

LEGISLATIVE ASSEMBLY OF SASKATCHEWAN
First Session — Seventeenth Legislature
4th Day

Monday, August 2, 1971.

The Assembly met at 10:00 o'clock a.m.
On the Orders of the Day.

QUESTIONS

Seating of Elected Members

Mr. D.G. Stuart (Leader of the Opposition): — Mr. Speaker, before the Orders of the Day may I ask the Premier if he intends to introduce a Bill to allow for the seating today or tomorrow for the Members for Athabasca and Gravelbourg. I understand both of the Members were declared elected election night in the final count and have now had their recounts and in both cases the judge has declared them the winner.

Hon. A.E. Blakeney (Premier): — Mr. Speaker, the Government is still considering this matter. We want to know among other things whether it is likely that there will be appeals to the recounts as there was not in the case of the Member for Prince Albert West.

Mr. Stuart: — A supplementary question. May I ask the Premier, I am sure he could find this out today. I can give him a statement right now on behalf of the Opposition that we will not be appealing in Gravelbourg recount. I am sure that he could ascertain quickly today or very early today whether they intend to appeal in the case of Athabasca. As a result could we have a statement maybe early this afternoon, because frankly then we should like to introduce a Bill to do the same thing, we would much sooner the Government do it of course because that would indicate they intend to support it. Could we know today?

Mr. Blakeney: — Mr. Speaker, I shall attempt to ascertain that later today. It will be decided in our case by the candidate in Athabasca and his constituency organization and I cannot speak for them without consulting them.

Choiceland Iron Mine Feasibility Study

Mr. Stuart: — Has the Premier laid on the table the feasibility study, or is he prepared to do it now, in the case of the Choiceland Mine?

Mr. Blakeney: — I have not, it was an oversight, not exactly an oversight, but inability to command any Xeroxing facilities today because the public servants aren't here. We will certainly do that tomorrow at the latest.

Changes in the 1971 Highway Program

Mr. D. Boldt (Rosthern): — Mr. Speaker, the other day I asked the Premier — the Minister of Highways was not in — whether he would elaborate on the number of changes that were made in the highway program, since you took office. He made a statement that there would be some changes made. Could we have the changes?

Hon. N.E. Byers (Minister of Highways): — Mr. Speaker, I do not have with me a full statement of the very minor revisions that were made in the 1971 highway program, nor do I have at hand a list of the extra items that were included in the program and contracts awarded prior to June 24. I shall be willing to give the Member a resume of that tomorrow when I have had more time to look up material.

Souris Valley Extended Care Hospital

Mr. G.B. Grant (Regina Whitmore Park): — Mr. Speaker, I wonder if the Minister of Health (Mr. Smishek) could supply us with the answer to the question I directed to him on Friday?

Hon. W.E. Smishek (Minister of Health): — Mr. Speaker, in respect of the Souris Valley Level IV Care. The answer there, Mr. Speaker, is that there will be about 350 patients initially and hopefully the place will open on November 1. Initially it will take care of the patients that are now in hospital, there may be some exchange between the nursing homes and the Souris Valley Extended Care Unit, but for the time being it will primarily be taking care of the patients who are in the mental hospital, but eventually it will accommodate additional patients.

Mr. Grant: — The question was: how many new patients will be admitted in 1971-72? The Minister had indicated that the hospital would shortly be open to receive patients from Southeastern Saskatchewan. I gather that in 1971-72 there will be no new patients, that is none to speak of.

Mr. Smishek: — Mr. Speaker, there may be some new patients but not very many.

Leave Requested for Introduction of a Bill Respecting Certain Elections in the Constituency of Athabasca and Gravelbourg

Mr. Steuart: — Mr. Speaker, I wonder if I with consent of the House we could revert for a moment to the Introduction of Bills. Before you ask, I will explain what I have in mind so the House can judge — I realize we have gone past that item but I knew we were going past — I wanted to ask the Premier under the Orders of the Day what were the intentions of the Government in regard to Athabasca and Gravelbourg elected Members. I want permission to revert to the Introduction of Bills or notices of

Motion whichever is the appropriate item on the agenda. I wish to ask the Assembly for unanimous consent to move an Act respecting certain elections in the constituency of Athabasca and Gravelbourg, with this thought in mind. If the Government decides later this day that they will facilitate a Bill, then the Bill has already started through the machinery and I don't think it really matters whether we introduce it or the Government introduces it if we both agree with it. Obviously if the Government doesn't agree . . .

Mr. Speaker, I would ask the Assembly for unanimous consent to move:

An Act respecting Certain Elections in the constituency of Athabasca and Gravelbourg.

Motion negatived.

Mr. Speaker: — Leave is rejected, it will have to be tabled as notice.

Mr. Steuart: — Was leave rejected, I was . . .

Mr. Speaker: — Yes, leave was rejected. If when leave is asked one Member or more says 'No' well that means leave is not granted for the special notice.

Mr. Steuart: — I didn't hear, I . . .

Mr. Speaker: — There were at least two 'No's' that I heard.

Mr. Steuart: — Can we have a vote on that or is that just . . .

An Hon. Member: — No.

Mr. Steuart: — You don't make the decisions.

Mr. Speaker: — Order! When the Speaker asks: is leave granted? It only takes one Member to say 'No', and I heard at least two 'No's.' I did try to count them, but I know there were at least two, so I have to declare that leave was refused.

Mr. Steuart: — I give notice that I will on Wednesday next move for leave to introduce an Act respecting certain Elections in the constituency of Athabasca and Gravelbourg.

I resent very, very much that they refuse permission to facilitate this legislation.

STATEMENT

Athabasca Pulp Mill Project

Hon. A.E. Blakeney (Premier): — Before the Orders of the Day I have a statement. I apologize to the House, it is a rather lengthy statement, but it is a matter of importance. I want to make it before it is made public.

August 2, 1971

Mr. Speaker, I want to announce today that I advised Mr. Karl Landegger by telephone and in writing that the Government will not proceed with the Athabasca Pulp Mill Project.

Some Hon. Members:— Hear, hear!

Mr. Romanow: — We won an election on that!

Mr. Speaker: — Order, the Premier has the floor!

Mr. Blakeney: — I had hoped to deliver this decision to the President of Parsons and Whittemore in person, but Mr. Landegger was confined to his bed and unable to make the trip to Regina. Instead, I met with Mr. Joseph Condon, vice-president of the firm and spoke to Mr. Landegger by telephone.

My letter to Mr. Landegger states in part:

It is my wish that immediate steps be taken to determine the expenditures or obligations that may have been made or incurred to date in connection with the project and that no further obligations be incurred or expenditures made in respect thereof.

Still continuing the quote:

I have arranged for representatives of the Government to meet, without prejudice, with you or your representatives for the purpose of determining the expenditures made or obligations incurred in respect of the project to date and for the purpose of discussing such proposals as may be made to finalize the matter.

Still continuing the quote:

It is my view that immediate steps should be taken to this end. Accordingly, I have instructed Mr. David Dombowsky, Deputy Provincial Treasurer, to be prepared to meet with you or your authorized representatives from or after 1:30 p.m. on the afternoon of August 2, 1971, and thereafter to such extent as may be necessary or convenient for this purpose.

Finally, Mr. Speaker, the letter states that unless this issue can be satisfactorily settled at a reasonably early date, it would be the Government's intention to introduce legislation to deal with the matter.

Mr. Speaker, I should now like to comment on the financing of this project. Athabasca Forest Industries has issued and sold in Canada debentures in the amount of \$35 million maturing on June 15, 1991. These debentures are unconditionally guaranteed by the Province of Saskatchewan.

Under the terms of the debenture indenture, Athabasca Forest Industries Limited may redeem the debentures at par if the proceeds from the debentures have not been drawn down from the project fund by June 15, 1972. Since this project will not proceed, no funds will be paid out of the project fund by June 15, 1972, and therefore the debentures should be redeemed by the company forthwith thereafter, along with accrued interest.

If the Company should in any way default on its obligations with respect to this issue, the Province will make good its guarantee. During the period before formal redemption takes place, the Province is prepared to purchase such debentures offered by holders at a price not less than par value.

In addition to the financing in Canada, Athabasca Forest Industries has been negotiating in the United States the private placement of \$72 million in promissory notes to be guaranteed unconditionally by the Province of Saskatchewan provided the terms thereof are satisfactory to the Province. Finalization of this financing on terms satisfactory to the Government has not been reached as at this date.

Mr. Speaker, I want to make it clear today that the Government is not prepared to proceed further with this financing.

It is my belief that the decision not to proceed with the project will come as no surprise to the people of this province.

In a pre-election statement, I indicated that a government led by me would not be bound by any arrangements made between the previous Liberal Government and Karl Landegger, president of Parsons and Whittemore. Subsequent to the election, I have had a number of meetings, the first with Mr. Landegger and the remainder with his officials. I regret that his business commitments in France and his subsequent illness prevented me from having further personal meetings with him.

My objections to the project arise mainly from my concern over the financial risk, pollution control and forest management.

There are many factors which have to be considered in addition to the normal risks associated with a project of this size. The pulp industry is presently built to over-capacity. This, coupled with the decline in the market due to a cutback in orders from major purchasers, has resulted in a drop in prices and very serious financial problems for the industry. Here in Saskatchewan a pulp producer has also to contend with freight rate inequities and many pollution unknowns.

If the project were to fail, for whatever reason, our Government would have to find at least \$149 million. This includes \$107 million of guaranteed debt as well as other provincial commitments. A loss of this magnitude would sorely stretch the Province's ability to raise money for other worthwhile projects and would jeopardize the Province's existing programs.

Parsons and Whittemore was prepared to increase the Province's share of equity in Athabasca. While this makes it possible for the Province eventually to benefit to a greater extent if the project succeeded, the Parsons and Whittemore proposal does not reduce the risk; indeed, it increases the Province's financial exposure.

As far as pollution control is concerned, my Government is not satisfied that sufficient studies have been done to conclude that effluent can be controlled or controlled within a dollar value which would not jeopardize the economics of the mill.

The mill, one of the largest in North America was to be

located on the confluence of the Beaver and Dore Rivers. This is a very small river system and the problems of assimilation of effluent would, therefore, be compounded. This river system flows through Lac Ile a La Crosse and into the Churchill River system. Any uncertainty or miscalculation as to the design or operation of the system could cause immeasurable and irreparable damage to one of Western Canada's greatest river systems or, alternatively, could mean that the mill while constructed, might never be operated.

The Van Luven Report, a study on requirements for effluent treatment at the mill, concluded that much more study was required to settle satisfactorily whether pollution could be controlled, by what means and at what cost. Officials of the Saskatchewan Water Resources Commission and the Federal Department of the Environment indicated that the following major studies would have to be undertaken before it could be determined with assurance whether or not pollution of the waters involved could be kept to an acceptable level. The studies are four-fold, namely: (1) a study of the assimilative capacities of the water systems in the area and alternative means of providing for the required pollution control; (2) a study of the hydrological characteristics of the water systems involved to ensure that sufficient water supplies are available for the control of pollution in mill effluent as well as for the mill itself; (3) a study of existing fish and aquatic life in the rivers in the area so as to be able to predict likely effects of the operation of the mill on them and to propose methods of controlling these effects; (4) the study of the effects of the operation of the mill and of the forest operations on the general environment, for example, wildlife, forest resources, soil erosion, groundwater, etc., so as to minimize the impact of the harvest operation on these environmental aspects.

The Company felt that many of the answers to these questions could be obtained by intensive and immediate studies. My feeling is that with so much at stake, we cannot gamble that the studies would produce sufficient information within the time available to the Company to proceed with the project. We cannot gamble that these studies would produce this information so as to enable the Government to make a reasoned decision. The problem is that the economics of the mill are predicated on an immediate construction start and there is no way of getting this information immediately.

Forest management is also of great concern to the Government. Regeneration is known to be a problem in Saskatchewan forests due to long winters and scanty rainfall. As well, the Government is concerned that clear cutting of the type followed in Prince Albert and contemplated for Athabasca will make regeneration of certain species difficult. The Government is also concerned that the forest management practices which would have to be implemented in order to preserve hunting, fishing and environment generally, would make the harvesting of wood uneconomic.

While the matters referred to above are not all of those considered, they are the main matters reviewed by my colleagues and me in arriving at our decision. After considering all relevant factors, we have reached the conclusion that it is not in the public interest to proceed with the Athabasca Pulp Mill project on the terms contained in the original documents or on any terms which it appeared possible to negotiate with the Parsons and Whittemore sponsoring group.

Accordingly, Mr. Speaker, the project will not proceed.

Some Hon. Members:— Hear, hear!

Mr. D.G. Stuart (Leader of the Opposition): — Mr. Speaker, may I on behalf of the Opposition make a short comment on the Premier's statement? I am disappointed, I am not surprised, but I am disappointed. I am disappointed on behalf of the people of this province and especially the people of Northern Saskatchewan. This to me is another clear cut victory for the Wafflers and the radical element in your party.

Some Hon. Members:— Hear, hear!

Mr. Stuart: — You can laugh, but those birds will have you laughing out the other side of your mouth, they are having it right now.

It is very significant that this decision was taken after they had their famous meeting out in Qu'Appelle over the weekend. Again the string has been jerked and little Allan has jumped. Okay, I say that this is a defeat, victory for the Wafflers, it is a defeat for the unemployed, it is a defeat for the union movement, who wanted this program, who wanted this to go ahead, I know they wanted it to go ahead. If you answered the truth that you would know and you would admit in this House that a great many people in the union movement knowing there were a 1,000 union jobs just around the corner, at this particular project, were putting pressure on to go ahead with this. It is also defeat for the people of Northern Saskatchewan, the Indian and Metis, because no matter how much you talk, how much you say, the Indian and Metis would have received hundreds and hundreds of jobs in that mill, in the townsite and . . .

Some Hon. Members:— Hear, hear!

Mr. Stuart: — . . . just as they have in the Prince Albert area, where over 30 per cent of the people employed have been Indian and Metis and still will be. Mr. Speaker, every objection that the Premier brought forward might have been covered, I don't say could have been, but I say might have been covered, and again similar to the case of the iron mine I say he rushed into it to please his radical followers and he should have taken more time.

I am confident that the reforestation practices would not, as they are not doing in Prince Albert, jeopardize the future of that great forest up there, in fact it would have been improved. I am confident that proper pollution control methods within economic limits that would have still made this mill viable, could have been developed. I know that Van Luven took a more pessimistic view than some others, although he said it could have been done. That is one reason we brought in Sandwell Consultants who have far more experience, more experience probably than any other consultants in the world — and they are Canadians — in the development of effluent control and pollution control in pulp mills in northern Canada, and they were as confident that it could have been done. Granted there needed to be more studies. But, again, I think that the Government in view of the desperate need for industry and jobs, especially in Northern Saskatchewan, were ill-advised to cancel this.

This should have been at least carried on for another month or two and I think they would have had a great many more answers than they have today. Then if they found that they could not go on with it, then of course I don't question for one minute that it is the privilege of the Government to cancel this.

I don't for one minute question that the Premier did when he was the Leader of the Opposition and in the campaigning point out that if he was elected it could well be that he would cancel it. He warned everyone concerned. This is one reason in fact the major reason, why we would not allow any drawdowns and some drawdowns were asked for, because while we had signed the contract and we had gone ahead, I recognized at the time that if we went too far down the road and the Government was defeated — as it was — and your Government was elected, and you decided — which you have the right to do, not to proceed with this and we didn't want this to be any more complicated or complex than it is today. Because when the Government withdraws from this, I hope that they will recognize the legitimate expenditures and costs to Parsons and Whittemore. No more than the legitimate, but certain the legitimate. I hope, and I ask the Premier to answer this question, I hope they will not follow through with the rest of the demands by the Wafflers and throw these people out without any compensation at all.

I expect that they won't pay them one cent more than they have coming. But I also expect that they will give them reasonable compensation because we don't want to damage, any more than we have damaged now, the credibility and the credit, both financial and the credit of people making deals with the Government of Saskatchewan by summarily dismissing these people and saying, 'we don't care what you spent. We don't care what trouble you have gone to. We don't care what your out-of-pocket costs are. You are out.' If we can't come to some agreement we shall bring in legislation, of course. We all recognize in the final analysis that the Government has the power to pass an Act to kick these people out and give not a five-cent piece and I am sure there is nothing they could do about it. I hope, and I am confident, that the Government doesn't intend to act in this way, because these people are still a partner with the Government in the Prince Albert pulp mill. The Prince Albert pulp mill is a successful operation and I hope will continue to be.

The other things the Premier mentioned. The markets. Of course the markets were difficult. Who is to say they will not be difficult. Anyone who knows the pulp industry knows that it is a very unpredictable industry. But when this mill would come on stream three or three and one-half years from now, those in the pulp industry, many in the pulp industry, some of the leading people in the pulp industry, are confident that the market will grow to the extent that it will be able to absorb this output. And, in a sense, it certainly would have been one, if not the most efficient mill at that time in Canada or anywhere in the world. It would have had no difficulty, at least in our opinion, of disposing of this product because it would be efficiently produced and certainly it would have been one of the highest quality pulp anywhere in Canada.

I am bitterly disappointed they decided to arbitrarily cut this off. I think they should have had more studies. And as I say, I say today this is victory number two, three, or whatever number it is for the Wafflers and it is a crushing defeat for the unemployed who are looking toward some help from this

Government, or from anybody to provide them with jobs. Again, I ask Mr. Blakeney to stand in his place and say, now that they have dashed the hopes of hundreds and hundreds of people, what does he intend to replace it with? What in God's name is he prepared to do for the jobless, the unemployed and the under-employed in this province now that he has summarily kicked out the iron mine, the pelleting plant, the whole program of expansion here at the steel mill in Regina, and now that great complex of the pulp mill in Dore Lake?

Mr. D. Boldt (Rosthern): — Mr. Speaker, on a point of privilege. I find it extremely cold in this Chamber. Are the others the same or am I sick? I think that the Government can economize some other ways than by fuel.

Mr. Speaker: — Order, order!

ADJOURNED DEBATES

Address-in-Reply

The Assembly resumed the adjourned debate on the proposed motion of Mr. B. Dyck (Saskatoon City Park), and the amendment thereto by Mr. Steuart (Leader of the Opposition).

Hon. A.E. Blakeney (Premier): — Mr. Speaker, when I concluded my opening remarks on Friday, I said there would be a New Deal, a New Deal for many people in Saskatchewan, a New Deal for the unemployed, for working people generally, for the sick, for senior citizens — and a New Deal in resource development. And certainly, Mr. Speaker, there is need of a new deal. There is no need to outline the evidence for a new deal. The Opposition in its amendment makes this case for me.

Just one month to the day after our Government took office, the Opposition is critical because we have not done enough for our jobless citizens. Jobless citizens, Mr. Speaker. And there are jobless. There are jobless because Liberals deliberately created unemployment.

Some Hon. Members:— Hear, hear!

Mr. Blakeney: — There are jobless because after seven years of promises, seven years of resource giveaways, seven years of the taxpayers providing massive support for private enterprise. After all of these things there are more jobless today than there were in 1964.

Some Hon. Members:— Hear, hear!

Mr. Blakeney: — We have had seven years of applying every favorite nostrum dear to the hearts of the free enterpriser. We have seen unemployment rise and rise. And what's a complete answer to the Member for Milestone (Mr. MacDonald) is that we have seen thousands and thousands of our people leave our province in order to find a job.

Some Hon. Members:— Hear, hear!

Mr. Blakeney:—And after that record, Mr. Speaker, Members Opposite have the gall to come in here and be critical of us because this situation is not cleaned up after 30 days. But we are taking steps, Mr. Speaker, to make this province more attractive, more attractive for working people and more attractive for employers.

Our first step is going to be to remove this climate of fear and oppression, to restore free and honest bargaining. We, Mr. Speaker, have faith in free men bargaining freely.

As a start, Mr. Speaker, we will repeal The Essential Services Emergency Act, in its entirety. As I've said we are going to do this as a move to restore free collective bargaining in Saskatchewan. This is the first in a series of steps which will include rejuvenating the Department of Labour and ultimately the enactment of a new Trade Union Act. There will be new mediation and conciliation procedures, effective machinery and more highly capable personnel. My colleagues in this debate will be saying more. We are moving at this Session to shorten the hours of work, something we repeatedly called upon the previous government to do. Something which we have asked them to do. In seven years they did not change that legislation by one syllable.

I want to say, Mr. Speaker, now, that there will be no Liberal-style labor courts under this Government.

Some Hon. Members:— Hear, hear!

Mr. Blakeney:— I was most interested to hear last week, the Leader of the Opposition (Mr. Steuart) say that deterrent fees are a dead issue. I trust that he will also say that the Liberal-style labor courts are a dead issue . . .

Some Hon. Members:— Hear, hear!

Mr. Blakeney:— . . . because as they well know they certainly were a dead issue in the political campaign which ended June 23.

There will be announcements in the near future of other programs for working people. Mr. Speaker, I won't touch on them now. But let me assure you we intend to see that working people, like all others, enjoy first class citizenship and that their legitimate rights like the rights of others are fully and fairly protected.

Mr. Speaker, there is going to be a New Deal for the sick. There are still few Members of the Liberal Government of 1968 sitting in this House — not many, but a few — including the former Minister of Public Health (Mr. Grant). He will recall that when he introduced amendments to authorize these so-called utilization fees, I called them a tax on the sick. And they are that! A tax, and a flat tax. The fee is the same amount whether the patient makes \$4,000 a year or \$40,000 a year. And because it is a flat amount, regardless of ability to pay, that makes it a regressive tax.

That would be bad enough. But going to the doctor or to the hospital isn't like buying a fishing licence. You can't choose whether you are sick or not. And it has been shown time

and time again that people with low incomes have more health problems than those in the middle and in the higher income groups. Maybe sickness is why they have low incomes. I don't know, but the facts are perfectly clear. People with low income have more sickness than people with high income.

So this tax on the sick becomes regressive with a vengeance. A flat tax is regressive because it takes a greater proportion of a poor man's income than a rich man's. But when a tax is devised not only to take a greater proportion of a poor man's income, but also actually to take more dollars from a poor man who is a sick man, then here is a tax which can only be called viciously unacceptable.

Some Hon. Members:— Hear, hear!

Mr. Blakeney: — So we say, Mr. Speaker, that tax must go and deterrent fees must go, and I am glad to say they are gone effective yesterday.

So let's look at this tax from another point of view. How does it fall on different age groups? How does it fall on families of different size? Well by and large, big families have more difficulty making ends meet than do small ones. By and large, old people, retired people, live on more restricted incomes than those who are in the prime of their earning power.

I could produce documentation by the yard to support these statements, statements that on the average people of 70 and over have smaller incomes than people in their earlier years and prove that people with large families have it tougher to make ends meet than people with small families.

But I don't think anyone is going to dispute those facts. In short, older people and large families have little money to spare.

So let's look at the impact of deterrent fees on three families. I picked out a couple, each age 35, no children. I also picked a couple, each age 35, with five children — 1, 3, 5, 7, and 9 in ages. And then I have another couple who are 75 years of age, no dependent children at home. Now let's look at these three families. The 35-year-old childless couple, in an average year, will require about 11 medical services in something less than three hospital days. Now compare this with the same family, two people each 35 but who have five children. We find that this family uses, not 11, but 40 medical services a year, and not three but about 10 hospital days a year, just about three and one-half times as many services as our childless couple.

Now let's look at our elderly couple, each of them 75. We find that this couple uses not 11, but 32 medical visits a year. That is three times as many as the childless couple. We find that this couple uses not something between two and three hospital days in a year, but 16 hospital days a year. In fact they use six times as much hospital services as our childless couple of 35. On the average, then, the family with five small children will pay three and one-half times as much utilization fee as the childless couple. The elderly couple will pay three times as many medical utilization fees, and six times as many hospital utilization fees as the childless couple. All these figures are taken, Mr. Speaker, from the 1970 annual reports

of the Hospital and Medicare Plans.

From these figures, Mr. Speaker, the following can be drawn. He who defends deterrent fees, as Members opposite did, as a proper basis for financing medical and hospital care, must be prepared to say that a 75-year-old couple is three times, or six times as well able to pay taxes as a 35-year-old childless couple. He must be prepared to say that a 35-year-old couple with five children, is three and one-half times as well able to pay taxes as he would if he had no children.

The Government of 1968, some of whose Members are sitting opposite, wasn't prepared to say that out loud. But the Liberal Government wouldn't have saddled this Province with deterrent fees if they didn't believe in that philosophy.

Some Hon. Members:— Hear, hear!

Mr. Blakeney: — Unless they didn't believe — in fact they have stated — that they believed that the sick should help to pay for their own care. It is what the former Minister used to call, participating in the healing process.

Mr. G.B. Grant (Regina Whitmore Park): — Someone has to pay it.

Mr. Blakeney: — That, indeed, is correct, Mr. Speaker. Someone has to pay it and in our submission the people who should pay it are the people who are most able to pay and not the people who are sick and flat on their back.

Now we hear, Mr. Speaker, that deterrent fees are a dead issue. I am certainly pleased to hear that. But if that is true — and I say, if it is true — then it is only because that Liberal Government is a dead government.

Some Hon. Members:— Hear, hear!

Mr. Blakeney: — It is only because that Liberal Party was repudiated at the polls. It is only, Mr. Speaker, because the people of Saskatchewan spoke out in their wrath and said that they agree, they agreed with the New Democrats who have unswervingly opposed deterrent fees, not only in 1968, but with respect to the Hospital Plan from 1947 and with respect to the Medical Care Plan from 1962 and I want to point out to the Members opposite that from 1947 to 1957, this Province supported the Hospital Plan out of Provincial revenues without a dime from the Federal Government.

Some Hon. Members:— Hear, hear!

Mr. Blakeney: — And even during those years we didn't decide that we needed to apply deterrent fees. Let me make it clear, Mr. Speaker, that we don't view lightly the whole problem of rising costs of health care. This Government is very deeply concerned about that problem. We were, when we were in Opposition, and we are now concerned about it now in power. We believe we have the directions or know the directions in which some of the solutions lie. The Hon. Minister of Health (Mr. Smishek) will

be saying much more about that as time goes on. But we say, and we say unequivocally that taxing the sick is not the solution.

Some Hon. Members:— Hear, hear!

Mr. Blakeney: — Experience of the last three years has proved that beyond a shadow of a doubt. And even if deterrent fees had shown that they significantly lowered health costs — which they have not — this Government would still be taking action, still be taking action to repeal deterrent fees, because as I say, Mr. Speaker, deterrent fees are a vicious tax, are a regressive tax, an unfair tax, and that, Mr. Speaker, is why I say deterrent fees must go, and deterrent fees will go.

Some Hon. Members:— Hear, hear!

Mr. Blakeney: — Mr. Speaker, in our submission there should be a New Deal for senior citizens. Under the present Federal Government and under our former Provincial Government, both of the same political persuasion, older people had little enough to give them cheer and comfort. I believe, and all the people on this side of the House believe, that our pioneers have the right to retire in dignity, with some measure of freedom from anxiety and poverty. And to the extent of its powers, this Government intends to see that they have this right. We intend to give substance to a bill of rights for senior citizens — a new deal for those who have so much in the building of this Province.

Some Hon. Members:— Hear, hear!

Mr. Blakeney: — I've already referred to the heavy burden of deterrent fees on the elderly. With this Session we will remove that burden, but we're going a step further. In recognition of the limited resources of most retired people, we've introduced legislation to abolish medical and hospital premiums for every resident 65 years of age and over.

Some Hon. Members:— Hear, hear!

Mr. Blakeney: — Beginning on January 1st, 1972, every senior citizen will receive medical and hospital coverage free as a matter of right.

Liberals have expressed the view that this is too generous. They say that some people will be getting this help who don't need this help. They say it should be restricted only to those who get guaranteed income supplement. Let me make a few quick points.

If the Liberal Party wanted to help those who get guaranteed income supplement, it could have exempted those people from the tax seven years ago and it did nothing.

Some Hon. Members:— Hear, hear!

Mr. Blakeney: — If the Liberal Party wanted to do something for people who get guaranteed income supplement, it could have relieved them of deterrent fees and it did not.

Some Hon. Members:— Hear, hear!

Mr. Blakeney: — Thirdly, it suggests that somehow everybody who doesn't get guaranteed income supplement is comfortably well off. Well, let me just give you an example. If a person is, say 67 years old, gets a pension of \$150 a month — he's not eligible for guaranteed income supplement. In 1970 he would have paid income tax of \$7 or \$8 a month, so out of his \$142 a month he has to cover all his living expenses, and he had to cover deterrent fees and he had to cover his medicare and hospital tax. For such a person, a \$36 cash payment is a significant item. We make no apology — for our part, we're proud of the fact that we can give such people the help that they so richly deserve.

Some Hon. Members:— Hear, hear!

Mr. Blakeney: — We have moved quickly to implement our election pledges on deterrent fees and removing the medicare tax but we plan to do more. We've begun work on a prescription drug plan which will make drugs available at reduced prices. We're planning similar action with respect to hearing aids and eye glasses and dentures and braces. As soon as practicable we will extend hospital plan coverage for senior citizens to include nursing care in nursing homes in the manner outlined in detail during the campaign. These steps, we believe, will go a long way toward removing the economic barriers to good health and adequate care for our senior citizens.

Further, Mr. Speaker, we intend to fight in Ottawa, as the previous Government did not, to raise the Federal Old Age Pension. The present pension — sole support of many older people is a disgrace.

Some Hon. Members:— Hear, hear!

Mr. Blakeney: — And the most recent increase is the Old Age Security Pension — a handsome 42 cents a month — is shameful. We'll fight to change that.

Mr. Speaker, this Government has taken the first steps toward a new deal for senior citizens and during our first term of office, I want to promise this House — as I promised the people of Saskatchewan — that we will introduce for our senior citizens programs which will truly be a bill of rights for senior citizens.

Some Hon. Members:— Hear, hear!

Mr. Blakeney: — Mr. Speaker, I turn now to resource development.

As my announcement earlier this morning confirms, under this Government the people of Saskatchewan are going to have a New Deal in resource development. On Friday last, the Leader of the Opposition (Mr. Steuart) had quite a bit to say about the Athabasca Pulp Mill project, negotiated and launched by the former Liberal Government, and I'll return to deal with his remarks of last Friday in a moment.

But, first let me discuss some principles of forest resource development. Mr. Speaker, there can be no shred of a doubt in the mind of the Member for Prince Albert or in the minds of the Saskatchewan people where we stand on the development of our resources. We made that perfectly clear in policy statements during the last Legislature and during the recent election campaign. More particularly, on February 18, 1971, I stood in this House and laid out the criteria we would apply to the Athabasca deal or to any other pulp mill deal. Let me review them.

I said that, first of all, the deal must be financially prudent. (2) I said it mustn't permit huge promoters' profits out of construction contracts, management fees and the like. (3) I said it must be open and fully disclosed with all the fringe benefits and other benefits to the developers disclosed and costed with reasonable accuracy. (4) As I said, it must guarantee reasonable protection for subcontracts. (5) It must fully protect our forests, our waters and our air against pollution. (6) It must preserve our forests and our lakes as wildlife habitat and recreation areas. (7) It must provide reasonable compensation to small operators who have lost their livelihood because forest cutting rights have been signed over exclusively to the mill.

Do these criteria mean that we stand opposed to resource development? Of course not. Do they mean that we close the door to outside capital? Of course not. They are concerned with how we develop our resources and for whose benefit. They're concerned with long-term costs and benefits as well as short-term gains. We believe they're reasonable and I think the people of Saskatchewan indicated by their votes that they thought they were reasonable.

Some Hon. Members:— Hear, hear!

Mr. Blakeney: — So to further amplify our action in calling a halt to the Athabasca project under the existing arrangements, let's see how the deal of which the Leader of the Opposition is so proud, let's see how it measures up to these criteria.

Is it financially prudent? Before I assumed office, Mr. Speaker, and on the basis of the information disclosed by the former Government, I said it was not. Now that I've had an opportunity to examine the arrangements in detail, I am even more convinced that it's financially imprudent from the point of view of the people of Saskatchewan.

Some Hon. Members:— Hear, hear!

Mr. Blakeney: — The direct cost of the mill, excluding working capital, would have been about \$160 million. The whole project in total would be in the order of \$180 million. The Province would be required to guarantee unconditionally \$107 million in long-term debt. In addition, the Province would have been required to invest or guarantee directly or indirectly another \$42 million. This includes such things as a railway branch line, power lines, roads and the like. It means that nearly \$150 million is at risk by Saskatchewan to build and service \$170 million to \$180 million project. It's still difficult to determine the exact net risk to be taken by Parsons and Whittemore. A generous estimate is \$20 million. A more than generous estimate is

\$30 million. Let's say \$30 million and be more than generous and I can't see any way that Parsons and Whittemore could have had that exposure. \$150 million by the Province, \$30 million by Parsons and Whittemore, the developer. And what about the equity? Parsons and Whittemore would own 70 per cent of the equity, the Province, 30 per cent. If the mill were to fail, for whatever reason, the Province would lose \$150 million, the developer, at the outside, \$30 million. In all likelihood, much less. But if it flourished, the Province would get 30 per cent of the profits, the developer 70 per cent. Mr. Speaker, when I call a deal like that financially imprudent, I am using very moderate language.

Some Hon. Members:— Hear, hear!

Mr. Blakeney: — Now, my friends opposite will say, 'Well, of course you've got to take risks,' and I agree with them. But if the people of Saskatchewan are going to take the major share of the risk, they should get the major share of any benefits.

Some Hon. Members:— Hear, hear!

Mr. Blakeney: — Of course, Mr. Speaker, the Leader of the Opposition would find it sinful for the public to reap profits from their own resources, profits which he says should remain solely in the private domain. Ah, but he will say — and he said this morning — 'You haven't measured all the benefits. What about the jobs to be created?' And that's an important question, because we certainly need more jobs in Saskatchewan. So, let's look at jobs.

The Prince Albert mill, in the mill and in the forests, employs about 800 men. One might expect the Athabasca mill to employ many, many more but besides being a bigger mill, it's a much more sophisticated mill technologically. Consultants to the former Government estimated a work force of about the same as Prince Albert — 800. Let's say at best 1,000, but at the 800 figure an investment of \$150 million by the taxpayers of this province is an investment of \$200,000 to create every single job. This Government is convinced that by investing that money, by direct investment or by guarantee, that amount of money could be invested in more labor intensive industries and we can produce six, eight or ten times as many jobs.

Some Hon. Members:— Hear, hear!

Mr. Blakeney: — And let me say this, Mr. Speaker, when I say this I am not saying anything different than the Hon. Eric Kierans says when he is critical of the Federal Government policies. He says that we should be investing our money in labor intensive industries and not in large capital intensive resource exploiting industries.

