63 for it. The inequity cannot be justified. But the Minister says the rates haven't gone up. May I point out to the Minister, that the value of the vehicle has gone down, if he doesn't know it. And by his failure to recognize this fact, the cost of insurance to these people has gone up, and has gone up for families who are struggling to make ends meet. They own the 1964 cars. The people who are unemployed, they're on unemployment insurance. Oh, I know the Minister will say immediately, "Oh, these young reckless drivers, they drive all the older cars." Mr. Speaker, low income farmers, unemployed workers . . .

MR. STEUART: — Old age pensioners . . .

MR. WHELAN: — Older type vehicles, these are the cars that they drive. And further, they don't drive them very far. They don't drive them as many miles as the owners of a new vehicle. People don't drive a 1964 car through Arizona, nor do they drive a 1964 car to Toronto or to Vancouver, on long trips. Mr. Speaker, the Minister may be right when he says that rates haven't gone up. But the cost of insurance has gone up. The taxes and charges on vehicle owners through the insurance office have now reached \$2.3 million. And they will probably be higher this year. And the cost of insurance to the vehicle owner with an older car, Mr. Speaker, is beyond explanation. Rates haven't gone up, but they haven't gone down, therefore, they discriminate in an outrageous fashion against the owner who drives a few miles a year and owns a 1964 car. These are the people out of work, as I said, the low income family, the people on the farms, the low income people in our cities.

MR. STEUART: — Old age pensioners . . .

MR. WHELAN: — No, you took their soup and crackers and taxed them. They don't have a car anymore. We have had so many announcements about the reduction in accidents — actually there are still about 200 deaths on the highway each year — I was under the impression that we would now cut insurance rates, at least cut them in two, after reading all of these announcements. But instead of this, they're going to be the same. The total payment has doubled. The taxes and charges are about \$2.3 million. The reserves have quadrupled. While the people of the province are in trouble financially and need relief from high rates, yet nothing is being done.

Oh, they will tell you that the costs have gone up for repairs. But that is negotiated, and Mr. Speaker, it is fixed, and it hasn't gone up 100 per cent. And the body shop operators, the people who own these repair shops, will tell you that it hasn't gone up 100 per cent, and the Minister knows it. And I'm well aware, as I said, of the three categories that are fixed, public liability, injury, and property damage, collision, and so forth. And I'm well aware of the explanation in each area. I'm prepared to allow the full amount for damage to the other fellow's vehicle and injuries. However, the vehicle owner over 65 who drives 2,000 miles a year, pays the same rate as a man who drives 50,000 miles a year with the same type of car. This inequity should be corrected. Mr. Speaker, the driver with the older vehicle is entitled to a reduction, and the driver who drives 2,000 miles a year is entitled to a reduction. And frankly, with the reserves we have, I think we should allow a sizeable reduction for the following reasons:

SOME HON. MEMBERS: Hear, hear!

MR. WHELAN: —

1. Vehicle owners are facing economic hardship.
2. There is a drastic reduction in miles travelled because of a lack of money to pay for gasoline.
3. Huge reserves have been built up.

Mr. Speaker, in my estimation, a one-cent levy on gas for all licensed vehicles would adjust, with some equity, the amount being paid in insurance. The person who drives many miles would be contributing to the insurance fund, while the driver who drives 2,000 miles would be contributing considerably less. By combining this one cent levy with a portion of the reserves, a 25 per cent reduction in rates is feasible, and this will be introduced, Mr. Speaker, by the New Democrats.

SOME HON. MEMBERS: Hear, hear!

MR. WHELAN: — It is economically necessary as well as feasible, at this time when the income of farmers and a vast portion of our population is economically depressed, Mr. Speaker.

Mr. Speaker, the need for employment, in order to keep people in this province off welfare lists, to keep families together, to keep them living and enjoying life in this province, is urgent. There has been too much buck passing, too much indifference, too many headlines, not enough action.

The city of Regina has needed a technical institute for years. I think that's been announced three times. Now they're going to start on it May 15th. Young people in my constituency who can't pay university tuition fees, finish grade 12 and plead for a chance to continue their education. "For goodness' sake," they say, "give us a chance to earn a living." The technical institute would do that. At the same time, it would provide employment for the construction industry.

Mr. Speaker, its been announced about five times, and it's still not in sight.

SOME HON. MEMBERS: Hear, hear!

MR. WHELAN: — Mr. Speaker, there's a need for senior citizens' homes, geriatric centres, local nursing care accommodation, level IV care. For goodness' sake, build the accommodation that is needed.

SOME HON. MEMBERS: Hear, hear!

MR. WHELAN: — Mr. Speaker, our city is served by temporary book trailers as libraries, a plan to provide permanent libraries combined with recreation centres, is long overdue. I suggest that this government get on the job to provide library-recreation centres for our young people.

Mr. Speaker, the whole north west part of the city is without adequate recreational facilities. Service clubs like the Kinsmen Club have been aware of the need and they have been most energetic in this respect, and I commend them, but the Wascana Creek valley should be developed. The city does not have the financial capacity to do the job. A plan to develop recreation parks within the urban centres should be started, and immediately.

AN HON. MEMBER: — Right now . . .

MR. WHELAN: — Mr. Speaker, well, immediately in my terms, but immediately in Liberal terms is seven years.

SOME HON. MEMBERS: Hear, hear!

MR. WHELAN: — You saw it with the hospital, you know, the geriatric centre, that was immediate, and they haven't started on it yet.

SOME HON. MEMBERS: Hear, hear!

MR. WHELAN: — Without jobs and looking for jobs the young people of this country will be travelling across Canada. The need for a good sized, properly equipped, youth hostel in Regina is urgent. Surely, if they can't provide young people with jobs, the least they can do is give them a bed to sleep in while they're travelling, Mr. Speaker.

SOME HON. MEMBERS: Hear, hear!

MR. WHELAN: — I urge that we begin immediately to develop a youth hostel program in conjunction with the Federal Government.

Mr. Speaker, people who travel on holidays by trailer require proper trailer camps. On the outskirts of Regina, there is a need for a large trailer camp with proper facilities. Let's build one, there's a need for it.

Our province, rural and urban, needs low cost housing. To date, Mr. Speaker, this Government has failed miserably in this respect. We should plan and build 7,500 houses in Saskatchewan in the next 12 months.

SOME HON. MEMBERS: Hear, hear!

MR. WHELAN: — Mr. Speaker, the need for urban studies on tax assessment, on transportation, on police protection, on financing, exists, and is ignored. Young university students, bright eyed, anxious to help their community should be paid to do this kind of research, and the research, Mr. Speaker, should not be ignored.

Mr. Speaker, I have tried: (1) to urge the Government to act, (2) to place the blame where it should lie for conditions that exist. Mr. Speaker, I have suggested a drastic decrease in government insurance rates, a much needed decrease in insurance rates. I have recommended a list of projects that should get immediate attention. These are necessary. These should be developed in a way that they would keep our people here, in this province.

The problems of this province are, lack of farm income, unemployment, no jobs, unfair distribution of income, inadequate assessment of taxes . . .

SOME HON. MEMBERS: — Not too many Liberals . . .

MR. WHELAN: — And Liberals, Federally and Provincially, you're absolutely correct, that's a real problem. There's the number one problem right there.

These problems are causing economic and grievous harm to the population of the people of this province. Mr. Speaker, the Throne Speech does nothing to solve these problems. I will not support the motion. I will support the amendment.

SOME HON. MEMBERS: Hear, hear!

HON. J.C. McISAAC (Minister of Education): — Mr. Speaker, I am very happy to be able to take part in this debate on the Speech from the Throne. I want to congratulate the mover and the seconder from this side of the House, for the job they did in moving and seconding this debate. I also want to extend best wishes to the two Hon. Members opposite who changed seats since we last sat in this Legislature (the Members for Regina Centre and Saskatoon Riversdale) and wish them well in a very difficult task they have in front of them. As well congratulations to the Member on this side of the House, my colleague, the Hon. Don MacLennan (Last Mountain) who has moved to the Cabinet (Minister of Labour) since our last session.

SOME HON. MEMBERS: Hear, hear!

MR. McISAAC: — The Speech from the Throne

this year, Mr. Speaker, contained further evidence, once again, of this Government's top priority to the field of education.

SOME HON. MEMBERS: Hear, hear!

MR. McISAAC: — Among other items, legislation to provide an expanded bursary program will be introduced later in this Session. The Premier, in his remarks, made reference to the establishment of a bursary committee, as a part of this legislation. This committee will examine the present bursaries provided with government funds to government departments and the university and it will examine the best means of utilizing additional funds. In answer to some of the points raised by the Member for Biggar (Mr. Lloyd) yesterday, this committee will become operative as soon as legislation is passed which will not be too long — and definitely in time for the opening of the university and technical schools this fall. At that time that committee as well, Mr. Speaker, will consider the possibility of making loans to those students in vocational courses or other courses who don't come under Canada Student Loan requirements or Manpower programs or some other form of assistance.

Now this evening I want to spend a few moments, Mr. Speaker, to outline some of the many major developments that have taken place in education in this province in the past several years. I say some because it is a long list, and it is an impressive list, and a positive list.

SOME HON. MEMBERS: Hear, hear!

MR. McISAAC: — I leave the negative aspects to my friends opposite because they have already demonstrated in this debate that they are still more interested in negativism than in positive aspects.

SOME HON. MEMBERS: Hear, hear!

MR. McISAAC: — Now it is a well known fact, Mr. Speaker, that the entire educational process at all levels right across the country and indeed outside this country has been subject in the last decade particularly, to tremendous stresses. And stresses, I suppose, Mr. Speaker, that arise primarily from the demands made by a rapidly changing society, and stresses which are by no means peculiar to Canada or to Saskatchewan as every Member, I am sure, who examines the fact will realize. Education has come to be regarded as the magic passport to a more satisfying life and it is at this point that education gets confused with schooling per se. And of course we all realize there is a good deal of difference between true education and the mere piling up of more and more years of formal schooling.