When the Leader of the Opposition was talking about jobs on Friday, he tugged at our heartstrings about how the Athabasca project would produce jobs for Indian and Metis people of the North. And he talked again on other occasions, Mr. Speaker, about 30 per cent of the people in the Prince Albert mill being Indian and Metis. The way this is done is this: Mr. Speaker, it is well known and regrettable but a well-known fact that a good number of Indian and Metis people do not take to regular work,

regular nine to five work on a continuing basis and when they obtain employment, they occasionally do not stay for long. This means that they must be replaced. If you hire another Indian or Metis person, you have hired two. And if you have hired another one, you have hired three — you've only got one on the job at any one time but you've hired three — and on this type of mathematics, they will show that 30 per cent of the people who were hired were Indian and Metis. But at any one time, the people who are working in the Prince Albert mill, and the forest operations, are significantly less than 10 per cent Indian and Metis.

Some Hon. Members:— Hear, hear!

Mr. Blakeney: — Right now, how many Indian and Metis people are employed in the Prince Albert mill? Is it 400, or is it 300, or is it 200, or is it 100? In the mill and in the woods operation combined, there are no more than 80 Indian and Metis employed — less than 10 per cent of the work forces. \$150 million to produce 80 jobs for Indian and Metis people. Hardly a prudent risk, Mr. Speaker.

Furthermore, Mr. Speaker, the Indian people in Northern Saskatchewan don't want the pulp mill. Let me read you a resolution, a copy of which was sent to me on June 11.

Whereas the Chiefs and delegates of Black Lake, Montreal Lake, Patuanak, Fond du Lac, Red Earth, Shoal Lake and Peter Ballantyne strongly oppose the building and operation of any further pulp mills, particularly the proposed Dore Lake pulp mill at Meadow Lake because of the detrimental effects of pollution:

(1) The general accrued hazards it will inflect on the livelihood of the people plus all forms of plants and animals in the entire Churchill and Nelson drainage system. (2) Because of the dangers to hunting, game and waterfowl and trapping. (3) The contamination of water for human consumption. (4) The ruin of aesthetic surroundings. (5) the tourist industry; and (6) commercial fishing.

Be it resolved that the Federation of Saskatchewan Indians take the necessary strong action immediately to prevent any further planning for construction of this mill.

Mr. C.P. MacDonald (Milestone): — How did they vote on it?

Mr. Blakeney: — Moved by Chief Gilbert Bird of Montreal Lake and seconded by Chief Simon Linklater of Peter Ballantyne and carried unanimously.

Some Hon. Members:— Hear, hear!

Mr. Blakeney: — Mr. Speaker, I think that that makes it fairly clear the Montreal Lake Reserve is right in the area where the Prince Albert mill is harvesting timber, the Patuanak Reserve is right in the area, presumably where timber would be harvested for the Meadow Lake mill, yet these people decided that they didn't wish that mill. No, Mr. Speaker, no matter how thin you slice the

costs and how thick you slice the potential benefits it could not have been financially prudent, in fact, it would have been financially imprudent for this Government to continue the Athabasca project.

Now let's proceed to the second criterion, any deal must not permit huge promoter's profits out of construction contracts, management fees and the like. I can't tell you whether there would be unreasonable profits in the construction of the Athabasca project but I can tell you this, that the construction contract of \$117 million went to Parsons and Whittemore subsidiaries without tender, without competitive bid. The Financial Post stated that the profit on these contracts would range between \$10 and \$15 million. Management and sales contracts at about \$2 million a year, again went to Parsons and Whittemore. So, at least the potential for large profits on captive contracts was there and there by the very nature of the deal itself.

Some Hon. Members:— Hear, hear!

Mr. Blakeney: — The third criterion which I proposed was that there should be full disclosure of the deal before proceeding and that there should be disclosure of all of the attendant benefits flowing to the developers of the projects, all the hidden costs to the Department of Highways or the Power Corporation or the Department of Resources. Now these were never disclosed and so far as I am aware have never yet been effectively considered.

The fourth requirement was that the deal must provide reasonable protection for subcontractors. My only comment here is to note the litigation involved at Prince Albert. I did note that there were bonds proposed to deal with this and very possibly they would have been sufficient. I compliment the Members opposite for attending to that criterion.

No 5 is the key criterion. A development deal must fully protect against pollution. This the Parsons and Whittemore arrangements certainly did not. Consider this. Pulp mills are notorious polluters. Control of pulp mill pollution poses some of the most serious of all industrial pollution questions, both for industry and for the public. And here I am saying nothing that the Minister of Environment, the Hon. Jack Davis at Ottawa doesn't say. The Athabasca mill would have been situated on the Beaver River, part of a very small drainage system which ultimately flows into the Churchill. During the winter months the volume of effluent from the mill would have just about equalled the flow of the river. Just picture that, Mr. Speaker. Down stream from the mill, half water and half malodorous, black chemical pulp mill waste.

The Van Luven Report prepared for the Government and tabled last March, outlined requirements for effluent treatment at the mill and concluded, Mr. Speaker, that much more study was required to come up with a satisfactory effluent treatment method and determination of what the cost would be.

Some Hon. Members:— Hear, hear!

Mr. Blakeney: — Provincial and Federal pollution experts said at least four major studies had to be completed — and I outlined those in

my press statement — before there could be any reasonably clear idea of the pollution and environment problems. Yet the former Government, the remnants of which sit opposite, Mr. Speaker, was in such haste to announce the project for election purposes that they shoved aside the advice of their consultants, they shoved aside the advice of their officials, they ignored serious warnings and they signed on the dotted line.

Some Hon. Members:— Hear, hear!

Mr. Blakeney: — Mr. Speaker, the studies called for by the Van Luven Report had not been done and were not done between March and June and have not been done to this day.

Some Hon. Members:— Hear, hear!

An Hon. Member: — They were rushing into it.

Mr. Blakeney: — Mr. Speaker, this is the real problem. Long before the necessary studies could have been completed, the commitment to the mill would have been irrevocable. It is not unlikely that the people of Saskatchewan could have been faced with two options to solve the pollution problem. Either a \$180 million mill and railway line lying empty and silent or a continuing public subsidy of an elaborate and expensive effluent treatment operation as the price of having one of the largest pulp mills in North America.

Mr. Speaker, when the Government left office and even today no one can show you the design of the pollution control system which will meet all of the requirements of the law.

Some Hon. Members:— Hear, hear!

Mr. Blakeney: — We are told that this could be done, and of course, perhaps it could be done but we are also told that the economics of the mill are such that construction must start now or we lose a winter two years from now. There is no time we are assured for delaying commencing construction of the mill while these particular studies are proceeded with.

Mr. Steuart: — Did Parsons and Whittemore in their recent negotiations tell you they would not go ahead with it? Did you ask them, 'If we delay this for six months that they would not go ahead with it?' Did you ask them that?

Mr. Blakeney: — Mr. Speaker, I think that the negotiations with Parsons and Whittemore are not for public discussion here.

Some Hon. Members:— Hear, hear!

Mr. Steuart: — Hiding information. You are the ones who ask us to lay everything on the table.

Mr. Blakeney: — Mr. Speaker, I am sure . . .

Mr. Steuart: — Five weeks and he is hiding

things already.

Mr. Blakeney: — Mr. Speaker, I am sure the Member for Prince Albert West because of his close associations with a good number of the officials of Parsons and Whittemore has no difficulty in getting that information.

Some Hon. Members:— Hear, hear!

Mr. Steuart: — . . . withholding information upon which you based a decision to cancel this and you won't give this House the order.

Mr. Speaker: — Order!

Mr. Blakeney: — Mr. Speaker, do I have the floor?

Mr. Steuart: — Certainly you do.

Mr. Blakeney: — Thank you, Mr. Speaker.

Some Hon. Members:— Hear, hear!

Mr. Blakeney: — Mr. Speaker, I charge the former Government with shameful irresponsibility in attempting to commit the people of Saskatchewan to a deal with so many pollution uncertainties.

Some Hon. Members:— Hear, hear!

Mr. Blakeney: — Mr. Speaker, the facts are clear that they ignored their own consultants; they ignored their own staff and they ignored their Federal advisors and I want to say that again — they ignored their own consultants, Van Luven; they ignored their own advisors in the Saskatchewan Water Resources Commission and they ignored their Federal consultants.

Some Hon. Members:— Hear, hear!

Mr. Blakeney: — All for the sake, Mr. Speaker, of what they thought would be a favorable election issue and they made a massive miscalculation as is attested to by the number of Members who sit to your left, Mr. Speaker.

Some Hon. Members:— Hear, hear!

Mr. Blakeney: — Let me turn now, Mr. Speaker, to requirement No. 6 — any deal must preserve our forests and our lakes as wildlife habitat and as recreation areas. I have spoken before about the practice of clear cutting our forests, the method of tree harvesting in practice at Prince Albert and projected for Athabasca. It is doubtless the most economic way now known to harvest pulpwood. There is no doubt about that and that's its attraction. But I think people in this Province have seen the scars it leaves, the naked land, exposed to erosion, unable to provide cover for wildlife. Will the forests of northern Saskatchewan, given the scanty rainfall and long severe winters, regenerate and grow again? Some experts say, Yes, Yes. And some who are not experts say, Yes, Yes. But some say, No. But

the fact is that nobody knows for sure. The fact is that nobody knows for sure. Just let me say today that we are far from satisfied that the methods used at Prince Albert are consistent either with sound reforestation practices or with the preservation of wildlife and recreational resources.

Some Hon. Members:— Hear, hear!

Mr. Blakeney: — On this we are not dogmatic but we were and we remain unconvinced by any evidence offered.

Now the final criterion which I set forth was that any deal must provide reasonable compensation to small forest operators displaced by the mill. The Athabasca agreement totally ignored this question. What would have happened there we can see by observing what happened at Prince Albert, where scores of small forest businesses have simply been forced to cease operating. Scores. And he can find those himself or he could have found them and still can find them in the records of the Department of Natural Resources as small contractor after small contractor no longer has a contract.

Some Hon. Members:— Hear, hear!

Mr. Blakeney: — When one is assessing jobs created, one must deduct the jobs destroyed. And the granting of exclusive forest rights to a single, highly automated operation inevitably throws the independent operator out of work. So in this respect too, the Athabasca project was found wanting.

There were a number of other factors which I and my colleagues considered in reaching our decision not to proceed but the ones which I have set out here today are the main ones.

Let me emphasize, Mr. Speaker, that we did not take this action lightly. We are well aware that only the most persuasive reasons can justify the departure from an agreement legally executed by the Government. Despite the fact that we warned both Parsons and Whittemore and the Government of the day that our Government would retain its freedom of action with respect to this agreement, we should not have taken the course of departing from these agreements if any other satisfactory solution had been open to us. We believe the reasons were persuasive, and we believe we have the support of the great majority of the people in calling a halt to this project.

Some Hon. Members:— Hear, hear!

Mr. Blakeney: — This, Mr. Speaker, brings us to the matter of compensation. I am not at liberty to speculate on this question today because I hope and I expect that meetings between Parsons and Whittemore and our representatives will continue on this question.

But the Leader of the Opposition was not so reticent last Friday. He said in effect, 'You better be careful, this might cost you a lot of money.' Well, I say to him and I say to the people of Saskatchewan today that if his prediction should turn out to be true and it costs the people of Saskatchewan a lot of money, there is only one culpable party and that is the Liberal Government that ceased to be on June 30.

Some Hon. Members:— Hear, hear!

August 2, 1971

Mr. Blakeney: — And of all the people sitting in this House, Mr. Speaker, the one best able to verify that statement is the former Provincial Treasurer (Mr. Steuart).

Let me tell you, Mr. Speaker, what I found and let me tell you, Mr. Speaker, why under no circumstances would I want that man helping me to protect the people of Saskatchewan.

Mr. Steuart: — I'd show you up.

Mr. Blakeney: — When we took office I found among the dozens of agreements signed between the former Government and Parsons & Whittemore, I found one dated June 14, 1971. I'll have to set the scene for the significance of this agreement, but I want you to keep that date in mind — June 14, 1971, nine days before the election.

Among the basic agreements in the Athabasca deal is one called the Infrastructure Agreement. It contains a number of agreements about matters to be dealt with or resolved in order to make the mill possible. It talks about roads and railway services, access to forests and the like.

Let me speak of two of these agreements, two of these things which were required before the project would go forward. One had reference to the cutting rights on the Cold Lake Air Weapons range, under National Defence control. The other had to do with arrangements made to construct a railway branch line between the mill site and the Canadian Pacific Railway. Specifically, Mr. Speaker, the Infrastructure Agreement provided that if these two matters, and others, were not satisfactorily resolved, if either party was not satisfied with the arrangements, then either party, that is, Parsons & Whittemore or the Government of Saskatchewan could call off the whole pulp mill deal. Here was an opting-out clause which could become operative. Either party could get out of the deal if these things were not resolved to the satisfaction of both Parsons & Whittemore and the Government.

Mr. Steuart: — Hear, hear!

Mr. Blakeney: — Just a moment. I shall explain precisely just . . .

Mr. Steuart: — I can hardly wait.

Mr. Blakeney: — Okay. Now what was the situation on June 14? The cutting rights in the Cold Lake Air Weapons range were not resolved and insofar as I am aware, the Federal Government has given no written commitment with respect to those cutting rights yet. Point number one.

But the situation with respect to the railroad is even more striking. There was an agreement between the parties and the CPR but this agreement specifically provided that it would be void if legislation did not pass through Parliament by June 30. So on June 14 it was virtually certain that on June 30 the Government of Saskatchewan would be able to withdraw from all

the pulp mill agreements without compensation or penalty.

Some Hon. Members:— Hear, hear!

Mr. Blakeney: — That was on June 14. But on June 14, nine days before the election, an election in which the pulp mill deal was a major issue, the Liberal Government signed an agreement saying they were satisfied with the railway agreements, agreements which they knew would be non-existent by June 30 and are non-existent today.

Some Hon. Members:— Hear, hear!

Mr. Blakeney: — And yet they said they were satisfied with that agreement and by saying they were satisfied with non-existent agreements, they appear — and I only say appear — to have done away with the right of the Government of Saskatchewan to terminate those agreements without compensation or penalty. Shortly put, Mr. Speaker, the facts are these: the Liberal Government knew that on June 30 there would be no railway agreement. The Liberals knew that if there was no railway agreement the Government of Saskatchewan could withdraw from the agreements without compensation or penalty. They knew, or suspected, that they were losing the election. In the face of these facts, in the face of these facts nine days before the election, they signed an agreement which seems to say that the Government of Saskatchewan was satisfied with the railway agreements, agreements which did not require the CPR to build a single mile of railroad before June 30 and which after June 30 would be totally void.

Now, Mr. Speaker, I want to table for the benefit of Members, a copy of the Railway agreements so they can read for themselves that it would be and is now void, so they can read for themselves just what this amending agreement on June 14 did.

I hereby table a copy of the General Amending Agreement and a copy of the Railway Agreement. I do not know the full legal effect of this remarkable agreement but I specifically say and I am expressing no legal opinions on the matter but what the Liberals and particularly the Provincial Treasurer intended to do is clear beyond doubt. He intended by the stroke of a pen to strike away opportunities to call off the Athabasca deal without cost and without compensation under the terms of the contract.

Mr. Speaker, that is what the effect of these agreements appears to be. He, for himself, can explain why he would have signed these nine days before the election or had them signed. As a matter of fact he didn't even sign them, he had his deputy sign them.

Mr. Steuart: — Is he accusing me of signing something?

Mr. Blakeney: — But, Mr. Speaker, I want to ask this House to consider why he would on nine days before the election sign an agreement which possibly could cost the people of Saskatchewan millions of dollars if, as appeared likely, the New Democratic Government should be elected, and if, as appeared likely, we would not proceed with the merger.

Some Hon. Members:— Hear, hear!

Mr. Blakeney: — Mr. Speaker, we don't have to speculate on the benefits of that agreement to Parsons & Whittemore. They are clear enough. Where were the benefits of that agreement to the Minister and the Government? Where were they? What did they get from it? He admits this morning that that mill didn't have to go ahead on June 14. He has asked us to delay it another month, but he wouldn't delay it nine days. What did they get from that? What did Members opposite get from that? I could speculate, Mr. Speaker, but any speculation I did would very quickly breach the rules of this House where I am not supposed to impugn the motives of Members opposite. I leave Members on this side of the House to speculate on what considerations led the Ministers of that caretaker Government to attempt by this nefarious agreement, to cut off all the options, to make certain there would be a claim to compensation.

Some Hon. Members:— Hear, hear!

Mr. Blakeney: — Mr. Speaker, the signing of this agreement by the Government opposite in its dying days, nine days before polling day, is the most damning evidence of culpability I have ever seen.

Some Hon. Members:— Hear, hear!

Mr. Blakeney: — Who signed the agreement? Mr. Speaker, it is signed on behalf of the Provincial Treasurer and he can read the agreement which I have tabled. Mr. Speaker, I say that if the Government opposite didn't know the effect of this agreement — I can't believe that — they are grossly incompetent. And I say if they did know the effect of that agreement there is something which I will ask this House to judge.

Some Hon. Members:— Hear, hear!

Mr. Blakeney: — So let me make crystal clear to this House and to the people of Saskatchewan where the responsibility lies. Whatever the ultimate cost may be in the settlement of the Athabasca Pulp Mill deal, every dollar, every dime, every penny which must be paid out by the people of this Province, if it must be paid out, is the result of the deliberate and calculated actions on June 14 of the Party which sits opposite. They and they alone must should the blame and the responsibility.

Mr. Speaker, the people of Saskatchewan deserve a better government, a government elected to protect their interests. I can assure every Member of this House that there will be a stop to this type of deal. There will be a New Deal in resource development.

Some Hon. Members:— Hear, hear!

Mr. Blakeney: — Mr. Speaker, because the Throne Speech offers help for those who need help, support for those who have been oppressed, because it heralds the first instalment of a New Deal for all the people of Saskatchewan, I will oppose the amendment and support the motion.

Mr. D. Boldt (Rosthern): — Mr. Speaker, I listened very carefully to the Leader of the Government and I have a copy of a speech which he was kind enough to give to one of our Members. When he came to the page where it says "Resource Development," I am quite sure I heard him say, although it doesn't say in this report, that I will tell the people of Saskatchewan how we are going to develop our resources. He didn't say one thing about how they were going to develop the resources of Saskatchewan. All he did was criticize how the Liberals tried to develop the resources of Saskatchewan. You know in NDP election advertisements time after time, you could see it on the television and hear it on the radio and read it in the newspaper that the people of Saskatchewan would have to put up \$117 million in cash. This is what they said. Today the Premier was honest enough, and I suppose he stumbled on it when he said we were going to guarantee \$117 million. But during the election campaign this was the main issue, they had it on television, \$117 million and in some instances even this money was stacked up — \$117 million in cash.

Well, you know, Mr. Speaker, the other day it was said by the Leader of the Opposition (Mr. Steuart) that this was just a fanfare session. When I saw the Premier (Mr. Blakeney) here the other day speak and the way he shook his head, I have never seen him go into such a tantrum in all my life. They were going to bring in some emergency legislation and all he did was criticize and talk about the election campaign. Sure we got beaten and I accept the verdict from the people of Saskatchewan. We got beaten and all we came here for is that you were going to tell us about the former Premier's defeat. The real purpose of this Session was to censure and castigate the former Premier, Ross Thatcher, in this House. And I think it is a real disgrace to call a session after the former Premier has passed away and when three Members in this House have not been officially elected. One day they were going to call a session, then Mr. Blakeney says, "Well, you know, I don't think we really need a session. We can do it all by regulation." Then the next time we hear there is going to be a session. The main purpose, Mr. Speaker, is all they want to do is to bask in the victory of June 23. Well, let them have their little fun. We had our fun in 1964. We had our fun in 1967. So this time it is their turn to have their fun.

If this is all that they think the people want to hear in this Session after all these million dollars worth of promises they are mistaken. I can remember the day when I heard Mr. Romanow — when the former Premier said all these promises are to cost one billion and some hundred million dollars — I heard him on radio and he gave a kind a horse laugh and said, "Oh, no it's not going to cost that much, maybe a million bucks." Well, you know, being a labor lawyer I'll excuse him because he doesn't know a financial sheet from a fiction story.

Now that we are in the Session, we all of a sudden hear of a fall session going around in the corridors. The press tells us that we are going to have a fall session. You know, we don't know what kind of legislation is going to come up. They talk about the farm machinery Bill, they're going to help the farmers, they are going to do this, they are going to do that. But with their steamroller tactics, Mr. Speaker, on Friday night we heard we were going to have some changes in the Bill. My speech was handed to the press, but since the announcement today about the pulp mill cancellation, the speech is not authentic. I can't state the facts that I wanted to make because it was all

cancelled out. Today really must be one of the saddest days in Saskatchewan. Really a sad day.

Some Hon. Members: — Hear, hear!

Mr. Boldt: — First, we hear the iron ore mine being torn off the board. They'll never come back. I'll guarantee you people couldn't bring in a peanut stand here in Saskatchewan. Then, I was almost convinced that they would not announce in this Session that the pulp mill deal was cancelled. But I suppose every day they wait will cost them half a million or a million dollars. So today they made the announcement that the pulp mill is out the door.

Now I should like to ask the Premier and the Members opposite, what are you going to do about the Wollaston Uranium mine? Will that be the next sad news that we are going to hear. But I'm going to tell you what kind of deals you people make and I'm sorry that the mover of the Throne Speech is out of this House.

The Minister of Education the other day or shortly after the election went to Saskatoon and he met with the school board. I don't think he was back in Regina when this young Member from City Park (Mr. Dyck) said, "Oh, we had a wonderful meeting with the Minister of Education (Mr. MacMurchy) and we are going to have more teachers hired in Saskatoon." Well, I suppose when the Minister of Education came back to Regina he had to issue a statement. He countered by saying that school boards will have to live with the original Liberal budget.

I want to tell the Government that you want to watch this fellow Dyck. He's got the gift of gab, there is no argument about it. We remember and the former Minister of Co-ops remembers a fellow by that same name who was able to convince the former government, a former CCF government, that Rosthern needed a potato chip plant. Oh, I can remember the day when Russ Brown was in here and we had the chips distributed — I think in 1962. That was a big deal! That was the kind of industry that they could bring into the province. The Government lost tens of thousands of dollars on that deal. I should think around \$50 or \$60 thousand. And SEDCO still owns the building, they haven't been able to get of it. That industry never got off the ground. That's the kind of industry they bring in. Just an out and out Socialist — the man who operated this mill was an out and out Socialist. Tens of thousands of dollars were lost.

Then you know this same chap went over to Ottawa and said that they had to have a potato storage plant in Rosthern. So they gave him a grant of about \$70,000, the Provincial Government gave them a grant of many thousands of dollars and he borrowed the rest of the money. And that thing went "belly up." Just went bankrupt — this is the history of the industry that they brought in.

Well, it didn't take long, several years later, this gentleman convinced a group of farmers that we had to have another storage plant. Not in Rosthern, this time but in La Plain, half way between Rosthern and Duck Lake. They spent thousands of dollars, I think, in the neighborhood of \$60,000. The other day I read in the Star-Phoenix and in the Valley News that the Sheriff was going to sell this building — \$40,000 against it.

Socialist administration! Many, many creditors are going to lose thousands and thousands of dollars.

I heard the mover of the Throne Speech (Mr. Dyck) on his advertisement on the TV and on radio and the press, that he had visited to many people in Saskatoon, that there were so many old-age pensioners who only had a television and a piece of toast. That's all they had. And they were going to build nursing homes. Well you know the former Government and the Liberal Government never have built a nursing home in this Province yet. No, Sir, nobody has. The local people built them.

Some Hon. Members: — Hear, hear!

Mr. Boldt: — So now the Government is going to go into the nursing home business. You know, this gentleman who I was talking about, that poor fellow, always a Socialist promoter. He wouldn't have a colored television if it wasn't for the Liberal Government. You know that man is on welfare. He hasn't got a nickel, no, Sir, he'd be starving to death if it wasn't for the Liberals. He's not an old-age pensioner, all he is doing is receiving a welfare cheque. He is one of the people that man Dyck wants to place in a nursing home. The man is no older than I am. He doesn't belong in a nursing home. You have the wrong philosophy. Every church, be it Protestant or Catholic, don't want people in the nursing homes if they don't have to be there. You don't put people in a nursing home unless they have to go there. That's no place for them because everyone knows once you're admitted to the nursing home someday you're going to come out of there head first. But they want to put them in there.

I want to tell the Minister of Education (Mr. MacMurchy) that you want to be real careful about this fellow from City Park. He can out-talk you, out-smart you and out-wit you in every area. I want to advise Mr. MacMurchy to see the Member from Touchwood, who was then the Minister of Co-ops. He knows all about this gentleman. When I listened to the Throne Speech I could see this dangerous chap how he was going to try and manipulate the Government. And he will, he certainly will.

During the last election the prime issue was the family farm, and Mr. Romanow thinks now they've brought in some really good legislation. You know, when we got the Bill on Friday, I read it on the way back to Saskatoon and I thought maybe there was some good in it. We haven't had time to discuss this fully in caucus, but I want to say one thing. I thought during the election campaign that when a Bill was to be brought in that the Government was going to do something for the farmer. In this Bill the Government doesn't do anything for the farmer.

Some Hon. Members: — Hear, hear!

Mr. Boldt: — No, Sir. All they're doing is they're telling the credit unions, they're telling the banks and the machine dealers and the machine companies that we will pass a law whereby you can't touch the farmers. That's what they are doing. I had hopes that this Government was so concerned about the farmer — why don't you say that you're going to put up \$100 million and we will pay the accounts of the poor farmer who cannot sell . . .

Some Hon. Members: — Hear, hear!

Mr. Boldt: — We will guarantee — but no, they are disrupting the credit of the farmer. If I was a machine agent, gentlemen, I wouldn't sell a machine to anybody unless it was for cash. This Bill is only going to be active until August 1, 1972. But the farmers will know and the agents will know that this Government cannot be trusted. This Government cannot be trusted. They are not going to spend one nickel to help the family farm. Not one. You are asking the free enterprise system to do it for you . . .

An Hon. Member: — And the credit union.

Mr. Boldt: — Yes, Sir. It's a real let down and a disgrace. "Oh, this is the real thing you know" says the Minister of Agriculture (Mr. Messer). The minister of Agriculture went on the radio and admitted that the Provincial Government may be over-stepping its authority in doing this, that there was a danger the Bill might be declared ultra vires. Well this is not the way Liberal lawyers operate. The Government side don't give a darn whether it is legal or not. No, Sir, "we will just bulldoze it through" and then he goes on to say, "even if the Federal Government says that you have no right to pass this legislation we don't care, it will take eight months, every lawyer might get his feet into the trough you know and fill his pockets. By the time they have proven it is legal you know it will have served its purpose." I suppose I should excuse the Attorney General (Mr. Romanow). He is still a young lawyer you know but he behaves very similarly to the Minister of Highways from Manitoba. He doesn't give a hoot whether the lawyer or the judge says something. No, Sir, he doesn't care.

An Hon. Member: — He'll never be a judge anyway.

Mr. Boldt: — The man should be in jail.

Mr. Steuart: — What man?

Mr. C. MacDonald: — Romeo?

Mr. Boldt: — No, Borowski.

Mr. MacDonald: — Oh, I'm sorry. Here is the fellow you were talking about.

Mr. Boldt: — He can read my script later on if he wants.

When one considers, Mr. Speaker, the election issue as stated by the NDP would be farm income and the agricultural crisis in general, one would have really expected the priorities in this Special Session would have been legislation getting better prices for farm products. We want better prices. They even said they were going to get farms stable, assured income. One would have expected that legislation would have been passed to increase the farm prices for farm products. However, farmers will soon realize how irresponsible and dishonest NDP election promises were.

Some Hon. Members: — Hear, hear!

Mr. Boldt: — Not a bit of truth in what they said. Instead their top priority is labor, a 40-hour week that will cost the machine agents hundreds of dollars a month to keep their boys on. And of course they said the prices of machines were too high. Will this make the machine prices come down? They will go up. A minimum wage increase to \$1.75 an hour and this is going to reduce prices they say. Prices are going to go up if you have to pay more for wages. And then of course the repeal of Bill 2, and health benefits for the rich and the poor. Here in Saskatchewan the NDP Government told us of the plight of the Saskatchewan farmer and at the same time they told their counterparts in the House of Commons to make absolutely sure that Otto Lang would not be able to get the Stabilization Bill through the House on June 23.

Some Hon. Members: — Hear, hear!

Mr. Boldt: — So that the farmers of Western Canada would not get the \$100 million from the Federal Government. I suppose they felt that if the \$100 million was in the hands of the farmers they might not be able to win the election.

Mr. C. MacDonald: — Cheap politics.

Mr. Boldt: — Then shortly after the election the new Premier took off to Ottawa urging the Federal Government to pay out the \$100 million immediately. Yes, immediately.

An Hon. Member: — Hear, hear!

Mr. Boldt: — You don't know the difference, you don't know the difference.

Some Hon. Members: — Hear, hear!

Mr. Boldt: — Just how stupid can you get. Those MPs who stopped that legislation, Mr. Premier, and Mr. Attorney General they were campaigning in Saskatchewan night and day with little Allan. All you would have had to do was to kick them out of Saskatchewan and tell them to mind their own business and see that this Bill would get passage in the House before the summer recess and farmers would be better off by \$100 million; the machine companies would be better off; everybody would be better off.

Mr. C. MacDonald: — They could pay their bills.

Mr. Boldt: — They could pay their bills.

Some Hon. Members: — Hear, hear!

Mr. Boldt: — When is that \$900 going to come to the farmer? No it won't come for another two months. No, they have no plans for the farmer.

An Hon. Member: — Hear, hear!

Mr. Boldt: — You don't even know what a farmer is. All the Minister

of Agriculture (Mr. Messer) has suggested and has to offer to the farmers is that farmers get more involved with packaging and selling their products. What a bright idea! I suppose that if a farmer kills a chicken he should also package it. What the Minister of Agriculture recommended is that if he makes some ice cream that he package it and stand next to a peanut stand and try and sell it. You know that was 25 or 40 years ago when farmers were peddling their products. But now through health regulations it cannot be done and you people want to turn the clock back. You people want to turn the clock back 25 or 30 years. What is the new deal for the farmer? I suppose Socialistic arithmetic tells them that the increase of the minimum wage will bring costs down for the farmer and the consumer as a whole. They still haven't learned how to add. I believe that the Saskatchewan people have always been concerned about the affairs of the Government. Never in the history of my political life have I seen so many concerned Saskatchewan people so shortly after the election and today certainly will be no exception after the pulp mill announcement.

Some Hon. Members: — Hear, hear!

Mr. Boldt: — You know the NDP are extremely silent, very, very silent. Many an honest individual has come to me. Yes even school teachers have come to me and they said . . .

Some Hon. Members: — Hear, hear!

Mr. Boldt: — I can name them to you too, saying that we wanted the Liberals in power but we didn't want them to have too big a majority and we are sorry it went the other way.

Some Hon. Members: — Hear, hear!

Mr. Boldt: — Just wait until I'm finished with you. We know the NDP were dishonest in their promises, they've backtracked in their promises so far . . .

Some Hon. Members: — Hear, hear!

Mr. Boldt: — . . . and we don't expect them to fulfil them. They are concerned at the support and the elements within the party, a party elected by the extreme radical, by the demonstrator, by the long haired, fuzzy, foggy thinking professor.

Some Hon. Members: — Hear, hear!

Mr. Boldt: — That's your support. It has been stated in one of our Western newspaper editorials that the defeat of the Liberal Government of Saskatchewan was the result of the opposition of the labor unions — this is no surprise to me — school teachers and the clergy. I'm sure there are other factors but I could agree that these are the main ones. Some of the school teacher's behavior and the Saskatchewan Teachers Federation in the past election is just a shameful disgrace.

Some Hon. Members: — Hear, hear!

Mr. Boldt: — To call on home after home and hear the parents say that the school students were told to make sure their parents voted NDP or they would fail their grades . . .

Some Hon. Members: — Hear, hear!

Mr. Boldt: — This can happen in the USSR, and it can happen in Saskatchewan.

Some Hon. Members: — Hear, hear!

Mr. Boldt: — It is a sad thing. It is a sad thing to listen to a church service when the clergy is much more interested in the social gospel than the spiritual gospel. I want to tell you for the benefit of the Arm River Member, the most foolish and disrespectful letter I ever got as Minister of Highways was from the Member from Arm River.

The union labor bosses have been against a Liberal Government since we formed the Government in 1964, there is no secret about that. But with this Government, Mr. Speaker, you are going to have more problems with the union than we have ever dreamed of. The Throne Speech calls for the abolition of Bill 2, The Essential Services Act.

Some Hon. Members: — Hear, hear!

Mr. Boldt: — Over 50 per cent of the people support the Government in its removal. Remove it, I will not support the Government in its removal. Remove it, I will not support the repeal of Bill 2. But let me say this to those farmers who voted NDP, that you believe in strikes, Mr. farmer, and if the railroaders, the dock workers, the grainhandlers and any other union that affects the farm operation, entertains a strike, I hope you will be willing to pay the price and the cost and don't you cry to the Federal Government. No, Sir, you voted NDP Socialism, Socialism you wanted, Socialism you are going to get.

Some Hon. Members: — Hear, hear!

Mr. Boldt: — And I hope for the 30 or 35 per cent of the teachers who were elected, I hope that the teachers are going to ask for what they got promised. Surely the student ratio must be eliminated.

Some Hon. Members: — Hear, hear!

Mr. Boldt: — This is what you promised. Why didn't you do it the day after the election? Oh, no, you know, like one superintendent of the school unit said, "There will be no change, there won't be any change by this Government because every thing the Liberal Government did made sense."

Some Hon. Members: — Hear, hear!

Mr. Boldt: — It made economic sense. How many teachers have been

hired? None. Just none. No, you won't change the student ratio because the teacher, he eventually wants one student, one teacher; one professor, one student. I hope, Mr. Speaker, that the teachers are going to ask for a 25 per cent increase in salary as promised by the NDP and if they don't I hope they will go on strike because this is what you have told them. I hope the Government will put the 600 unemployed teachers to work in the classroom as promised by the NDP. This is the way they were going to increase employment — 600 teachers and they say, "Oh we are going to give them jobs." To teach what? To teach in an empty classroom. By Socialistic arithmetic, the increase in salaries, the increase in classrooms, and the creating of positions for the unemployed school teachers, they were able to convince the majority of the people of Saskatchewan that the taxes would go down. Yes, Sir. Surely even you people aren't that stupid to believe it.

Some Hon. Members: — Hear, hear!

Mr. Boldt: — I am convinced that with some people the more they get themselves educated the crazier they get. And the Socialists are absolutely no exception. No, Sir.

Some Hon. Members: — Hear, hear!

Mr. Boldt: — Well you know this really was a surprise to me when I heard Little Allan announce that MacMurchy was going to be the Minister of Education. I know why Little Allan appointed the dirt farmer and a poor one at that to become the Minister of Education . . .

Some Hon. Members: — Hear, hear!

Mr. Boldt: — I know why. Usually the experience that I have had with the farmer, he still is the most sensible and the most responsible taxpayer and citizen.

Some Hon. Members: — Hear, hear!

Mr. Boldt: — The farmer has by far the best judgment when it comes to financing and to being realistic. I have been told by Members . . .

Some Hon. Members: — Hear, hear!

Mr. Steuart: — How many have you got?

An Hon. Member: — 21.

Mr. Steuart: — How many in the front bench?

Some Hon. Members: — Hear, hear!

Mr. Boldt: — How many on welfare? How many on welfare, that's the first question you've got to ask.

I have been told by the teaching profession that the Teachers' Federation of Saskatchewan has nobody to recommend

from the elected "kooks" of the profession to take over that portfolio. No, Sir, they wouldn't recommend one of you fellows on the back benches. Not one of them. So the teaching profession is headed by a dirt farmer and the teacher has the dirt department.

Some Hon. Members: — Hear, hear!

Mr. Boldt: — Mr. Byers, I left the Department of Highways in good shape and . . .

Some Hon. Members: — Hear, hear!

Mr. Boldt: — And even Little Allan will admit it — that the highway program was a good one. It was a good one.

Some Hon. Members: — Hear, hear!

Mr. Boldt: — Now don't you go and muck it up. Look at these promises. The NDP hits highway programs and I think Mr. Meakes said it in the House here. This is a dandy and I hope Mr. Byers, the Member for Kelvington, will take this and note what he said in the House here only a few months ago. "Mr. Meakes said the highway program could be cut back as much as 25 per cent." The Leader-Post, February, 1971. Well cut it back if you want to go back to gravel. You don't believe in oil, you don't believe in pavement. In fact 25 to 30 years ago is the day and age that you live in.

Now, Mr. Speaker, the teachers are going to be in for a rough ride from Little Allan. The handwriting is already on the wall by appointing a dirt farmer and not a teacher. That must have been a slap to the Federation. I am sure not too long from now, these teachers in the Federation might need the old vet for some surgery.

Some Hon. Members: — Hear, hear!

Mr. Boldt: — Now what about the firing of the civil servants? I don't blame the Government for firing some of the people we hired. If I was sitting over there, I would fire a good number of them. Yes, Sir, I would. I fired a few when I took over several departments — the Crown corporation, so did other Members, so did the former Premier. And we never said we wouldn't but when the Premier told the public that the civil servants would not be fired there would instead be increased job security. You didn't tell the truth, No, Sir. And I say this, Mr. Speaker, if a man lies to me once, I never will believe him even if he happens to stumble on the truth. How do these firings take place? We read in the press that somebody got a letter from the Premier that he shouldn't show up next morning. We heard on the radio that this is either done by letter or the deputy is sent in to bring the good tidings to the individual. Have you Ministers or the Premier not the guts to call the individual and tell him or her the facts of life? Can't you tell somebody that their service is no longer required? Why do you send your deputy? Down-right disgrace!

Some Hon. Members: — Hear, hear!

August 2, 1971

Mr. Boldt: — Every individual I asked to resign I did so personally and I told them the reasons why and I'll tell you how I dealt with one of the senior executive officials of SGIO.

Mr. Romanow: — Tell me.

Mr. Boldt: — Yes, I sure will. A certain man named Blackburn, everyone knows him, an import Socialist, an import Socialist with no ability. I believe he came from Edmonton. He was made the senior executive next to the General Manager of SGIO. I told him personally, I had him in my office, that I wanted his resignation. I offered him, and he accepted, six months' severance pay.

Mr. Romanow: — How much did you people give Wilf Gardiner?

Mr. Steuart: — Zip.

Mr. Boldt: — I offered and he accepted six months' severance pay plus all his payments in the pension plan and all the payments of the Corporation towards his pension plan. If my memory holds good he walked out of the Saskatchewan Government Insurance Office with about \$13,000.

Mr. Kramer: — Whose money?

Mr. Boldt: — Corporation money for your information.

I feel convinced that Blackburn had very few abilities except to promote Socialism. He applied for the office of general manager in the Manitoba Government's insurance plan. I informed one of the Members of the Cabinet in Manitoba. He asked me, I said, "Blackburn couldn't run a pigsty." But they hired him as a manager and they paid him several thousand dollars more than the General Manager of SGIO today in Saskatchewan. The information I have received is that he tried to set up this Government Insurance Office in Manitoba, but he made a real mess of it. He just couldn't do anything, so finally I hear now by the news reports that they have engaged the General Manager of SGIO from Saskatchewan to set up the insurance plan. No, Sir, I can tell you that Mr. Dutton is no Socialist. He will set it up, the best manager I ever came across.

During the campaign the NDP were advocating industrialization. I am really surprised that so many people were fooled into believing that in one breath they said, "We'll invite industry to come into Saskatchewan," and in the next breath, "tax the living daylights out of you."

Well, many people are funny like Art Linkletter says, but I am sure that many people have also realized that they were crazy on election day. The Choiceland Iron Mine was scuttled only a few days after the election. Two apartment blocks were in the process of being built at Nipawin, the property had been bought and the day after the election, the owner stopped the projects. The people are moving out of Nipawin today and they will move out faster than in the past history.

Some Hon. Members: — Hear, hear!

Mr. Boldt: — A new motel was in progress, a dining room and additional units were planned. These have now been abandoned. The town of Nipawin is stunned and sick.

Some Hon. Members: — Hear, hear!

Mr. Boldt: — The sensible people just can't apprehend the disaster. But this is the way the Socialist, the Wafflers, the long-haired and the demonstrators demonstrate their ability to create jobs. Here is where I have to digress a little bit from my remarks. The Dore Pulp Mill will be lost, I wrote this on Friday. You people have publicly stated that Landegger is a crook, an American shyster. You called him everything you could think of. If you are convinced that everything you said about him is true you would be the most dishonest people if you made a deal with him. The angels and the devils are not bed-partners, however; to some lawyers, honesty, integrity and fairness doesn't mean a thing. No, Sir!

How does this affect the town of Meadow Lake? Before the election travellers, business people had to make reservations long before hand if they wanted to stay in Meadow Lake. Today the hotels are empty. Meadow Lake is practically dead and today I'll bet there will be many more people sick. What else has happened since the election at Meadow Lake? Well, Mr. Blakeney talked about the Canadian Pacific. I have a little story to say about the Canadian Pacific Railway as well. A contractor came to me, the Canadian Pacific had awarded a contract to a contractor to construct the rail bed from Meadow Lake to Dore Lake.

An Hon. Member: — What date?

Mr. Boldt: — Before the election. In the meantime the election was called. The contractor was informed by wire not to start until after the election. The contractor came to me personally, I met him at Saskatoon at the Suburban, to see if we could get some work for him on highways in the meantime while he was there. He had already moved all his equipment on site. He had his cook there, he was paying his men half wages to keep them and he wanted to know whether the Department of Highways could give up some of the spot improvement on highways in the area and I am sure the Hon. Member from Kelvington will see that we authorized \$15,000 — we had it in the program, we gave some work to him — so that he could be working and be able to pay his men. We authorized \$15,000 worth of work in that area on Highway No. 155. I was also informed that if the election went against the Government — by the contractor, he informed me of this — the Canadian Pacific would pull out of the contract. They had agreed — oh, listen to this — they had agreed to pay the contractor \$25,000 for moving on site and they would pay him \$25,000 for moving out. For your information, Mr. Speaker, the contractor has moved out a long time ago, he won't move out tomorrow, he's already moved out. I assume that the building of the railroad bed contract was cancelled, not tomorrow, not today, but at least two or three weeks ago.

This, Mr. Speaker, is the Socialist's way of creating jobs. How childish? How stupid? How ignorant and foolish can you get

and those who support you.

Some Hon. Members: — Hear, hear!

Mr. Boldt: — On June 23, the majority of the people of Saskatchewan voted for Socialism, and Socialism they'll get. Four years from now, 20 to 30 per cent of the people will be on welfare. No argument about it. And 20 to 30 per cent of those employed will be working for the welfare department making sure that those on welfare are well taken care of so that when the election comes around they'll be told how to vote or they'll lost their welfare payments.

Let's take a look at some of the individual promises made by the NDP candidates. Arthur Thibault, a man with 12 years experience in the Legislature, he will work for a New Deal for the people. Plank No. 1, listen to this, extend No. 6 Highway to No. 55, built to heavy traffic, Mr. Minister, heavy traffic in order to accommodate highway service from resource development in the Choiceland area. In the Choiceland area! What kind of resources is Arthur speaking about. Oh, apparently Little Allan hadn't confided in Arthur that Roman, a Canadian would be also kicked out of the province. So the Minister of Highways (Mr. Byers) can now scuttle Arthur's number 1 plank for his constituency. There is no need for it. Plank No. 3, remove from the realm of politics some of your major problems such as highway safety. That is a good one, Arthur, I agree with you. You are following in the footsteps of the former Government.

We removed the drunks from our highways when charged and found guilty and this applied to everyone including the Member from North Battleford (Mr. Kramer). But I understand he has been at it again and the Hon. Cabinet Minister will now be riding the bicycle for another 18 months. No wonder little Allan didn't want him in the Cabinet. But Mr. Kramer had other ideas, he stormed out of the Caucus maybe to examine a 48-ouncer, I don't know. Within a few days Mr. Kramer was appointed to the Cabinet and I was shocked to hear via the news media in the Saskatoon area that Mr. Kramer would also be in charge of the Highway Traffic Board, the Liquor Commission and the Liquor Board. This was reported in the news media in Saskatoon. Now I am not sure whether the first reports of the Saskatoon news media were correct, maybe not. If not correct then I want to thank the Premier for having him removed from those areas which influenced more than any other branches of government the safety of our highways as they could have well influenced and impaired the Hon. Member from North Battleford. Is it not a disgrace for the people of North Battleford and for Saskatchewan as well that a Minister of the Crown who claimed several years ago, and even demonstrated so sincerely his concern for highway safety when he doesn't know when, how or where to indulge and to force his way into a Cabinet.

What else did Arthur promise? Plank No. 4. Tax-free gas to small . . .

An Hon. Member: — Read No. 3 first.

Mr. Boldt: — I am sorry, I would do it, but I left it on my desk. I'll get it for you afterwards if you haven't got it. What else did Little Arthur do, or promise? Plank No. 4, tax-free gas

to small independent men using vehicles for making a living such as electricians, plumbers, bakers, etc., as well as farmers. Well, you know, Arthur Thibault has a change of mind. In 1965 when we introduced the purple gas legislation for farm trucks as reported in the Debates and Proceedings on page 995, "Those opposing this kind of reduction were, Mrs. Cooper, Messrs. Thibault, Whelan, Berezowsky and my friend, Mr. Robbins." Now the electricians. I am sure that the electricians and the plumbers and the bakers and many other labor people are in need of a tax reduction. I want to ask the Government to make absolutely sure that these tax benefits will be introduced at the next general session in the spring of 1972. It is interesting to note that the NDP Government which they have always referred to as the Government that supports the farmers, are not concerned about lowering the taxes for the farmer in Manitoba as reported in the Winnipeg Free Press of May 11. I quote from the report.

Farmers must pay 20 cents tax on purple gasoline used in farm trucks. This can be collected retroactively if they haven't paid it, Finance Minister Saul Cherniack told the Manitoba Legislature Monday.

I don't believe that the Saskatchewan Government has any intention whatsoever of extending purple gas to other sectors. Even on a hotline they said they were going to have gas bowlers where you could buy your purple gas. Are you going to put up bowlers at service stations where you can fill up purple gas in your farm trucks? This is the promise that they made.

Let's talk about the property mill rates. The new Premier of Saskatchewan speaking at Lloydminster on January 20, 1971, said this:

We will guarantee to the people of Saskatchewan not only to hold mill rates, but to cut, and to cut sharply mill rates for basic school purposes on homes and farms. The New Democratic Government will raise the required money from increased taxes on larger incomes, from corporation taxes and from increased resource royalties.

Mr. Premier, I hope the Government will try this one on for size. You have already scuttled not one, but two major industries and maybe you are working on the third, the Wollaston Lake Mine. These industries were intended by the former Government to help ease the burden of taxation, however your Government has other ideas. To raise the taxes from the larger incomes sounds really good to me. That will hit 11,000 school teachers in the Province right between the eyes, I hope you nail them good and proper. Most of the teachers are your supporters and they have voted for this increase in taxes.

How are you going to solve the native and the Metis problems. The last time you were in office your solution to the problems was, you saw they had problems, but you didn't do anything about them. Oh, you thought maybe we'll give them the beer and we give them the vote, then they'll be happy, that was your solution. This is the Government that makes all kinds of sanctimonious statements about minority groups. I saw no native people at the opening of the Session. There were no Hutterites. I also didn't see the people representing the construction industry, the business people, although there could have been some, maybe a few scattered around. I think it is fair to say that by far the invitations were sent to the

Socialists, and the union people. Oh, I noticed some teachers, but it was not the kind of people that I should like to see moving ahead in Saskatchewan.

I want to say a thing about the deterrent fees. Deterrent fees, the utilization fees, the premium tax to those over 65 as mentioned in the Throne Speech were mentioned by Mr. Blakeney and the Member for Pelly (Mr. Larson) the other day. I am personally convinced that they were in the right direction, and equally convinced that the majority of the people do not want them. People today want something for nothing and of course the NDP were promoting their giveaway programs. How long and how much can we afford to be a welfare state? Our schools and universities indoctrinate our students with Socialism and the welfare state. They have succeeded in pushing the Church completely out of the physical and monetary assistance to the needy. In fact too many of our church leaders today feel that their responsibility is to convince the Government that they have the sole responsibility for the total needs of the total man. The social gospel has replaced the spiritual gospel. It might not take too long when our philosophy in human and spiritual values will not differ that much from Communist Russia and Communist China. Christianity is ridiculed, downgraded and scoffed at by many of our professional people who teach our students and are paid for by the tax payers, many of whom disagree with this new philosophy.

In listening to the Member for Pelly (Mr. Larson) the other day, and today to the Premier, he stated that he found it difficult to believe and unjust for a government to tax a man when he is flat on his back. This didn't make sense to him, he said, it just didn't make sense to him. I don't think that the Hon. Member or the Premier had thought out this statement too well, nor do I know whether they are capable of doing so. Not only the man who pays the tax gets sick, Mr. Speaker. I have a 12-year-old daughter who could become ill. What is wrong with the parent paying a deterrent or utilization fee. The homeowner in Regina if he was flat on his back, did not receive tax write-offs. Did Henry Baker while he was the mayor, did he take the municipal and school taxes off his property? No. Whether one were sick in the hospital or not he still pays that tax. The farmer cannot get relief . . .

Mr. Romanow: — Are you going to vote against the Bill, Dave?

Mr. Boldt: — That's your Bill, the machinery Bill. Deterrent fees, removal of the fees. The opposition has stated its position.

The farmer cannot get relief from land taxes whether he is sick or well. I am of the old school of thought . . .

Some Hon. Members: — Hear, hear!

Mr. Boldt: — You can call me Orthodox or you can call me a Conservative but I feel that the individual and the family still have some responsibilities.

Some Hon. Members: — Hear, hear!

Mr. Boldt: — I want to get personal here. In the case of my family

my mother is still living. She is not filthy rich but she is well-to-do. She doesn't need the interest on the investment that was left to her by my father. All her children are not in any need of any Government subsidies. Not one of them. They raised a family of eight children. But if the Provincial Government wants to pay her \$36 — she is 73 or 74 — and if the Provincial Government wants to pay all the hospital costs and all the doctors' fees, her children will inherit — and I am one of them — just that much more money and we might be able to buy out just a few more Socialists. Yes, Sir. We will let the school teacher, we will let the poor labor man who is making payments on his home, we will let him pay for my mother's premium and all the doctors' fees. Why if John Diefenbaker or Mike Pearson, the two best known politicians alive today, if they lived in Saskatchewan, why should the labor man pay that \$36 for them? Why? Or the \$72 as the case might be. Why should they pay the \$72. They can afford it better than anyone else in this room. But you are going to pay the \$72. We shall let the school teacher, the poor labor man who hasn't a home or a coupon to clip pay for those who can travel, visit, play, play the stock market, bet on the races, pay all the hospital and doctor calls for those 65 and over.

Mr. Speaker, I will support the amendment and not the motion.

Some Hon. Members: — Hear, hear!

Hon. E. Kramer (Minister of Natural Resources): — Before the Member sits down I should like to ask him a question.

Did I hear him say that I had been forbidden from driving for another 18 months? Did I hear you say that?

Mr. Boldt: — No, I didn't. I said this: he had been at it again and he will not be driving for 18 months.

Mr. Kramer: — Mr. Speaker, this is cheap gossip. It is not proper to call a man a liar or a coward in this House but for want of better words I demand that he retract that. He is impugning something that he has absolutely no proof of, that is absolutely false as almost everything else he has said is false, but I'm checking him on this one. Mr. Speaker, I demand a retraction.

Mr. Speaker: — The Hon. Minister asks the Member for Rosthern (Mr. Boldt) to withdraw the statement which he said wasn't correct, that he has had no suspension for 18 months. I would ask the Hon. Member for Rosthern to withdraw that because maybe his facts were, as he put it, not correct.

Mr. Boldt: — I didn't say that he had been told not to drive for 18 months so I have nothing to withdraw.

Mr. Kramer: — Mr. Speaker, he left the impression and this is what he said, the record will show what he said and I demand a withdrawal. I can wait until the records are read but I will absolutely not tolerate this kind of slander in the House. If

he said it outside of the House he would be subject to a law suit. He doesn't dare to make that statement outside the House. He is sick.

Mr. T.M. Weatherald (Cannington): — On the point of order, I understand that the rule — and I'm sure I'm correct in this — that we have on the Orders of the Day, a place where a point of privilege can be brought forward and I believe, I submit, Mr. Speaker, that is the proper place for the Member for The Battlefords (Mr. Kramer) to bring this point of privilege forward.

Mr. Speaker: — While speaking in this House, on a personal point of privilege, the Member could rise at the time and object or he could wait until the conclusion of the Member who is speaking, and the Hon. Member for The Battlefords has risen at the conclusion of the Member for Rosthern's (Mr. Boldt) speech and asked for a retraction at this time. If the Hon. Member for Rosthern is not prepared to make a retraction at this time, I cannot say from memory exactly what he said, I shall have to reserve any decision until the records are available to me. But any Member is perfectly in his right to rise at the time that a statement impugned to them is not correct, such a statement would be if the facts are as the Minister states. So, therefore, I shall ask that if the Member for Rosthern wishes to withdraw now and if he doesn't it will not be pursued any further until I get the transcripts and will be raised at that time.

Do you wish to withdraw?

Mr. Boldt: — No.

Hon. R. Romanow (Attorney General): — Mr. Speaker, speaking to the point of order. The Hon. Member for Rosthern (Mr. Boldt), the speaker who just finished taking his chair says that he made no statement to the effect that the Minister of Natural Resources (Mr. Kramer) had been suspended for a period of 18 months. Now the Minister disputes that. Certainly the passage that the Hon. Member from Rosthern read, if it doesn't say it specifically, I should respectfully suggest it leaves a very strong innuendo. Now to me an innuendo, or direct statement in this House, both have the same effect. Now the Hon. Minister of Natural Resources is a man who, I think, like all men in this House, should be taken at his word. He says that is not true. He asks the Hon. Member from Rosthern to withdraw. I am only asking the Hon. Member from Rosthern to avoid the unpleasantness of looking at the transcript. I wonder if the Hon. Member for Rosthern wouldn't take into consideration my observation with respect to innuendo and the statement, reconsider it and in fact withdraw the statement as requested by the Member.

Mr. Speaker: — The Hon. Member is not prepared to categorically withdraw the statement in which the rules state that if a Member objects he must withdraw, if he is not prepared to withdraw at this time, I shall have to peruse the transcript. I have asked the Hon. Member does he wish to withdraw and he has answered me, No. Do you wish to withdraw it now at this time, Mr. Member?

Mr. Boldt: — Mr. Speaker, I have said,

No and my word is No. If you want me to say it two or three times, I'll say it three times.

Mr. Speaker: — Okay, I shall peruse the transcripts and take this under advisement at a later time.

Some Hon. Members: — Hear, hear!

Mr. E. Whelan (Regina North West): — Mr. Speaker, first may I express to you my congratulations on your being named as the Speaker of this House. May I call to the attention of all Hon. Members that you are the Dean of the Legislature, for you have been a Member of this Assembly continuously and longer than any other Member seated here, and that you also represent the largest rural constituency in the Province of Saskatchewan.

It is particularly gratifying to me as a Member of this group to know that your constituency, the constituency of Wadena, has been continuously represented since 1934 by farmer-labor, CCF or the New Democratic Party.

I wish to congratulate warmly and sincerely the mover and seconder of the Speech from the Throne. The Hon. Member for City Park (Mr. Dyck) and the Hon. Member for Yorkton (Mr. Carlson) are articulate, able spokesmen for their constituencies.

Some Hon. Members: — Hear, hear!

Mr. Whelan: — Mr. Speaker, I wish to thank the people of Regina North West for re-electing me. The constituency of Regina North West is the second largest constituency in the province. I shall attempt to justify the confidence the people in the constituency have expressed in me.

Now, Mr. Speaker, the Hon. Member for Rosthern (Mr. Boldt) had his huge majority cut in the last election to a mere 200 votes or thereabouts. I say this, that, if his constituents had heard him misconstruing and misinterpreting and exaggerating today he wouldn't even be here, Mr. Speaker.

Some Hon. Members: — Hear, hear!

Mr. Whelan: — Mr. Speaker, the Hon. Member for Rosthern says this is a sad, sad day. Well, Mr. Speaker, it is a sad day for the Liberals who signed deals with their friends nine days before an election. But I say, Mr. Speaker, it is a much sadder day for the people who are being robbed of their resources who have to pay for their bad deals and who have to pay millions of dollars for generations.

Mr. Speaker, when the Hon. Member for Rosthern rises in his place to castigate the Hon. Member for City Park (Mr. Dyck) the House knows the waste that existed in the construction of highways and the House knows that this was a factor in the defeat of the Government. Canvass any voters who live along a highway that was under construction. I know, Mr. Speaker, I was in Kelvington and one would have expected more, a better example for such a person who maintains that he is an example himself of efficiency and good management. You know the Hon.

August 2, 1971

Member for Rosthern sat on the other side, sat where he is before, in Opposition, we entered this House together. After listening to the Hon. Member today, seven years in Government hasn't improved him one bit.

Some Hon. Members: — Hear, hear!

Mr. Whelan: — He is saying the same things today that he said seven years ago.

Mr. Speaker, I have some other points that I should like to make. May I call it 12:30.

Mr. Speaker, those of us on this side of the House and the 56 or 57 or 58 per cent of the population who voted New Democrat were definitely not influenced by headlines. Those of us who have been in the House before and have watched the activities particularly of the Hon. Member from Prince Albert West (Mr. Steuart), who is the temporary Leader of the Opposition, are not impressed, and not the least bit influenced, and we are not waiting with any degree of anticipation, when we read the huge headline that they the Opposition group would come out fighting.

Mr. Speaker, when the Session began the headliner for the feature attraction in the main bout who was going to 'come out fighting' wasn't even in his corner. It was only because of the good nature of Hon. Members and because of some powerful persuasion by those in this House who are generous that the House unanimously allowed him in the ring. Mr. Speaker, when he entered he came in from the back door and, Mr. Speaker, he has not been fighting, he has been whining since this Session began. If he is going to do any fighting, Mr. Speaker, he is going to have to do it in a concrete way so that we can see it. This means that he is going to have to represent a certain position and certain groups. Mr. Speaker, I contend that he is going to have to battle for them with vigor and with enthusiasm. Now in the fight game when you come out fighting, particularly after you have talked a good fight, it means that you start swinging. Mr. Speaker, I am going to make a prediction that on the deterrent fee vote instead of voting against the motion, they are going to do a lot of whining and then when the chips are down, I predict that, as they have all clearly indicated, when a vote is taken in the words of the fight lingo, they won't come out fighting.

Some Hon. Members: — Hear, hear!

Mr. Whelan: — As a matter of fact on the first punch, Mr. Speaker, they are going to take a dive. They won't come out fighting, they won't land a punch, they won't wade into us, they are afraid to, Mr. Speaker. I predict that on every issue they will take a dive.

Mr. Speaker, first, let me answer some of the charges that were made by the Hon. Member for Prince Albert West (Mr. Steuart) in his remarks. Second, let me tell the House why I don't think the Hon. Members opposite are coming out fighting against any piece of legislation that is before this House. And third, let me try to answer the question as to whether this Session is worthwhile.

First, the Hon. Member for Prince Albert says there is a witch-hunt going on in the Government and that we are firing Liberal civil servants, left and right. Most of them would be right, I think, but anyway, Mr. Speaker, how can you tell who the Liberals are. Second, are there any Liberal civil servants left? My experience in this city during the election campaign in regard to civil servants — and I am sure in any area the experience was the same — and regardless of what the Hon. Member says, civil servants who were supposed to be Liberals were voting solidly for the New Democrats. Why? Because of the incompetence, the inconsistency and the inept manner in which the Liberal Government Members treated the civil servants. Time after time after time, civil servants talked to me frankly, without hesitation, and said, oh, they had been hired or recommended by a Liberal MLA, and they said they and their families intended to support the New Democrats.

Now, the Hon. Member from Prince Albert West tells us that we are going to dismiss Liberals. I ask him sincerely and I ask him objectively: which ones are the Liberals? Maybe they had a way of telling, but it certainly didn't work. I say to him, and I say to him deliberately, the reason we are not firing people he thinks are Liberals is because we think they may be New Democrats, and Mr. Speaker, that includes an immediate member of his family. We think that his own son after putting up with his illogical nonsense, after putting up with what this House has to put up with, that even his son is liable to vote New Democratic.

Some Hon. Members: — Hear, hear!

Mr. Whelan: — The Hon. Member for Prince Albert West says we are "grandstanding." If it is grandstanding to keep an election promise, then, Mr. Speaker, we are grandstanding. If it is grandstanding to remove a tax from the sick, then, Mr. Speaker, we are grandstanding. Mr. Speaker, if we remove medicare premiums for people over 65 and this is grandstanding, then, Mr. Speaker, we are grandstanding.

Some Hon. Members: — Hear, hear!

Mr. Whelan: — If removing chains from the working people, chains that were put on by the previous government, if unshackling them and giving them their freedom is grandstanding, Mr. Speaker, then we plead guilty. We are grandstanding. Mr. Speaker, if giving a man who works 48 hours a week, a 44-hour week by law, is grandstanding, there is no doubt about it, we are grandstanding. If trying to protect the farmers from the machine companies, from the mortgage companies and from the banks, is grandstanding, then, Mr. Speaker, we are guilty.

But I say this, grandstanding or no grandstanding, whether it is by legislation or by regulation, Mr. Speaker, what we are doing here today is keeping a commitment that we made; a commitment we are going to keep, and we are going to keep that commitment, Mr. Speaker, because as responsible representatives of the people of Saskatchewan, it is a commitment to the wishes, the desires, the hopes and the aspirations of the majority of the people of the Province of Saskatchewan.

The Hon. Member for Prince Albert West (Mr. Steuart) said,

Mr. Speaker, if I recall correctly, he said this Session would cost \$6,000 a day. The people of this country, Mr. Speaker, pay taxes to a Federal Government. Sure they do and for what reason? Well, to provide medicare and those funds are available to every province in Canada, and more available when we do not charge deterrent fees. As has been said to this House already, by charging a deterrent fee we lose what is rightfully ours as part of the Canadian community of provinces — a huge grant of \$4 million. We have been losing hundreds of thousands of dollars that adds up to millions in grants because we taxed the sick. The Hon. Member talks about a session that will cost \$100,000 — \$100,00 spent that will recover for the people of this province millions of dollars in this year and the years to come, to say nothing of the worry and the insecurity that will be removed. I say it's a pretty good deal and it's a new deal.

Some Hon. Members: — Hear, hear!

Mr. Whelan: — But no the Hon. Member for Prince Albert would rather tax the sick than pick up the Federal subsidy that we, as taxpayers, have already paid for.

The Hon. Member for Prince Albert West asks us to consult Mr. Roman re the Choiceland project. Is this the same Mr. Roman who was stopped at selling the very heritage of Canada to a foreign country, the most important industry we have — uranium I think it was — to a foreign country. He was stopped not by persuasion by the Prime Minister of Canada, not by lengthy telephone conversations but stopped only when essential legislation was passed in our House of Commons, forbidding the sale of these essential resources. Is this the man who even the Federal Government could not persuade and we are supposed to persuade him! Surely, surely the Hon. Member for Prince Albert West is prepared to admit that if the Federal Government had some difficulty consulting Mr. Roman, we might have some difficulty persuading him, we might have some difficulty negotiating with him. We may not be able to deal with him in tens days - it's just a possibility.

Now, Mr. Speaker, I should like to turn for a moment to those whom this energetic and resourceful Opposition will be fighting for, if they "come out fighting." I suggest they will be trying to land some punches on mothers who go to the hospital sick, on senior citizens with chronic conditions, children with asthma and eczema and broken bones; they will come out fighting to subjugate and to humiliate and, if they can't pay, to exploit them, and if they can, because of financial embarrassment, prevent them from receiving a medical service that is more than 95 per cent paid for. Yes, if they keep the newspaper headline intact, they will come out fighting for a \$2.50 payment every day when the patient is sick in hospital. Mr. Speaker, I should have thought by now that Members opposite would have got the message from the people of this Province that they don't want deterrent fees. They want them removed as quickly as possible and they want them removed permanently. They don't care about newspaper headlines, and furthermore they are not the slightest bit influenced by the remnants of the Liberal Party even if they have a 42 per cent vote. They are not influenced by them.

When people over 65 in this Province whose income was individually only \$111 a month, the Members opposite who were the Government have been known to take their health cards from

them. Let me quote an example of a lady in my constituency with an income of \$111.04 a month whose blue card, medical care card she had kept since 1962, was taken away by these people — they thought she was affluent. They thought she had too much money because she was getting \$111.04. They took it from her on the basis that she could afford to pay her medical care premium. They sent her a little form; this is what the form said: your rent is \$53, for food allowance you're going to have \$28.50, clothing allowance for a month \$10, telephone \$4.36, personal allowance \$3.25, household allowance \$1.60, medicare premium \$3. Yes, she was getting \$111.04 and that's what you want to go back to.

Mr. C. MacDonald (Milestone): — What were they when you were there?

Mr. Whelan: — I told you at the last Session. The people of my constituency in a questionnaire said the Department of Welfare was the worst run department in the Government. He still doesn't believe me. Will you believe me now, look where you're sitting. Well there may be some people opposite who say the senior citizens are affluent and not entitled to coverage without premium. Let me point out to them, the senior citizens built this Province, if they don't get a square deal from us they'll go somewhere else. They've been doing that. To say that we are handing them money, to suggest that we are giving them something they don't deserve is inaccurate and unappreciative and I say typical of Liberal thinking. Mr. Speaker, I say that the people over 65 have earned the right to free medicare. They have bought it and paid for it and worked for it and I say as a New Democratic Party MLA that those we promised it to, voted for it and the people of this Province voted for it, then they are entitled to it. We don't care whether the people opposite come out fighting against it or not. They can fight against it if they like, the people over 65 will get the benefits that we promised them here and now at this Session.

Some Hon. Members: — Hear, hear!

Mr. Whelan: — Mr. Speaker, one of the blackest days in the history of this Province was when the old Government, the shattered remnants of which sit depressed, disjointed and almost leaderless opposite, introduced legislation to make those who are mentally ill pay for their care in mental hospitals, retroactive to 1945. To make them pay for it was discrimination; to make it retroactive was outrageous. It was in effect both discriminatory and outrageous. Their reasoning went something like this. This is what they said: to be mentally ill was different, you were in a different category, you don't get coverage under hospitalization. It was the kind of an illness that should be penalized, that should be abhorred, that should be treated as a horrible disease. Those who may have kept their estates intact, although they received treatment for physical illness would find that when the time came when the person who was mentally ill passed away, that if that individual had received treatment for that kind of illness, his estate would be charged, retroactive to 1945, for the care he received in this Province.

Mr. Speaker, this was a shameful performance. This was

one of the most discriminatory, one of the most unkind pieces of legislation ever introduced. I was ashamed when it was brought before this House. I could scarcely believe that in this day and age one kind of illness would be treated differently; that we in this Province looked after those who were sick but if they were mentally ill, it was different. They paid for that type of illness, they paid for it themselves. Mr. Speaker, I am proud to say that as quickly as possible, in this so-called "grandstand" Session of this House, we will remove this deplorable legislation from the statutes of this Province . . .

Some Hon. Members: — Hear, hear!

Mr. Whelan: — . . . so that those who are mentally ill will not receive discriminatory treatment any more. And if the Hon. Member for Prince Albert thinks that this is grandstanding, if he thinks we should not be passing this legislation, I challenge him to get up in his place in this Legislature and I challenge him to vote against it. If he does, then I suggest he stand as a leadership candidate for the Liberal Party.

Further, the working people of this Province were used as whipping boys by the Members opposite. They passed legislation to shackle them to their jobs. The legislation humiliated a working man, it made him just a little bit more than a slave. He could not withdraw his labor from the market. In pious terms the government of the day talked about the high cost of living but they did nothing about it. They allowed the machinery companies to exploit the farmers; they allowed the supermarkets to fix the price of food on the grocery shelves; and when the working man tried to get enough money to keep his family fed and clothed, they said, "Oh, no, you can't do that, you can't strike." They set up a phony arbitration board and told them how much they would get for their services. Mr. Speaker, the result was the most backward legislation in the history of this country. Working people fled, but those who stayed, Mr. Speaker, decided to fight. The last word that the departing working people had — whether they were unemployed and seeking jobs or whether they were fleeing from this outrageous legislation was — for goodness' sake get rid of the Liberal Government.

Some Hon. Members: — Hear, hear!

Mr. Whelan: — And, Mr. Speaker, the working people of this Province took that advice, they tumbled into this political battle in a manner that I have never seen before. People who had supported the Members of the Party opposite for 30 years not only voted against them but worked against them. This legislation that set the clock back 30 years had to go. Our commitment to the work people, to the working men and women, to the carpenters, to the bricklayers, to the ironworkers, to the electricians, to the pipefitters, to the gasfitters, to the laborers, was get rid of the Liberals and we'll get rid of the legislation. And, Mr. Speaker, our commitment was made to them; our commitment to them is going to be kept. We don't care whether the Hon. Member for Prince Albert (Mr. Steuart) calls it grandstanding, we don't care. We think that in this election we were fighting for the people. It is about time we stood against those who made profits on foodstuffs and on farm machinery and if the Members opposite want to come out fighting, I suggest and I invite them to come out fighting against the profiteers

and against the food manufacturers.