This Government does recognize the importance of quality education, Mr. Speaker, and it recognizes the very sincere desire of the people of this province for a top-quality system, not only in the schools, but at other levels. I think too we recognize also, that there are limits to both the human and the financial resources available to meet the almost fantastic demands that are made on the system. I suggest that we have faced up to these challenges and that we have accepted our responsibility in this regard because we have implemented changes that have contributed to a far greater measure of

equality of opportunity for citizens of all ages than ever existed before in this province.

The policies of the Government with respect to budget reviews and teacher-pupil ratios have been criticized by my friends opposite, both inside and outside the House. I want to make it clear at this time to these prophets of doom over there, Mr. Speaker, and to the people of the province that we make no apologies, none whatsoever, for the positive steps that we have taken in this regard, and for exercising responsible leadership in trying to put the brakes, to some degree, on the ever-escalating cost of education and to seek to ensure that we are getting full value for the many millions of dollars now being spent. Despite some cries that went up from Members opposite and others when the decision was announced that all school board budgets were going to be scrutinized and that school grants were going to be related to approved budgets, I suggest, Mr. Speaker, that the budget review process has worked and worked exceedingly well.

I would go farther and say that as a result of the implementation of this policy all groups in education, trustees, teachers, administrators and every other group are seeking and looking today for better, more productive inputs into the education system and I think thereby contributing to a number of quality improvements in the overall system.

In short, Mr. Speaker, budget reviews just have not been the terrible ordeals forecast by some of the Members opposite. Some mention was made of the school trustees, school board members and the association of school trustees across the province who have been very helpful in this co-operative endeavor between the Department and the school boards.

SOME HON. MEMBERS: Hear, hear!

MR. McISAAC: — And I suggest too that school boards today are involving their principals and their professional staff to a far greater degree in assessing programs and staff requirements.

The next storm of protest that came from Members opposite and others had to do with the decision of this Government to increase the teacher-pupil ratio. Most of the opposition here was inspired and kindled by some of my friends opposite. Like many of the Opposition statements, their remarks, and their intent, have really been nothing more than a windstorm, a tempest in a teapot.

Because the critics of government policy here are operating on a number of misguided assumptions, first of all, that spending more money on education is in itself a guarantee that the quality will be improved. Secondly, that there is a very direct relationship between the teacher-pupil ratio and the quality of the instructional program. I am sure that everybody in this House is aware and teachers and students and trustees are aware that many teachers can provide a much better quality of instruction with 35 pupils in front of them than many other teachers with 10, 15, or 20. In other words the quality of the person standing in front of the class has a good deal more to do with the overall quality of education than the actual numbers of students. And there has also been an assumption here in the criticism on this program, Mr. Speaker, that conventional patterns

of organizing a school for learning experiences cannot be changed in any way.

With respect to this issue of increasing the teacher-pupil ratio, I want to again outline the position of the Government in this respect. There are two inter-related matters here. Consideration of quality in the educational system and of course economic considerations.

I think the following facts in this regard speak for themselves and we are prepared to let the people of the province be the judges at any time on this issue.

During the past six or seven years we have seen the teachers' salary bill, the total instruction bill in the province double and perhaps there have been good reasons for it. We certainly support the general improvement in salaries to which teachers as well as others were entitled. There have been improved qualifications of the teaching force generally in the province. There has been an increase in total numbers and one has only to look to the annual report of the Department to verify these facts.

We've seen the ratio in this province, Mr. Speaker, go down from almost 1:24 when the Member for Biggar was Minister to about 1:20 in 1969-70. So therefore with the knowledge that each increase in one in the provincial teacher-pupil ratio would save the taxpayers approximately \$3 million, we had no hesitation whatsoever in asking school boards last year to try and increase that ratio by two where possible.

SOME HON. MEMBERS: Hear, hear!

MR. McISAAC: — We shall be looking for some further improvements in some systems in the 1970-71 school year, with the full realization, however, that there are some unique situations in rural Saskatchewan that deserve special consideration and this we shall be giving them. The ratio, for 1971-72 will still be considerably less than that in effect when this Government took office in 1964.

SOME HON. MEMBERS: Hear, hear!

MR. McISAAC: — As I said earlier, we make no apology for this decision because among other things, with improvements in the qualifications in our teaching force, we see no reason why a modest increase in the overall ratio should produce any loss of quality.

I want to remind Members of the House, Mr. Speaker, that this province had no general guidelines nor general policy on staff-student ratios, other than the minimum. Almost every other province has had for some time specific ratios in this regard. Indeed most of them are higher than the 1:7, the 1:15 and the 1:25 that were proposed for this province. Indeed in most other provinces they are much more rigidly applied than they are here. I suggest too that a policy on ratios is a must if we are going to allocate provincial funds in the fairest manner possible.

The financial problem in education, I suppose, could be said to be two-fold. First of all to try and find sufficient funds from whatever the source (and we can argue about that).

But secondly, perhaps more important, to distribute those funds equitably across the province once they are collected. I suggest, Mr. Speaker, when the history of education in this country is written a few years hence that it will show this province took the lead in taking positive action in these and other fields as far as education is concerned. Because today, in Alberta, in British Columbia and indeed in Manitoba, other provinces are following some of the policies and procedures that we have implemented here.

When we call the next election, Mr. Speaker, whenever it is, I know that the people will support us in these particular issues of budget reviews and teacher-pupil ratios, not only that but on our general record of achievement and education right across the whole educational field.

This morning the Government announced plans for the construction of a nurses' training facility for Southern Saskatchewan here in the city of Regina.

SOME HON. MEMBERS: Hear, hear!

MR. McISAAC: — This school will mark the completion of a move begun in 1966 with the passing of The Nurses' Education Act. At that time it was a major renovation in nursing education in all of Canada and again it is one that has been adopted since by other provinces.

The significance of that change was two-fold. It eliminated first of all uneconomical costs of operating eleven different hospital schools of nursing in the province. I think it improved the quality of nursing education very definitely as a result. It moved it from an almost pure apprenticeship type training to a much broader based program and from a three-year course to a two-year program.

This southern school, Mr. Speaker, will also offer other para-medical courses to be developed to meet the rapidly changing needs in the whole health field today. Hospitals in Moose Jaw and in Weyburn and other points in Southern Saskatchewan and outside of Regina will be used in the training of these people in this institution. This training institution, Mr. Speaker, will be the beginning as well of a third major provincial institute for Saskatchewan.

SOME HON. MEMBERS: Hear, hear!

MR. McISAAC: — And I might say for the benefit of Members on both sides that the courses to be offered there will be complementary to those offered at Moose Jaw and at Saskatoon and other vocational centres in the province.

The institution is intended for that large group of high school graduates who want to further their training and who are not desirous of attending university. I suggest that the tendering on this project next month or two will not only help the employment picture but it is another clear demonstration of our announced intention and avowed intention to provide all groups with educational opportunity in this province.

SOME HON. MEMBERS: Hear, hear!

MR. McISAAC: — In 1968, Mr. Speaker, we amended The School Act in this Legislature to confer upon people living on Indian Reserves the right to vote and take part in school affairs. While we have not yet seen many bands become part of school units as a result, we certainly have definitely seen an increasing awareness of the importance of education on the part of our native people.

School boards, teachers, university people, the colleges of education and many government departments, not only in education, but in many others have been working and are working with Indian and Metis representatives constantly to try and develop policies and programs, and a curriculum better fitted to their needs.

I suggest, Mr. Speaker, that the entire record of this Government in the field of expanded opportunities for Indian and Metis people is without equal anywhere in this country.

The newly opened and operating training centre in Cutbank, is an example; the Curriculum Resources Centre operated at the University with provincial and other outside support; the dozens of upgrading courses being provided all across this province at many locations; and the many hundreds of integrated classrooms throughout this province, I think all speak for themselves. I am certainly not naive enough for one minute to think or imply even that the problems in this regard have all been solved or are all behind us. But I do say that we are not sparing the financial and the human resources and the will and the effort and the energy necessary to solve the problems for those people.

Three years ago, Mr. Speaker, this Legislature amended The School Act to allow schools so designated by the Lieutenant-Governor-in-Council to have French taught or used as the language of instruction for periods longer than one hour per day. This action was taken to meet the wishes of those parents seeking this kind of instruction and of course in the broader interest of Canadian national unity.

Since the passing of that legislation, I think good progress has been made in the establishment of French language schools in the province. During 1970, the number of designated schools increased from five to ten. We estimate in the Department that eventually some 20 communities in the province will take advantage of that 1967 amendment to Section 209. Designated schools now include Willowbunch, Gravelbourg, Ferland, Regina Separate, two districts in Saskatoon, Prince Albert Separate, North Battleford Separate, Vonda, St. Isidore de Bellevue.

This year, Mr. Speaker, with Federal Government assistance special arrangements were made with the College Mathieu people in Gravelbourg, because it was considered essential by this Government to maintain at least one first class bilingual secondary school in the province. And accordingly, the Department recognizes in full, tuition fees paid by school boards on behalf of students from anywhere in the province who attend at College Mathieu.

The Saskatoon French School, a private school up until last fall became part of the Saskatoon Separate School system and has been designated as an experimental school for a three-year period. Both of these projects, Mr. Speaker, are going along

very, very well. I think it is worth noting that the teaching of French generally is arousing the interest of more and more students across the province.

An improved curriculum has been introduced and is in use. The fact is that now French is being offered at the Grade VII level in more and more schools and I'm sure that both of these are contributing factors. Last year this Legislature, Mr. Speaker, passed legislation making it compulsory for school boards beginning in 1971 to provide educational services for handicapped children and that amendment has been hailed by many people as the "Bill of Rights for Handicapped Children in Saskatchewan."

The regulations of the Department of Education under which this legislation becomes operative will enable boards to discharge their responsibilities either directly by providing services themselves or indirectly through purchase of service from another board or another agency.

The costs of providing services for handicapped children will be of course, a recognized expenditure in school board budgets, including, I might say, Mr. Speaker, the costs of transportation for handicapped children to central locations in the larger urban school districts. This provides a very welcome relief to the parents of handicapped children who have had to provide this service at considerable personal expense within the city, Mr. Speaker.