And, finally, Mr. Speaker, there is the farm legislation. Under the benevolent and beneficent and efficient administration of the Federal Liberals, farm income in this Province has dropped to a point where it has set records. It is the lowest in years. The cost of everything the farmer has to buy has gone up. Farm machinery prices have galloped and jumped, foodstuffs, everything the farmer has to buy has skyrocketed. The cost of money he has to borrow has risen as a result of the ceiling being taken off the bank rate. The cost of money has gone up at an unbelievable rate. Faced with the high cost of money and the high cost of machinery and the high cost of production, the farmer is in a jam. The old Government — the one that was thrown out — talked about legislation, but legislation without anyone to administer it is just so much window dressing.

The Mediation Board which had a sizable staff now has a complete complement of three. The need for debt consolidation and the need for negotiating mortgages and agreements for sale, the need for negotiating every kind of farm debt — this most necessary part of the Saskatchewan farm economy, this vehicle for handling economic problems, has been stripped to the bare bones. An emergency is fast arising. I am sure that every Member here knows of a mortgage foreclosure, a cancellation of an agreement, a farmer who can't buy fuel, whose credit is gone or limited, who can no longer pay interest to a finance company or a bank. Members opposite are going to come out swinging, they are going to come out fighting. They say we are grandstanding. We are grandstanding when we pass legislation to give the farmer a second breath, to give him a chance to work a little longer. We are grandstanding and they are going to come out fighting on behalf of whom? On behalf of the mortgage companies who are foreclosing, on behalf of the machinery companies, on behalf of the banks. These are the friends they are going to come out fighting for.

Mr. Speaker, I want it clearly understood that we are in favor of free adjudication, and I think this legislation is written in that manner, but, Mr. Speaker, the people in this Legislature, the people who sit here have decided and have put in the legislation which is on the desks of all Members, are going to do their level best, to protect, to stand by and to fight for the farmer. This is not grandstanding. Surely if we are concerned this is a real issue, this is a real problem and I suggest that we are trying to put forward a real and concrete solution.

Is this Session worthwhile? I say to the families who are paying deterrent fees, is it worthwhile? Our own family spent \$100 on deterrent fees of one kind or another in one year so it is worth something to me but to many groups, to the senior citizens, to the lower income groups, I say it is really worthwhile. To those over 65 who must scrimp and save to pay their medicare premium, who built this Province, who earned the right to free medicare, who earned the right to this consideration, I say to them, this Session is worthwhile at \$6,000 a day.

To the family of those who are mentally ill, who have been bounded and beaten and slugged with the most unbelievable legislation, who have had to suffer this discrimination against those who are mentally ill as well as to pay for it, retroactively

August 2, 1971

since 1945, I say, Mr. Speaker, this Session is worthwhile to them.

To the working man who wants his freedom, who doesn't want a rigged arbitration board, who wants to bargain for his labor, is this Session worthwhile? I say, Mr. Speaker, it is. It is more than that. It represent to him, his freedom.

To the farmer who is harried, who is losing his livestock, who is losing the land that he has worked for by mortgage foreclosure, who is living day to day facing insecurity, this Session is really worthwhile.

Mr. Speaker, the Members opposite say that we are grandstanding. If it is grandstanding to fight against the tax on the sick, to fight for three years against this damnable tax on the sick, and then put it in legislation as we promised to do, then this is grandstanding. If we remove the premium for those 65 and over, and that is grandstanding, then I plead guilty. If removing legislation that causes labor strikes from the books in this Province, then we are grandstanding. If protecting farmers, whose very livelihood, everything they have done and everything they have built is threatened with foreclosure, then we have grandstanded.

But Mr. Speaker, grandstanding or no grandstanding, and whether the Opposition says they are coming out fighting or not, I can tell you that on this side of the House, there are some people who have, one session after another, quietly and without headlines, without any let-up, have really and truly come out fighting. They have come out fighting on behalf of senior citizens, for the working man and woman, for the farmer, for the mentally ill and, in this Speech from the Throne, Mr. Speaker, there are no headlines for them, the headlines belong to the people they represent. Mr. Speaker, so do the benefits.

Members on this side of the House, sitting as the Government, find I am sure, that: (1) the Opposition criticisms are trivial and unfounded; (2) that they are not fighting for the right people; (3) that the Session is worthwhile in practical application to the people whom we represent.

Mr. Speaker, I cannot support the amendment, I will support the motion.

Mr. D.W. Cody (Watrous): — Mr. Speaker, I want first of all, to congratulate you on being elected to the very high office of Speaker. Knowing you as I have in the past, I am confident you will do an admirable job.

Mr. Speaker, I also want to congratulate Mr. Blakeney and his very fine choice of a Cabinet. I know that under Mr. Blakeney and his leadership they will do a good job with a high degree of efficiency.

Mr. Speaker, very briefly I wish to turn to my own constituency of Watrous. Watrous constituency is one of rather straight lines, one of the few left with straight lines of course, it is sort of rectangular, 72 miles long and 35 miles wide, made up of many ethnic groups of which I am proud. We are mainly a farming community with five good sized towns and four average villages. It is the only constituency in the

Province which can boast of a mineral water beach and I invite everyone including the Members of the Opposition side to meet and come out to our very pleasant resort.

I want to thank all of the people who voted and worked for me throughout this last election campaign. I want to make particular mention of the young people, for if it hadn't been for the tireless work of the young people, I'm sure this election would not have been possible.

Mr. Speaker, Wednesday, June 23, 1971, will go down in Saskatchewan political history as the time a brilliant, dynamic young lawyer, Allan Blakeney by name, led his Party to a landslide victory in the Provincial election.

Some Hon. Members: — Hear, hear!

Mr. Cody: — On Wednesday, June 23, 1971 Saskatchewan was led from darkness into light, from despair to hope.

Mr. Speaker, the record of the previous Administration should not be allowed to be buried. We should not allow it to be buried lest people forget. This record of inefficiency must be brought up from time to time to remind people, and the Members opposite particularly, of the dangers of such rude interruption of good government as we had from 1944 to 1964.

Mr. Speaker, if the previous Government is to be remembered at all, it will be remembered for deviousness and hard heartedness. It will be remembered for pitting one segment of society against another, teacher against trustee, farmer against labor, labor against government, and worst of all, big business against us all. It will be remembered for its cruel and vicious legislation against people. I should like to say, Mr. Speaker, at this time and review some of this legislation for it is the purpose of this Special Session to repeal some of it.

Let's take health and the imposition of deterrent fees. If ever a government demonstrated a lack of morality and compassion, it was the previous Government in connection with the health care of its citizens. Let's look at the record. They imposed deterrent fees on hospital and doctor use of \$2.50 and \$1.50 a day. But whom were they deterring? Was it anyone who could afford it? Was it anyone who could afford to pay for it? I should say not. It was intended to deter only those who could least afford the cost and who needed coverage the most. It was a direct tax on the sick. It was, Mr. Speaker, a sick tax. I am very pleased to be associated with a government that intends to make the health care of its people a priority.

Some Hon. Members: — Hear, hear!

Mr. Cody: — I want, Mr. Speaker, to turn now to another area of the Throne Speech and that is the section dealing with labor. The previous Liberal Government conducted a deliberate and systematic campaign against labor. They again attacked with vengeance, one section of our society. They again enacted vicious restrictive legislation, anti-union legislation. Political interference in industrial relations became the order of the day. But worse than that, Mr. Speaker, they denied, yes, wiped away, one of the basic fundamentals of the democratic rights in a democratic

society and that is the right of a worker to improve his conditions.

Once again they showed a lack of respect for democratic traditions. This Government, Mr. Speaker, believes that we have a responsibility to treat all citizens fairly and we take pride in giving back to the labor movement an equal place in our society by guaranteeing free collective bargaining, repealing Bill No. 2 and removing political interference. One can indeed say, Mr. Speaker, that it is a New Deal for people.

Mr. Speaker, it is my belief and the belief of most Members of this House that our free and democratic institutions must be strengthened and preserved. With that in mind, I am pleased to see that my colleague, the Hon. Member from Saskatoon Mayfair (Mr. Brockelbank) has moved a private Member's resolution for legislation initiating an independent boundaries' commission. This will complete a fair redistribution of our electoral boundaries. I say this, Mr. Speaker, because the record of the previous Administration points out that we do not all have, and that we do not all share the same faith in our democratic process. It seems ridiculous to me that there are some Members sitting in the House who represent one-quarter of the people that others represent. One of the Members now isn't sitting in his seat. There could have been, Mr. Speaker, two reasons for this gross distortion. The first reason being that the Members of the former Government and of that committee, some who are sitting opposite, some who leave their benches from time to time, felt that one New Democratic Member could represent four times as many people and still do as good a job as a Liberal Member representing one-fourth as many.

The second reason is more sinister and I believe the real reason and that is that they intended to perpetuate themselves in office even against the wishes of the majority of the people of Saskatchewan. Their contempt for democratic traditions was surpassed only by the people's contempt and indignation and a shared determination to wipe them out of office which we certainly did on June 23. If the recent Saskatchewan election gave us anything at all, it gave us a renewed faith in people, a renewed faith in the democratic process.

Mr. Speaker, as I have mentioned previously, the people of my constituency are engaged primarily in agriculture. Therefore, I am pleased to see legislation which will give the farmer protection by offering a year's moratorium on payments for land and machinery and livestock, again demonstrating that the New Democratic Party recognizes the farm situation and is prepared to do all in its power to see that the farmers are helped back to the road to economic recovery.

I also commend the Hon. Member for Touchwood (Mr. Meakes) for introducing a private Member's resolution which will establish a land bank commission. If there is any piece of legislation which will be popular, particularly to the constituents of Watrous, it will be the Land Bank Commission. The farmers throughout the Province, as I have just said, and including Watrous, are interested in this bold, imaginative program and they will see once and for all that a family farm in Saskatchewan can be made viable. It proves that this Party believes that human values will not be sacrificed for just the sake of technology and efficiency. It proves that the New Democratic Party is committed to saving a rural way of life.

I have, Mr. Speaker, tried to let this House know the hopes and aspirations and expectations of the people I represent. Much has been done in the past few years to build up a mistrust in our political system. We must do away with obsolete dogmas and outworn slogans and re-establish confidence. It is my hope and the hope of my people and I am confident it will come about that we have an open government and every chance will be given for participation and examination of policies.

It is, Mr. Speaker, with this in mind that I invite the Premier and his Cabinet to come out to my constituency when time is available and meet with our people. "All questions," Robert Kennedy has said, "must be raised by great voices and the greatest voice is the voice of the people. Let that voice speak and the stillness you hear will be the gratitude of mankind."

Mr. Speaker, let the word go forth from this Legislature to the people of this Province and to the people of this country that Saskatchewan has come to terms with herself. She is ready once again to take her rightful place with a renewed dedication to achieve new goals, to meet the needs of a new generation.

Mr. Speaker, Saskatchewan is going to have this New Deal for People. I am sure by this time that you will have gathered, I will support the main motion and I will not support the amendment.

Some Hon. Members: — Hear, hear!

Mr. P. Mostoway (Hanley): — Mr. Speaker, I should like to congratulate you on your election to the high office which you now hold. As for myself, I should like to thank the people of Hanley constituency for granting me the privilege of representing them. As you may or may not know, Hanley constituency is a sort of hybrid constituency being primarily rural but also having a portion of Saskatoon in it. Nevertheless rural and urban share mutual concerns in spite of this unnatural but healthy alliance.

Mr. Speaker, I think this Government should be commended for introducing legislation to abolish deterrent fees.

Some Hon. Members: — Hear, hear!

Mr. Mostoway: — Without going into detail which has already been brought out I should like to say that this legislation will, I am sure, clear up much confusion. Now I mean confusion as was to be found when some people on entering hospital were required to put down initial deposits, others were not. Not aware of the various agreements certain jurisdictions had with certain hospitals, many people in Hanley constituency often wondered why and for what reasons.

Mr. Speaker, in the field of mental health I again commend this Government for its proposed legislation. If we are to believe what psychologists tell us, many cases of mental illness are in part, a product of our society. Is it fair, then, to single out this type of illness and consequently seize portions of estates?

Related to this is another area of concern to me and various people in Hanley constituency and that is the care and treatment of young men and women who are physically handicapped. I don't think there ever has been or is provisions for these people to be together for companionship, proper care and attention. And here I am referring to the type of plant such as may be found in so-called Cheshire Homes. I know that in Hanley constituency certain organizations are holding hard-earned money in trust to supplement any government effort in this area. I know of one girl, almost totally physically handicapped, who for about eight months of the year can look forward to looking at the four walls of her home. For variety she can look out her window and gaze at a monument to man's ingenuity in solving certain problems — Blackstrap Mountain.

I would also ask this Government to give careful consideration in the near future to more permanent and far-reaching programs concerning recreational facilities in our centres. Now in all sincerity I am not suggesting vast grants of money but rather moderate ones, clearly spelled out so as to act as initiating stimuli for local projects.

May I also ask the powers that be — this would be directed primarily to the Federal — that if they are willing to spend millions of dollars on youth surveys and youth participation programs, could they give consideration to having some of these young people going into various communities and involving themselves with recreational activities. Many of these young people — and for the benefit of one of the Members opposite some of them do have long hair — many of them are excellent athletes who could put on extended ball, golf or whatever you have, workshops. Others could organize and teach our children things such as art, pottery, leather work, etc. If needed, surely our schools which are usually empty at this time of year could be used for such purposes.

Mr. Speaker, no doubt the proposed farm legislation will be welcomed by the farmers of our province.

Some Hon. Members: — Hear, hear!

Mr. Mostoway: — Again, may I point out the fact that many of our farmers are caught in a bind. In Hanley constituency alone, and the others are in the same position, many farmers don't know where their next payment is coming from. Some have had to take on other work and I know of cases of that in my own constituency. Some have had to take on other work to keep family and farm together, and to put food on the table. Some have had telephone service cut because they couldn't pay their bills. In the Glenside and Broderick areas of Hanley constituency, irrigation farmers feel that they have been left out on a limb and justifiably so. The farmers of Hanley constituency, just in case they don't see enough red in their books at year's end, can always gaze at night, at that little red revolving light on Blackstrap Mountain, a real monument to progress for people. Mr. Speaker, I know this Government will give careful consideration in the future to helping the farmers of this Province maintain a way of life that was very often the envy of their city cousins.

Mr. Speaker, I should hope that this Government gives consideration in the near future to the inclusion in the school

curriculum of courses geared more to the needs of our young people. Here I refer specifically to such courses as would better help our young people to cope with the business of living after leaving school. I mean such things as basic law, rights, privileges, credit buying and many other things to which they, as well as a host of adults, often fall victim.

Mr. Speaker, in my area there are three potash mines. No doubt they are beneficial in that they provide jobs for people. They help to diversify the economy. However, there has been in the last few years an air of uncertainty on the part of workers, management and — and I stress this — owners too. On behalf of these people and the centres which benefit from this industry, I should like to see this air of uncertainty cleared up, or a good attempt made at it. While I am on this topic may I also ask this Government to speed things in regard to improved mine safety. Now I am not implying that safety standards are not reasonably good now. I merely wish to say that they should and can be better, thus saving the lives of workers.

Some Hon. Members: — Hear, hear!

Mr. Mostoway: — Mr. Speaker, thank you for allowing me to bring to light some of the areas of concern of the people of Hanley constituency. I oppose the amendment but I will support the motion.

Some Hon. Members: — Hear, hear!

Mr. D. MacDonald (Moose Jaw North): — Mr. Speaker, may I first congratulate you on your election to the office of Speaker. I should also like to congratulate Mr. Blakeney for being elected as Premier of this Province. May I also publicly congratulate Mr. Snyder for Moose Jaw South on his appointment to the Cabinet. As a fellow member for the City of Moose Jaw I am very happy to see our great city represented in the Cabinet of the new Government. I wish him every success in behalf of our city. I should also like to congratulate the freshman Member for Saskatoon University, Mr. Richards. His maiden speech regarding Bill 3 was a most refreshing presentation from that side of the House. It is obvious he is a new Member and he has a great deal to learn about the method of debate from that side of the House. He completely forgot to tell us that we were defeated on June 23, he did not tell us what a miserable little group we were, he did not tell us about the type of villains we have been over the past seven years. Surely the worst mistake of all that he made was that when he used the words, 'deterrent fees,' he did not even bleed a little, nor did he shed a single tear. I don't believe he once used the phrase, a tax on the sick, the poor and the aged. All Mr. Richards did was to give us his thoughts and ideas in a concise and logical manner. His unemotional and logical presentation will not likely evoke any congratulations from his fellow Members. However, I am sure some of the experience of his fellow Members will rub off on him. I am sure they can tell him where to get his acting lessons.

Mr. Speaker, I should like to take a few minutes to discuss Moose Jaw. As happened all over this Province we had a very interesting election in Moose Jaw. I believe that Mr. Snyder will agree that the election campaign in Moose Jaw was clearly fought on a very high level. During the campaign Mr. Snyder

August 2, 1971

raised some very important issues, made several promises that I feel are very worthwhile for our city. I intend to co-operate fully with the Member for Moose Jaw South and his Government to see that Moose Jaw gets its fair share. One of the first projects that we should like to see in Moose Jaw is the \$1.5 million provincial office building. I certainly agree that it make sense to decentralize some Government activities and develop regional centres. We in Moose Jaw look forward to an early start on the building. The project should certainly fit in with your expressed program of expanded public works. During the campaign Mr. Snyder promised an immediate start and Mr. Blakeney affirmed this when he was in Moose Jaw on June 5, 1971. I am sure that Members opposite realize that the Provincial Government already owns the proposed site for this building, this vacant lot has been a burden to the taxpayer and we look forward to an early start.

We in Moose Jaw also look forward to the zoological park which he promised for our Moose Jaw Wild Animal Park. Over the years this park has been a tourist attraction not only for our city, but for the Province as a whole. It has really been the only attraction of this type in the Province. The costs involved in keeping this facility up to the standard expected of it has become too great for a city the size of Moose Jaw. We certainly welcome provincial takeover of the park to make it into what we all dream it may become.

During the past few years pollution of the Moose Jaw River has been of concern to the residents of our city. The NDP promised us a Moose Jaw River project to eliminate pollution and re-activate our beach area. This promise rates a great deal of merit. However, I am a little concerned with the interpretation of this promise by the Government opposite. A short time ago Mr. Snyder announced that there was still money available from the STEP program that the Liberal Government instituted. He suggested that city council should get at the job of cleaning the bulrushes and used cars out of the river. The only catch is that for a month or so of cleanup the City of Moose Jaw taxpayers will be required to pay \$20,000 or \$25,000, which will raise our mill rate nearly one mill. This is a great deal of money to improve slightly the aesthetics of our river, but it won't reduce pollution at all. I am not sure the taxpayers in Moose Jaw can afford your program to reduce pollution. I would urge a re-interpretation of your promise here.

We have another to intensify development of Buffalo Pound and Besant, to eliminate the algae from the lakes and build a swimming pool. This promise fits admirably into your plans to enlarge the tourist industry in our province. However, once again I am a little worried about your methods. The swimming pool was planned at Besant under the Liberal Administration, the excavation was started and your Government awarded the contract, then withdrew it. A lovely park and a great trans-Canada tourist attraction now stands in a shoddy state of disrepair. Patrons are swimming in a dangerous and polluted mud hole. This certainly appears contrary to your promises and intentions.

We in Moose Jaw are also a little apprehensive about your promise to expand the technical institute in this city. The announcement a short time ago by the Minister that you plan to proceed with the technical institute in Regina leaves us in

Moose Jaw a little fearful for the future of our facility. Perhaps an announcement by the Minister concerning the Saskatchewan Technical Institute in Moose Jaw will remove our apprehension at an early date.

I shall conclude these remarks about Moose Jaw by saying that I wish the new NDP Government a good deal of success in dealing with its promises to Moose Jaw. Our city is looking forward to a good deal from your Government.

Some Hon. Members: — Hear, hear!

Mr. MacDonald: — Mr. Speaker, the New Democratic Party has now been in power for five weeks. Their true personality is now showing. The front they put on during seven years in Opposition and especially during the campaign has now been smashed. We find we don't have an NDP that is the people's party, as they have tried to lead us to believe. In fact, in five short weeks this Government is showing that it intends to become a bureaucratic institution with a firm first and no sense of fair play or decency. We have had some fantastic examples of what the New Democrats feel is fair play. We have already heard such beautiful phrases as, 'run them out,' and 'no consideration or compensation,' 'make examples of them,' all this from a New Democratic Party that for years complained about heavy-handed tactics. We have already seen legislation that is aimed at penalizing the persons that employ three or four employees. This is the same government that ran all over this Province promising help to the small businessman, a lot of people obviously bought this nonsense. The thing they didn't realize is that the New Democrats consider anyone, with more than one employee, is big business.

The Government is the same NDP, that during the election campaign, told anyone who would listen that if they were elected there would be no witch hunt. I don't want to take away their right to fire whomever they wish, but I do object to the right to say one thing and do another. These are the same people who said they would give government back to the people, and now we find that this is a party that gives in to organized pressure groups. This is the same New Democratic Party that talked about a New Deal for Indian and Metis.

Just this morning we find out that our new Premier doesn't feel that our Indian people don't know how to work properly. He feels that they aren't the kind of people who can hold a regular job. I am beginning to wonder what this New Deal will mean to them. These are the same New Democrats who said that they would put people before profits. And yet one of their first acts is to shut down the iron-ore project. And why? Because they say the profits may not be — and I emphasize may not — be to their liking. What do they mean, people before profits?

Mr. Speaker, these are just a few examples to show that the New Democrats ran an election campaign under false pretenses. During debate on some of the legislation there will be many more examples.

Mr. Speaker, the Throne Speech was a most incredible document. The New Democrats have been screaming, for I don't know how long, about unemployment. The Throne Speech ignores

the problem. The Government inserts the line in the Throne Speech saying, 'we have observed the serious misgivings of stagnation of the Provincial economy' and offering nothing as a remedy.

The only solution they do offer is that they will set up a Task Force. You have heard a lot about the high taxes that were imposed on Saskatchewan people by the old Liberal Government, and yet there is no tax relief offered in the Throne Speech. In fact, it assures us there will be higher taxes next spring. Mr. Speaker, it might be fair to suggest that this is a new and inexperienced Government and they must be given a chance to prove themselves.

I agree, but by the same token I feel that it is the duty as an Opposition Member to point out errors and omissions made by this Government. I intend to be very critical of the mistakes this Government has made and is making in some of the Bills that it has introduced in the Legislature. I do feel there are many.

During the first Session, however, I will be less critical of the glaring omissions that are being made by this Government. I will give them the benefit of being a new and inexperienced Government and will expect much greater things from them in the future.

Mr. Speaker, it is obvious that I will support the amendment and will vote against the motion.

Some Hon. Members: — Hear, hear!

Mr. H. Owens (Elrose): — Mr. Speaker, I should like to congratulate you on your election to the high office you now hold in this Legislature, knowing that you have the knowledge, the ability and the integrity to fill this office to the satisfaction of all the Members.

In rising to take part in the Throne Speech Debate, I do so as a new Member of the Government, representing the constituency of Elrose. I want to thank the constituents of Elrose for honoring me in this capacity.

The Elrose constituency has been noted for many years as being one of the most progressive constituencies in Saskatchewan, having elected in 1938 the late L.H. (Lou) Hantleman on the Farmer-Labor ticket.

Some Hon. Members: — Hear, hear!

Mr. Owens: — Mr. Hantleman was elected in 1934 in Kindersley and was one of the famous "quints," but redistribution placed him in Elrose which he represented, 'till voluntary retirement in 1944.'

Elrose elected Maurice Willis in 1944, and in each succeeding election until he voluntarily retired in 1956, after 12 years as a Member in the Government Again, Elrose sent another CCF Member to the Government, when Olaf Turnbull was elected in 1956 and again in 1960. However, disaster struck in 1964, but the aftermath has been a return to responsible

government on June 23 and Elrose again returning a Government Member to this Legislature.

Some Hon. Members: — Hear, hear!

Mr. Owens: — I hope my term in this Legislature will be as successful and rewarding as my predecessors.

Elrose constituency is located in one of the better grain-growing areas in Saskatchewan and, therefore, the farming economy is of vital concern to my constituents and myself. It contains no large trading centre, but several smaller service centres which depend entirely on the farming community they service for their livelihood, so the fate of the outlets providing the services is also a matter of deep concern.

If the farmers are economically buoyant, it naturally follows that the towns will flourish and businesses will expand, but the reverse is also true as, in fact is the case at the present time. It follows naturally then, that those factors that influence the farming economy are of prime importance. Some of these factors are beyond the scope of this Assembly and in such areas I will be supporting the Government as it seeks action and co-operation from senior governments.

In those areas that are within our jurisdiction, I will be supporting our Government in legislation that will effectively bolster our farming community and hence all of Saskatchewan.

One of the chief areas of concern is in the field of taxation, specifically property taxes on farms and small businesses, as they pertain to school operating costs. Relief must be provided in the immediate future if we are to save the smaller farmers and businesses from bankruptcy, caused by circumstances beyond their control. In addition we must recreate a farm industry that will remain attractive to those now farming and attract those who wish to make farming their life occupation, but cannot do so because of the high capital investment and operating costs.

Surveys indicate that the average age of Saskatchewan farmers is past 50. Many of these people would like to retire and should be able to do so with dignity, but are prevented from doing so by the inability to sell satisfactorily their farming interests to the young people who desire to farm, but who do not have ways or means to get started. Therefore, Mr. Speaker, I will be supporting our Government in enacting legislation that will make it possible for our older farmers to sell their farms and retire with dignity and security and also provide our younger people, who wish to farm, with ways and means to do so as well as offering them security and a purpose in living.

The health of our people is a priority item. I am pleased to know that all Members of the Legislature are prepared to recognize the importance of the legislation presented at this Session. The cost of health care is a serious matter and requires much study and action, especially in the areas of drug and hospital care costs.

The Minister in Charge has indicated that a thorough study of all aspects of the health program will be made and with this

August 2, 1971

I am in full agreement. Our present program, in effect, gives the providers of our health service a blank cheque. What private operator of any establishment gives his employees this privilege? I submit, Mr. Speaker, you would go into bankruptcy in a very short period of time. I further submit, Mr. Speaker, that our Government will need to institute a more sophisticated policing program to control effectively our health costs.

Mr. Speaker, I should like to make a few comments on education, a field that I have been interested in for many years — 16 years as chairman of a school unit board.

During those years and under the administration of the CCF Government, the trio involved, namely the education department, the teachers and the trustees, proved themselves capable of co-operating and working together to produce what became known as the most progressive and forward-looking educational system in Canada.

Some Hon. Members: — Hear, hear!

Mr. Owens: — We had problems, but most of them were resolved at the local level. There was no direct government or departmental interference, just good, clean advice, guidance and leadership. Since 1964 the unrest in the educational field has been of unprecedented proportions. Teachers have been used as whipping boys, being accused as the main reasons for higher costs, tied in with higher salaries, and lower teacher-pupil ratios, while trustees have had their power so eroded that they must feel they are considered very poor administrators, especially when their budgets must be approved by higher authority before they are assured of their share of Provincial assistance.

Surely these groups must have breathed a sigh of relief on June 23 when they were assured of the election of a government that will again change the directional trend in our educational system, and Saskatchewan will once again gain the reputation and the position it held seven years ago.

Some Hon. Members: — Hear, hear!

Mr. Owens: — Referring back to the Elrose constituency, I should like to point out that it has a unique feature uncommon to any other constituency in Saskatchewan, being bounded on the south and east by the South Saskatchewan River, giving it the longest shoreline of any constituency and the total north shoreline of Diefenbaker Lake.

This comparatively new man-made lake in the centre of prairie Saskatchewan was built primarily for power and irrigation purposes, but the potential for parks and recreational areas is almost unlimited and this potential should be realized, at least in part, in the immediate future, especially now since legislation is forthcoming to allow our people more leisure hours. This lake or this area is more accessible to more people in Saskatchewan than any other lake and so it behoves us to make it more attractive as well. The north shore of this lake needs and deserves much more action than it has received to date.

When I look across the lake to the shoreline that borders

the constituency of Morse and Arm River, and see the parks and recreation areas that are being developed there, I feel I should be an unworthy representative for Elrose if I failed to approach the parks and recreation department for more of the same for my constituents and others who frequent this area.

Mr. Speaker, more and more people of Saskatchewan are discovering the empty fraud that has been worked on them in the name of Capitalism. More and more people are recognizing that a Socialist Saskatchewan is the only answer to the problems that confront them. In an earlier depression the people rebelled against the cruelty and injustice of a profit-seeking society and they formed the CCF and elected them as the Government of Saskatchewan in 1944. On June 23 last, the people of Saskatchewan, again spoke in no uncertain terms in regard to their future by electing the New Democratic Party as Government of Saskatchewan.

Some Hon. Members: — Hear, hear!

Mr. Owens: — At the heart of our purposes as a government, is the conviction that ordinary people must achieve and retain control over their own lives. In order to accomplish this end we must establish a Comprehensive Planning and Growth Agency. We cannot pass on a decent place to future generations unless we do plan. It has been said that, "people don't plan to fail, they just fail to plan."

This Government must restore the principle that government exists to serve the people, not to dominate the people. Saskatchewan has passed the crossroads toward a Socialist and genuine humanistic society. The seventies will be a decade of decision for Saskatchewan. Compromises are no longer possible. A program of change toward Socialism will not come easily. Change never has come easily, nothing worthwhile in history has ever come easily.

Mr. Speaker, our Government is confident about the future of Saskatchewan and just as determined that long-standing problems can and will be solved. Our Government is ready to serve the needs of a modern industrial society with policies to cope with our agricultural and housing crisis, our rising costs and our high taxes, our educational problems, our health and welfare problems and others.

Our Government will regain control of our economy and give Saskatchewan a positive voice in her own destiny. We do not take lightly the task that awaits us but we do accept the challenge to build a society that we shall be proud to pass on to the future generations.

Mr. Speaker, I support the Speech from the Throne and I oppose the amendment.

Some Hon. Members: — Hear, hear!

Mr. M. Feduniak (Turtleford): — Mr. Speaker, may I first congratulate you for the high post you have just acquired. I should also like to convey my condolences to Mrs. Ross Thatcher and the Thatcher family. I should like to congratulate the Member for Saskatoon

August 2, 1971

City Park (Mr. Dyck), the mover, and the Member for Yorkton (Mr. Carlson), the seconder, on the manner in which they moved and seconded the Throne Speech.

I wish to thank my predecessor, Mr. Bob Wooff, who established so much good will in my constituency that makes it easier for me to follow. When one speaks . . .

Some Hon. Members: — Hear, hear!

Mr. Feduniak: — . . . of honesty only men like Mr. Wooff qualify for this title. His whole environment, integrity, prestige, dedication, I hold in very high esteem.

After my nomination, it was questionable whether or not I could fill Mr. Wooff's shoes, but when I looked at the size of my feet, I didn't think I had too much to worry about. I wish to thank all the people in Turtleford constituency who worked so hard to elect me, in spite of the gerrymandering of our constituency. I am very happy to be on Allan Blakeney's team.

Some Hon. Members: — Hear, hear!

Mr. Feduniak: — Mr. Speaker, not too long ago the farmers were told by the Liberal Federal Government to grow all the wheat they could and they would sell it. They also told the farmers to get into larger operations, to become more efficient. The farmers did that, they bought more land and bigger machinery at highly inflated prices and financed them by high interest rates.

It has been proven by analysing the facts that this efficiency only benefited the big business and not the farmers who made all these additional investments. On top of all this, the price of grains dropped by some 40 per cent. A year later, the Prime Minister of Canada said to the farmers, "you grew it, you sell it." When the payments came due on land and machinery, with all kinds of grain on hand, they were not able to meet these payments. As a result foreclosures and repossessions took place. Many farmers lost their land and machinery.

I am told that some collectors called on farmers to collect the past due notes, in many cases found the farms abandoned and the machinery left behind.

Mr. Speaker, a week ago last Friday, I drove out with an employee of mine to pick up three units — three repossessions. We drove into the yard, I walked up to the house, knocked on the door, and no answer. But I noticed through a blindless window, the furniture had been removed, the farm was abandoned. When we came back with these units to my shop, I noticed another unit had been delivered by another farmer who had given it up.

Mr. Speaker, the Royal Commission and the Barber Commission found that the American dominated farm machinery companies are getting exorbitant prices for farm machinery. An insult, which adds to injury, is the high rates of interest charged at present, running about 16 per cent.

A group that uses this plan are usually the people who can least afford it. A farmer buys some machines, uses them seven

to ten days, puts them away and pays high interest rates on them for the rest of the year.

It is not only the farmers who are affected by these problems. The dealers are also getting it too, over 50 per cent of machinery dealers have been forced out of business and have closed their doors thus eliminating necessary services to farmers. Warranty has been a problem too, as it is the farmer or dealer who has to pay transportation involved in going to or bringing in machinery for warranty work. I believe that the machinery companies should bear these costs under warranty. Also there are unreasonable increases for repair parts. For instance, a baler needle No. F2526 used to sell for \$13.50 back in 1965. In 1970 it sold for \$23.

There are many reasons for the high prices for machinery imported from the United States. Freight rates are large factors. The farmer pays the freight on the steel shipped from Canada to United States and then pays the freight on the product coming back to Canada. On a large tractor the freight is \$624 from Racine, Wisconsin to Regina. Unreasonable increases in the price of steel is another factor. For instance, the Steel Company of Canada gave their employees a wage increase in three years amounting to 16 per cent. However, they increased their profit on steel by 42 per cent in one year. They employ high paid personnel such as executives, directors, university graduates and engineers, who possess very little realistic knowledge in actual farm operations and the type of equipment needed. This results in producing poor quality and inefficient machinery to suit the conditions.

Mr. Speaker, to prove this theory, we have several farm machinery manufacturing firms here in Saskatchewan, Manitoba and Alberta, mostly started by farmers and blacksmiths who had firsthand knowledge about the farming, land conditions, etc. They designed and manufactured some of the best units in North America. For instance, Morris rod weeders and cultivators. Several firms made stonepickers, grain augers — to mention a few. Now most of the swathers are made in Manitoba for the major United States machine companies. Many of you will remember that in the war, a group of Army Service people made a tractor in Edmonton called 'Rock Oil.' It was very reasonably priced but it didn't continue very long because one of the big businesses bought them out.