Rural school unit boards this year, Mr. Speaker, were permitted by law to employ their own superintendents. I can report to the House that about four units took advantage of this provision and another five or six have indicated to us that they intend to do so in the coming year. This year, for the first time, Mr. Speaker, dozens of school boards throughout the province are employing teacher-aides as a result of legislation we also brought into the House last year. I think that the success of this program initiated and supported by the department, supported by grant funds, indicates that there will be a further expansion in the number of these people employed in the school system next year.

Pension benefits for teachers of the province were increased substantially last year. Last year in this last session and later in this current session, Mr. Speaker, a Bill will be introduced to assist those teachers who retired prior to 1963 below a certain level of benefits.

Time doesn't allow a description of all of the other legislative changes that we have introduced through the years and the benefits which are now being felt throughout the Province in the school system. I submit again that when you look at the legislative record of this Government over the last several years with respect to education, it has certainly been one of the most significant periods in the history of education of this Province.

SOME HON. MEMBERS: Hear, hear!

MR. McISAAC: — I want to take a few moments, Mr. Speaker, to point out a few other highlights from the point of view of quality improvements to the consumer. And I refer here to 'the consumer' as

the student of both high school age and over. Commencing in September of this year secondary education was reorganized to provide for a good deal more flexibility than up to now. The new approach was the culmination of five years of study and planning by teachers, by trustees, by students themselves and many other people. The main features of the new approach in Division IV or senior high school includes many things. First of all, there is an opportunity for a good deal more freedom of choice from a broad range of elective courses. Secondly, an opportunity for some specialization without locking the student into a particular stream or track such as old A or B, where he went straight academic or into the general stream. The new program provides for a good deal more variation than was possible before. Thirdly it is characterized by a de-emphasis on compulsory subjects in the secondary school program in grades 11 and 12. English is the only compulsory subject. I think above all it puts graduation requirements for a complete high school standing within the reach of most students. A minimum of seven subjects per year and a total accumulation of 21 credits, five of which must be earned in courses at the grade 12 level. I think this approach recognizes a well-known fact that many high school graduates do not indeed go on to university courses. I might mention again that this is a program that is now being considered for adoption in the Province.

Under departmental policy of a gradual extension of accreditation to well qualified and competent teachers, the privilege and responsibility of evaluating and assigning the final standing of grade 12 students has now been granted to over 500 teachers. Last year, in September, one complete school — the Aden Bowman collegiate in Saskatoon — has been accredited in total, on an experimental basis.

The term 'accreditation' as it is used here, Mr. Speaker, simply means giving teachers the right to evaluate and assign students their grade 12 mark in the subject for which they are accredited. The traditional grade 12 departmental examinations are gradually being replaced in other ways. For example, by machine-scored objective tests with that counting for 50 per cent of the student's standing and the teacher's marks for the other 50 per cent. For many and valid reasons, I think, the trend is certainly towards less and less dependence on departmental grade 12 examinations as a means of measuring high school achievement.

During the last two school years, Mr. Speaker, the department conducted a pilot project in the use of the semester system of organization in 14 high schools throughout the Province. The reaction of principals, teachers, parents, students and school boards was so favorable that we made the decision to grant any school that wished to go on this basis of organization the privilege to do so. The result is that this year 1970-71 over 100 high schools are operating on the semester plan.

The introduction of driver education as a part of the school program four or five years ago in this Province was another Canadian first. This year we have another 13,000 students enrolled in the current school year, bringing to something over 40,000 the number that will have taken driver training. I am sure the Member for Regina North West (Mr. Whelan) who spoke in this debate before me will be well aware that the record of the younger aged drivers certainly proves the value and the validity of this program.

SOME HON. MEMBERS: Hear, hear!

MR. McISAAC: — For the first time, Mr. Speaker, in many years the general supply of well-qualified teachers was adequate with the exception of a few areas of specialization. The improved supply made possible the discontinuation of recruitment outside the Province and I think a very significant reduction in the number of teachers holding Probationary Certificates, (from 445 in 1968 to 132 in 1970).

During the course of the last session, Mr. Speaker, I made reference in one of the debates to our plans for improving and extending opportunities for adults anxious to obtain high school standing. With the recognition that there are many adults who did not finish high school — through no fault of their own — but who may have acquired through formal and informal educational experiences, an educational maturity at or above the level of high school, the decision was taken in the course of the past year to implement a testing program for adults. Any person who has been a resident of Saskatchewan for at least six months and has reached 19 years of age and has been out of school at least a full year may apply and take these tests. Individuals passing this test are awarded an equivalency certificate of grade 10, 11 or 12 standing, as the case may be. The first test sittings were held in November and December and 361 people took those tests. Grade 12 standing was obtained by 297 people with others obtaining grade 11, grade 10 and a few not obtaining any standing at all.

The equivalency certificate is one that is recognized by the Public Service Commission. Details of this program have been circularized to employers throughout the Province and I certainly expect that most employers will recognize the departmental equivalency certificate for recruitment and employment of individuals.

I am convinced, Mr. Speaker, that the acceptability of this program certainly proves that it has been a very, very sensible step and a necessary one and one that's been welcomed by adults right across this Province.

Beginning last year for this current school year, Mr. Speaker, for the first time in the history of the Province a complete free text program for grades 1 to 12 became operational. You will recall, Mr. Speaker, that this is a Liberal program because when this Government took office in 1964 no high school texts were provided. And not even all of the elementary texts. So in 1970 with the provision of grants sufficient to enable school boards to provide all of the required texts from grades 1 to 12, no students were required to purchase any authorized texts.

I want to conclude, Mr. Speaker, by emphasizing that I think this Province has an educational system of which all Members in this House can be proud. In fact I think when you look at the limited economic resources that we have to devote to education — and they are limited because there is a limit to that which can be devoted — our index of effort in providing a high quality program for all of our citizens is second to none anywhere in this country. First, any way you want to look at it the quality of our elementary and secondary programs as determined by the retention rate — and determined by the calibre of our graduates — the very high proportion of the 18 to 24 age group who are enrolled in both forms of secondary training. Second, the efforts to provide more and better training opportunities to meet manpower needs such as the school announced this morning and in general the provision of a greater measure of equality of opportunity across this Province. It certainly adds up to a

significant program of enlightened legislation and policies, Mr. Speaker, in one of which I am proud to have played some part. Needless to say, Mr. Speaker, I will be supporting the motion.

SOME HON. MEMBERS: Hear, hear!

MR. J.A. PEPPER (Weyburn): — Mr. Speaker, in rising to take part in this debate I should first like to congratulate my leader, the Member from Regina Centre (Mr. Blakeney) on his recent appointment and for the manner in which he is handling his responsibility.

SOME HON. MEMBERS: Hear, hear!

MR. PEPPER: — And he is being ably assisted by another very young man, (Mr. Romanow). I can assure you, Mr. Speaker, that we on this side of the House are proud of them and place our full confidence in them. I also know that we all realize that the shoes that they have been left to fill will not be easy to fill but we have every confidence that they will meet the challenge.

SOME HON. MEMBERS: Hear, hear!

MR. PEPPER: — I should like to extend my congratulations to the mover of the Speech from the Throne and also the seconder, the Member from Bengough, Mr. Mitchell, and the Member from Watrous, Mr. Schmeiser, respectively.

It would be, and must be a pleasure for anyone to have the opportunity to do this duty but it is a little different when one is faced with a document based on small election promises, small baits, bribing the voters to give you another chance. After you realize that you haven't fulfilled your promises of the past such as the 80,000 new jobs that were so faithfully promised to the citizens of this Province, and what did you do? Instead you gave them unemployment, frustration and the greatest exodus of people from this Province to neighboring provinces that was ever witnessed in our history.

The Liberal Government promised to lift the burden of heavy taxes placed on the shoulders of our people by the former Socialist government. They only lifted in their promise Mr. Speaker, because immediately after the words were uttered they dropped them back on the people's shoulders along with many millions of dollars of increased and new taxes amounting to somewhat over \$35 million in one year. Yes, the year after the last election, 1968.

If this is the best that this Liberal Government can do, Mr. Speaker, I tell you it just isn't good enough for our people.

SOME HON. MEMBERS: Hear, hear!

MR. PEPPER: — And the people of our province are inviting an opportunity any day to tell them so. People are not going to be fooled by another Throne Speech which very possibly is the one just prior to an election. Our people whom we are elected to represent are responsible people. They judge the quality and the governing ability of a political party by its actions between elections not just their actions and promises prior to an

election. Our people have found, Mr. Speaker, that promises not kept are not only deceitful but they do not meet the great necessities of life that are so urgent and pressing at this time.

SOME HON. MEMBERS: Hear, hear!

MR. PEPPER: — Our citizens, young and old, are becoming more frustrated and more confused than ever before with an increasing lack of finances and a larger debt than they can bear or ever hope to meet during their lifetime. I am afraid that in many cases, Mr. Speaker, it will be passed on to the next generation, if a Government sitting to your right doesn't do something about it.

Agriculture is one of the areas where greater and greater emphasis must be placed and considered if our problems in this Province ever can be solved. Not only must they be considered but again, I reiterate, immediate action must be taken to at least alleviate the situation many of our farmers find themselves in today. Last year in this House your Government, sitting to your right, Mr. Speaker, insisted that they were taking all necessary steps towards correcting the agricultural situation by diversification. We on this side told them that assisting the farmers to purchase cattle, hogs or building shelters for them, was and would only create greater problems if they did not get busy and set up support prices, guaranteeing the farmer the protection that he needs to prevent the price or sale of his product from falling to a figure where he can no longer continue to operate.

SOME HON. MEMBERS: Hear, hear!

MR. PEPPER: — In many cases, Mr. Speaker, many of them have lost everything they have by becoming involved in this transaction. We warned the Government sitting opposite that this could and would happen. Ask those farmers who diversified into hogs and poultry just what happened. They will soon tell you, Mr. Speaker, and many of them have expressed their feelings to me in regard to the Government's diversification program, in a manner in which I am forbidden to use in this House. If I was the Minister of Agriculture or if I was the Premier of the Province having caused such a serious and chaotic condition for these farmers, or at least making no provisions to prevent this from happening, I should think twice before I would set foot on their premises.