There has been some legislation passed called the Dealer Termination. In Alberta, Bill No. 83 was passed by that Legislature. In 1970, Bill No. 64 was passed by the Saskatchewan Legislature. This Dealer Termination legislation provides elimination of contract between dealer and machine company. Under this Act the dealer has the privilege to return all new machinery without depreciation and all parts that qualify at current prices, less 15 per cent of wholesale cost. But this does not solve any of our problems. We want to keep our dealers in business so they can make a living and provide services to the farmers who need them.

Some Hon. Members: — Hear, hear!

Mr. Feduniak: — In order to solve some of these problems we could introduce the Saskatchewan development fund for agriculture to develop farm machinery manufacturing as recommended by the

Royal and Barber commissions, who state that it is highly feasible to promote this industry in Canada, presumably in the Prairie Provinces, perhaps combining two or three provinces together on this project. It would certainly tend to increase employment for our people. We should also reinstate the Agricultural Machinery Association testing. Time and money could be saved if the implements and parts were to be standardized. This would reduce inventory stocks and costs and provide more services.

These are some of the problems and solutions introduced very briefly and are subject to many details. The basic solutions, of course, would be implementation of parity prices to apply to every occupation, job and operation but this will only be possible under Federal jurisdiction. I hope this will be possible before too long in Canada.

Some Hon. Members: — Hear, hear!

Mr. K. MacLeod (Regina Albert Park): — Mr. Speaker, I have a few remarks to address to this Assembly in connection with the Throne Speech and in rising to speak on this debate, I should say first that I have, throughout my life, been greatly impressed by the fine building and the grounds here. I think that it's a tremendous monument to the people who had so much faith in this Province and I should like to compliment the workmen who do such an excellent job of keeping the grounds and this building, and this particular room, in such excellent shape for us.

Mr. Speaker, I am quite aware, of course, that democracy is not made up solely of the external or physical things that I have mentioned. I believe it is made up perhaps more of people and traditions and I want to say how much I appreciate the right to be here in this free Assembly and the responsibility that rests upon me as a representative of people of this Province. I appreciate further that the plans that I have for the Members opposite, the plotting that accompanies those plans, would if I were in some other countries receive rather abrupt and terminal attention, because, Mr. Speaker, they're all doomed there. They are going to end up on the wrong side of the House in due course.

Before the Speaker leaves, I should like to congratulate him on his elevation as Speaker. Mr. Speaker, I was a teacher in the area west of Dalton, west of Archerwill, Saskatchewan — I know the Minister of Agriculture (Mr. Messer) regards that as God's country — but that was in the Dalton-Wadena constituency at the time of his first election and the people in the area have stood in awesome wonder at his steady progress and advancement through the House and this steady advancement and progress is the subject of occasional comment in the constituency.

I should like to inform you, Mr. Deputy Speaker, that the accommodations over here are very comfortable. We have lots of legroom, there is quite a bit of space over here and we do not find that we have any difficulty in moving about with complete ease and freedom.

Some Hon. Members: — Hear, hear!

Mr. MacLeod: — And for those on the other side of the House who have not had the opportunity to wander about these wide-open spaces, Mr. Speaker, I assure them that four years from now some of them, but not all of them will, I suspect, have the opportunity and the pleasure of undergoing what I am now enjoying.

Some Hon. Members: — Hear, hear!

Mr. MacLeod: — Mr. Deputy Speaker, I have the honor and the privilege to represent the constituency of Regina Albert Park. I should like at this time to . . .

Some Hon. Members: — Hear, hear!

Mr. MacLeod: — . . . A titter seems to have run through that crowd. Don't worry, I ask nothing.

I should like particularly to thank the campaign workers, the Liberal central office, the other candidates of our Party, some of whom are here today, whose advice and assistance we greatly value and all of whom greatly contributed to our success in Regina Albert Park and I particularly thank Mr. Stewart Cameron for his untiring efforts of my behalf in Albert Park.

An Hon. Member: — Don't forget to thank Harrington!

Mr. MacLeod: — Oh, you could have doubled the number of people there, you still couldn't have won.

Regina Albert Park, Mr. Speaker, is basically a residential constituency. It has two old-age homes at the present time and there is another one under construction soon to be completed. There is one apartment block which has been sitting rather vacantly out there for some time now. It is now being completed and when completed in the very near future will house more than 100 additional people. Another apartment block has just been completed and filled in that area. There are a number of townhouses constructed in the area just recently. A large number of single family dwellings are being constructed and soon to be commenced are two 72-suite apartments in Albert Park.

All in all, I think, Mr. Speaker, we may justly lay claim to the proposition that this is the smallest but one of the fastest growing constituencies in the Province. And all of this commenced and was underway prior to June 23, Mr. Speaker, just in case anybody should get the wrong idea.

Mr. Speaker, this constituency contains the largest number of apartment buildings of any constituency in the Province of Saskatchewan and it contains some of the nicest apartments and some of the worst. It stands astride the glide path to the main northwest and southeast runway of the airport and because of that, Mr. Speaker, it has endured a noise pollution level unmatched, I suggest, by any other constituency in the Province.

Albert Park has just about 5,000 people who are entitled to vote. The transitory nature of our apartment dwellers leads to some difficulty in enumeration. I am told that in one of the

August 2, 1971

polls, we had 145 per cent people vote as compared to the enumeration. So in this particular apartment area, in any event, they were gathered up on election day and brought to the polls. We are quite prepared to believe that these people actually reside there. They live and abide within our boundaries even though they weren't actually on the enumeration list.

I am told that some extreme difficulty was also encountered by members of the census teams who went about the constituency at about the same time.

With respect to the campaign, Mr. Speaker, I want to say at this time that in Regina Albert Park the campaign was fought, we think, on a very responsible and honorable level by both candidates. We stuck to the issues and I think this campaign does credit to politics in general to the candidates and my worthy opponent in particular. There was only one incident on election day in which supporters of my worthy opponent conducted themselves improperly during the course of the election and I am convinced that this was not in any way deliberate. It was, in fact, accidental and occasioned by the ignorance of one or two of the supporters of my opponent — not mine.

I am attempting to pay my worthy opponent a compliment and I do so unhesitatingly because I am sure that the one instance that came to our attention I'm convinced was accidental and was not deliberate. So I am prepared to believe that any wrongful conduct was innocent of any evil design except for one. They had the design surely to bring about my defeat, which in the word of politics isn't an evil design.

I might say that, of course, there were, in fact, three candidates but the election primarily was a contest between myself, on behalf of the Liberal Party, Mr. Jerry MacDonald on behalf of the NDP. There was a Conservative candidate who polled just over 200 votes so the remarks that I have made refer to the worthy Mr. MacDonald.

Now, as a Member for Regina Albert Park, Mr. Speaker, I should like to assure you that the Member for Albert Park intends in this House to take his duties pretty seriously. I intend to act responsibly and for the benefit of all citizens. I intend in turn to look at the Government for the same sort of conduct on its part. I expect it to go about its affairs properly and in a businesslike manner with proper attention to the affairs of the people. I must say, Mr. Speaker, that with some bit of disappointment I observed the tendency of the Government to rush into print at all times. My eye caught an item in the Leader-Post on the evening of July 12, 1971 — the evening edition — and it mentioned (and I'm sorry that he is not in the House) that the worthy Minister of Education (Mr. MacMurchy) had moved his office. I thought that that was rather an important announcement obviously, at least he thought so. I started to look for another one and I found another press release where he says something like this:

Education Minister Mr. MacMurchy studying an interim report from a committee studying bursaries. He says he is not prepared to comment on it and the report has not been released.

And then it goes on to say:

The interim report deals with the needs facing students. He didn't know when the committee's final report would be made or when he would be able to make long-term recommendations.

So there we have another press release from the Minister of Education. And I started looking for them simply because of his apparent tendency to rush out and get his name into print.

Of course I would be remiss, Mr. Speaker, if I didn't mention the apocryphal story — at least I hope it's apocryphal — about the previous campaign in which our worthy friends on the other side of the House had a proposed meeting in the town of Lumsden, and with their usual accent upon press releases, they sent a notice in advance to the Leader-Post, I understand, that there were 300 screaming, exuberant fans who attended this meeting in Lumsden, and they mailed it in and shipped it off to the Leader-Post, or one or more of the publications around the country. The difficulty is, I understand, that a rainstorm — a real cloudburst — came along about 7 o'clock that night and the whole meeting was cancelled. So that this meeting at which 300 screaming, enthusiastic fans were apparently there, never did occur. And I think that this is an example, among other things, of the cult method. Now, I won't get into that at the present time because having gone through the past election campaign, I am quite aware that counts don't always come out in favor of the Liberal Party.

But in any event, I was rather interested in this bursary report because any time a Minister thinks it's worthwhile sending out a notice that he has received an interim report, that he hasn't studied, and he hasn't considered and that hasn't been released and doesn't know when the rest of it's going to come in, I thought maybe we could speculate that we are about to hear some more things. It's obvious that he wants us not only to hear all the news, that is the news, he wants us to hear some news that isn't.

Now, I expect that we shall have following that from the Minister of Education a few more items. I have no doubt that he will give a news release in due course that he has read this interim report but hasn't thought about it. I expect, Mr. Speaker, in due course we'll get another press release from the Minister indicating that he has considered the report. I expect a further one, of course, that he's made a decision and will announce that decision in due course, and of course we'll be blessed with a final release, presumably, that he will have a decision which he will announce.

Now, I am not saying that the Minister is overly impressed with his new magnitude of his new portfolio. It's very possible that the department is breaking him in gently. But this press release syndrome on the part of the Ministers, and particularly the Minister of Education (Mr. MacMurchy), does lead to some pretty wonderful and singular possibilities. And, Mr. Speaker, I wish to state here and now that there are some daily functions which the Minister must regard as totally urgent and important but I recommend that he perform these without fanfare and accompanied by the minimum of noise.

But I do think we've found the secret, Mr. Speaker, of why the Minister hasn't been able to deal with the pupil-teacher ratio. He's been so concerned with getting his name into the

August 2, 1971

press. The Minister is changing his parking lot — I hope we don't hear about that.

Now, Mr. Speaker, I should like to go on with what I think is something that has concerned me a great deal and that is the quality of leadership that we have in the Province.

To begin with, it is not entirely the type of leadership that we want when you call a Special Session, Mr. Speaker, to emphasize publicity that you've had over the last campaign. Now, of course, they're entitled to do that but it's one with which I don't entirely agree but "up with which I am prepared to put," because we were beaten and they're entitled to spend a little time gloating.

I was very pleased with the Premier's remarks that the Choiceland deal is far from dead. But I was disappointed at his suggestion that anybody who couldn't afford to build an iron mine is obviously insolvent. I don't suppose the Premier is insolvent but I am quite sure — at least I doubt yet — that he can afford to buy or build an iron mine.

Now, it is this total exaggeration of remarks from across the way that has so disappointed me. It's the misrepresentation that troubles me more than anything else. I am quite sure that Interprovincial Steel Corporation is a very well run company. I am sure that properly run it will be counted upon over the years with some management to produce profits not only for itself but jobs for the people and taxes for the Province, and I'm convinced it'll send the sort of ripple out through the economy that will be beneficial. But to characterize that company as insolvent because it hasn't been able to afford an iron mine is the grossest of exaggerations.

I guess perhaps that the sort of thing — maybe I should be learning about this in the House — because I just listened to the Hon. Member from Regina North West (Mr. Whelan) and in listening to him I started to wonder if maybe I had missed a caucus meeting because I was convinced and I was totally under the impression that we favored the elimination of utilization fees and we would vote in favor of the elimination of utilization fees.

Some Hon. Members: — Hear, hear!

Mr. MacLeod: — After having listened to him for awhile, I was not sure if I had missed one of the meetings. Now, I do appreciate that if you've got a speech prepared, and somebody pulls the rug out from under you, that should never in any way prevent you from giving a speech that you've already prepared. And I suspect that's what happened in the case of the Member from Regina North West.

An Hon. Member: — . . . his wife . . .

Mr. MacLeod: — Oh, his wife prepared one speech and then went on holiday — I get it. I understand.

Mr. Steuart: — The Primrose Path!

Mr. MacLeod: — The Primrose Path! In any

event — as an aside, Mr. Speaker, — I certainly was interested in this comment about the relative who voted NDP — shameful conduct, though it is — and I couldn't help but remark that it's hard to tell who went astray. It depends on which side of the fence you're on. I'm quite sure that all of us have given a similar example. Here there's this gentleman Whelan, a very honorable dedicated Member of the Liberal Party and he's got a relative who votes NDP and sits in this particular House as an MLA.

An Hon. Member: — Liberal MP in Ottawa!

Mr. MacLeod: — A Liberal MP in Ottawa and here look at this fellow who has gone astray and has joined the NDP.

Mr. McPherson: — Ed got off the track!

Mr. MacLeod: — Ed got off the track, yes. I wouldn't want to dwell on this too much longer but I do think I have to put the record straight. What happened was that in this family Ed became CCF for awhile and after observing the tendencies that were demonstrated, the other member then joined the Liberal Party.

Some Hon. Members: — Hear, hear!

Mr. MacLeod: — That's the way it happened.

Mr. Whelan: — And got elected!

Mr. MacLeod: — And got elected! Well, I guess one of the worst exaggerations that I have observed in the House up to now and I suppose I'll get used to this type of thing, is when the Premier suggested that the last Government supported — that is, the last Liberal Government in Saskatchewan — a six per cent unemployment ratio.

Some Hon. Members: — Hear, hear!

Mr. MacLeod: — Now, that has to be one thing of a landmark in misrepresentation because, Mr. Speaker, . . .

Mr. Romanow: — I was here . . .

Mr. MacLeod: — I was here, too, and I listened to what went on and what did go on apparently was that the Provincial Liberal Party congratulated the Federal Government on its fight against inflation and regarded it as a number one problem in Canada.

Some Hon. Members: — Hear, hear!

Mr. MacLeod: — Out of that was manufactured a support for an unemployment ratio which was never accepted in my recollection by the last Liberal Government. So there is nothing in any record at any time to support the Premier's statement and the comment to which he alluded, does not in any way support his statement nor does any comment made by the last Liberal Government.

August 2, 1971

The other thing — and I don't want to beat this thing to death — but I do think that a point should be made once more in connection with the now defunct Prince Albert pulp mill.

Some Hon. Members: — Hear, hear!

Mr. MacLeod: — I'm so scared to death of what they're going to do to that pulp mill that I just can't help myself.

The now defunct Athabasca pulp mill is the one to which I refer. The one on Dore Lake up in Northern Saskatchewan.

Briefly, what the advertisement said during the course of the campaign and what was repeated again by the Premier in this House was simply along this line. They said the Government of Saskatchewan is spending, risking, putting out certain amounts of money, many millions of dollars. And he said in effect that this cost \$200,000 of investment per job. Now, the big thing that I resented about the advertisement on television during the course of the campaign and the thing which I resented in the House, quite frankly, is the overall implication of this and the comparison with what actually occurred. Perhaps I could just give a simple example of how by applying it to some other case; namely, my own residence at 1930 MacPherson. Now, that house I bought for \$16,700 and I put up . . .

Mr. Romanow: — Plutocrat!

Mr. MacLeod: — Well, yes, I'm a lawyer and after all I earn \$3,800 a year!

An Hon. Member: — Almost as well as you teachers.

Mr. MacLeod: — Just as well as you teachers. In any event, the Government of Canada, through the National Housing Act guaranteed a loan from the Bank of Nova Scotia in excess of \$13,000 so I put up about \$3,700 of my own money and the Bank of Nova Scotia loaned \$13,000 guaranteed by the Government of Canada.

Now, it would come as a great surprise to me — and a great surprise to the Bank of Nova Scotia — to discover, if they followed the reasoning adopted by the Premier, that the Government of Canada has a \$13,000 investment in my house. They should own 70 per cent of my house because they guarantee the loan of \$13,000, a loan which I hope they'll never have to worry about. That's the kind of reasoning that we've had up to now and that's a total example of the kind of reasoning we've had on the Athabasca pulp mill and it's totally and absolutely false. As far as I can see that's the kind of reasoning that prevent people, honestly and fairly, to assess the kind of a deal that the people of Saskatchewan were presented with when that Athabasca pulp mill agreement was put up.

Some Hon. Members: — Hear, hear!

Mr. MacLeod: — Now I'm not saying that there aren't pluses or minuses and I am not saying that upon the entire evaluation of these pluses and minuses, you wouldn't determine that the pulp mill should not go ahead. I am not saying that at all. I am

merely saying that the type of remarks that I've heard from the Members of the Government makes it totally impossible for the people of Saskatchewan to get the proper facts and to evaluate anything and that's the type of thing where politics lets the people of Saskatchewan down.

Mr. Speaker, one thing about this pulp mill that was totally ignored was the subsidiary type of jobs — subsidiary employment — and the multiplier effect. And when you talk about \$200,000 investment per job, it's worthwhile noticing that when the University of Saskatchewan, Regina Campus was being mooted for the City of Regina, we were told that a university body of 8,000 people (8,000 students) was sufficient to support an adjoining population of some 35,000.

Well, now, Mr. Speaker, there is no doubt about it that we'd have had an awful lot of subsidiary industry and subsidiary employment — some doctors and lawyers and teachers and other people — all needed in that area because of the Athabasca pulp mill. And what I regard as totally unfair and inaccurate is the suggestion that \$200,000 investment per job is what that pulp mill was going to create.

I think what has happened, Mr. Speaker, is that the present Government opposite during the campaign made statements which trapped the Government after it took office. I think they either had to bungle the deal to prove that they were right all along or cancel the deal so that nobody could prove whether they were right or wrong.

Mr. Steuart: — Give in to the Wafflers.

Mr. MacLeod: — Give in to the Wafflers. By the way, I'm not sure when Mr. — the Hon. Member, I think he's from Saskatoon — is it University — I understand he's really calling the shots. No, he's not really.

Mr. Speaker, I'm very sorry to have to spend time dealing with these frivolities but unfortunately I am not yet accustomed in this House to listening to all that nonsense without regarding it as the nonsense that it is. And I am here, Mr. Speaker, to say that I do not intend to object here just for the sake of objecting. I am going to try wherever possible to be as objective and reasonable as possible. I subscribe to the comments made the other day by the Leader of the Opposition (Mr. Steuart) about our general philosophy of opposition. I assure this House that we shall be as vigilant as possible in our proper defence of the welfare of the people of Saskatchewan. And when I say 'welfare,' Mr. Speaker, I am talking about real welfare and I'm talking about welfare by action and not welfare by words. But let me reiterate, we intend to be constructive.

And in that regard, Mr. Speaker, I have looked at the Speech from the Throne and at the very most the things that offend me number perhaps two or three dozen.

Now, they've handled this Session, Mr. Speaker, as an extension of the NDP publicity department, only this time at the expense of the people. This Session was created solely for the purpose of creating headlines. On Wednesday we had the Throne Speech and we got all sorts of headlines. Thursday we had the utilization fees problem — more headlines. Friday

August 2, 1971

morning we had an early press release — a very early morning press conference — to announce a farm bill, obviously announced, Mr. Speaker, for the purpose of getting as much publicity as possible for the Minister of Agriculture (Mr. Messer), presented to the nation, Mr. Speaker, prior to the time I gather that they had even printed the Bill but they wanted to catch the Friday headline.

Some Hon. Members: — Hear, hear!

Mr. MacLeod: — Oh, no, we wouldn't do that! Presented to the nation before we got it and we got that thing during the argument on the motion to extend the sitting hours and they finally decided, Mr. Speaker, that if we were going to quarrel about the time we sat, maybe they should show us what they're going to talk about.

And then, of course, having all the Wednesday, Thursday, Friday arguments headlines, the Government knew that it would not have any more good announcements and as a result it decided to compress what we had to say into the least amount of days. And having squeezed the maximum benefit from the Session up to then, it wanted to shut it off and get done with it as soon as possible.

It's Exhibition Week in Regina and this is a civic holiday and I notice that even the former mayor of the City of Regina (Mr. Baker) instead of being out at the Exhibition, as he probably desires, is sitting in this House.

An Hon. Member: — Conscientious!

Mr. MacLeod: — Conscientious Member!

Some Hon. Members: — Hear, hear!

Mr. MacLeod: — Conscientious, prevented from being that good citizen that he'd like to be by going out there to back the Regina Exhibition. The Regina Exhibition will be deprived of his support until some other time. So the pattern is clear . . .

Mr. C.P. MacDonald (Milestone): — He didn't get a free pass!

Mr. MacLeod: — Well, in any event, the reporters are human. They are all up at the races, I imagine, except the good faithful ones still here. So what is going to happen is that by tying this thing so that the Government gets the maximum of publicity — and shuts everybody else off or ties them up in such a way that they don't get anything.

Well, Mr. Speaker, I'm not saying that this speech isn't necessary. I'm saying that it is a very necessary speech. The difficulty is that to a large extent it's been further delayed by the Government. There are four areas at least of real emergency that we could, with dignity and honor, in justification of our being here study and bring to the top of our agenda. Two of them have been dealt with at considerable length and I won't spend much time on them.

The first one deals with jobs. I was not a part of and I'm not going to spend a lot of time defending the actions of

the previous Liberal Government . . .

Some Hon. Members: — Hear, hear!

Mr. MacLeod: — . . . but it does seem to me, Mr. Speaker, that that Government did understand clearly and fully that the process of getting industry is a long and tedious operation, Mr. Speaker, and when you lose something, you lose it for a long time.

Some Hon. Members: — Hear, hear!

Mr. MacLeod: — And without industry, you've got no jobs. And if this Session has done anything it's been a platform to announce how many new deals aren't going to be brought into Saskatchewan. If this Session has been called just for the purpose of discussing the problem of unemployment, that alone would have justified its existence.

We want that Choiceland mine and we'd be glad to have an emergency session on it and we'll be glad if you get the best kind of a deal. And if you won't get the best kind of a deal, and if you can't get the second, we want the third best. And if it satisfied your campaign promises to make a nickel better deal, go ahead and make that deal or make the same deal in a different way, go ahead and make it that way too. Because in every deal there's room for a nickel improvement and if you can do better, this is good for the people of Saskatchewan. And, Mr. Speaker, we'll give them full credit. We'll suffer darn near any sacrifice over here for the good of all the people.

Some Hon. Members: — Hear, hear!

Mr. MacLeod: — And the good of all the people demands that we have that Choiceland iron mine. And if you've got to do it all by yourself and the people of Saskatchewan spend all the money, let's do it. But I can say, Mr. Speaker, that if we lose that iron and steel complex that can result from that Choiceland iron mine, the people of Saskatchewan will forever hold the Government across the way totally and irrevocably responsible.

Some Hon. Members: — Hear, hear!

Mr. MacLeod: — And if we don't get it, if somebody else gets the jump on us, the same thing will happen in mines, in steel, as happened in the oil industry — eventually all the subsidiary industries and everything else will go somewhere else. The time is now, Mr. Speaker, we can't delay.

The second problem that I mentioned is just as real, that's the problem of the farm economy and I agree that it's pretty serious but I don't agree that it's serious in the way that the people across here say it is serious. All we get, Mr. Speaker, is a farm bill hastily prepared, put in under the oddest of circumstances, that is, in my submission, the greatest hoax ever perpetrated upon the farmers. I won't deal with this further, Mr. Speaker, expect to say that nothing I have seen yet could have demonstrated to me the shallowness and the hollowness and the weakness of the NDP platform than this Bill on the farm economy which masquerades as some sort of assistance.

August 2, 1971

to the farmer. There are some problems, Mr. Speaker.

Some Hon. Members: — Hear, hear!

Mr. MacLeod: — I just don't think it's a good enough Bill. It isn't half good enough.

Mr. Messer: — You should have brought it in two years ago then.

Mr. MacLeod: — I wasn't here.

Some Hon. Members: — Hear, hear!

Mr. MacLeod: — I can understand, Mr. Speaker, how we can have some difficulty keeping track of all those "characters" but I can't understand how they can have any difficulty keeping track of who was here and who wasn't here.

Mr. Speaker, there are some real problems and I should like to draw one or two additional ones to the attention of this Assembly. In recent years we've had the skyrocketing use of drugs become a national disgrace. You look in almost every paper, Mr. Speaker, and you see more dangers, the problems and the hideous consequences of drug abuse. This harvest of heroin, for example, that starts in the Himalayas, in Burma, in Laos and Thailand, is transported to the United States and Canada through Vietnam, in most cases, and is a growing menace. It's a tremendous menace to the future citizens of Canada and the future leaders that are now exposed to this menace. British Columbia Medical Association announced the other day that there were 10,000 addicts in the Province of British Columbia, almost all of them under the age of 30. In Vancouver the Catholic Family and Children Services reported that an overwhelming number or percentage of the orphans that they are now getting come from drug abuse. In just over two years they have reported a substantial number and a continuing increase. This doesn't in any way include the total of the large number of children whose care is being neglected because the parents are involved in drug abuse. The mayor of Vancouver has said recently that the drug problem in the area of Vancouver is absolutely beyond control. In Canada, as a whole, we have 14,000 offences in 1970 against Canada's Narcotic Control Act. And just in the City of Regina alone the other day, we had a report go before city council on the drug problem.

I am suggesting, Mr. Speaker, that along with poverty and crime the wide-spread use of drugs is probably the number one problem in the long-term for Canada. What are we doing about it? Well, Mr. Speaker, we are spending our time at a self-congratulatory Session of this Legislature, bringing in frilly-dilly legislation, ill-conceived, hastily drawn — and I am talking primarily about that totally inadequate farm legislation. Now if we are going to have a special emergency Session, my suggestion is that we do something about emergencies.

In Winnipeg, drug and drug abuse, will be introduced as a subject in the Grade Nine health curriculum in Winnipeg schools. Authorities on the subject intend to visit schools and discuss the problem.

Now if the Minister of Education (Mr. MacMurchy) were a little more concerned with that, and a little less concerned with getting his name in the headlines, perhaps he could deal with the problem. I don't know what the answers are. I know that a special team consisting of a psychiatrist, paediatrician, social worker, are going into the children's hospitals dealing with the drug when the drug addict arrives there.

I know that our young people, today, are faced with the task of making some pretty critical decisions, education, career, decision on drugs, not to mention the relations with the opposite sex, which I won't dwell on today. They make these decision, Mr. Speaker, at a time when they are least able, through experience, age and knowledge to make these decisions. So what have we got for an emergency? Well, we have the committee to study alcohol. Well, that's only the third one. There is another one that troubles me and that is an external one, Mr. Speaker.

There is the sorry and pathetic condition of the refugees and the ravaging of Bengal in East Pakistan. You will recall, Mr. Speaker, that this nation with a huge population, one of the oldest of so-called civilizations, achieved what was thought to be a tremendous step in the direction of freedom about a quarter of a century ago, with the departure of the English Colonists, the departure of the last viceroy, Lord Mountbatten. It was to be the golden age of India and the creation of India and Pakistan was a triumph for the dogooders. The colonial yoke had been broken, with the advice, the consent and the best wishes in support by the colonial power. And it was replaced immediately by some of the most terrible dislocations. Families were uprooted, sent packing to the country, depending on the religion you professed to end up at either India or Pakistan. Problems then were primarily between the two countries — India and Pakistan or India and China.

But four months ago, Mr. Speaker, civil war broke out in East and West Pakistan. I want to say that the most hideous and inhuman action has been taken. The suffering of men, women and children is almost incalculable. In the four months since the fighting began, about seven million refugees have left East Pakistan and have poured into India. They walked there without food and shelter and the refugee camps and torrential rains multiply their misery. The most inhuman conduct still accompanies this revolution. Atrocity follows atrocity.

In the last issue of the Time Magazine, Mr. Speaker, a report was transmitted through the Press trust of India. As a simple example of the seriousness of the revolution in India and in Pakistan, a group of refugees hid in a field as a Pakistan army approached and a mother with a six-year-old child was among them. The child started to cry and the mother who was fearful that they would all be slaughtered, strangled the child.

I have heard the Members of the Government, time after time, come out with the most severe condemnation of the actions of the United States in Vietnam and spare no time or detail recounting the events of these years. I want to know where is the condemnation of the conduct of East Pakistan and the conduct of West Pakistan with their military forces.

I don't know what we can do, Mr. Speaker. But I do know

this, Mr. Speaker, the United Nations report on Foreign Aid, from the industrialized countries to the under-developed countries of the world, is a sorry report indeed. It shows, Mr. Speaker, where the aid comes from. I might say that the Communist countries are at the very bottom of the list. But the industrialized countries who have the lowest per capita contribution to the needy people of the world is made by countries that have governments which call themselves Socialists. The very bottom of the list is Norway and Sweden.

These fellows are far more interested in winning votes than in helping anybody. So I want to know: where is humanity first?

The Province of Saskatchewan hasn't done a lot. But the Hon. W.R. Thatcher made an offer of assistance to refugees who might come to Saskatchewan. Now that offer has been interrupted by the election campaign, the ensuing defeat, and of course, Mr. Thatcher's death.

But I should be prepared to debate what we should do, Mr. Speaker. I don't see any reason why we can't send a mere one million dollars, perhaps a little more than \$1 per person for this from this Province. We could do something. And as I mentioned, incidentally, when I use words like Socialist, Free Enterprise and Capitalist, I might say that they don't play a prominent part in my vocabulary, because I have never yet been able to identify properly what Socialist is. All I know is that these countries call themselves Socialists, and these countries give the very least.

Mr. Speaker, with emergencies around us, we have every reason to call a special session. We have a self-congratulatory session. Well, I don't mind that. Go ahead! Mr. Speaker, I should like to deal with some real emergencies.

The Hon. Member — and I think he is from Saskatoon City Park (Mr. Dyck) — I am not sure — praised Mr. Blakeney for his political skill and his political judgment. Well I agree with that political skill. He skilfully engineered a publicity campaign, the likes of which I have never seen. He brought on this Session, Mr. Speaker, as an extension of the campaign, and I agree that he is skilful. But I don't have to like it. We haven't had a real emergency debate on real emergencies, because, Mr. Speaker, the Members of the Government bench are far more interested in publicity releases than they are in emergencies.

As a result, Mr. Speaker, I regret that I will be obliged to support the amendment to the motion, but when the motion comes on I shall be obliged to vote against it.

Some Hon. Members: — Hear, hear!

Mr. D. Lange (Assiniboia-Bengough): — Mr. Speaker, I rise in support of the motion. I should like to compliment the Member from Moose Jaw North (Mr. MacDonald) upon his constructive criticism of our side of the House.

I was to deliver my maiden speech to the floor of this Chamber on behalf of the constituents of Assiniboia and Bengough. I am proud to have been given a mandate at this age and I am looking forward with much anticipation to an exciting and challenging experience in the Legislature. I will endeavor to do

justice to the confidence of my constituents. Although perhaps young for the position now, I feel that if the first few days in Legislature are indicative of what the experience is going to be like, I shall age rapidly.

It was with some reservation, that I heard the Premier announce this morning, the cancellation of the Dore Lake pulp mill, for now, one of us on this side of the House must bear the onerous task of informing Joe Bishop that he did not get a job.

Some Hon. Members: — Hear, hear!

Mr. Speaker: — Order, order! Since David is making his maiden speech, I think it is the courtesy of the House not to keep interrupting.

Mr. Lange: — I think that it is fitting that a maiden speech should bear a certain philosophical bent particularly since it will be possible to compare it with those that I give in the future after the first signs of decadence have crept into my character.

So in my speech I shall attempt to show how social movement is growing in society, how public education is the only solution to coping with the movement and how this is incorporated into the work of the Government. For the benefit of Lloyd Robertson, of Weekend television, I shall be speaking instead of singing.

We are presently in the midst of a revolution. It is not like any revolution which has occurred in the past, but one entirely unique. It is a social revolution, originating with the individual and his culture. Before it is finished, it will have touched the base of virtually every aspect of our society. It will have affected our daily way of life, our morals, our culture, and even our financial institutions and corporate structures. And in its final act, it will affect our political structure. The clamor for social change manifests itself in many forms of protest, in both the young generation and the old. We are protesting the hypocrisy of war, the rampant technology and destruction of the environment; protesting poverty and disordered priorities in the face of unprecedented abundance; protesting the tragic waste of both human and natural resources; and, perhaps, more important than all, protecting the loss of self — the loss of the individual as a separate entity in society.

This social change is apparent in Saskatchewan when one looks at the results of the recent election. Although Saskatchewan people were, perhaps, protesting the previous Liberal Administration, our mandate is also indicative of the growing unrest in people under our present political structure. It is possible that our political system, like many other machines in society, has become obsolete, has run its course and needs to be changed. Old line parties must either change their philosophy in accordance or succumb. People have had enough of governments concerned only with pragmatic reform and are now looking for one concerned with social change.

The election has produced an air of hope and expectation in the public. I would suggest that the most direct approach we could take to solving the problem would be through the educational system. Legislation such as the student-teacher ratio is a

August 2, 1971

blatant denial of the right of any member of our society to be an individual.

The education of a society is a slow, tedious, and most expensive process, but it is also the only process through which our society can hope to progress. And to remove the teacher from the student, under present educational philosophy, is to remove opportunity for that student to become a creative, thinking individual. The last place in which any government should begin to cut back on budgets should be in the field of education.

Rather, more money should be spent upon education than upon educational research. Adult education programs should be expanded and all information services should be developed to make full use of mass media. Education should be a lifelong process and not something which stops at the end of formal education.

Our school systems give priorities to the sciences rather than to the humanities. In order to qualify for entrance to University, for example, we must have had courses in high school which are oriented heavily towards the sciences. Subjects in the humanities or fine arts don't carry as much credit because there isn't the demand in our society for cultural or humanitarian qualities that there is for technical abilities.

The total economic structure is oriented towards waste and obsolescence, solely for monetary ends. Consequently an individual is coerced into technology by the very real need of making a living. So a man has become a servant of his own machine — a tool of his tools, if you like. A way of rectifying this would be to place more emphasis upon humanities in our school system. We presently teach such subjects as physics, algebra and chemistry. These subjects have no value whatsoever to the student in terms of living, unless he chooses to pursue them after he has left high school, and then they have value, generality, only in a monetary form. He gains no understanding of an individual by learning algebra. Psychology, on the other hand, is a subject which could teach the students how to get along with others. Economics which he could use throughout life is not taught. We do not have sex education, or drug education. Sociology, philosophy, political science are more subjects which could be of tremendous value to the individual, but are not taught.

We must learn to make science and technology a tool which will work for us and not to become, ourselves, a tool of technology. Our educational system could do this by placing emphasis and priorities upon subjects other than those related to science and technology and at the same time making us aware of the potential of science.

People would not have to be subjected to the pandering of financial institutions if there were some subjects such as business management and economics taught.

The recent election campaign is also an excellent example of the political ineptitude and ambivalence of people within our society. The words, Socialism, Capitalism and Free Enterprise were bandied about in an irresponsible manner. Few people know the meaning or the philosophy behind these words. If one stops to rationalize the matter, he will realize that

we presently have all three in our society simultaneously. Our schools, for instance, are social institutions, paid for by the people of the community. Our farms at the same time are capitalistic in the sense that they must show a profit if they are to survive economically. And yet we still have free enterprise in the sense that the individual can choose which system or aspect he likes and can operate it as he wishes. Yet in our society we have huge multi-national corporations, which are so powerful they can dictate to and influence the lives of each and every one of us. And yet society could not function without these corporations. Our daily lives depend upon them. The question is not one of their elimination, or of their nationalization, but one of control.

Are we, the people, going to be controlled by corporations or are we, the people, going to control corporations? Resolving this problem will be a democratic process, of course, but think of how a high school background in political science and economics would help the voting population. They would be informed and rationally capable of weighing the alternatives themselves instead of having to depend upon, the sometimes slanted and twisted words of certain politicians and press. We are assuming here, of course, that we have a public which is informed upon the issues. But we have tremendous facilities available now to aid us with educating and informing people. It is now possible to have a public so well informed that we could hold a plebiscite on virtually every issue that arises. Our priorities must be long headed to introduce a program like this.

Here are some of the examples of issues which are presently before us and of which it will be our duty to inform the public. The closing of small hospitals is a major bone of contention. If we leave them closed then a more comprehensive medical program must be introduced to replace the loss of a hospital. It will be our job to present the alternative solution and if it is accepted to make people aware of how to use it. The land bank program and its implications upon urban and rural living is another example. What are the alternatives? What facilities must we provide along with it and how shall we be able to convince people to comply with these facilities? What must we do to make the program work? An informed public will be able to weigh the issues itself.

The onus to change society then must be upon the education system for society cannot change any more quickly than the thinking of the individuals within society itself and the onus to change the educational system is upon the MLA. All change ultimately takes place through laws made upon the floor of this Chamber. Let us hope that as we grace our leather swivel seats we do not become smug in complacency. We must make a proving examination of where we are going and what our options are. We must be aware of the problems which pervade society and flexible enough to change with the new ideas which inoculate society. But MLAs should never know more than the rest of the public about an issue. In a democratic society all men should know what the issues are; we should know the moves that are made because of the issues and the consequences of those moves. Saskatchewan could, as it has before under the New Democratic Party, set a precedent for North America and indeed for the world with an education system engendering the individual's importance.

Some Hon. Members: — Hear, hear!

Mr. H. Rolfes (Saskatoon Nutana Centre): — Mr. Speaker, may I along with all the others, offer you my congratulations in being elected as Speaker of this House. It is no easy task from what I have seen so far to keep order and to have the Members of the House follow the rules. As a new Member of this Legislature I want to assure you that I will always try to abide by the rules and to be guided by your Honor's decision. I have only one request to make of the more experienced Members of this House and that request is that they always follow the rules so that the new Members will know what the rules are.

Some Hon. Members: — Hear, hear!

Mr. Rolfes: — I want to illustrate with one example and I must admit that I have been somewhat dismayed and disillusioned. It was my understanding, Mr. Speaker, that we always refer to the Members as the Hon. Member of Prince Albert West or the Hon. Member of Regina Centre. However, since the Throne Speech began on Thursday last, Members have been referred to by their christian names, by their surnames, and also by less complimentary terminology. It is my hope, Mr. Speaker, that the experienced Members will accept their responsibility and assist the new Members in learning their rules.

Some Hon. Members: — Hear, hear!

Mr. Rolfes: — I should like, Mr. Speaker, at this time to thank all the people of Nutana South who worked so hard and diligently in getting me elected. I wish also at this time to pay a compliment to my worthy opponent, Mr. Austin Forsyth of the Liberal Party. It was said that Austin Forsyth was the conscience of the Liberal Party and I want to tell you that I firmly believe that Austin Forsyth had sincerity and integrity. Although I didn't agree with his political philosophy, he fought a clean campaign and he accepted the will of the people and for this I want to thank Austin Forsyth.

Some Hon. Members: — Hear, hear!

Mr. Rolfes: — Mr. Speaker, in the last election there were many people from all parties who supported me and came out and worked. Many of them felt that the Liberals had dealt democracy a very severe blow by their legislation on the redistribution more commonly referred to as the gerrymander. People in Saskatchewan still believe in the principle of representation by population.

Some Hon. Members: — Hear, hear!

Mr. Rolfes: — It is my belief also, Mr. Speaker, that the people must have the basic right to discharge a government when they wish and this must be done without undue hardship or restrictions placed in their way. In order that the democratic process may prevail I ask all the Members of this House to give unanimous support to the resolution introduced by the Member for Mayfair (Mr. Brockelbank) on the establishment of an Independent Boundaries Commission.

Some Hon. Members: — Hear, hear!

Mr. Rolfes: — Last week, Mr. Speaker, the Hon. Member for Milestone (Mr. C. MacDonald) referred to this Session as a grandstand theatrical performance. It would appear to me, at least, that one of the Members on his side has accepted the challenge and is going for the first prize. I want to compliment the Hon. Member for Prince Albert West (Mr. Steuart) on his theatrical capabilities for his sense of humor and for his witty remarks. But I also want to tell him that I found his arguments and his remarks totally without substance as did the people of Saskatchewan a few weeks ago.

Mr. Speaker, in Nutana South, I have many senior citizens and handicapped people, people who reside in such places as Cosmopolitan and Eamer Courts, Eventide Home, Central Park Lodge and the CNIB. These people and other senior citizens who live on subsistence salaries in my constituency will welcome, I'm sure, the proposed legislation on the abolition of deterrent fees and the exemption from medicare premiums for people 65 and over. I agree with Members opposite that when this legislation is passed that a heavier financial burden will be placed on most of the people in this House and for that, Mr. Speaker, I do not apologize.

Some Hon. Members: — Hear, hear!

Mr. Rolfes: — Mr. Speaker, although I do not represent a rural constituency, I was born and raised on a farm and like many of my constituents in Nutana South have relatives on the farm. I recognize that Saskatchewan's economy is largely dependent on agriculture and my constituents are well aware that their livelihood in large measure is dependent also upon a sound and viable agricultural economy. The Hon. Minister of Agriculture (Mr. Messer) must be commended for recognizing the serious plight of the farmers. The legislation that he has proposed will in the interim save many a small farmer from going into bankruptcy thereby and from there possibly joining the ranks of the unemployed and welfare recipients.

Our Government must do more. I urge them to prepare legislation on agriculture in addition to the proposed resolution on the establishing of a Land Banks Commission. Legislation must also be proposed for the restriction of ownership of farm land to Canadians. And, secondly, the re-introduction and the expansion of the Agricultural Machinery Testing Program.

Permit me, Mr. Speaker, to spend a few minutes on our youth. And at this particular time I should like to compliment the Hon. Member opposite from Regina Albert Park (Mr. MacLeod) who, I think, recognized a very serious problem with our youth and that is the abuse of drugs. And I should think that our Government in the four years that we have should very seriously look at this problem. I should also like to say at this time that I personally believe that one of the reasons why our youth are on drugs today is that they find so much of what we do today irrelevant and we must in the '70s come up with programs that are really in tune with humanity, that put people first. I make no apologies when I firmly believe that the Members on this side and our Government will do that job.

Some Hon. Members: — Hear, hear!

Mr. Rolfes: — Many of our young people in the last election worked very hard to elect their NDP candidates. They will expect some fundamental changes to take place and when I observe the number of young people that we have on this side of the House, I know that we shall come up with that legislation and that the young people will not be disappointed. I don't think too many Members in this House will argue with me when I say that the greatest natural resource that this Province has is our youth. If this Province is to have a future our Government must help society in providing the environment which will permit the young to develop their whole selves. Furthermore we must encourage our young to become active participants and we must permit our young to express their voice of dissent. We must not forget that they were born in a society which was beset with problems of pollution, population explosion and useless wars. I think many of the young, as myself, and many people in this House, firmly believe that many of these evils are a direct result of an uncontrolled profit economy which concentrates wealth and power in the hands of a few people.

Some Hon. Members: — Hear, hear!

Mr. Rolfes: — They do not feel that there is security in such a system and consequently they either revolt against it or opt out by the use of drugs. It is the task of this Government to help our youth build a truly free and peaceful society, a society based on the philosophy of co-operation.

I should now, Mr. Speaker, like to turn to the field of education. It was said that Saskatchewan had built one of the finest education systems in the world in the '50s and the early '60s and this was under the leadership of the former leader of this Party, Woodrow Lloyd and Olaf Turnbull.

Some Hon. Members: — Hear, hear!

Mr. Rolfes: — I must, Mr. Speaker, say in all sincerity that I as an educator have looked somewhat with disappointment on the trend that our educational standards have taken in the last seven years. From a fine system we today have merely a mediocre one. Nowhere has the policy of the Liberal Party of divide and rule been more noticeable than in the field of education. And I think it was mentioned previously by Members on this side of the House that the Liberals seem to go out deliberately to set trustee against teacher; teacher against parent and everybody against everybody else. It is our Government's task to work diligently to restore this trust amongst teachers, trustees and parents. We must also, Mr. Speaker, clearly define what we mean by education. Education is a word that is bandied around just like Socialism and Capitalism and Free Enterprise but we must determine what we want out of education. To me, education is not merely the dispensation and the assimilation of facts. If that is all it is, then the teacher-pupil ratio plays a very little part. But to me education is an on-going experience, an on-going experience between a child and a teacher, whereby a child can acquire some of his own sense of self-worth, where he learns how to live rewardingly with others and where he accepts his own potentials. Because, Mr. Speaker, it is a series of experiences with people, the pupil-teacher ratio and the quality of the teacher play a very important role in this educating process.

The Liberal Government's insistence on a high pupil-teacher ratio as a basis for all school grants, defeated the primary purpose of developing the individual. Including in the pupil-teacher ratio, all outside staff, whose function was to help children with problems, resulted in the downgrading and often times elimination of reading specialists, counsellors, social workers and speech therapists.

From my experience as an elementary school principal, I know that children with problems can be readily identified, at least, as early as the third year in school. It is at this stage that they are more easily helped. They are still open about their problems. They have not yet built around themselves walls nor have their attitudes hardened into anti-social behavior. It is at this stage that we need counsellors, social workers and others to work with our children. An arbitrary pupil-teacher ratio does not permit the flexibility needed to assess each situation and to determine what professional staff are required. I am particularly pleased that the Hon. Minister of Education saw fit to remove the arbitrary pupil-teacher ratio for school program planning.

Some Hon. Members: — Hear, hear!

Mr. Rolfes: — The Hon. Member for Prince Albert West (Mr. Steuart) reminded the Government last Friday that every time you lower the pupil-teacher ratio, you cost the taxpayers \$3 million. Surely the Hon. Member realizes that it costs thousands of dollars for every person whom we have in the Prince Albert Penitentiary. And it costs thousands more for each emotionally disturbed child whom we have in Ranch Ehrlo and Brown's Camp.

I am certainly convinced that maybe we can cut down on some of the very doubtful exorbitant rehabilitation costs by providing some professional staff at a very early stage in a child's life. I will be the first to admit, Mr. Speaker, that there will always be individuals who will not be able to function in society and will need to be housed. But I am convinced that if we provide more professional help, then, to the child and to the family, much of the exorbitant cost can be reduced. In many instances, the professional help is already there and this is a sad thing. But because of the lack of co-ordination between the Departments of Health, Education and Welfare, a person who requires the help is unable to benefit from it. Oftentimes we find duplication in services and services required in one branch are inaccessible to people in a different area of need. I ask my Government to look into this matter of co-ordinating the professional help that we have already and possibly save the people of Saskatchewan thousands of dollars and at the same time give the urgent and the skilled service that we need for these people.

For example, as a counsellor in Saskatoon, I have found that when I was working with a child, the family often at the same time was receiving help from Family Counselling Services, from the Welfare Department, from McNeil Clinic for Disturbed Children and the Psychiatric ward at the University Hospital. All of us were working on the same child, on the same problem but often times, Mr. Speaker, we were working at cross purposes and many times one party did not know that the other was working with the child. There should be one clearing house where people can go for advice when the problem first begins. For example, new married couples having problems in adjusting to each other

and to their new state, families unable to live within their income and requiring budgetary services; parents with questions about raising their children and teenagers with problems. The school in my estimation as the focal point of the community could most easily be adapted into this broader perspective.

I should also like to see our Government decentralize the Department of Education and return more authority to the local school boards.

Some Hon. Members: — Hear, hear!

Mr. Rolfes: — In my opinion, Mr. Speaker, the Department of Education should set minimum but not maximum standards. It should function in an advisory, consultative capacity and not hand out dictums and ultimatums to local school boards. In co-operation with the Saskatchewan Teachers' Federation and the Saskatchewan School Trustees' Association, it should establish the objectives of education which objectives then would become the guidelines around which local schools and school systems could develop a curriculum. Although I have advocated and believe in local control in education, I should like to suggest that our Government, in consultation again with the STF and the SSTA, attempt to establish province-wide bargaining. I do not believe that this is a contradiction. I do know that area bargaining has not been successful and provincial bargaining of basic salary scale could do much to solve many of the problems experienced with either local or area bargaining. I would further recommend that conditions of employment be locally negotiated.

Before closing, Mr. Speaker, I feel that it is necessary for me to reply to the Hon. Member for Prince Albert West (Mr. Steuart), when he attempted to plant the seed of dissension among the teachers of this side of the House. I want to tell him that I am satisfied and at the same time compliment our Premier in appointing the Hon. Gordon MacMurchy as Minister of Education.

Some Hon. Members: — Hear, hear!

Mr. Rolfes: — In my conversations with Mr. MacMurchy he has been very co-operative. He doesn't pretend to know all the answers. He is willing to listen and he doesn't view his position like a general marshalling his troops. The teachers of this Province did not object to the occupation of the former Minister of Education (Mr. McIsaac). We did, however, object to the centralization that took place. We did object to the divide and rule policy that seemed to prevail, and we did object when the high standard of education which we had been accustomed to was quickly downgraded by an arbitrary pupil-teacher ratio. Mr. Speaker, I want to compliment our Government for the legislation it has proposed and, therefore, Mr. Speaker, I take great pleasure in supporting the main motion.

Some Hon. Members: — Hear, hear!

Mr. J.G. Lane (Lumsden): — Mr. Speaker, a tradition that has been continued by the new Members this afternoon — far be it from me to break it — is that a little time is spent on the attributes of the constituency which he represents.

I should first like to thank the citizens of Lumsden for electing me to this Legislature. I don't think I have to spend too much time describing this constituency, Mr. Speaker, because all the Members except the Regina Members pass through this great constituency on the way to this Session. Much of the activities in the constituencies have been chronicled by various magazines. They refer to the spirit of the town of Pense and that was chronicled in the Weekend Magazine, the beauties of the town of Lumsden itself were also described in a later issue of that magazine supplement. I should also like to extend, as we have been invited to various other places around the province — I should like to extend an invitation to all the Members to ski on White Track this winter, and I should hope that the Government opposite would see fit to continue to expand those facilities recognizing this booming winter sport.

But the constituency of Lumsden also had a very interesting campaign prior to June 23. During that campaign certain election promises were made by the New Democratic candidate. This just wasn't an ordinary candidate, this man was a former Member of this Legislative Assembly in the CCF Party and represented the constituency of Lumsden for two terms. I am sure that his man would not make any irresponsible promises or promises that would not be kept by the NDP that formed the Government.

I am going to refer, Mr. Speaker, to some of these promises. I refer first to a copy of the Lumsden Advance, a one-shot effort that hit the constituency during the campaign. In that Lumsden Advance, volume one, number one, the NDP candidate promised a nursing home for the constituency of Lumsden. I am certain he means the town of Lumsden but anyway the constituency would be very happy to have this nursing home. I assume, too, that this nursing home will be one of the good nursing homes referred to by the Hon. Member from Saskatoon University (Mr. Richards). I know, too, that the concern expressed last week by the Minister of Welfare (Mr. Snyder) will be evident by this new nursing home in the town of Lumsden.

Mr. Boldt: — We don't get it.

Mr. Lane: — Oh, I think we'll get it Dave — they promised. The New Democratic candidate also made several verbal promises in the constituency which I know will be honored by the Government opposite. He made a verbal promise to rebuild Highway No. 364 from Balgonie to Edenwold, Avonhurst and Edgeley. He also promised to pave, this is interesting, pave the new highway to Sedley from Kronau. I urge immediate fulfilment of these promises so that the question of the political responsibility of the New Democratic Party candidate does not come into question.

The Lumsden Advance also contained another promise by the NDP candidate and that is that compensation would be paid for farmers suffering flood damage in the Qu'Appelle Valley river system. I am assuming by the answer given to a question in the House the other day by the Hon. Premier that he had forgotten about that promise and again I am prepared to show him a copy of that Advance at any time and the promise made. I trust again that that promise will be kept. Several other promises, of course, were made by the NDP during the campaign and I should like to discuss a few of them.

You have promised to remove deterrent fees and you are

August 2, 1971

acting on that promise. You have a mandate from the people of this Province to implement that promise. But as the Leader of the Opposition (Mr. Steuart) said the other night, "Make no mistake that the responsibility for holding the line on the escalating public health costs is now yours." You can spend four years saying the Liberal Party did this, that or the other thing but make no mistake the day of reckoning will come and the people will want to know whether or not you can act responsibly in this regard.

Some Hon. Members: — Hear, hear!

Mr. Lane: — If you can control the escalating public health costs you will have our support. If you cannot, you will not get our support and you will not get the support of the people of this Province.

Another promise made, and I am going to spend some time on this as it is a matter of special concern to myself. I refer, for example, to some campaign material that's authorized by the Prince Albert East NDP, that's Mike Feschuk, "Why put up with the high cost of drugs, start a drug-care program — Vote for Mike Feschuk." Now a few other comments were made by Members opposite in that regard prior to assuming the responsibilities of office and I refer to a statement made in the Legislative Assembly last session by the new Premier (Mr. Blakeney): "We will set up a drug-care program. Some Hon. Members:— Hear, hear!" Mr. Brockelbank has made a statement to that extent, as has Mr. Gordon Snyder and I refer to Mr. Snyder's statement March 10, 1966 in this House:

I think it can be logically argued that the time has come to provide through a public agency prescription drugs for all our people.

I should like to go into a little more detail on the Member for Saskatoon Mayfair's statement (Mr. Brockelbank) on March 17, 1966, where he stated:

I think everybody agrees that it is a good thing to have insurance to cover the cost of drugs. I think what the Members of this House want is to have this kind of insurance come into effect just as soon as we can.

Now these were statements made by Members opposite. We have the campaign promise, but it seems there was a mix up somewhere along the line and there is an interview printed in the Regina Leader-Post of July 20, 1971. It is an interview with the present Minister of Public Health (Mr. Smishek). He says and I quote:

Mr. Smishek says there has apparently been some misunderstanding of the NDP's election platform for health, particularly its proposed drug plan and its plan for handling small hospitals. We did not say that we would introduce an insured drug program, we were talking about bulk-buying of drugs and about providing a list of approved drugs to be handled in this way, he said.

Oh, the responsibilities of office, Mr. Minister! The Government misled the people of this Province. It promised a drug program but now intends to backpaddle and welch on its promise. Now, we are not promised one, says Mr. Smishek. Keeping in mind

that rousing song, sung with great vigor and gusto at the NDP Convention, "Solidarity Forever," I can only surmise the following: No. 1, Mr. Feschuk misled the people of Prince Albert East Cumberland and should make a public apology and state that he has no intention of keeping his promise, or that Mr. Feschuk was speaking just for himself. We can surmise that the Minister of Health does not know what his own party is doing. We can surmise that the Premier was making an irresponsible promise in the House last year. We can surmise that Mr. Brockelbank made an irresponsible promise. We can surmise that Mr. Snyder made an irresponsible statement in this House or we can surmise that the Minister of Health made a false statement in the Leader-Post and as such, a public retraction and apology is in order if it is false.

This Party opposite has been misleading the people of this Province of Saskatchewan with regard to a drug-care program. But the statement made by Mr. Smishek, assuming it to be true, indicates that he is in closer touch with reality than is the Hon. Member for Prince Albert East Cumberland, or Mr. Brockelbank, or the Premier, or Mr. Snyder. I refer to a statement of the Government of Canada that was made in the Federal-Provincial Conference and of officials on the cost of drugs and hearing aids held June 10 and 11 in Ottawa, 1970. That Crown paper was prepared by the Department of Consumer and Corporate Affairs, Consumer Research Branch. I quote from page 98:

It is tempting to believe that the problem of drug prices to the consumer could be solved by placing drugs under a Government-sponsored scheme such as medicare.

I hope the Hon. Member from Prince Albert East Cumberland (Mr. Feschuk) is listening very closely to this. For his benefit I might add that the Department of Consumer and Corporate Affairs in Ottawa sets and places the interest of the consumer first and its concerns and interests are known to most, obviously excepting the Member for Prince Albert East Cumberland. The Department of Consumer and Corporate Affairs in Ottawa has studied in great depth this problem of drug pricing and has this to say about a comprehensive drug program:

This would not solve the problem, it would merely shift directly to the Government and indirectly to the consumer as taxpayers the burden of supporting the existing drug retailing system. It is true that professional fee schedules may be set by negotiations between provincial and voluntary associations of pharmacists proposing a fee schedule and the Government paying for it, or some percentage of it, the pharmacists would likely retain much freedom to manoeuvre under such arrangements and would be able to exert enough upward pressure on fees every time the Government program came up for renewal. Costs to the Government would rise.

Again, I will remind the Members opposite that the Department which prepared this paper is very active in the field of drug pricing and concerned about the high cost of drugs, as is, I assume, everyone in this Chamber. But irresponsible promises do absolutely nothing to rectify the problem. Such promises mislead the people of this Province and is another example of the window-dressing proposals of the Government opposite. But with regard to the matter of a voluntary prepaid drug scheme the background paper prepared by the Department continues on page 98:

Voluntary drug insurance schemes would face one of the same difficulties foreseen for Government medicare schemes; that is the need to face up to constantly rising drug costs which will inevitably lead to rising insurance premiums.

I should hope that some of the prevailing irresponsibility of Members opposite will end immediately.

There is a very serious problem which must be dealt with here and that is the high cost of prescription drugs. Looking at these further studies on this matter, all other studies indicate that one of the major reasons, if not the major reason for the high cost of drugs, is an inadequate and inefficient retail distribution system. The pharmacist is caught in the middle of this system and must be protected. We must devise a system for the people of the province which will lead to economies of scale which will protect the Saskatchewan pharmacist who is supplying a basic service to the people in all areas of this Province. A system which will lead to the elimination of pharmacies in this Province will further add to the demise of many small towns in rural communities and yet this is the system that is proposed by the Member from Prince Albert East Cumberland (Mr. Feschuk).

I can assure the Members of this House we will co-operate in every way to reduce the cost of drugs to the consumer, but we will insist that the proposals must be basic to the solving of the problem and not mere political propaganda or misleading statements or ignorance. Because of the urgency of this problem I propose that a Legislative Intersessional Committee be formed immediately to study the rising cost of drugs. A program similar to medicare or an insured scheme will not reduce drug prices. Drugs are a great expense because the retail distribution chain is inefficient. This Government has put the question of distribution of liquor before the distribution of prescription drugs and its priorities are all wrong and I urge the establishment of a committee at this time.

Some Hon. Members: — Hear, hear!

Mr. Lane: — Oh, in the matter of public health, the Government made several promises with regard to reducing the cost of physical aids, one of which I shall cover in some detail and that is the promise to reduce the cost of hearing aids. The public should be made aware that hearing aids are presently available at a cost of approximately \$30 from the P.Y.E. Electric Company of England. This, of course, does not take into accounting fitting, testing, etc. I should hope the Government does not intend to mislead the public into merely cheaper hearing aids, however. The Government's counterparts in Manitoba are considering legislation to regulate the sale of hearing aids. Compulsory technical training should be established for those involved in selling hearing aids. These comments are made in the hopes that the Government will not institute a program of superficial proposals in the matter of public health. I urge this Government to forget about the window-dressing proposals in dealing with public health and I urge the Government to solve problems and not avoid them.

Mr. Speaker, in the Speech from the Throne, legislation was promised to protect farmers unable to pay their debts, to protect farmers from seizure of their farm land and machinery, and

legislation has now been introduced. I'm particularly interested in this, Mr. Speaker, because amendments were made to The Limitation of Civil Rights Act which gave to the farmer substantial protection against seizure of his farm equipment and he merely had to make an informal court application and he would be heard by a judge who was empowered to make such order as he saw fit. We have also had on the statute books for a number of years The Land Contract Actions Act and this protects most citizens who own land from arbitrary foreclosure and cancellation. The Government, however, has deemed the existing legislation to be inadequate.

But I submit, Mr. Speaker, the legislation as proposed by the Government may well destroy the farmers' ability to obtain credit. Most companies will not lend unless they have reasonable collateral. The legislation, in effect, removes this collateral or prevents action to recover on collateral for a period of one year. It merely puts off the paying of loans for a year. No one is going to lend money over the next year to someone who has substantial debts to pay off a year later. Legislation too must be revised to protect the local implement dealer. When seizure has been put off for a year his collateral will have depreciated substantially and no protection in this regard is given to the implement dealer. I would suggest that the Government be very, very careful with this legislation because the previously mentioned legislation was one of the factors that caused many of the implement dealers to leave this Province or go out of business. This has led to the problem of farmers not being able to obtain parts or having to wait for parts during an equipment breakdown. I hope again that your legislation in this regard is very carefully thought out because it could easily hurt and not help the farmer. Here we have another example of the Government's window-dressing proposals. This moratorium legislation was announced to the press by the Minister of Agriculture (Mr. Messer). This Chamber was by-passed by the Minister, a practice which indicates the respect to which the Minister holds for this House.

But a greater principle was broken by the Minister of Agriculture and I quote from the Leader-Post of Saturday, July 31, page 4 with respect to loans made by the Farm Credit Corporation, which is a Federal Government agency or under the Federal Farm Improvement Loan Program.

The Agricultural Minister admitted that the Provincial Government may be overstepping its authority in doing this and there was a danger the Bill may be declared ultra vires beyond the jurisdiction but that decision is up to the Supreme Court of Canada. He was then quoted as saying: 'Even if it does go to the Supreme Court it could take seven, eight or nine months and by that time it will have served its purpose.'

I find this statement appalling, Mr. Speaker, that a Minister of the Crown would propose legislation not caring whether it was legal or illegal, lawful or unlawful because, Mr. Speaker, the Minister of Agriculture is bound by the laws of Canada whether he thinks so or not. I don't care whether the Government has 45 or 60 Members it is still bound by the laws of Canada. I must remind the Attorney General (Mr. Romanow) that he has sworn to be responsible for the administration of justice in this Province. You too, Mr. Attorney General, are bound by the laws of Canada and I hope an apology from the Government is in order. The

practice of passing legislation that may be unlawful is contrary to all principles of democracy and the Minister of Agriculture (Mr. Messer) should be severely chastised for his attitude and I will again remind the Government that you are not above the laws of this country and don't forget it. I might remind the Attorney General and the Minister of Agriculture that the legislation does not have to go to the Supreme Court and if you are concerned about the validity of the legislation you can refer it immediately to the Court of Appeal of this Province and you would probably get an answer in a very short period of time. Your attitude, Mr. Minister of Agriculture, is shocking and abhorrent in a federal democratic country.

I should like to spend a couple of minutes replying to a few comments made by the Hon. Member from Assiniboia-Bengough (Mr. Lange). I have made a couple of notes on his statement. He advised the House that a revolution was coming. I agree, there is a revolution of consciousness coming. I am not convinced that using multi-national corporations as a scapegoat answers the problems. The policy of the NDP in the past has been to substitute another evil and that is an overriding bureaucratic system and that doesn't work. And the words you used 'make people comply' is a weakness in your argument. It must be a question of individual choice. The individual must be sufficiently taught and educated so that he can make a rational choice on his own but the idea of making him comply, I find personally very, very wrong but I agree that there are going to be some drastic changes in the consciousness of the people. I am not convinced in my own mind that this revolution can come about without a solid economic base. The Government opposite has seen fit to remove many possibilities or opportunities for an economic base for this province. I should hope that your thoughts in this matter will be reconsidered in light of their past experience, as I say, substituting an overriding bureaucracy for a multi-national corporation. Two wrongs don't make a right. I should hope that you would stop future moves by the Government opposite in this regard and would be wary of it.

In summation, Mr. Speaker, I would remind the Government that some very irresponsible promises were made to the people of this Province in the last election. The people remember them, we will remember them and we will make sure that you remember them.

I will oppose the motion and vote for the amendment.

Some Hon. Members: — Hear, hear!

Mr. D. Faris (Arm River): — Mr. Speaker, I rise to congratulate you on your election to a most difficult position. I know that you will fulfil your role with dignity and impartiality.

I am pleased to have this opportunity to speak following the Hon. Member for Lumsden (Mr. Lane) because I wish to make reference to the former Member for Lumsden (Mr. Heald). He too has been elevated to a high office. He is to be congratulated on knowing when to leave a sinking ship.

Some Hon. Members: — Hear, hear!

Mr. Faris: — In addition, as Mr. Trudeau's key supporter in Saskatchewan,

he earned his elevation. It is not an easy thing for a person from Saskatchewan to support Mr. Trudeau. He deserved something. Instead, however, he was appointed a judge. I asked a lawyer friend why it was that Liberals received such appointments. Happily, he was able to explain it by referring to MacKenzie King's reply to that same question. MacKenzie King said that he appointed Liberals as judges because Liberals made the best judges. I'm certain that those sitting opposite will appreciate those sentiments. While the Opposition in this House may not represent the people of this Province, it certainly represents the lawyers, almost one-third of the Opposition Caucus is made up of lawyers. We look opposite and we see many who have distinguished themselves at the Bar, and some of them are lawyers. But they are all of that group that MacKenzie King said made the best judges. Seriously, in a time when we wish to teach our young people to respect the law, it is not a time to continue the practice of appointing judges for political services rendered.

Some Hon. Members: — Hear, hear!

Mr. Faris: — Mr. Speaker, the Members opposite obviously feel they share in the divine right to rule. They not only believe that they have the divine right to be judges, but the Members opposite obviously feel that they have the divine right to be the Government. In referring to their discredited Government, do they refer to the mistakes they made? Do they apologize for their arrogance? Do they admit that it was wrong to tax the sick? Do they acknowledge with shame that they taxed cancer patients? Do they feel real sorrow that they taxed mental patients? No. That's right. The answer is, No, No, No. Rather, they characterize their Government by the words integrity, and honesty, and responsibility. They say it takes a lot of integrity to tax the sick. They say it takes a lot of honesty to tax cancer patients. They say it takes a lot of responsibility to tax mental patients. We say it takes a lot of arrogance to do it, and a lot of gall to defend it.

Some Hon. Members: — Hear, hear!

Mr. Faris: — They confuse integrity with hard heartedness; they confuse honesty with arrogance; and they confuse public rejection for martyrdom.

Some Hon. Members: — Hear, hear!

Mr. Faris: — Their attitude during this Session reminds me of a comment made of the Bourbon princes of Europe. Talleyrand said of the Bourbons that they learned nothing, and they forgot nothing.

Some Hon. Members: — Hear, hear!

Mr. Faris: — These same men who were characterized by hard heartedness and arrogance as a Government have forgotten none of it. They have learned nothing from their crushing defeat but to whine and whimper and snivel about how few Members they have in this House.

Some Hon. Members: — Hear, hear!

Mr. Faris: — They have few Members because they deserve few Members.

Some Hon. Members: — Hear, hear!

Mr. Faris: — They have few Members because the people of Saskatchewan wanted them to have few Members.

Some Hon. Members: — Hear, hear!

Mr. Faris: — And they know very well that if it were not for their gerrymander, they would have six fewer Members than they do now.

Some Hon. Members: — Hear, hear!

Mr. Faris: — They learn nothing and they forget nothing. Mr. Speaker, if they continue with their present attitudes, they, like the Bourbon princes, will disappear from the pages of history.

Some Hon. Members: — Hear, hear!

Mr. Faris: — Mr. Speaker, I have the privilege of representing a rural constituency. Perhaps it one of the most rural in Saskatchewan because of its 20 communities, the largest has a population of 1,000. Within the bounds of Arm River we have produced curling and hockey champions, and some of the finest grain and cattle in the world. Yet we have problems. Our towns are in great trouble. They depend upon the business brought to them by farmers. And our farmers have found their income steadily declining. Their costs go up every year, but their incomes decline. Not only do they sell less grain, but they get less for it. Farmer after farmer will tell you that they have more problems now than any time since the 1930s.

There are two particular groups of farmers who have problems in my area. They are the older farmers and the younger farmers. Most of the farmers in the area are nearing retirement age. Their life savings are tied up in their land. Their sons very often don't want to farm; they don't like the idea of working for nothing. These older farmers want to be able to retire in some dignity after a lifetime of work.

And the other group of farmers who are in trouble are those young men who choose to farm. There are young men in their twenties and thirties who want to farm. Some of these young men in Arm River have university degrees. In normal times they could do something else. But they want to farm. They like the life. They like to grow things. They want to bring up their children in the clean air and the open spaces. So they went into farming and they did what successive Liberal Governments told them to do. First of all, they specialized. They were told to get bigger, to get economic units. Grow all you can. So they did it. They got bigger. They produced more. They became the most efficient producers in the world. And their bins filled up and their prices fell. And then the Liberal farm experts, Trudeau and Lang and Boldt, told them to stop. They said, "You know what the trouble with you farmers is, you're

too specialized. You must diversify. Get into something good. Get into hogs." So they got into hogs, oh yes, they got into hogs and lo, the hogs did multiply and lo, the prices did fall. So the Liberal farm experts called a meeting. They said: (1) We've got too much grain and (2) we've got too many hogs. What does that mean? It means we've got too many farmers. If the logic escapes you, it does not escape the Liberal farm experts. It's all there in the Task Force Report. Problem: Too many farmers. Solution: Get rid of them. It's what Hitler waited for, the final solution. Hitler had the problems — answer: get rid of the Jews. Liberal Governments have problems — answer: get rid of the farmers.

Some Hon. Members: — Hear, hear!

Mr. Faris: — Well, the farmers knew what was happening so they got rid of the Liberals.

Some Hon. Members: — Hear, hear!

Mr. Faris: — Mr. Speaker, the Speech from the Throne is a thing of beauty. It takes this Province out of reverse and puts it into forward gear. But I especially like the emergency farm legislation. It is a courageous move that indicates that we understand the depth of the farm crisis. It is a pledge to the people of this Province that in the next sessions of the Legislature, we shall bring in those positive measures that are needed to deal with the holding down farm costs and rising farm income.

Some Hon. Members: — Hear, hear!