If something isn't considered to support the price of cattle or provisions made so that the farmer can be assured of operating at a reasonable profit it could be closer than you think to the time when many more of our farmers will be caught in the same position and forced out of business.

SOME HON. MEMBERS: Hear, hear!

MR. PEPPER: — You know as I look carefully through the Throne Speech delivered in this House on Tuesday last, I can find but very little specific help or assurance of help to the people of our province for the year that lies ahead. Sure, they tell us that the Saskatchewan mining outlook is bright but just try and tell that to the mining people of our province. The mine workers and families who have been laid off and have lost, in many cases,

all their earnings and, in some places, their dwellings. This is not much satisfaction to them, Mr. Speaker. I also notice in the Throne Speech that there are going to be more changes or proposals of change in the Election Act, our Sunday movies are going to get another going over, the small urban storekeeper is going to be faced with stiffer penalties for remaining open for other than authorized hours, the already existing Liquor Act will again be reviewed, a new program will be introduced to permit the local communities to establish lights on their local airstrips with provincial assistance. These are all perhaps important, Mr. Speaker, but they are not the important issues and factors facing Saskatchewan citizens today.

SOME HON. MEMBERS: Hear, hear!

MR. PEPPER: — The sooner we come to grips with the bread and butter issues, the sooner this Liberal Government, or any other government, will have fulfilled its responsibility and will put the Saskatchewan economy once more in a position of which we as citizens can be proud. But since the Saskatchewan financial and economic position white paper has been distributed to us, I think it is a certain and sure indication that this Liberal Government is not capable of doing so.

SOME HON. MEMBERS: Hear, hear!

MR. PEPPER: — But it is only getting us further in debt along with creating a defeatist atmosphere and forcing the morale of our people to an all time low.

SOME HON. MEMBERS: Hear, hear!

MR. PEPPER: — Now, Mr. Speaker, I should like to turn to an area in our province which I think is of the greatest importance if we hope to survive or overcome many of the problems confronting us today. I fail to see any assistance or serious steps being taken to alleviate the situation by this Government in its Throne Speech. This matter has to do with presenting measures to maintain and improve, make profitable and enjoyable the rural life of our people

SOME HON. MEMBERS: Hear, hear!

MR. PEPPER: — I believe, Mr. Speaker, Saskatchewan, today, is at the crossroads. There are two choices which are open to our rural people, the one of least resistance, which they are now embarked upon, along which both provincial and federal governments are leading them. This road will lead them to the closing or the abolishing two out of every three farms in the rural areas. The closing of many of our schools that have been doing such a splendid job of educating our youth of today, the forcing of hospital closures, the degrading of our health care, the creating of ghost towns, where once small businesses flourished and are now left forgotten, have created a very serious and sorrowful state of affairs.

I might remind you, Mr. Speaker, our rural people have another choice. They can once more take the other road which I warn you, will be an up hill climb. This is to join once

again with the New Democrats who are interested in rural life . . .

SOME HON. MEMBERS: Hear, hear!

MR. PEPPER: — . . . and who invite our citizens to unite with us in a common effort to fight these present trends.

SOME HON. MEMBERS: Hear, hear!

MR. PEPPER: — Might I remind you, that it was under the former provincial government of Saskatchewan that many of the provisions were introduced and made available to create enjoyment, happiness, satisfaction, and security, to all our people in rural Saskatchewan.

SOME HON. MEMBERS: Hear, hear!

MR. PEPPER: — It was under the former, CCF government, Mr. Speaker, that centralization of many of our rural one-room schools took place. These students were brought or bussed into our towns where new schools and school expansion took place. This move improved not only our educational standard for the students, but it made possible recreational facilities and an equal opportunity for all to participate in.

It was under the former government that some of our major hospitals of today were built. Yes, in Saskatoon, Yorkton, Weyburn, as well as many smaller ones, in rural areas of our province. These hospitals provided comfort, they provided treatment to our rural people without, in many cases, having to go very far from home. Naturally, to operate these hospitals, it took staff and maintenance people, which provided work for many of our smaller town people. And these people helped to assist our merchants and small businesses to operate efficiently by purchasing their necessary requirements.

Everybody seemed happy, and this was obvious all through the province. Our towns became electrified, and our farmsteads as well, by our Saskatchewan Power Corporation, which I might remind you, was born, promoted and established, under the New Democratic government.

AN HON. MEMBER: — That's a good government . . .

MR. PEPPER: — And now the Liberal Government takes credit for it.

A network of grid roads was built through the province, making it possible to deliver the farmers' products on good roads to his nearest shopping centre. But it's a different picture today. You know what is happening under the present Government, Mr. Speaker? These towns and villages that had glowing lights in their windows are now being vacated, and windows are being boarded up, and the people are being forced to move to neighbouring provinces to seek employment and to earn their living. Our future rural life in Saskatchewan is fast becoming a dismal and sad sight in the eyes of our people in Saskatchewan. And we in the New Democratic Party say, we must unite in an effort to fight the present trend.

SOME HON. MEMBERS: Hear, hear!

MR. PEPPER: — "For Sale" signs are springing up everywhere. "Closed" signs are being nailed on doors and windows, on many business places, in our small towns, where a few years ago, a very happy and comfortable living was being made.

My own constituency, Mr. Speaker, is comprised of some eleven municipalities. In the period from 1960 to 1968, the latest figure I could obtain, it showed that one-fifth of the population moved away, one out of every five people. I am sure that during the last two years, it hasn't improved, but will have changed considerably to, perhaps, two out of every five.

Now I ask you, Mr. Speaker, is the Weyburn constituency any different from any other part of the province? Just take a look at your own area, wherever it may be in the province, and I am sure you will find the very same situation. I have made a full study of the voters' lists in every poll in our last provincial election in my constituency, and have come up with much the same situation. About 23 per cent of those who were voters at that time, are either deceased or have moved away. I only hope, Mr. Speaker, that it is supporters of the right party that is left.

AN HON. MEMBER: — You have no problem with labor.

MR. PEPPER: — However, it isn't a very pleasant picture, I can assure you, and I say again, whatever government is in charge, it must take immediate measures to stop or if not completely stop it, take steps that will help at least to curtail this mass exodus of our best resources, our people.

SOME HON. MEMBERS: Hear, hear!

MR. PEPPER: — I feel that the decline of our rural communities, coupled with the uncertainty and the degrading Saskatchewan agricultural picture, is the most critical issue facing us today, and in this Throne Speech it is receiving the least attention, and certainly there are no new suggestions to help the situation.

AN HON. MEMBER: — Right!

MR. PEPPER: — I can only say, by its actions, that this Provincial Liberal Government is taking no measures to halt the recommendations of the Task Force on Agriculture, and apparently believe that economic efficiency can best be obtained by implementing it. I resent this, Mr. Speaker, and firmly oppose the economic doctrine that human values must take second place when they stand in the way of technology and efficiency.

SOME HON. MEMBERS: Hear, hear!

MR. PEPPER: — I believe it is out duty as Legislators to take and control and shape technology and efficiency so that these agencies will build and not destroy our rural communities . . .

SOME HON. MEMBERS: Hear, hear!

MR. PEPPER: — . . . because these communities play an important part in Saskatchewan today.

I am certain that the Federal Liberal Government with the help of the Provincial Liberals here in Saskatchewan are on a course that will lead to the takeover of family farms, which will be operated by corporate enterprises, which in turn will be operated by a few hired hands. Any of you who live as close to our neighbours to the south as I do, can see what has happened and is happening across the American border, where service centres have taken over small communities. There is no more rural life, and these service centres are dominated by the same corporations that own the land. I ask you, Mr. Speaker, and I ask the House, is that what we want for our people here in Saskatchewan.

SOME HON. MEMBERS: — No, no!

MR. PEPPER: — The announcement of pulp mills however large the Premier cares to try to make of it, is not the answer, nor does it face up to the problems facing our people today. And I warn you, that if it is not properly handled, it will only create greater problems, both economically and also adding a greater danger to the survival of our rural Saskatchewan. Much of our rural area's survival is in danger today because of devastating problems of pollution. That problem is certain to be increased if this mill becomes a reality, and if every precaution is not built in to protect the environment and give assurance and proof of continual clear water flowing down those northern streams. I am sure, Mr. Speaker, that no one has all the answers to the problems confronting the rural people today, but let's make a move and admit that our past is a failure. We must try a different course.

We in the New Democratic Party feel that farming is the means or the method of a very desirable way of good production.

SOME HON. MEMBERS: Hear, hear!

MR. PEPPER: — We feel that corporate ownership could certainly be restricted to family groups or co-operatives. More effort should be made to encourage more people to engage in farming, particularly young people, by sufficient loans or grants, by making land available to them through a land bank system, leasing it to them with the option for them to buy it. We would implement a program to try and revitalize rural Saskatchewan, making every effort to keep small hospitals open, or when they are closed, then attempts should be made to keep in this same community, a nursing home, an out-patient clinic, or much needed geriatric centres.

I believe, Mr. Speaker, that much of the reason for the depletion of rural Saskatchewan is a closing of the local schools. And it would be our plan to keep them operating where at all feasible. A great help towards this will be by eliminating the teacher-pupil ratio. This would be one manner which would certainly help.

And I ask you, would it not be possible to arrange for some machinery dealerships that are now closing, to carry more than one line of machinery repairs or parts? I know these

might only be suggestions, but I feel they are at least realistic, and will assist in keeping together our rural Saskatchewan, and they deserve a try.

Mr. Speaker, if the Throne Speech contained some items that would assist and show leadership in the building of our Province, I could support it, but knowing that the past records of both the Federal and Provincial Liberal Governments has not met the challenge; instead their records have spelled out the closing of post offices, railway branch lines, many railway stations, and where now a plan is being considered for closing or the cutback of from one thousand to one hundred grain delivery points, eliminating two-thirds of the farmers of our province. Where our Provincial Government is doing nothing about it, I say we must take the new road. It is time to offer a new deal for our people.

SOME HON. MEMBERS: Hear, hear!

MR. PEPPER: — And to take a firm stand against this very serious and devastating threat.

We in the New Democratic Party believe it is possible to do something about it. So muster our forces and let's do it. I know by now, Mr. Speaker, you will have realized that I am not supporting the Motion, but I do support the amendment.

SOME HON. MEMBERS: Hear, hear!

MR. R. HEGGIE (Hanley): — Mr. Speaker, again it is a privilege to participate in the Throne Speech debate. I want to congratulate the three Members of this House who have in the past year been accorded promotion. On the Government side, the Member for Last Mountain (Mr. MacLennan) has assumed the Labour portfolio, and I trust he will develop a more responsible position between labor and management to solve the disputes without the necessity of strikes.

SOME HON. MEMBERS: Hear, hear!

MR. HEGGIE: — In strikes, both labor and industry are the immediate losers, the public is the ultimate loser.

On the opposite side, my congratulations go out to the Member for Regina Centre (Mr. Blakeney) who has assumed the office of Leader of the Opposition. Mr. Blakeney moves into the position, well equipped by way of education and experience. I look forward, with interest to his stewardship of the party in its difficult days ahead.

The Member for Riversdale (Mr. Romanow) was the runner-up in the NDP leadership convention and takes over as deputy leader at a time when his party will require all his skills to keep it on track as an effective opposition. He will have his problems in assisting his leader in curbing the militant Waffle Group which over the past year is having considerable influence on the NDP in moving it to the left. Fortunately for the Provincial Liberal Party, every shift to the left under Waffle pressure, leaves a vacuum which the Liberals can easily fill.

AN HON. MEMBER: — Right behind you, right behind you!

MR. HEGGIE: — Before embarking on remarks relevant to the Speech from the Throne, let me say something to this House about the great events that have been taking place in the Hanley constituency. Everyone in Saskatchewan is just thrilled with the way the Canada Winter Games, recently concluded, were staged in Saskatoon. Saskatchewan will long remember the magnificent program of events which were so well presented by the host city of Saskatoon. I join with thousands of others in congratulating the Member from Saskatoon City Park University, Jeff Charlebois, who as President of the Winter Games Committee did such a magnificent job.

SOME HON. MEMBERS: Hear, hear!

MR. HEGGIE: — Praise must go as well to Earle Bowman, the General Chairman, and the volunteer workers who helped put the games over.

SOME HON. MEMBERS: Hear, hear!

MR. HEGGIE: — From the magnificent opening ceremonies, Mr. Speaker, when the Prime Minister officiated, to the memorable closing, when His Excellency, the Governor-General presided, excitement, colour, and goodwill were foremost. Everyone who took part said the staging of these games did more for national unity than a Federal-Provincial Conference. The young athletes themselves are the ones who will gain most in a substantive way.

Now I want to say something about the mountain. This had to be the focal point of the whole event. A man-made mountain rising 2,080 feet above sea level, on Blackstrap Lake right smack in the centre of Hanley constituency, brought more favorable comment than any other single thing connected with the games. Credit must go to Mayor Sidney Buckwold, of Saskatoon, who perseverance and salesmanship persuaded the Canada Winter Games Committee to award the games to Saskatoon. He literally reversed the aged old phrase, "He made the mountain come to Mohammed." Having worked nine years with Sid Buckwold on Saskatoon City Council, I know that his ability and persuasiveness played a big part in getting the Games for Saskatoon. I want to say to those doubters, who last year in this House were critical of the idea of building a mountain, let them go and take a look for themselves. Let them stand up and be counted. Yesterday, as I passed by the mountain on my way to Regina, the great hill was silent, the skiers were gone, the workers were gone, the 20,000 spectators were not there, but Blackstrap Mountain was there raising its crest proudly over the countryside.

SOME HON. MEMBERS: Hear, hear!

MR. HEGGIE: — A monument to ingenuity and skills of many people. The mountain is now a permanent part of the Dundurn landscape, a landmark for miles around and a permanent ski resort within Blackstrap Provincial Park for all Saskatoon and Hanley residents to enjoy.

Mr. Speaker, I now turn to the Speech from the Throne.

Unemployment — everyone recognizes that unemployment has risen to serious proportions. This is a Canada-wide problem and is most serious in Central Canada and British Columbia. It is less serious in the Prairie Provinces and fortunately the number of unemployed in Saskatchewan is less than the prairie average. However, let me hasten to add that if a person is unemployed it is little satisfaction to know statistically he is not adding greatly to the number. Fortunately the Government has embarked on a crash Public Works Program to create unemployment. I might mention here that the continued accelerated highway program of almost \$70 million helps keep the construction industry in business and creates thousands of summer jobs for workers.

Further, Mr. Speaker, the special employment program for university and technical school students, even to the point of the Government subsidizing the wages of students in certain sectors of the economy, is most commendable. There has never been an employment program like this in the history of the province. As an election issue unemployment should be relegated to its proper place when viewed in the light of what the Government is doing to alleviate the problem.

Agriculture — Premier Thatcher has stated time and again that this Government is in favor of diversification in agriculture. The Premier was preaching this doctrine of diversification long before the farmers and the public generally viewed the wheat marketing situation with alarm. After the disastrous damp grain crop of 1968 and the subsequent falling-off of markets and wheat prices, the farmers and the public began to realize that the Premier was right in advocating a change in the agricultural pattern. If the farming industry and the family farm unit is to survive it must not be subject to cyclical financing. In my own constituency many farmers have gone into hogs and expanded their cattle herds in the last three years. Further, many have diversified horizontally by growing a variety of field crops, including durum wheat, rape and flax.

One farmer told me he had for the first time harvested 500 acres of rape and flax and he was better off than he has been in the past five years. No doubt there are individual farmers who are finding the going rough and suffer a cash shortage; however, the world markets for grain seem to be stabilizing and the future for agriculture looks brighter in 1971.

As the farmer suffers so does the businessman in the towns and villages. Those urban centres which have long been used to diversified farming in their area suffer the least in the long run. Consequently The Livestock Loans Guarantee Act will be expanded in this Session to accelerate the diversification program.

Labor — One of the main planks in the recently announced NDP platform as a commitment to the Waffle wing is to do away with The Essential Services Emergency Act. This is easy to say in Opposition but it would be hard to do in office. The reason is that the Saskatchewan people would not stand for it. Consider the catastrophic situation if the Saskatchewan Power Corporation employees had gone on strike in January, when the average daily temperature was 20 below. Thank God that we do not have to put up with this in Saskatchewan.

Any extension of The Essential Services Emergency Act must

be along the same guidelines. No strikes where the public interest is at stake. Another point that I commend to the Government on its announcement in the Speech from the Throne, that changes will be instituted in The Workmen's Compensation Act. I am sure that both sides of the House will support changes which will increase the benefits to injured workmen.

Members on both sides of the House, last year expressed such a desire. What they advocate is to have compensation for a person injured during employment, equal to compensation for a person injured in an auto accident. At the present time the injured workman comes off second best.

Another progressive step in labor legislation is the absolute priority given to workers' claims for wages over all other claims and creditors.

Pollution — The Government will introduce legislation to control pollution by outlawing the use of non-returnable bottles and indestructible aluminum soft-drink cans and adjusting the price for salvaging of returnable bottles to give an economic incentive.

Foreign investment — We cannot have it both ways. If we want jobs for our people and the high standard of living we must have foreign capital and the United States is the obvious place for it to come from. Japan is another viable source of capital and its record of investment in Canada is creditable.

There is much said on all sides about foreign capital and foreign ownership in Canada. Personally, I feel that this is a subject that has been a whipping boy for many of our own shortcomings. Developing countries have always depended on foreign capital to build and expand. Canada and Saskatchewan are no exception. British capital built up and expanded United States industry following the American Civil War. British capital built Canada's first transcontinental railway in the 1880s. British capital built the Argentine railways; the railway systems of India, Egypt, Australia, South Africa and East Africa. Why? Because for 100 years from the close of the Napoleonic Wars in 1815 to the outbreak of World War I, Britain was the most powerful country with the best developed industrial plants and with huge resources of investment capital.

Germany, before World War I, financed and built many European railway systems. After World War I the United States became the centre of industry and high finance and American capital began to move into Canada and many other countries. Canada is a country of boundless natural resources which requires capital for their development. It is only natural that capital would flow across the border. Canada and Saskatchewan in particular, just do not have any amount of capital to develop these resources.

No doubt as we grow and develop we will generate our own capital, in fact, Canada has made considerable investments in the West Indies and the Caribbean area. Militant leaders in those areas have expressed publicly and by demonstrations that they too resent foreign investment. It just seems to be the case of whose ox is being gored.

What has the NDP to offer under its new Leader as an alternative? Very little that is of any practical value to

Saskatchewan citizens. Oh, there is the lofty program announced by the Leader in February, a kind of manifesto that the Socialists come out with from time to time. They are always declaring manifestos. No one in Canada ever takes them seriously. In 1933 they came out with the Regina Manifesto; in 1956 there was the Winnipeg Declaration; and now in 1971 we have the Blakeney pronouncement.

What does it involve? Nothing new in agriculture; a land bank to take unproductive land out of cultivation and a buy-back program for farmers wanting to quit farming. Even the Federal Government with all its resources is not rushing into this kind of program. The United States has been saddled with this type of land bank since the mid '50s. It is a too ambitious and costly program for any provincial government in Saskatchewan to undertake.

Mr. Blakeney says that an NDP Government will preserve the family farm. What constitutes the family farm? Is it a half section? A full section? Two sections or five sections? Mr. Blakeney doesn't say and I doubt that he has the answer. More window-dressing to try and win back some farm support that has gradually been slipping away from the NDP.