Mr. Faris: — Mr. Speaker, I want to conclude by asking once again that the Federal Liberal Government stop playing politics and pay out the \$100 million to Western farmers immediately.

Some Hon. Members: — Hear, hear!

Mr. Faris: — And further, let it be known by them and everyone in this Province, that the New Democratic Government will fight to the finish against their stabilization plan that only promises to stabilize poverty for Saskatchewan farmers.

Mr. Speaker, I oppose the amendment and support the main motion.

Some Hon. Members: — Hear, hear!

Mr. A. Engel (Notukeu-Willow Bunch): — Mr. Speaker, I too should like to take this opportunity publicly to congratulate you on your election to this high office as Speaker. And I also should like to take this opportunity to thank the senior Members of our party who helped some of us rookies and made this June campaign a success the way they did.

Some Hon. Members: — Hear, hear!

Mr. Engel: — There are several reasons,

Mr. Speaker, why the people of Notukeu-Willow Bunch are represented on the Government side of this House. One of the reasons, Mr. Speaker, is the former Government's attitude towards hospitals. In fact, I believe this was the number one reason for their poor showing at the polls. It was a black Friday in one of our small towns some nineteen or twenty months ago, Mr. Speaker, when they lost the services of their resident physician. Since that time the Local Hospital Board has reviewed many applications from doctors and tried unsuccessfully to get one of these applicants to fill the vacancy. Let me tell you, Mr. Speaker, it was a real thrill to be in this same town on a Thursday on July 22 when the hospital was restaffed and a new physician began his practice.

Some Hon. Members: — Hear, hear!

Mr. Engel: — Mr. Speaker, contrary to what Members opposite say about a New Deal for People, the people of this town and the surrounding areas are enthused about their new deal.

Now, if you could stretch your imagination, Mr. Speaker, to the extent that half of us would be on the other side of the House, if this had happened I am sure this town would still be denied the services of a resident doctor. The local hospital would still be closed, the employees of this hospital would still be out of work. In fact, Mr. Speaker, in this small town senior farmers who are residing there would begin thinking of moving to a larger centre; older business people who had intentions of staying and people formerly employed by the hospital, all would be trying to dispose of their homes. The point I am trying to make, Mr. Speaker, is that one of the key factors contributing to the depopulation of our small towns is the lack of health care services.

The Bill that makes medical care available to all our senior citizens is of top priority to the older people living in my constituency. We don't intend to exclude anyone from proper health care. So I say the availability of a service, a doctor and a facility, is very important to people, especially for those who have a choice as to where they make their home. If, during the winter months, when older folks seldom start a car let alone keep their driveway cleared, it is a pretty comforting thought to have a doctor live in your own town. But you move this doctor and hospital 20 or 30 miles away and you have a new set of rules.

The other advantages to a rural community of a small hospital that I wish to point out are the fiscal and monetary gains to the small town. The fact that a small hospital offers employment up to as high as \$80,000 a year to its local residents, you add to this the money a doctor would spend locally as well as that of a druggist, the money earned by other people offering related services provided by the community, in a time when things are financially pretty tough, this makes a big difference to the rest of the town. The savings enjoyed by the Department of Health, if you tie up expensive beds in our larger hospitals with cases that can be handled adequately by a local plan, in some cases where the per-bed cost in a rural hospital is less than half of that in our city hospitals where some patients are forced to wait for months for a bed, I think these small hospitals have a great deal to offer.

Mr. Speaker, we value the rural way of life. In our New Deal for People we have stressed programs that would make this way of life a reality for our farmers and those living in our small towns. We must take action to maintain a viable family-farm unit. To do this, the rest of the province realizing its dependence on a healthy farm community, must bend a little and be prepared to go a second mile to reverse the trend we have been forced into by the former Government's policies.

I think I have a pretty good idea since I've heard the Member from Wilkie (Mr. McIsaac), he was speaking at a meeting during the campaign — he was down to dedicate a gymnasium — and I quote from an address he made in my constituency:

In the field of education we went from the ox cart to space age in the last ten years.

The pupil-teacher ratio apparently dealt with the space age and I am quite sure his practice would tell him what the other area would be about.

Some Hon. Members: — Hear, hear!

Mr. Engel: — I suppose he was referring to the idealistic type of training in his ox-cart classification where pupils were given individual attention ten years ago. We now have a little better idea and we can understand him and his Administration a little better when he referred to a deductible clause in fixing either a fender or a broken arm. Accordingly, Mr. Speaker, if they were give another term or another chance, the rate of our insurance on our physical bodies would be based according to our age. This is exactly the opposite to the principle we are proposing in our Throne Speech today. The rural people of Saskatchewan that are represented in such force in this Government are assured that problems directly related to them will have solutions for their comforts, conveniences and ideals in life. They had their hopes restored to them in good measure on the 23 of June. The legislation before this House in this special Session will give them a new lease on life in the country. They are already reaping the benefits of this kind of Government they chose — a Government that puts humanity first.

Mr. Speaker, I am opposed to the amendment but I will support the motion.

Some Hon. Members: — Hear, hear!

Mr. G.B. Grant (Regina Whitmore Park): — Mr. Speaker, I wonder if the Hon. Member would accept a question at this time. I am not sure whether I heard correctly or not but I think I did. Was he referring to the Kincaid Hospital? If I am correct, I'll proceed.

Mr. Engel: — Yes, I was.

Mr. Grant: — I should like the Hon. Member to tell this House of any action I took, the Department took, or my Government took to deny a doctor to that hospital.

Mr. Romanow: — Well, it was the general

attitude of the Government.

Mr. Grant: — No, no he was talking about the Kincaid hospital. Mr. Speaker, he was talking about the Kincaid hospital and I want him to tell me what I did, or what the Government did or what the Department did to deny a doctor to that hospital.

Mr. Engel: — I'll answer that when I find out which constituency the Hon. Member represents. It's a small one I can't find it. I should like to point out that it is what the Hon. Member didn't do that they didn't have a hospital.

Some Hon. Members: — Hear, hear!

Mr. Grant: — I will tell the Hon. Member, Mr. Speaker, that we gave that hospital board every co-operation and they know it.

Mr. Speaker: — If the Member wishes to take part in the debate he may have the floor at this time.

Some Hon. Members: — Hear, hear!

Mr. Grant: — Thanks for the invitation, Mr. Speaker, I hadn't planned on speaking but since you invited me, I'll accept. I am a little puzzled as to why the Hon. Member from Notukeu-Willow Bunch (Mr. Engel) wouldn't be able to identify 14 souls over here and the constituencies they belong to. After all he has had nothing to do now for four days, only get acquainted with us and I should be glad to help him out if he needs some help.

Mr. Speaker, on your right sits the most promising Government in Canada. Of this I shall give them credit. What they can't think to promise, isn't worth promising, and what they do promise they say most of it's going to be free. Well, the Hon. Minister of Health (Mr. Smishek) said that the people of Saskatchewan have been singing, "halleluia" since June 23. He may be right but I haven't heard too much of it. Thank goodness the Speech from The Throne ended, "May divine Providence guide this Legislature in all its deliberations." Believe me, Mr. Speaker, we are going to need the help of the divine spirit to keep them within reason because they are certainly not prepared to listen to us.

Mr. Speaker, the Leader-Post used to carry a by-line and I don't know why they discontinued it because it was a pretty good one, "Where all think alike, no one thinks very much." Well, apparently there is a lot of thinking going on in this House these days because believe me, we don't all think alike. It is understandable how there would be a difference in thinking between political groups, I think this is good, it is part of our democratic process and I hope we encourage different thinking. But, while this is so, it is incomprehensible to me as to how there can be such a wide variation of thinking of the Members opposite. Possibly it is because the right hand doesn't know what the left hand is doing, possibly it is because the promises were flowing so freely that they couldn't keep track of what each other was doing, particularly what the Wafflers were cooking up.

Mr. Speaker, I should like to continue, now that you have invited me to do so, but there is one very important Member missing from the Government side of the House tonight and I certainly want him to be present when I make my remarks from here on in and so I am going to ask leave to adjourn the debate.

Debate adjourned.

ADJOURNED DEBATES

SECOND READINGS

The Assembly resumed the adjourned debate on the proposed motion of the Hon. W.E. Smishek (Minister of Health) that Bill No. 3 — **An Act to amend The Saskatchewan Hospitalization Act** be now read a second time.

He said: Mr. Speaker, in closing the debate on Bill No. 3 I should first of all like to extend my appreciation to the Members on the Government side of the House, particularly our young contingent of Members who have spoken in support of this Bill during second reading. I thought that their speeches in regard to the removal of deterrent fees were both thoughtful and eloquent, they presented them with force and conviction, a conviction and feeling for the people of Saskatchewan. A conviction that medical and hospital deterrent fees have no place and no room in public health programs. I believe that these young Members, who are sitting in this Legislature are going to be the conscience of both sides of the House.

May I also express my appreciation to some of the Members in the Opposition for their contribution, criticisms, and ideas.

Mr. Speaker, I listened with a good deal of attention to the remarks of the Opposition in respect of Bill 3. I am not quite sure whether they will be supporting Bill 3. The Hon. Member for Cannington (Mr. Weatherald), who followed me after I moved second reading, said that the Opposition will be supporting Bill 3. He admitted that deterrent fees were unpopular. He admitted that deterrent fees are socially undesirable. He admitted that deterrent fees have not reduced costs of medical and hospital care. He also conceded that politically they were stupid. And then he proceeded to argue why the deterrent fees should be retained. You know, Mr. Speaker, I am always puzzled and I regret that the Hon. Member from Cannington isn't here, you know several years ago when we heard the news of the death of the Right Honourable Arthur Meighen, it was said that the last of the Tories, of the real Conservatives, went to his rest. Any time that the Hon. Member for Cannington gets up to speak I am just not so certain.

Mr. Speaker, when I moved second reading of Bill 3, I provided statistics that deterrent fees did not reduce the average length of stay in the hospital. I demonstrated, statistically, that deterrent fees did not reduce the average number of separations, nor did they reduce the number of patient-days of stay in the hospital. What deterrent fees have done is place \$21 million of costs directly on the people of Saskatchewan, and what deterrent fees have also done is that Saskatchewan lost some \$4.5 million of revenue or grants from the Government of Canada.

Mr. Speaker, I did listen with particular attention to the new Leader of the Opposition (Mr. Steuart) when he spoke on Bill 3. He again reminded us that we should be alert and that we should watch the rising costs in health and welfare and education schemes. And I agree that health programs and welfare programs and education programs are costly programs, but they are programs for the people. While I agree that we must ensure that we get our dollar value in respect of these programs I also feel that they are worthy public expenditures. I want to assure the Leader of the Opposition and the people of Saskatchewan that the Department of Public Health will be making careful assessments to ensure that we do get our dollars' worth for the programs we administer in the health field.

Mr. Speaker, I think it is worthwhile to review and remind ourselves of the arguments that were used back in 1968 and subsequently to that. The reason deterrent fees were introduced the Liberals said was to control skyrocketing costs. I said this before in this Legislature but I think it is worthwhile repeating and taking a close look as to the increased costs in hospital and medical care. I want to remind the Members opposite that in 1964 . . .

Mr. Steuart: — Mr. Speaker, on a point of order. When any Minister is closing a debate he is not allowed to bring new material in, he can answer anything that was said on this side of the House. I have no objections if he brings in the reason why we brought in deterrent fees but it wasn't mentioned on this side of the House and I think the Minister should stick to the rules. He has a chance for rebuttal but he doesn't have a chance really under Parliamentary rules to make a brand new speech on the subject.

Mr. Speaker: — I think the rule has been well established that any Member who closes a debate should not introduce new material but answer any statements or clarify any statements which he may have made earlier, but not to introduce new material.

Mr. Smishek: — Mr. Speaker, it is this particular point I am trying to clarify. The Members opposite said that the reason deterrent fees were introduced is to control costs because costs were getting out of proportion and I merely want to answer this allegation and point out to them that in 1964, the Saskatchewan Hospital Services Plan out of consolidated revenue provided \$15.8 million. In 1964, the gross expenditure for medical care from the consolidated revenue was \$19.7 million. In total in 1964 out of consolidated revenue the Government of that day provided \$35.5 million for these two important programs. In 1971 out of consolidated revenue we are to provide towards the Saskatchewan Hospital Services Plan \$32.4 million and about \$7.7 for Medical Care. In other words about \$40 million for the two programs. So in a period of seven years if one is to look in terms of the increase in costs to the Provincial Treasury or to consolidated revenue the increase is something in the order of \$4 million. Surely, Mr. Speaker, this cannot be construed as an exorbitant cost, when one also recognizes that some additional benefits were added.

Mr. Steuart: — Surely, the Minister does not delude himself . . . what about the . . .

Mr. Smishek: — I am just coming to that particular point. In 1964, when it came down to cost sharing from Ottawa, the CCF Government received \$21.4 million towards helping finance the Hospital Services Plan. In 1971, the Government of Canada is going to provide \$70 million towards the cost of these two programs. But it must be remembered, Mr. Speaker, that we are not getting this money for nothing. Remember that the citizens of Saskatchewan are paying a 2 per cent social development tax imposed by the Government of Canada and we are getting our share of the money back from the Government of Canada.

Now, Mr. Speaker, the Hon. Member for Cannington (Mr. Weatherald) during his remarks made a reference that the Minister of Health was being a Robin Hood in reverse in taxing the poor in order to give to the rich. Mr. Speaker, he went on to say that a larger percentage of the people of 65 years, particularly in rural areas of Saskatchewan, needed assistance much less than urban wage earners under 65. Then he proceeded to say that it's the workers who are going to pay this increased tax as a result of us providing free medical and hospital cards for those 65 years of age and over. You know, Mr. Speaker, I have known the Hon. Member for Cannington for the last seven years. It is interesting to note that all of a sudden the Hon. Member for Cannington has become interested and concerned about the working people of this Province. You know, year in and year out, he was one of the leading spokesmen and advocates of reactionary anti-labor legislation proposed by the former Government. Year in and year out, he supported compulsory arbitration. Year in and year out, he supported the ideas of the former Administration in keeping the workers down. All of a sudden he is interested in the working people of this Province.

Mr. Speaker, had the Hon. Member for Cannington (Mr. Weatherald) opposed the anti-labor and restrictive labor laws introduced by his colleagues, perhaps the working people would have been much better off and would have been able to pay the taxes more freely, but, as a result of the restrictive legislation the Liberals imposed, today Saskatchewan workers are getting something like \$15 a week less than the average workers in the Dominion of Canada. So it may be a little more difficult for the workers to pay any increased taxes. But, Mr. Speaker, we are not proposing to increase taxes in order to exempt those 65 years of age and over from payment of the fee.

Now, Mr. Speaker, when the Hon. Member all of a sudden becomes concerned about us exempting those 65 years of age and over and that the workers will have to pay the premium, I wonder where the Member was in the last three years. Why didn't he propose the removal of the \$120 ceiling in the case of the social development tax where the poorer people have to pay the brunt of that tax; or in the case of the social security tax, which is 4 per cent and again has a ceiling of \$240; or in the case of the Canada Pension Plan which has a ceiling of \$86.40, again the burden of those taxed most heavily falls on the low income groups. I didn't hear the Hon. Member at any time advocate the lifting of the ceiling in respect of these taxes. So when he starts suggesting that I am behaving like Robin Hood in reverse, Mr. Speaker, I think the Hon. Member should examine his own conscience.

Mr. Speaker, a suggestion has been made that in the case of those 65 years of age and over who are to be exempt from payment of the premium, that not only should they be exempt, but also

the premium in respect of the whole family should be removed. Also suggestions have been made that only those should get the exemption who are not receiving the Guaranteed Income Supplement. Mr. Speaker, I have now been able to obtain the most up-to-date statistics available in the Government Departments of the numbers of persons who are receiving Old Age Security. The exact figures as of May 31, 1971, in the Province of Saskatchewan is 94,017 receiving Old Age Security. Out of this total number, 54,650 were receiving the guaranteed Income Supplement or 58 per cent. In other words, Mr. Speaker, the majority of those 65 years of age and over are living on an income of \$135 a month or less. Mr. Speaker, I believe that our proposal to exempt those 65 years and over from paying the premium is a proposal that is long overdue. We do not believe, as a political party and as a Government, in the means test principle.

I, in many ways, object to the references of the Member for Milestone (Mr. MacDonald) to the effect that we are going to be paying the premiums for those who are going to be living in the Waldorf Astoria and for those who will be spending their time in Florida, and his reference to the former Provincial Treasurer, Mr. Fines. I am not aware that Mr. Fines is presently a resident of the Province of Saskatchewan and that he is paying any premiums. He is not covered by medical care, he is no longer a resident. These kinds of arguments have no place in a common-sense, logical debate. He is trying to make an issue out of something that doesn't exist.

Mr. Speaker, the Hon. Member went on and said that the Government should have looked at the needs of more housing and other essential needs of some of the less fortunate people in the Province of Saskatchewan. Mr. Speaker, the Hon. Member was the Minister of Welfare; for seven years he had time to look at the less fortunate. What did he do? Mr. Speaker, this Government is doing something about the less fortunate. This Government is removing deterrent fees to help the unfortunate. This Government is exempting the people 65 years of age and over from payment of the medical and hospital premiums. This Government is concerned about the less fortunate. Mr. Speaker, this is only a beginning of the extension and improvement of the health services.

I can assure this House that as we improve and extend services we are also going to be looking very carefully at the cost of services. I agree with the Leader of the Opposition (Mr. Steuart) that we must be concerned about the cost of health services and other programs. It is my conviction that our health services can be organized more effectively so that we can get more value for our dollar. This Government proposes to experiment and to innovate in the health field. We have already initiated a number of studies to be made within the Department. I have had meetings with the College of Physicians and Surgeons. I had a meeting with the Saskatchewan Hospital Association. I have had a meeting with the Saskatchewan Medical Association. I can assure the Members of this Legislature and Members of the Opposition that we have placed before the medical profession and other health bodies our program. We have invited their criticism, their ideas, their suggestions as to how our program can be best implemented. It is the intention of this Government to work with the people in the health field to ensure that not only are we getting the best value for our dollar, but also to ensure that Saskatchewan is once again going to take the lead in establishing the best health services for the people of

Saskatchewan, and is going to give a lead to the people of North America in developing the most progressive ideas.

Some Hon. Members: — Hear, hear!

Mr. Smishek: — We make no apologies for our promises. Mr. Speaker, our promises will be fulfilled. It is not possible to initiate our total program within 28 or 30 days. But watch us, we shall be moving ahead in the next four years. Saskatchewan is going again to gain the distinction of being the prime leader in the health field in North America.

Mr. Speaker, I move second reading of Bill No. 3.

Mr. C.P. Macdonald (Milestone): — Mr. Speaker, on a point of order. Is it not the rules of the House that before a standing vote is called that there must be a Nay in the House, and I heard very distinctly that there was no 'Nay.' I should like to ask you, Mr. Speaker, did you hear a Nay?

Mr. Speaker: — The rules of the House are that two Members rising in their place at any time can call a recorded vote, whether it is Yeas or Nays. Two Members did rise in their place and ask for a recorded vote, so call in the Members.

Motion agreed to and Bill read a second time on the following recorded division:

YEAS — 50

Messieurs

Brockelbank
Byers
Wood
Smishek
Romanow
Snyder
MacMurchy
Kramer
Kowalchuk
Baker
Thibault
Robbins
Pepper
Meakes
Whelan
Brown
Kwasnica

Carlson
Engel
Tchorzewski
Richards
Owens
Larson
Taylor
Faris
Dyck
Cowley
Cody
Feduniak
Mostoway
Comer
Rolfes
Hanson
Oliver

Feschuk
Kaeding
Flasch
Steuart
Coupland
Gardner
Grant
Boldt
MacDonald
. . . (Milestone)
McIsaac
Loken
Weatherald
MacLeod
McPherson
Lane
MacDonald
. . . (Moose Jaw North)

NAYS — 00

Messieurs

SECOND READINGS

Hon. G.T. Snyder (Minister of Labour) moved second reading of Bill No. 6 — **An Act to Repeal The Essential Services Emergency Act, 1966.**

He said: I suppose, Mr. Speaker, that it may be considered somewhat out of the ordinary that the first legislative act of the new Minister of Labour should be to introduce a Bill to repeal a labor law. However, I make no apology at all. If there was ever an occasion on which it was possible to be constructive in destroying something, this is that occasion. I feel certain the overwhelming majority of Saskatchewan citizens will agree.

The Essential Services Emergency Act, Mr. Speaker, has been at best an unnecessary statute and at its worst it has been a mechanism which has undermined the entire concept of collective bargaining. As a matter of fact, Mr. Speaker, it is doubtful if any other action in my career can be the source of greater satisfaction than the repeal of this particular piece of legislation. I make this statement, first in my capacity as a servant of the people who is charged with the responsibility for protecting the best interests of working people whether they are employers or employees. It can be said without reservation that the Bill before the Legislature is intended to promote labor-management harmony and accordingly will benefit both employees and employers alike. I am also gratified, Mr. Speaker, to be able to participate in the repeal of this legislation as a long-time Trade Union member in as much as this Act has rendered a grave disservice to the Trade Union Movement. Finally, as a citizen of this Province, I am relieved that The Essential Services Emergency Act will be no more because this piece of legislation has posed a serious threat to the freedoms, the security and the welfare of every man, woman and child in Saskatchewan.

A statement has been made, I believe, Mr. Speaker, that a politician is a man who can rock the boat himself and persuade everyone that there is a terrible storm at sea. It is obvious, however, that the erosion of the collective bargaining process which Bill 2 has already started to accomplish represents a very significant storm which, if carried further, could deteriorate management-labor relations in this particular Province to the point of utter chaos.

With your permission, Mr. Speaker, I should like for a few moments to first explore the ramifications of the legislation in its mildest form, that is that it is an unnecessary enactment. It will be remembered, Mr. Speaker, that the word 'emergency' is included in the title of the Act, a term which, at least in my mind, suggests a life or death sort of situation. I suggest to you, Mr. Speaker, that no genuine emergency has arisen since the passing of this statute in 1966, nor is one likely to develop in the future. In no case has there been a refusal to make provision for services the absence of which would place life or property in jeopardy. The Act was originally introduced in 1966 to terminate arbitrarily a strike of employees of the Saskatchewan Power Corporation. Since that time the former Liberal Government has consistently employed scare tactics designed to delude members of the public into believing that the Act was necessary in order to safeguard their lives. It has been implied, for instance, Mr. Speaker, that strikes could result in

the elimination of heat and power in mid-winter which could cause Saskatchewan citizens to freeze. It has been suggested that people may die because hospital facilities are unavailable during a work stoppage. The assertion has been made, Mr. Speaker, that a man's home could burn down around his ears during a walkout of fireman. I suggest to you tonight, Mr. Speaker, that is not only blatant nonsense but it constitutes an insult to the integrity of all Saskatchewan working people, both in unions and those who are non-unionized. Surely, Mr. Speaker, no honest person could surely entertain the belief that any responsible Saskatchewan citizen, union member or otherwise, could in any way knowingly contribute to the death or injury of his fellowman. Union leaders have consistently made it clear that genuinely essential services would be maintained in the event of strike action and in every case, Mr. Speaker, in this Province in which life or property has been endangered this has been done, often at considerable inconvenience to the union members involved.

Individuals who adopt the view that union members would stand by and watch human beings suffer, display a wilful lack of knowledge and understanding of the Trade Union Movement and what it stands for.

Some Hon. Members: — Hear, hear!

Mr. Snyder: — There are people, Mr. Speaker, who seem to think that unions are interested only in milking employers. For the most exorbitant wage settlements possible, without any regard for their employers, his business or the public interest. Most intelligent citizens, Mr. Speaker, or voters, know that the facts of the matter are otherwise. Granted, Mr. Speaker, unions are in the business of negotiating for favorable working conditions for their membership. But they are not naive enough to ignore the economics of the company which issues the pay cheques of their members. They are not unrealistic enough to refuse to temper their demands where the employer cannot afford to accede to them. They do not want a bigger slice of the pie than anyone else, they are simply striving for a fair deal. For the edification of those who have been unable or unwilling to grasp it, Mr. Speaker, unions are playing, what I think has to be regarded as a very positive and a very constructive role in our society. They are making very real progress in achieving their objectives of improving the wage and improving the working conditions of their members. In doing so they have assisted in a more indirect way, in raising the living standards applicable to non-union employees as well.

Members of labor organizations are assisting materially in the improvement of industrial efficiency and the expansion of productivity. At the same time these organizations are doing a good deal also to safeguard the welfare of union members and their families away from the job. They are actively engaged in encouraging their members to upgrade their educational and vocational qualifications. They are providing moral and financial encouragement to the sons and daughters of their members to stay in school, to equip themselves to face the challenges of the employment world of tomorrow.

Individually and collectively, Mr. Speaker, union members are contributing in a real and dynamic way to the affairs of their community and of their province. Similarly those responsible for the enactment of Bill 2, Mr. Speaker, have provided

concrete evidence of a shocking degree of ignorance of the functioning of the collective bargaining process and of its importance to our democratic way of life.

It is widely recognized, Mr. Speaker, that the process of collective bargaining is a most efficient means of regulating the conditions of employment. It is a system which ensures quality of treatment and standardization of conditions with a subsequent elimination of the undesirable differences and discrimination.

As such, Mr. Speaker, it is advantageous to employees and to employers and to the economy of the whole. It is an instrument, Mr. Speaker, for the seeking and the attainment of social and economic justice. I notice that on this particular occasion the floor is being held by one of the freshman Members from the gerrymandered constituency of Regina Albert Park (Mr. MacLeod). But I think for the large part with these few exceptions that most people recognize that the collective bargaining process is an essential ingredient of Canada's socio-economic political system.

For example, the submission of the Canadian Chamber of Commerce, to the 1968 Wood's Task Force on Labour Relations stated, and I quote:

The Chamber believes that collective bargaining is the best method in our economic and industrial system of determining wages and working conditions.

To be effective, however, Mr. Speaker, and to permit the orderly and progressive development of the Canadian economy, the collective bargaining process must be allowed to operate in a free and unrestricted way. Its success is dependent upon an independent trade union movement. If bargaining is to be fair and meaningful, each side must have some bargaining power and each side must be unimpeded by domination by each other or by other outside influences.

It is in this area, Mr. Speaker, that Bill 2 exerts its most devastating impact. Despite the many protestations to the contrary, since 1966, Bill 2 has become what it was always intended by the previous Administration to be, a universal instrument of compulsory arbitration, a means of imposing second-class citizenship on Saskatchewan employees, a means of taking away collective bargaining rights, a means of enforcing low and unfair wages, a means of setting up the former Administration as judge, jury and executioner, the highest tribunal in the land from which there was to be no appeal. Let's make no mistake about it, Mr. Speaker. The Essential Services Emergency Act is an embodiment of disrespect and contempt for the democratic process and it is a weapon which has the fire power to destroy collective bargaining.

This is no exaggeration, Mr. Speaker. The spectre of this statute for almost five years has been hanging over every collective bargaining table and has been upsetting the balance of free collective bargaining in the Province of Saskatchewan.

The parties to negotiations in many instances have not settled down to serious bargaining in the knowledge that the issue would eventually be resolved by compulsory arbitration, in which a government imposed wage guideline was to be the

certain outcome. If bargaining is to work, Mr. Speaker, it is imperative that the union side possess some bargaining power. In this connection employees have only their services to offer or to withdraw. The right of workers to strike, and the right of the employers to lockout their employees, are generally considered as necessary for the proper operation of a collective bargaining process.

If employees and employers disagree on matters of wages and working conditions, the employees may refuse to work or the employer may refuse to offer employment on the grounds that the terms are not acceptable. The right to strike amounts, Mr. Speaker, to a simultaneous exercise of rights of the individual workers to withdraw their labor if they regard conditions of work to be unsuitable.

Our democratic institutions, Mr. Speaker, guarantee us certain freedoms. Freedom of religion, freedom of association, freedom to education, freedom of speech and so on. The freedom to decide not to work is as important as any other freedom which we enjoy in our Canadian society. The threat of strike represents a powerful economic device and a very legitimate one.

This is not to suggest, Mr. Speaker, that the strike weapon should be used casually or irresponsibly. It represents, I believe, a very serious failure on the part of negotiators to reach a mutually satisfactory agreement. It is not a step to be taken lightly and it is not regarded as such. The employees are only too aware that immediately when they walk off the job, their income ceases. However, it must be accepted that there are circumstances under which an employer will sometimes refuse to consider justifiable improvements in working conditions. And under those circumstances, on occasions, members have no other recourse other than to withdraw their labor.

It is apparent, Mr. Speaker, that the magnitude of strike losses in this country tends to be grossly inflated. In the words of the Wood's Task Force on Labour Relations, and I am quoting:

Few unions strike frequently. Many strike infrequently and some very rarely.

In Saskatchewan, Mr. Speaker, the time loss attributable to accident, sickness and unemployment are well over one hundred times greater than the time losses resulting from strikes. And that ratio was even greater prior to 1964. Even in a bad year, Mr. Speaker, man days lost in strikes will not be equivalent to more than one tenth of one per cent of working time available. It should not be overlooked, Mr. Speaker, that responsible employers, too, are not in accord with the philosophy inherent in Bill 2, The Essential Services Emergency Act.

Employers, I suggest, do not want settlements imposed upon them by government, and rightly so. They are not prepared to accept conditions affecting their enterprise in which they have had no hand and in which they have not had the opportunity to determine, with their employees, the circumstances under which their business will operate. Moreover they realize that the viability of their enterprise depends on a happy and contented labor force, the achievement of which can be best facilitated by the two parties themselves, bargaining in good faith, without interference.

August 2, 1971

In addition, Mr. Speaker, many employers have indicated that a strike is often the only visible portion of the iceberg which represents a very great larger portion of unseen labor management disharmony. Human relationships cannot be legislated, Mr. Speaker. The ending of a strike by compulsion does not necessarily terminate the dispute. This approach may be far more costly than a strike which results in the final analysis in a mutually satisfactory settlement.

Long-term benefits, Mr. Speaker, of employee morale, of loyalty and contentment, are far more significant to thoughtful employers than the arbitrary and unsatisfactory imposition of compulsory arbitration.

Criticism of compulsory, government-controlled arbitration is widespread in Canada, Mr. Speaker. Time will permit me only to quote to you three examples tonight. Speaking in the House of Commons on September 19, 1968, the Hon. Bryce Mackasey, the Federal Minister of Labour, had this to say:

Compulsory arbitration is a dictatorial solution which is really no solution at all. I think that far too few appreciate the collective bargaining process, too many people fail to distinguish between labor and management in assessing blame for a strike. On those rare occasions when we have found it necessary, in this country, to introduce ad hoc restrictive labor legislation, that legislation inevitably has worked against the best interest of labor and has come down on the side of management.

Here, Mr. Speaker, is the recommendation, another reference, a recommendation of the labor-management committee on the construction industry in Saskatchewan, which the previous Administration created, and which reported to the previous Government last year. I am quoting from the report of that committee.

It is our conviction, after nearly two years of review, that there is no substitute for the collective bargaining process. There should be no government compulsion in the process in the construction industry. Government has a role to play during contract negotiations, and that role is to provide the parties with effective mediation machinery.

As a final example, Mr. Speaker, let me quote from the September 8, 1966 issue of the Regina Leader Post, a newspaper that is not generally known for its support of the New Democratic Party. Speaking of the newly enacted Essential Services Emergency Act, the editorial writer suggested that the Act be left on the shelf and added, and I quote:

That would be a good place to leave it to gather dust as visible evidence that responsible Saskatchewan union and management leadership is able to settle differences without calling upon coercive authority of the people as it is exercised through their Government to impose compulsory arbitration.

Mr. Speaker, there can be no more damning evidence of the extent to which Bill 2 has no place in our democratic society than its relationship to international labor-organization Convention 87, dealing with the freedom of association. This Convention which has been ratified by 77 countries, Mr. Speaker, provides that workers and employers, without distinction

whatsoever, shall have the right to establish and join organizations of their own choosing, without any interference from public authorities. The Convention states further that such organizations shall not be liable to be dissolved or suspended by administrative authority.

Unbelievable as it may seem, Mr. Speaker, it has not been possible for a progressive country like Canada, to ratify this Convention because assurance cannot be given that the terms of the Convention will be carried out throughout this country. The sole reason for the inability of the Canadian Government to ratify the Convention is the existence of The Essential Services Emergency Act, with its clauses involving compulsory arbitration, the decertification of unions and other heavy penalties.

I am pleased to say tonight, Mr. Speaker, that one of my first official acts, following the repeal of Bill 2, will be to advise the Government of Canada that freedom of association has again returned to Saskatchewan, and that accordingly Convention 87, can then be ratified.

At this point, Mr. Speaker, I expect a question might be asked: how does the Government of Saskatchewan intend to ensure that the economy will not be disrupted by harmful strikes without Bill 2 to fall back on?

I might say in this regard, Mr. Speaker, that in the unlikely event that a genuine emergency should arise, the situation can be handled by legislative action as a very extreme and a very last resort, but applicable only to that one situation. Why should a threat to all of the collective bargaining process be created simply because of the possibility existing at some future time that there may be an emergency? What is needed in this Province, Mr. Speaker, is not a Bill 2 or labor courts, but a drastic improvement in the industrial relations climate in Saskatchewan.

This is an area which has been sadly neglected in the past seven years. It is the intention of my Government, Mr. Speaker, through the Department of Labour, which I have some responsibility for, to rebuild the machinery of mediation and conciliation in order to facilitate an industrial relations climate which the previous Administration has tried and failed to get with an iron fist.

The record for labor peace in Saskatchewan during the 20 years of Administration by the former CCF Government, was the envy of every other province in Canada, Mr. Speaker. We propose to restore to Saskatchewan the kind of labor management consultation which will promote healthy industrial relations and industrial harmony. We intend to establish a conciliation program designed to identify labor-relations problems before they attain the status of disputes, thereby enabling the Department to provide conciliation services earlier. We intend to take steps to equip labor-management and conciliators with better defined bargaining criteria.

It is our hope that an approach of this kind will facilitate better informed bargaining and result in earlier and more equitable settlement. Above all, Mr. Speaker, we intend to restore an atmosphere of trust between labor and management which has been lacking as a result of the anti-labor policies of the former Liberal Administration.

We intend to encourage the unrestricted interaction of people, the employers and the employees, who will sit down together, not as enemies, but as partners working together for a common cause to negotiate all aspects of their work relationship in a free given and take atmosphere. This way, Mr. Speaker, I am convinced that the area of conflict can be substantially reduced and rendered more flexible and that the present system of free collective bargaining can be adapted to the new demands of our technologically oriented society.

On this basis, Mr. Speaker, it will continue to play a vital role in the industrial development in Saskatchewan and in the attainment of our economic goals of full employment, the continuing rising standard of living and an equitable distribution of income.