Mr. Blakeney says that an NDP Government will nationalize the potash industry. Ten mines in Saskatchewan cost nearly \$1 billion. Where is the money to come from? This would absorb 2 1/2 complete budgets. Who would run the industry? Markets are difficult to find. Usually government run enterprises do worse than their private enterprise counterparts when the going is rough. Isn't that the farmer's complaint about the Canadian Wheat Board? Just silly nonsense to say the least.

No doubt this buy-back policy is a concession to Wafflers. It sounds good to the woolly-headed Socialists to be able to say that people own their resources. If the Socialists mean confiscation of the potash industry then Saskatchewan will be likened to a South American country or a black African Republic.

I think Saskatchewan people have long ago passed that type of confiscation. This kind of nonsense cannot be taken seriously by the people of Saskatchewan.

Mr. Speaker, I will have more to say on the various subjects in future debates in this House. I therefore take great pleasure in lending my support to the main motion and will vote against the amendment.

SOME HON. MEMBERS: Hear, hear!

MR. M. KWASNICA (Cutknife): — Mr. Speaker, I first of all want to congratulate the mover and the seconder of the Throne Speech for doing the best they could with the feeble blueprint which they had in front of them for a Throne Speech.

But really one can't be too hard on the mover and the seconder. The real problem lies with the Premier and a Government that is totally bankrupt of any sound policies for Saskatchewan people in difficult times. The Premier is more concerned with tricky and flashy pantomime than he is with sincerity and concern and we, on this side of the House, suspect that the

February 23, 1971

Liberal plan is to deliberately present a rather weak Throne Speech so that the few goodies that will be dangled in front of the people of Saskatchewan in the Budget will look so wonderful that the Premier hopes they will vote for it in overwhelming numbers.

But the people will remember that Liberal times are hard times. They will remember too that same trick used prior to the 1967 election, and then after the election the Government said that everything was fine and dandy, whereupon \$35 million worth of new taxes was heaped upon them in 1968.

Mr. Speaker, before I proceed any further I want to take this opportunity to pay tribute to Woodrow Lloyd for his many years of devoted service to the CCF and the New Democratic Party in our province.

SOME HON. MEMBERS: Hear, hear!

MR. KWASNICA: — If it wasn't for Woodrow Lloyd it is doubtful Saskatchewan and the rest of Canada would ever have had a Medicare Plan as there is today.

SOME HON. MEMBERS: Hear, hear!

MR. KWASNICA: — I want to congratulate too Allan Blakeney, the Leader of our party, who won out in a tough fight at our convention last July. I also want to congratulate Roy Romanow for being chosen as our deputy leader. These two young and dynamic statesmen with the help of all their MLAs and candidates, and with the help of the people of Saskatchewan, will lead Saskatchewan into a bright and prosperous decade of the 70s with a "New Deal for People."

SOME HON. MEMBERS: Hear, hear!

MR. KWASNICA: — Mr. Speaker, as I listened to the Throne Speech being read last Tuesday, I expected to find some real action on the problem of pollution in our province, some strong leadership in dealing with industrial and chemical pollution to prevent Saskatchewan's land, air and water from further contamination. The only idea this feeble Government opposite could come up with is livestock pollution controls. Of all the serious threats such as industrial and chemical pollution, this Government chooses to go after the farmers' cattle. Just one more item to prove that this Government is against farmers but 100 per cent behind big business and industrial pollution.

There is no doubt about the seriousness of pollution in our province and in our country and in the world. Some scientists say that we have 30 years left if nothing is done. One chemical DDT has proven to be a real threat to human life. DDT kills or slows down plankton in our oceans, which produce approximately 70 per cent of the world's supply of oxygen. Since scientists have found DDT in penguins in the Antarctic and in polar bears in the Arctic they can only come to one conclusion — that man has already polluted the world's waterways. DDT has gotten into the food chain already and DDT does not lose its killing power for many years.

A similar situation can arise with other herbicides and pesticides and other chemicals such as Dieldrin and Mercury. The problem is that chemical companies have not looked far enough ahead before putting chemicals on the market. Being short-sighted and somewhat profit motivated, their only concern is to get a product on the market to do a job and the heck with the long-term effects.

I expected the Throne Speech to come up with some leadership here, but instead, it only deals with cow manure.

Mr. Speaker, I should like to show you how inefficient and ridiculous the Government Opposite has been regarding pollution and the inaction of this Government.

I want to quote some news headlines and a few excerpts from certain news items. I should like to quote one here from the Saskatoon Star-Phoenix, October 22, 1969, "Provincial DDT Ban Urged by Wildlife Group":

The Saskatchewan Wildlife Federation has asked the provincial government to ban DDT content chemicals in the province, and warns that DDT will affect production of wildlife. DDT has been banned or restricted in British Columbia, Ontario, several states, Sweden and Denmark and Saskatchewan should act now rather than to wait until damage is done.

Now has the Saskatchewan Government banned or restricted DDT? I checked with the Department of Agriculture and they say, no, there is no ban on DDT in Saskatchewan.

Another headline, Saskatoon Star-Phoenix, October 15, 1970:

Pollution rampant in Saskatchewan, Regina citizens' group says. The Provincial Government Wednesday was warned that Saskatchewan is faced with many forms of pollution and immediate steps are needed to prevent further damage to environment.

And they mention domestic sewage and hydrogen sulphide and other pollutants.

The third item that I wish to quote to the Minister about pollution and bring to his attention is, "Oil companies blamed for cesspool in park." This was in the Saskatoon Star-Phoenix, October 15, 1970. According to that article, Elmer G. Hindmarsh of Saskatoon, president of the Saskatchewan Wildlife Federation, said that Moose Mountain Provincial Park, 45 miles north of Estevan has been turned into a cesspool of oil-coated waters and garbage dumps, with wholesale clearing of natural cover. And it says that only feeble attempts have been made to properly dike sites to prevent oil spills from spreading. As a result oil has seeped into marshlands and water sources. Garbage from oil camps pollutes the stripped lands within the park, deliberately dumped on the shores and banks of lakes.

Open flare pits, wells in the core area of the park and a general devil-may-care appearance exists within the park.

Well, this is what the article says.

February 23, 1971

Then the Minister of Mineral Resources (Mr. Cameron) jumped on that one and in a news release says, "Cameron denies pollution charge," Saskatoon Star-Phoenix, October 20th.

In reply to statements made last week by Saskatchewan Wildlife Federation president of the park, Mr. Cameron said Mineral Resources officials have no instance of oil spills around any oil wells in the park.

Well, the problem is that the credibility gap here is quite large. One group says Yes and the Minister comes in and says, "No, there is no pollution at all."

I have another news article here, "Guy rejects Lang's claims of Saskatchewan River pollution," it says, On August 27, 1969.

Allan R. Guy, Minister-in-Charge of Saskatchewan Water Resources Commission said Tuesday he is surprised that the Saskatchewan and Qu'Appelle Rivers were included in a list of polluted rivers by Otto Lang, Federal Minister responsible for energy and water resources.

And what does Mr. Guy say further on:

Our observations do not lead us to believe these two rivers are polluted to any serious extent, Mr. Guy said in commenting on Mr. Lang's statement that the Saskatchewan and Qu'Appelle Rivers are among those with their own sad story to tell.

Well, Mr. Speaker, I want you to remember this particular statement by the Hon. Minister, because in a few minutes it will be proven to be interesting. Another article with Mr. Guy, the Hon. Minister, again in the headlines says, "Guy warns about panic in pollution," October 23, 1970, I quote:

A provincial cabinet minister Thursday cautioned against panicking about pollution. A.R. Guy, Minister-in-Charge said, 'We have a reasonably pure atmosphere and reasonably pure water here. We want to clean up areas we know have pollution problems'.

Further on in this article is says:

The provincial government introduced water pollution control legislation in 1967 which went far beyond sanitary requirements necessary to protect public health. It was aimed at ensuring that water quality would be preserved and enhanced for all other uses today and tomorrow.

Another article October 28th, Star-Phoenix, "Mercury level high across Saskatchewan River system," I quote:

If .5 parts per million is the level of mercury considered safe for human consumption, then the entire Saskatchewan River system through this province could have easily qualified for closure of all fishing during the past year and not just that portion of the river stretching from Saskatoon to the Manitoba border.

Three university doctors, who conducted mercury tests last fall along the river, said that in every instance

the mercury level was higher than 15 with the highest being an average of being 9.1 parts per million of mercury being found in pike at the Clarkboro Ferry.

What does that mean, Mr. Minister?

SOME HON. MEMBERS: Hear, hear!

MR. KWASNICA: — It means that you said a few months earlier that you have everything under control and don't panic about the pollution in Saskatchewan. Everything is under control.

SOME HON. MEMBERS: Hear, hear!

MR. KWASNICA: — Let's carry on. If you don't understand the chemical terms that is too bad for you. Let's carry on with the story about the inefficient Minister of Pollution. "Pollution in Saskatchewan under control despite news reports." Saskatoon Star-Phoenix, October 31, 1970.

Every complaint of pollution in the province has been investigated by the Saskatchewan Water Resources Commission and the government feels satisfied it is on top of all major polluters, Saskatchewan Water Resources Commission Minister Allan Guy says.

Not more than one month and one week later all of a sudden there is a problem about pollution. The news article says, front page, Star-Phoenix, December 5, 1970, "Mercury levels in rivers spreading."

Fishermen were dealt a severe blow today following an announcement that fishing carried out in almost all lakes and rivers in southern Saskatchewan should be for enjoyment only and very limited quantities of fish should be consumed by humans, in the Saskatchewan River System, and fish caught should not be eaten, Natural Resources Minister Barrie said, and the commercial fishing ban imposed last year will continue indefinitely.

Well, Mr. Minister, I wonder what happened to all your fancy words. Back on October 23rd you said you had all the legislation you needed. How come we don't dare eat the fish out of our Saskatchewan river systems if you had all that good legislation back in '67? How come? Mr. Speaker, isn't it interesting the attitude of these gentlemen.

SOME HON. MEMBERS: Hear, hear!

MR. KWASNICA: — Isn't it interesting, the attitude of some Liberal Cabinet Ministers about the concern for our natural resources of this province. You go out and talk to the people about the polluted fish and see how funny they think it is. Go out there, go and talk to them. Go to Lloydminster and talk about the fish in the North Saskatchewan River. The point is, Mr. Minister in charge of pollution, you can have all the legislation you want in the world, but if you don't do anything about it, it doesn't do you much good. This is typical Liberal action, do nothing, do nothing, and that's the way things are.

SOME HON. MEMBERS: Hear, hear!

MR. KWASNICA: — You know, it's funny about that Minister, he surely has a big mouth, but he won't get up and make his own speeches.

SOME HON. MEMBERS: Hear, hear!

MR. KWASNICA: — You know, in the earlier press releases, the Hon. Allan Guy, if you can call him honorable, said that he was on top of all the pollution problems. You know, Mr. Minister, the fish, the dead fish, who are floating around are on top of the situation too, and it doesn't do them a bit of good.

Mr. Speaker, if I could get the serious attention of the Members opposite for a minute, I'd like to point out just how dangerous mercury pollution can be and maybe we ought to be taking a look at it. I should like to quote another article about, "Mercury Victims Return Home," which many of you may have read, but I should just like to point out, in New Mexico, a case of mercury pollution of meat. Quoting December 18th issue of the Star-Phoenix:

Lois Huckleby says she expects her three mercury-poisoned children, one of them blind, and all crippled, home for Christmas dinner. Dorothy Jean 22, Amos 15 and Ernestine 10, were stricken a year ago after eating pork from a home butchered hog that had been fed seed grain treated with methyl-mercury fungicide. Amos is blind and afflicted with involuntary movements. He is regaining his balance, crawls and takes slow steps with help. Dorothy is walking and talking hesitantly, and with cheerful but strained effort. Ernestine spends most of her time in a hospital bed, but smiles at visitors and plays with toys (that's the 10 year old). Mrs. Huckleby was pregnant when the three became ill in December of '69, and last January she was moved to an Albuquerque hospital for special attention as doctors feared what her consumption may have done to the unborn child. She says a specialist has confirmed the baby, Michael, born last March, is blind. The grain fed to hogs by the childrens' father, Ernest Huckleby, had been meant for crop planting, and not for feed.

Well, this is how serious it can be. There is more in that article, and I think that all of us in this House ought to be taking a closer look at pollution.

SOME HON. MEMBERS: Hear, hear!

MR. KWASNICA: — And when I say that the Liberal Government in Saskatchewan today has done very little about pollution laws, I should like to bring to your attention, that on December 22, 1970, Mr. Speaker, the Japanese Lower House passed a law which defines pollution as a crime punishable by up to three year's imprisonment. So this is how far pollution has gone in that country and the steps they have to take in order to do a job.

Well, that's the problem as I see it, and the Government Members have really only begun to take a look at this thing. In spite of what many say, compared to other regions in North America, our air and water and soil are relatively clean when you compare them to some areas.

SOME HON. MEMBERS: Hear, hear!

MR. KWASNICA: — But this is no cause, Mr. Minister, for pride or complacency. It is more the result of delayed exploitation and slow growth than it is of any virtue or foresight on the part of the Government.

SOME HON. MEMBERS: Hear, hear!

MR. KWASNICA: — But whatever our immediate advantages in Saskatchewan the delicate balance of our environment is affected by many factors, some of which are outside our province's control. But the physical facts are obvious: air, water and wildlife pass freely across all political boundaries, carrying with them man's pollutants. But perhaps more important is the fact that we are bound up in larger economic, political and technological systems, the products and values of which threaten to turn North America into a gigantic garbage heap.

To turn the tide, even in Saskatchewan, will require the combined efforts of individuals, organizations and Governments on a scale approaching a modern day crusade.

A New Democratic Government pledges to provide the kind of leadership in this crusade which its CCF predecessors provided in achieving public hospital and medicare plans.

As a start, a New Democratic Government will establish a new Government Department to have overall responsibility for pollution control and maintenance of the quality of the environment.

Secondly it will provide financial assistance to agricultural producers and fishermen where controls result in increased costs or lower yields. That is, if we say that a farmer can't use a particular spray and that if it means a reduced yield for that farmer, we may have to compensate him for not using the spray.

Thirdly, a New Democratic Government will require that all industrial developments as well as new chemical and technological innovations be evaluated for their effects on the ecology before their introduction. It is too late to control it afterwards.

Fourthly, we would set up a monitoring system to measure and report changes in environmental conditions and provide early warning of potential problems in air, water and soil pollution. This is what I was hoping to see in the Throne Speech, some indication of a serious attack on the problem.

Fifthly, if and when we become the Government, we will establish and strictly enforce firm standards of permissible levels of industrial and domestic pollution.

SOME HON. MEMBERS: Hear, hear!

MR. KWASNICA: — Sixthly, we should immediately ban the use of non-returnable bottles and cans for beverages.

Seventh, we will engage in an educational campaign dealing with pollution and its relation to the profit system, because we feel the public ought to be informed about issues of this kind.

Finally we will regulate and control the disposal of pollutants by potash mines and other industrial concerns which adversely affect the rural community. This is a program I was looking for in the Throne Speech — it wasn't there, Mr. Speaker, nor anything close to it.

SOME HON. MEMBERS: Hear, hear!

MR. KWASNICA: — And even if it was there and implemented by that Government I doubt if we could see much action because they have legislation of all kinds now, which they haven't been using.

I was disappointed, Mr. Speaker, that the policies put forth for agriculture failed to come to grips with the basic problems of the farmers — slow grain sales, high cost of land and interest rates, high cost of machinery — a provincial government could have easily done something about the high cost of machinery.

An expensive Royal Commission, the Barber Commission, has confirmed what most farmers know, farm machinery is unduly expensive. And what did the Liberals do about this situation when the Barber Commission Report came out? Well, Mr. Speaker, you remember very well last session, a Liberal Member introduced a resolution to set up a committee to investigate the Barber Commission Report to see if the Barber Commission Report was right and then that committee would decide on what action to take. How utterly ridiculous! That resolution was designed primarily for show and pantomime, flashy show, that is all, to hoodwink the farmers into thinking that the Liberals would do something about the high cost of machinery. What a farce!

Mr. Speaker, in addition to the fact that farm machinery is unduly expensive, we believe that in some instances farm machinery is inefficient, of poor quality and not necessarily suited to prairie conditions. We also feel that the implement industry suffers from poor distribution. Spare parts have become an unreasonably expensive business racket designed to support planned obsolescence. In plain words, farm machine companies plan their machines to become obsolete in a few short years by making it ridiculously expensive and almost impossible to get spare parts. They force the farmer into buying a newer machine, therefore the farmer goes deeper in debt. And that is the machine policy that the Liberals are supporting in the province today — planned obsolescence, tremendous high costs.

In short, the interests of the American-dominated farm machine industry are incompatible with those of prairie farmers. The needs of our farmers are diametrically opposed to the interests of the other. The farmer only wants quality and service at reasonable prices, but all the machine company wants is profits. And let no one say that the farm implement dealers are to blame for this situation. I don't want the Hon. Minister of Agriculture (Mr. McFarlane) to go blaring again that we are going to do something that we never said we would do.

No one is blaming the farm implement dealers in the province. They are businessmen run by huge corporations and often they bear the brunt of criticism. After all, some 65 went out of business in Saskatchewan last year. But the farm implement corporations are still doing fine. It didn't hurt them at all.

To help the situation, Mr. Speaker, I propose that the Government establish a farm implement board which would have several functions to give the farmer a fair deal. This farm implement board would operate a farm machinery testing program similar to that provided by the Machinery Testing Administration set up by the previous CCF Government.

SOME HON. MEMBERS: Hear, hear!

MR. KWASNICA: — I want to inform the Minister who thinks this is some kind a state controlled thing. Maybe we need a little more control in this regard. Many farmers in my riding and across the province, I am sure, were extremely pleased with the information they got about new models of farm machinery and their performance records from the Agriculture Machinery Administration set up back in 1961 or thereabouts and which you did away with as soon as you got into power. That is how you care about the quality of farm machinery for the farmers. This farm implement board would regulate distribution of machinery, the sale and the servicing of farm machinery in the province. Laws would be passed, for example, to protect farmers from poor distribution of vital parts and service. It would be illegal to sell a farm implement without proper service.

AN HON. MEMBER: — What's wrong with that?

MR. KWASNICA: — Do you think the farmers of Saskatchewan are going to buy that? We will see. Let them decide.

A New Democratic government would provide for government guaranteed low-interest rate loans over a period of five years for the purchase of farm implements. That's a program we have for the people of Saskatchewan. This is a new deal for Saskatchewan people.

SOME HON. MEMBERS: Hear, hear!

MR. KWASNICA: — Mr. Speaker, I didn't see such progressive ideas anywhere in the Throne Speech. No ideas about farm machinery at all. Nothing at all. One of the major costs to the farmer is farm machinery — and the Minister of Agriculture (Mr. McFarlane) sits there smugly and says, "Socialism."

SOME HON. MEMBERS: Hear, hear!

MR. KWASNICA: — Mr. Speaker, what I feel that the farmers of the prairies would really like to see is a prairie based farm implement manufacturing industry. We could set one up in one of the three prairie provinces. This company could be a co-operative, could be government owned, could be partly a mixture of the two and it could be geared to providing farmers with suitable and reliable farm implements at reasonable prices. Perhaps the three prairie provinces could work together on the scheme. We talk about prairie unity and prairie co-operation. Perhaps the three prairie provinces could work together on a locally based implement industry. I'm sure our farmers would welcome the presence of the manufacturer right here on the prairies. It would use our raw materials and could provide hundreds of jobs for Saskatchewan people. This is the new deal.

And, Mr. Speaker, this same farm implement board could also import machinery at the best buy from foreign manufacturers as well. It could also provide assistance to any local farm implement makers in the province at the present time, thus gradually building up a completely prairie based farm implement industry. A farm implement industry that would be free from high tariffs and free from high freight rates. I am confident that with the proper management and direction this plan could greatly reduce the cost of farm machinery to farmers in Saskatchewan.

Mr. Speaker, throughout the Throne Speech statements on education I found that procrastination and a little bit of trickery are the key characteristics. Only a Liberal Government could come up with so many deceptions. The Minister of Education (Mr. McIsaac) who, I am sorry to say, is not in his seat, spoke earlier this evening and again reiterated his usual old type of program. He supported his teacher-pupil ratio increases and he says that they are saving millions of dollars. I want to recommend to Members opposite that maybe they are saving millions on the balance sheet but really in human values you are losing triple what you save.

Let me explain, because it seems to me that the Liberal Party has lost sight of human values. I mean, Mr. Speaker, when you put two more students in the classroom that it just adds to the burden of communication between the teacher and the pupil and you lose more of the personal communication between teachers and students. A teacher hasn't the time because numbers are just too great. A teacher handles 250 students in a semester. How can he possibly communicate with those 250 students about their problems, about the way things are going these days? And really the way things are going these days students are in real difficulty grappling with the hard realities of life. The family unit doesn't have time to talk to them because it is a part of today's high-pressure, fast-buck society. So the students are left on their own, they don't get advice from the school, they aren't given time at home, so what do many of them do? They turn to drugs to escape realism. The drop-out rate too is high because you keep packing in more students into the classrooms. Mental and social problems are rising among our teenagers. You want to take a look at that and yet the Government by jacking up the ratio by one student probably causes two or more students per classroom either to drop out or to 'freak' out. So, Mr. Speaker, you gain absolutely nothing. You gain on the balance sheet, you lose in human values.

I am very sorry that the Minister of Welfare (Mr. MacDonald), who should have a little concern about human values seems to have missed the point by miles.

Mr. Speaker, in talking to school trustees in my riding, they are telling me and they are telling me very forcefully, that as far as they are concerned pupil-teacher ratios have been jacked up far enough, centralization has gone far enough, and they tell me that this has got to stop. They say that they have had their bellies full of increased ratios and closing of their schools. It has gone far enough.

The Minister, who was not here, earlier also made glowing reference to legislation that he had brought in, making it mandatory that school boards provide some type of education for the mentally handicapped. Well really, in 1969 we on this side of the House presented a resolution, a major resolution, asking for just such legislation making it mandatory to provide

facilities but what did they do at that time, the Members opposite not two years ago? They laughed at it. They said, how can you do it? How can you bring in legislation making it mandatory when you haven't got the facilities. Two years later they got the facilities, they got the teachers, all of a sudden. At any rate they voted against the resolution, they amended it to such an extent you couldn't even recognize it and patted themselves on the back for all they had done. Well, all I can say, Mr. Speaker, I am glad that the Government opposite has finally taken that step and I must commend them for it.

The Minister also mentioned driver education and he keeps doing this year after year and says it is just tremendous what they have done. As if they, the Government opposite implemented that program. Absolute nonsense. Driver education was implemented as a program back in 1958 under the CCF administration. At that time it was under a different set-up. It was a new program under the supervision of the Saskatchewan Safety Council in conjunction with grants from the Saskatchewan Government Insurance. Now this Government boasts about a program that it has started. When we were the government the fee that was chargeable for in-car training was about \$8. All the Liberals have done is jack that up to \$20, and now it is almost out of reach of a good many students to get that training, but it brags about the program. All they have really done is jack up the rates and transfer the program from the Saskatchewan Safety Council to the Department of Education and always saying what a wonderful job they did. All we have now is more red tape and increased fees. Big deal! At any rate I must say I am glad that the Government didn't stop that wonderful program because it has been a wonderful thing for the students in the province.

The Minister says, too, grants will be increased and mill rates are going down, but as usual all of a sudden we hear that North Battleford predicts a seven mill increase and Regina about five mills, so there is not much point of talking about mill rates with this Government they just don't seem to understand. They keep singing the same old tune while the mill rates keep going up.

Regarding the teachers and The Salary Agreements Act, I could say a word on that. The Minister is suggesting amendments to provide for additional means of submitting disputes to arbitration under the present Act. It is just beyond me to see how arbitration is going to facilitate the negotiations. If you want arbitration you might as well call in a dictator and save time. That's what you get and that's what happens and yet this Government keeps moving in that direction. Give them more arbitration, sock it to them. Surely Members opposite realize that conciliation and mediation go much further to produce effective results than force and arbitration, particularly when arbitrators appointed bring in entirely new clauses not even asked for by either side as was the case in the Estevan area arbitration. All of a sudden a brand new clause comes out of the blue that neither side asked for and it's in the arbitration. What a farce! And this is negotiation?

It's high time this Government removed political interference from the bargaining process at any level. I assure the people of Saskatchewan that if we become the Government any changes made to the present Act will stress conciliation and mediation free from political interference.

Now the Bursary program mentioned in the Throne Speech.

Bursary program, well I just better hold that word back, it's not a program as yet. It's typical of a standstill Liberal Government, the last two years have been tough ones for university students. Student councils for the past two years have presented briefs to the Government and to us in the Opposition stating their case plainly and emphatically. In the summer of 1969 about one-third of the university students could not find work — the costs for one year of university, \$1,700 deters hundreds of students from low income families. Student loans are too restrictive and leave the graduate with an awesome debt hanging over his head.

So what does this Government do in three years after the needs are well known? It will make the fantastic innovation — a special committee on scholarships and bursaries will be established to make recommendations on all bursaries paid by the Provincial Government or the University. Fantastic innovation, a committee to be set up to investigate to see what is needed. So, Mr. Speaker, what are we going to get? We are going to get a long list of bursaries already paid and it may not be all that long, it might be very short. It may only take them an hour to figure them out. We'll see that the present schemes are totally inadequate and then we'll see the recommendations shelved as usual by the Liberal Government. But the university students should not be alarmed, there will be students on the committee who can again give their views on bursaries as they already did two years ago.

Mr. Speaker, the need for a bursary scheme has been proven without a doubt. If we were the Government, we should have had a bursary scheme five years ago, an extended one, along with more student loans with higher maximums because we on this side of the House feel that education is of prime importance. We made our proposals on a bursary scheme to the Government during the last session. All that we need now is just some financial allotment from the Provincial Treasurer (Mr. Steuart) and a few basic criteria set up and the scheme could go into effect immediately.

Mr. Speaker, the Throne Speech gives conclusive proof that the Department of Education under the Education Minister is continuing its dictatorial fashion, eroding local decision making and quashing involvement of parents, teachers, students and school boards in deciding what their priorities should be.

Once again, the Department will thoroughly examine school budgets and exercise firm controls. Once again methods for arbitration will be rammed down the throats of negotiators. Once again, boards are being told, and I have this information very recently, how many teachers to cut and how many classrooms will have to close. But here is where the greatest trickery is exercised. Now the Government is really trying to pull the wool over people's eyes. On one hand they have been dictating that schools close by instituting the ratio, on the other hand in this Throne Speech the Minister of Education (Mr. McIsaac) suggests that legislation is being prepared to require the concurrence of the Department of Education where a board proposes to close a school offering instruction in lower grades. Imagine that? The Minister is now trying to suggest that local school boards have been closing schools. Absolute nonsense, the school boards have not been closing schools by their own wishes, the Minister of Education has been closing them with his arbitrary ratios, left and right, over 150 last year and some

more this year, and they are trying to get the public to blame their own school boards. I don't think the public will buy that, Mr. Speaker.

Mr. Speaker, the Throne Speech makes mention of a measure to adjust the existing superannuation for teachers who retired prior to April 1963. Well, I am glad that that is being done. Really this is just a routine measure that has to be done to keep up with the escalating cost of living. The teachers of Saskatchewan have been asking for this adjustment for several years now but there has been no action by the Minister. Procrastination has been the name of the game here. But this year he has consented to increase teacher's pensions. I wonder why this is? Could it be, Mr. Minister, that you are using this as election bait? Mr. Speaker, he just admitted it.

Well, I sincerely hope that the generosity of provincial Liberals is a little more evident than the federal Liberals who gave our old age pensions a measly 42 cents a month. I hope that they will do a little better than that.

Well, Mr. Speaker, as you can plainly see from my comments that since the Throne Speech lacks substantial principles and fails to meet the needs of Saskatchewan people, I will not be supporting this feeble document but I will support the amendment as moved by the Hon. Allan Blakeney.

SOME HON. MEMBERS: Hear, hear!

HON. D.G. STEUART (Provincial Treasurer): — Mr. Speaker, I listened to some of that speech and every time I hear the Hon. Member from Cutknife speak I am impressed that we have done the wrong thing by increasing the student-teacher ratio. We have done the wrong thing, because when you have teachers like he is you should reduce it, one to one and even that is one too many because he just spreads his ignorance.

It is always very interesting to hear the sanctimonious people on the other side talk about pollution because I well remember when I was mayor in Prince Albert, we were having so much trouble with the water that we had to deliver it from street to street and house to house. What was the answer, you remember the government then, Mr. Member from The Battlefords (Mr. Kramer) and I see you have put some questions on the Order Paper. Why didn't you have the intestinal fortitude to put some questions on the Order Paper back in those days when you were the Government. I remember Mr. Tommy Douglas' comment when the water was so stinking rotten, this is a fact, you just listen to it young man, it was so bad Tommy Douglas' comment was, "If you go to Prince Albert take two baths, if you are going to be there more than two days, the water is so bad." That was his answer. We couldn't even get anybody from the Provincial Government to go to Edmonton to see if Edmonton was polluting the water or to talk to the Alberta Government. They just sat here and said there is nothing we can do. They are so sanctimonious — the Member from The Battlefords sees the need to rise — maybe he is leaving for home early, it's a long walk. So, Mr. Speaker, this death-bed repentance about pollution! I shall talk about pollution tomorrow. The Hon. Minister will talk about pollution and we shall put on the records of this House the fact that we have done more in the last two or three years

February 23, 1971

on pollution than they did in 20 years and we are one of the leading provinces. Mr. Speaker, I am going to have more to say tomorrow. I beg leave to adjourn debate.

Debate adjourned.

The Assembly adjourned at 9:30 o'clock p.m.