Accordingly, Mr. Speaker, I am pleased and gratified that Bill No. 6 — An Act to Repeal The Essential Services Emergency Act 1966, be now read a second time.

Some Hon. Members: — Hear, hear!

Mr. D.G. Steuart (Leader of the Opposition): — Mr. Speaker, before I get into the general text of my remarks, I hope that the Minister of Labour, (Mr. Snyder) who just took his seat, — if he hasn't already, and he may have, but I haven't seen it yet — will set the records straight as to the plans of his Government in regard to labor-relations and especially that he will answer, very clearly, the statements made at the Waffle meeting held at Fort Qu'Appelle this weekend. On behalf of that group, I quote:

Ron Ruth, of Regina, a trade unionist, said that the Waffle will insist that the Government take a strong pro-labor stand and will demand that it appoint pro-labor persons for arbitration boards and to the Labour Relations Board. We will also insist that a new trade union act be brought in within the framework of the new act, that it be pro labor.

Now, I must again say that I admire the Wafflers — not for their philosophy or what they are attempting to do to this country or this Province — but at least they have the courage to speak out for what they believe in and what they think. But to hear the new Minister of Labour's (Mr. Snyder) sanctimonious utterances concerning the repeal of this Bill and promising everyone that we will have labor peace and they intend to consult with everything, management and labor, and I presume intend to strike a very middle of the road line between these two forces, I certainly hope that very soon that he will assure the people of Saskatchewan that he intends to ignore the demands of the Waffle group and, in fact, take a responsible attitude in the labor-management relations in regard to industrial peace in the Province of Saskatchewan.

Mr. Romanow: — Why don't you ask . . .

Mr. Steuart: — I beg your pardon?

Mr. Romanow: — Why don't you ask Mr. Ruth that?

Mr. Steuart: — Oh, no, Mr. Ruth made the statement and I'm asking him and you people because I haven't seen any statement, Mr. Attorney General, where you are saying that you have the nerve, you, the Premier or anyone else — and some of these people, they're not just a group of people who just drifted into Qu'Appelle, you know, they're not just a group of people who have no status. One of the Members ran and received a tremendous number of votes and a great deal of support at your leadership convention. When the final count came between you and Mr. Blakeney, fortunately or unfortunately for the people of this Province — I don't know — they threw their weight to Mr. Blakeney so we can expect . . . and they've already had some payoff. Now they are making public statements and demanding certain things and all I've said, and I think very rightly so on behalf of the Opposition of the people of the province, is whether the Minister of Labour at the first opportunity will say, "Look, we really intend to be neutral. We really intend to be fair. We don't intend to load every board up with pro-labor people so that every decision is made while we're the Government (no matter how brief it may be), we'll be pro labor." In other words, will they act as fair and reasonable as we did when we were the Government?

Some Hon. Members: — Hear, hear!

Mr. Steuart: — Mr. Speaker, I rise today on behalf of the Opposition to fulfil a clear and immediate responsibility to the people of Saskatchewan, and that is to let everyone know where the New Democratic Party stands on labor issues.

The NDP Government has introduced this Bill to remove The Essential Services Emergency Act from the Statutes of our Province. The Liberal Party contends that this move is nothing but a political payoff by the NDP for the assistance of labor unions in the recent political campaign. The Socialists made a commitment to the labor unions and they are now fulfilling that pledge.

The repeal of this Act, while to the benefit of a small number of labor unions, is detrimental to the general public.

Mr. Speaker, what is Bill 2? Why did the Liberals bring in this Bill? Those are just two of the questions that must be answered today and during this debate.

For some time it has been apparent to those who are not prejudiced that collective bargaining in Canada is a very sick institution. A great many intelligent people think that it has become an outmoded practice and that it has broken down too often to the detriment of the general public in this nation.

As I see it, collective bargaining worked well until recent years. While there were bitter disagreements and strikes, they were usually resolved without serious inconvenience to the public or serious damage to the parties involved. In the past, collective bargaining worked reasonably well because the strengths of the two parties, employers and unions, were reasonably equal. Relatively equal strength has to be the case because if one party is very much stronger than the other, real meaningful bargaining won't take place. The stronger party will simply dictate the settlement and the weaker side will agree to it or be destroyed.

Now, years ago employers were invariably the stronger party and laws were designed to offset these advantages. For example, to prevent unions from being harassed by legal actions, they were not required to become legal entities. They were shielded from the restrictions of anti-trust and anti-combine legislation. Many other benefits favored the union and offset the greater power of the employer.

But today the situation has changed. Once again in too many cases the strength of the two negotiating parties is again unequal. However, this time it is the union strength which frequently far exceeds that of the employer. What small businessman or manufacturer can stand up to the tremendous power or the resources, unions like the Teamsters' Union, the Automobile Workers' Union, the Steel Workers' or the Packing House Workers'? What small contractor can truly negotiate with construction unions who hand him a mimeographed contract and tell him to sign or go broke? Frequently union demands have no relation to the profit or loss picture of the employer. The employer can't give what he hasn't got, if he does, he goes broke. Yet the union organizers time and time again are absolutely not interested in the economic facts of life.

Another factor which I believe is destroying collective bargaining is the manner in which it is being extended to the public sector. What government, for example, can permit electricity or gas to be turned off by Power Corporation employees? What government can permit — responsible government, that is — police or firemen to strike without endangering the very lives of the public that they are paid and sworn to protect? What government can permit hospital employees to leave their jobs for any length of time without endangering the sick? Yet such strikes have . . .

An Hon. Member: — You encouraged the doctors to . . .

Mr. Steuart: — No, we didn't encourage the doctors to do it, Mr. gentleman from that side of the House, you're the people who set the stage that drove the doctors. Don't try to blame it on us.

Yet, Mr. Speaker, such strikes have taken place on the Canadian scene with increasing frequency these last few years. There may be no real limit to what a government can pay in wages but let's never forget, it is the poor taxpayer who invariably pays the bill.

There are many, even prominent trade unions, who also agree that strikes have become obsolete. I quote from Time Magazine, September 7, 1970, when AFL-CIO President George Meaney, without a doubt the most powerful union man in the United States of America or maybe anywhere in the world. I quote; Mr. Meaney stated:

We find more and more that strikes really don't settle a thing. Where you have a well established union, you are getting to the point where a strike doesn't make sense.

Even your little friend, Tommy Douglas, a few years ago in this very province stated that strikes are becoming outmoded and obsolete.

In the present state of affairs, Mr. Speaker, under existing legislation once the two sides agree to disagree, reconciliation becomes more a matter of one side waiting out the other than any real concrete negotiations. Sometimes, in fact, nothing happens for months and everyone gets hurt.

Let's take the example up at Flin Flon. That strike went on for four months. The economy of that city in that district ground to a halt and yet as I understand it, the two parties didn't even begin to talk until they were virtually forced into it. Recently, supposedly intelligent people in our modern society referred to the ancient theory, "might is right." What a barbaric way to settle anything, especially our economic problems. And that's exactly how a strike is settled, no matter who wins it, whether the company uses their power to dominate the working people, or whether the union uses their power to dominate the employer. Might is right when it comes to a case of a strike.

I think the people of this nation are looking to legislatures to find a better way of settling labor disputes.

Some Hon. Members: — Hear, hear!

Mr. Steuart: — I think the people of this nation are demanding that the public interest — the public interest, the innocent people in these strikes — that their interest is put first — ahead even of the union or the employer. Let's make no mistake, Mr. Speaker, that no one wins in a prolonged strike. The workers lose their pay cheques and a great majority of them are sick at heart knowing that it may taken them years to win back their losses. The wives and the families of the unemployed husbands suffer over the powerless situation that the wage earners find themselves in. The companies lose huge sums of money and the loss to the economy generally through strikes runs in this nation into millions of dollars annually.

There is another factor frequently involved in bitter labor disputes. The last ten years have seen an increased acceptance by unions of the fact that picket-line behavior need not be governed by the same rules of conduct which are not provided to protect the rights of individual citizens in other situations.

Mr. Romanow: — That's not true!

Mr. Steuart: — Oh, yes, it's true! Originally picket lines, Mr. Attorney General, if you've ever tried to go through a picket line — you ask Mike Feschuk and the people up in Prince Albert — you just listen for a minute — and you ask the people up in the Prince Albert Co-op when they tried to walk in or drive into the parking lot to deal in their own co-op store after the workers there had been on strike for weeks and the whole situation became so bitter that it was a disgrace. They were threatened, sometimes their cars were scratched. They were threatened and their families were threatened. Don't tell me that nothing happened. Don't tell me that the same behavior takes place on a picket line takes place anywhere else.

It used to be a picket line was for information. But today the picket line has been abused. It may be thrown up anywhere. It may be manned by anyone and a person who crosses the picket line, whether he is involved in the dispute or not, does so

at his peril both physically and socially. Members of a picket line often carry out activities which otherwise would incur severe penalties.

Now, Mr. Speaker, the original Bill 2 was a means to find an appropriate method of settling serious strikes. The initial issue concerned the Saskatchewan Power Corporation and that dispute threatened not only the Province's economy but also the lives of the people of this Province. However, the long-term purpose of this legislation was to permit the Government to intervene in any labor dispute which imperilled Saskatchewan's economic health for the provision of necessary services to our people.

Today, under the legislation, when there is a strike in any essential industry which is detrimental to the public interest, the Government may order the workers back on the job. At the same time, an arbitration committee is set up which has compulsory powers. The workers may name one man to the board, the company names one representative and if they can't agree amongst themselves, they name the chairman. If they can't agree amongst themselves, the Government names the third party to act as chairman. And we agree the Act has very stringent teeth. A union leader who ignores the order to return to work may be fined \$1,000 a day. If the union ignores the order for more than ten days, it can be decertified and cease to exist in this Province. The Act is fair. Employers are subject to the same \$1,000 a day fine as the union for authorizing a lockout or in any other way hindering the orderly settlement of the labor dispute. In fact, the Government can forbid the company to carry on business in the Province of Saskatchewan if they have failed to comply with the regulations.

The legislation, Mr. Speaker, has been effective on five — I don't say it has been used — I say it has been effective in five different situations: the Saskatchewan Power Corporation, hospital unions, construction workers, a nursing home when the union asked us to put it in, and the pulp mill strike.

We believe it is fair and necessary to protect the public interest. I should like to state categorically that:

(1) This legislation was never used by our Government to bully, to oppress or intimidate any union that was engaged in legitimate negotiations to advance their reasonable interest of its members; (2) this legislation moreover was not employed in any dispute until the Government was assured that every other avenue or approach had been explored; and (3) this legislation was employed only when the public interest was involved.

Mr. Speaker, I should like to turn for several moments to the reason, to just why, the NDP wish to repeal Bill 2. I quote from the Regina Leader-Post of July 25th of this year. Mr. Blakeney, the Premier, is quoted as saying:

There is no rush to repeal Bill 2. The Essential Services Emergency Act, since it is operative only when the Government decides to use it, as far as the NDP is concerned for now, it is just a matter of not using it.

I suggest that the NDP changed their mind after they listened to the labor union bosses when they were summoned to the meeting with the Saskatchewan Federation of Labour.

We knew that meeting took place and I would have bet \$10 to a plugged nickel that when they snapped their finger, little Allan wouldn't have said, "How, when do I jump?" he'd have just said, "How high?"

Well, Mr. Speaker, I should like to suggest to this Assembly that the Saskatchewan Federation of Labour told the NDP to get rid of Bill 2 or else.

Mr. Romanow: — Or else, what?

Mr. Steuart: — Or else they would have withdrawn their support, stirred up the Wafflers and you wouldn't been there ten minutes.

Some Hon. Members: — Hear, hear!

Mr. Steuart: — You've got a very, very shaky hold! As I pointed out before, you're all doomed — it's just a matter of time. But if you're good boys to the Wafflers and if you're good boys to the labor unions, you might last four years.

Bill 2 didn't need to be implemented by the Government opposite. Indeed the only way The Essential Services Emergency Act can be brought into force is by a Cabinet order. Mr. Blakeney said the Cabinet assured labor that they wouldn't bring it into force. Well, if you're not tied to the string of labor and if they don't order you around, then Mr. Attorney General I can only come to the conclusion that the labor unions don't trust you to keep your promises any more than the rest of the people of this Province and so they said, "Just in case you get other ideas, you better take it off the books and do it right away."

An Hon. Member: — That's right, that's right!

Mr. Steuart: — Let me emphasize again today to this House and to the people of this Province, our Government is not anti-labor. We're not anti-anything. We're very much aware, a great deal more aware than you people are that a well paid labor force makes for a healthy community in a healthy province. The first thing you've got to find for a contented labor man is a job, and that's something that you've overlooked the last two or three days.

Mr. Speaker, we also believe that all times the public interest must transcend the right of any particular group, including any particular union.

Some Hon. Members: — Hear, hear!

Mr. Steuart: — And I challenge the farmers who sit on that side of the House that the next time there is a grainhandler's strike, the next time the railroad workers decide to tie up the movement of grain, to stand up in this House and say — as they probably all will, like little sheep, "I voted for the removal of Bill 2. I fell in line with the labor unions."

Never mind, if we had passed Bill 2 and you people didn't take Bill 2 off, this is a pattern that should and will eventually spread across this nation.

August 2, 1971

Some Hon. Members: — Hear, hear!

Mr. Steuart: — You people! Never mind what they said. Of course they said it, but I'm telling you tonight that it may be fine to vote against Bill 2 but I guarantee tonight that every farm Member, every Member from rural Saskatchewan, will live to regret the day if he stands in his place and votes for the repeal of this Bill.

Some Hon. Members: — Hear, hear!

Mr. Steuart: — The Liberal Government was just as generous to our own unions, to the people who work for this Government, as the financial capacity of the people of this Province permitted. However, we refused to be blackmailed by any labor group or any union group or any other organization. Our Government will not and would not have been intimidated by tough union leaders as you people have already shown that you can be and you will be.

We dislike seeing the present Government favor any one group at the collective bargaining table at the expense of another group.

Mr. Speaker, the Liberal Party is opposed to the removal of this Bill from the Statute books, especially when the NDP left the impression across this Province that they would not remove this statute until they were prepared to replace it with something that would protect the rights and the interests of the ordinary people of this Province against irresponsible and prolonged strikes, and they haven't done that to this point.

Some Hon. Members: — Hear, hear!

Mr. Steuart: — I call on the NDP Government to show some backbone and to withdraw this Bill from this Assembly tonight.

Some Hon. Members: — Hear, hear!

Mr. G. Flasch (Maple Creek): — Mr. Speaker, I welcome the opportunity to speak on the Bill to appeal The Essential Services Emergency Act. I should like to commend the Minister of Labour (Mr. Snyder) for having the courage to introduce the Bill in this House.

I have no pro-labor or anti-labor bias personally. I am concerned, however, that the rights which people have built up over decades, and indeed over centuries, and which have now become a part of their heritage, should suddenly be destroyed by some government which has a definite anti-labor bias.

Some Hon. Members: — Hear, hear!

Mr. Flasch: — I consider Bill 2, Mr. Speaker, to be a bad piece of legislation. I think that it takes the whole process of collective bargaining and relegates it to the stone age of labor relations.

It has been my opinion, Mr. Speaker, that if a man has a product to sell he should have the right to bargain collectively

for the price at which he will sell that product. If the only product that this man has to sell is his labor, then I suggest that it is his democratic right to sit across the table from his employer and bargain collectively for the price at which he will sell that labor. I do not believe that he should have the oft-mentioned 'Sword of Damocles' hanging over his head. I don't think that anyone can bargain in an atmosphere like that and bargain freely. Mr. Speaker, I suggest that Bill 2 is that sword.

I agree with Members opposite to a certain extent. I believe that there are certain services which might be considered essential services . . .

Mr. Weatherald: — Come on over. We have room for one more.

Mr. Flasch: — Not yet boys! I do not believe that suddenly at the snap of the fingers of some union boss, the whole bunch are going to jump up and walk out and plunge this Province into chaos. I don't think that people are that irresponsible.

I say, Mr. Speaker, that it was the callous attitude of the former Liberal Government towards labor that prompted the recent labor disputes that we have had in this Province . . .

Some Hon. Members: — Hear, hear!

Mr. Flasch: — . . . and that it was not irresponsibility of hospital workers, Crown corporation employees and labor in general that was at fault. Since 1964, Mr. Speaker, the number of man-days lost through strikes jumped from 5,200 to 40,000 per year. I don't believe, Mr. Speaker, that the attitude of labor has changed, but after 1964, I suggest that the attitude of the Government of this Province certainly did.

Some Hon. Members: — Hear, hear!

Mr. Flasch: — I have a clipping that appeared in various weeklies, I am sure, throughout the province. This one was taken from the Leader Weekly and it says:

Bill 2 — your insurance policy around the clock.

Do you know who paid for this? The Government of Saskatchewan paid this. They paid for this with the taxpayers' money, with some of the money which was taken from the very people that this Bill was designed to be imposed upon. I don't mind them putting their propaganda sheet in the paper but I wish they would pay for it out of their own party funds.

Some Hon. Members: — Hear, hear!

Mr. Flasch: — I notice that it mentioned hospital employees. It doesn't mention doctors. I don't know whether they are employed in hospitals or not, but they are not mentioned. I recall that the Government forced the hospital workers in Estevan back to work for something like \$1.70 per hour. I recall that they gave the doctors — and all they had to do was ask for it — they gave them a 11 per cent increase on something like \$20,000. It is easy to see whom they favor, who the elite are.

The former Government, Mr. Speaker, created a fear psychosis in this Province amongst its employees. During the recent election campaign, many of us were out campaigning and I know that it happened to me personally — I went around and knocked on a door and introduced myself and somebody would say, "How do you do. I am very pleased to meet you, but I work for the Power Corporation, eh?" Another person said, "We are all on your side, but mum is the word. We don't dare say anything. This is a fact, we don't dare say anything."

These people, Mr. Speaker, have been threatened with dismissal if they engaged in politics unless, of course, they engaged in it on behalf of the Liberal Party and then it was fine. I say that every man has the right to engage in party politics when he does it on his own time, if he can work compatibly with the people by whom he is employed. There is nothing wrong with it and I would stand up for that right anywhere.

My colleagues and I, in the teaching profession, who are sitting on this side of the House, know what it is like to bargain under a Liberal Government, or with the guidance, at least of the Liberal Government.

Mr. Steuart: — Look at the increases you had in the last seven years.

Mr. Flasch: — We had good reasons to oppose that Government in the recent election, and I shall mention only a few of them. We object to the arbitrary way in which they imposed area bargaining upon us. Some 50 people, I think, out of a total of some 700, at a trustees' convention voted for it. And it went because the Government wanted to bring teachers to heel. That's the reason. The imposition of the pupil-teacher ratio had its adverse effects. We weren't happy with that. The only good thing about it, I am happy to say, is its repeal, that's all.

Mr. Weatherald: — Mr. Speaker, on a point of order. I do believe, Mr. Speaker, that the Hon. Member should keep his remarks to the Bill that is before us. I would be very interested in his remarks on the teacher-pupil ratio. Teachers, I don't find under Bill 2.

Some Hon. Members: — Hear, hear!

Mr. Weatherald: — Well, okay, Mr. Speaker, if you want to throw the rules wide open, fine, let him go.

Mr. Romanow: — May I speak to the point of order, Mr. Speaker. My respectful submission to the House is that the Hon. Member is in fact fully in order, because, as I understand the thrust of his remarks, he is saying this: that it was the attitude of the former Liberal Government, the arbitrary, dictatorial attitude when it implemented Bill 2, could also be exemplified in its teacher-pupil ratios, salary teacher negotiation bargaining. And all that the Hon. Member is trying to do, is to show that there is a consistent Liberal Party line when it comes to doing these matters.

Mr. Weatherald: — Mr. Speaker, on the point of

order. That is fine. We have 14 over here and if you want to give us all the latitude to say anything that we like on any Bill, let her go. We don't mind at all.

Mr. Speaker: — I believe that any remarks on Second Reading should be related to the Bill that is before us. I think that Bill 2 as it is usually referred to, The Essential Services Emergency Act, in its application was broad enough to cover any laboring people, as I understand the Hon. Member, that is what he was intending to point out, that he could be covered as a teacher. Now if he goes into discussion of educational legislation then he will be out of order. I would say that as long as he relates his remarks to this Bill, Bill 2, he is in order.

Mr. Flasch: — Mr. Speaker, I say that my remarks are relevant, because we were definitely threatened with being included under Bill 2. And nobody knows it better than the Hon. Member from Wilkie (Mr. McIsaac) sitting across the way.

I don't think, Mr. Speaker, that the Government wanted us to reach an agreement. No decent effort was made to bargain collectively with us. Time after time nothing happened. I think that they were hoping that we should all go out on strike. A few of our people did in Prince Albert, but they were looking for us all to go out on strike. This would have given them an election issue and would have enabled them to include us under Bill 2.

I think, Mr. Speaker, the matter of establishing an arbitration board leaves a bit to be desired. It is fair enough to say that labor can pick its member, management picks its member, and then if they can't agree, and in all likelihood they can't because of the very fact that they are engaged in dispute. They are not likely to agree. And then, of course, in steps the Government and appoints the Chairman. I say, Mr. Speaker, that this is tantamount to the Government settling the whole dispute exactly according to its will in the first place.

I suggest that we, now, would have that power. I suggest, Mr. Speaker, that we don't want that because we have faith in people. We believe that if they are accorded some degree of latitude that they will settle their own disputes without Government interference.

Some Hon. Members: — Hear, hear!

Mr. Flasch: — I notice from a press release that the Opposition Leader (Mr. Steuart) said that his group in the House would vigorously oppose Bill 2. I would suggest that Bill 2 was a major factor in the debacle as far as they are concerned of June 23. I can't really see how it can be advantageous to the Members opposite to oppose this bill now that they are in opposition.

Mr. Steuart: — We've got principles.

Mr. Flasch: — I say, Mr. Speaker, that it is a deliberate attempt to save face. They talked against labor before the election and they have to continue doing so afterwards so that they can continue to court the favor of the big business friends who paid

August 2, 1971

for their election.

Some Hon. Members: — Hear, hear!

Mr. Flasch: — Mr. Speaker, Bill 2 was repulsive not only to those who were included under it, but to those who were threatened with inclusion under it. It aroused the ire of every democratically-minded citizen of this Province. I noticed too, that the Hon. Member from Prince Albert West (Mr. Steuart) mentioned the other day that the big union bosses were finally collecting the first instalments on the I.O.U.'s of what they contributed to our election campaign. Well, I don't know how much they contributed but I should like to thank them for any contribution they did make. I know one thing that none of that money found its way to Maple Creek. We won the election out there, but we have a deficit on our books, Mr. Speaker, and I should like to see it wiped out and I should be very pleased . . .

Some Hon. Members: — Hear, hear!

Mr. Flasch: — . . . Mr. Speaker, if the Hon. Member would tell me who the union bosses are who are willing to part with a couple of thousand of dollars, I shall gladly accept it. As a matter of fact I would even take it from Carl Landegger, but I doubt that he is in a generous mood today.

Some Hon. Members: — Hear, hear!

Mr. Flasch: — During their term of office, Mr. Speaker, the Liberals attempted to use organized labor as a scapegoat and to make labor responsible for all the economic ills of this Province. I don't think that any one group should be held responsible — maybe not even the provincial Liberals (the campaign is over now). Mr. Speaker, let me say that it was my wish that somehow the Members opposite when they were the Government, could have been brought under Bill 2. I really think that their attitude toward labor was responsible for most of the strikes that did occur. And if I look back, judging from their accomplishments in office during this period, I would say that they were virtually on strike themselves as a government.

Some Hon. Members: — Hear, hear!

Mr. Flasch: — Mr. Speaker, the onus is on this Government to restore the rights of collective bargaining to the people of this Province and recreate an atmosphere of trust between management and labor and, indeed, between all segments of society.

To sum up, Mr. Speaker, I wish to state that I consider Bill 2 a bad piece of legislation and that I will vote for the Bill to repeal The Essential Services Emergency Act.

Some Hon. Members: — Hear, hear!

Mr. E. Cowley: — Mr. Speaker, I am pleased to be able to rise on this occasion and speak in favor of this Bill.

I was pleased to hear the Leader of the Opposition

(Mr. Steuart) mention that they had principles. As I have listened to the debate in the last few days, I was beginning to lose my faith — what little faith I had in the Liberal Party. Time after time, legislation came forward and speakers from the opposite side of the floor stood up and said, "Mr. Speaker, we introduced this legislation, or we did this, because we thought it was in the best interest of the people of Saskatchewan." Obviously the people of Saskatchewan weren't in favor of it. They voted against it, so now we have changed our minds. I rather thought that they had been running the Government on a Gallup Poll basis, that they put in whatever legislation they thought was popular. Now that it has proved to be unpopular they are throwing it out and changing over to another horse in midstream.

Some Hon. Members: — Hear, hear!

Mr. Cowley: — Well, I am pleased to see that in the case of Bill 2 they have some principles. I am afraid that they are misguided principles, but at least I am pleased to see they have put them forward.

Mr. Speaker, the Leader of the Opposition stated that they hope that we would be as fair in our dealing with labor-management relations as the Liberals have been. I suggest, Mr. Speaker, that won't take much of an effort. As far as the insinuation that the introduction of this Bill, at this time, is a political payoff, it is a "bunch of baloney" and nothing more.

Some Hon. Members: — Hear, hear!

Mr. Cowley: — When this Party sat in the Opposition, when Bill 2 was introduced into this House, and when Bill 57 was introduced after it, this Party opposed compulsory arbitration in spite of the fact that many people said that it would be politically unpopular. We based our stand on principles. We based our stand on this before the election and we were elected. Mr. Speaker, it is important that this Bill be repealed now. It never was, and it is not now, the kind of legislation which is compatible with a democratic society. Only a Government which believed in pocket boroughs and gerrymandering, and believed that they were part of a democratic system, only such a government could have enthusiastically endorsed The Essential Services Emergency Act.

Some Hon. Members: — Hear, hear!

Mr. Cowley: — Compulsory arbitration must go, and it must go now. It is the first in a series of actions which this Government will take to strengthen democracy in Saskatchewan. It must go because it has begun the destruction of collective bargaining in Saskatchewan. During the election campaign one saw advertisements stating that collective bargaining had worked 98 per cent of the time in Saskatchewan, and yet those Members sitting opposite were willing to risk the whole process with this legislation. It was simply a grandstand play to try and convince rural Saskatchewan that they could, and would, hold labor down.

Some Hon. Members: — Hear, hear!

Mr. Cowley: — It was part and parcel of their policy of playing one group against another.

Mr. Speaker, I represent a rural constituency. The people in the constituency of Biggar were not fooled by these attempts to place the blame for their difficulties on labor. Farmers are much too aware of their own lack of bargaining power. However, they have rejected the theory that they can enhance their position through legislation which is discriminatory against labor and which removes the rights of the common working man. The repeal of The Essential Services Emergency Act was a part of the New Democratic Party's New Deal for people. That's where it came from, from convention resolutions put forward and passed by a convention of the New Democratic Party.

On June 23 rural Saskatchewan spoke out resoundingly in favor of this program.

Some Hon. Members: — Hear, hear!

Mr. Cowley: — Rural Saskatchewan spoke in favor of this program, I am certain, because they were confident that labor would support fully the right of farmers to bargain collectively if farmers found themselves in similar circumstances.

Some Hon. Members: — Hear, hear!

Mr. Cowley: — Mr. Speaker, Bill 2 must go. I'd like for a minute to turn to the whole question of compulsory arbitration. The strike is an important part of the collective bargaining system, as has been mentioned. The threat of a strike or the threat of a lockout is what enables the system to function. If the working man does not have the right to withdraw his services, I ask the Members opposite, what he has left to bargain with? Compulsory arbitration won't work. When you make it known that the decision can be left to an arbitrator, bargaining in good faith stops.

Mr. Speaker, there is no guarantee that an arbitration board will be impartial. In the case of the previous Administration, I believe there was real and justified fear on the part of organized labor that they would get the short end of the stick with regard to any arbitration board. Matters of principle should not be decided by arbitration board. For example, the scope of negotiations should not be submitted to such a board. This is a matter which should be rightly arrived at through collective bargaining between the two parties concerned. Arbitration boards have seldom broken new ground. At a time when we need, we desperately need, new approaches and new concepts, we cannot afford to stand pat with arbitrations boards. It is imperative that the new ideas like the four-day, 40-hour week be examined and that the decision with respect to this idea be arrived at through negotiations between the two parties concerned.

And finally, Mr. Speaker, as an argument against compulsory arbitration, the Provincial Government is directly concerned with, and directly affect by, negotiations with groups like the Saskatchewan Power Corporation employees. It should not be, and it should not wish to be, put in the position of having to

name a chief arbitrator in matters which affect it so directly.

Mr. Speaker, there are real alternatives to compulsory arbitration. We need, and I am sure this Government will enact, better legislation to assist the collective bargaining proceed. We need, and we shall have, I am sure, better conciliation and mediation procedures, and better trained and more mediation and conciliation officers. The collective bargaining system must be allowed to function freely in Saskatchewan.

The repeal of The Essential Services Emergency Act puts the onus squarely on the shoulders of unions and employees, where it should be. I am confident that they will adopt responsible attitudes towards negotiations. I look forward to an era of harmonious relations between employees and employers. It is quite possible there will be some rough spots on the road ahead, Mr. Speaker, but they are but a small price to pay for freedom. I am confident that the new atmosphere created in Saskatchewan on June 23 will go a long way to achieving the kind of employer-employee harmony that we all, I am sure, sincerely desire for Saskatchewan.

Mr. Speaker, I shall support the repeal of The Essential Services Emergency Act.

Some Hon. Members: — Hear, hear!

Mr. M. Feschuk (Prince Albert East): — Mr. Speaker, I wish to congratulate the Hon. Minister of Labour (Mr. Snyder) on his appointment and also on the legislation he has introduced in this Session of the Legislature.

There is no doubt that the benefits to all far outweigh the disadvantages to a few and the province as a whole will be better for this legislation. Labor and management will no longer have the threat of Bill 2 over their heads and will be able once again to carry out meaningful collective bargaining that should lead to much greater industrial peace than we have experienced in the last several years.

It will now be the responsibility of this Government to provide proper staffing in the Labour Department to ensure that the legislation is effected and also to make sure that the unorganized as well as the organized can, without threat to their jobs, enjoy the full benefit of this legislation. These labor changes are a step in the right direction. However, Mr. Speaker, we must still be concerned about excessively long hours where payment of overtime is little or no deterrent to management who would much rather pay overtime than train employees as essential workers.

This country is experiencing some of the highest unemployment in its history while many are working as much as 20 hours per week overtime, and others walk the streets. Surely a government has the responsibility to do so something about such a tragic situation. I raise this, Mr. Speaker, in the hope that we shall realize that our job is not finished with the progress made at this Session but that our Minister of Labour will continue to work in the direction he has taken, and that we can look forward to more improvements in the future sessions.

Mr. Speaker, may I say I am pleased to support the Bill, an

August 2, 1971

Act to repeal The Essential Services Emergency Act.

Some Hon. Members: — Hear, hear!

Mr. J. Comer (Nipawin): — Mr. Speaker, it's with a sense of pride that I rise today to participate in this debate to repeal Bill 2. I first joined the New Democratic Party in 1966 just after the remnants of that Government passed Bill 2. The Leader of the Opposition (Mr. Steuart) said, "We've got principles," and certainly Bill 2 shows some of those principles. That Government was based on the principle of being one of the most viciously anti-labor governments that this country has seen and certainly that this Province has seen. They were proud of it but obviously Saskatchewan wasn't proud of it. They mended that situation on June 23.

Some Hon. Members: — Hear, hear!

Mr. Comer: — Mr. Speaker, today we are participating in a historic debate on labor legislation. We are moving the repeal of Bill 2. We are striking a blow for labor democracy. When Bill 2 was passed through the Legislature in the summer of 1966, Woodrow Lloyd, the then Leader of the Opposition, declared, "This Bill is evil." And it was and it is.

Some Hon. Members: — Hear, hear!

Mr. Comer: — This Bill was a cruel blow to the working men of this Province. It gave the working man a sense of oppression. It caused free collective bargaining in any real sense to be something of the past, and the Government was proud of it. This Bill that we're dealing with today, Bill 6, restores free collective bargaining or takes great steps in restoring it. Free collective bargaining can only occur when the workingmen's representatives and the company's representatives negotiate to arrive at a new collective bargaining agreement to change wage rates and working conditions. Does this cause strikes? No, it does not. Does compulsory arbitration cause strikes? Yes, it does. Once you introduce a third party, a coercive force to collective bargaining, you introduce tension. One side invariably feels that it'll get a better deal by going to arbitration. And that side, from the beginning, opts to strike. That's what happened really when there was a strike against the Saskatchewan Power Corporation in 1966. Saskatchewan Power Corporation felt it could go to compulsory arbitration and get a better deal than it could in collective bargaining. The employees went to strike. This is the case in what happened in teacher negotiations last fall. The boards and the Department of Education were prepared to let a strike occur because they felt they could get a better deal. And it caused a teachers' strike. It could have caused a lot more teacher's strikes.

Many times when a strike occurred, the Government, the former Government was willing to move in with compulsory arbitration and then they boasted to the province, "We've stopped a strike." They didn't stop a strike, they caused it. They caused it by introducing compulsory arbitration, by threatening the working man and by threatening companies with compulsory arbitration. And it wasn't excessive wage demands. We all know that. It wasn't union bosses. I've been in unions. I'd like to see a union boss.

It was the realization by management that Government was willing to stick the workers with compulsory arbitration. As I have mentioned earlier, removing compulsory arbitration restores labor peace. We are removing, compulsory arbitration, to a large degree. We are moving towards restoring labor peace. We are restoring freedom in negotiations. Bill 6 is a just Bill and I certainly am proud to support it.

Some Hon. Members: — Hear, hear!

Mr. K. Macleod (Regina Albert Park): — Mr. Speaker, I have quite a number of remarks to make on this Bill and I therefore beg leave to have the debate adjourned.

Motion agreed to.

Debate adjourned.

Hon. W.E. Smishek (Minister of Public Health) moved second reading of Bill No. 4 — **An Act to amend The Saskatchewan Medical Care Insurance Act.**

He said: Mr. Speaker, the intent of the proposed amendments to this Act are very similar to those described in Bill 3, to amend the Saskatchewan Hospitalization Act.

The amendments before you remove the authority for regulations which prescribe medical deterrent fees that may be charged by doctors in this Province of Saskatchewan.

The Bill also provides that a person who has reached the age of 65 is a beneficiary under the Act and is exempt from paying premiums on his own behalf.

Mr. Speaker, it was on March 1, 1968 that the Liberal Government of that day announced that they were going to put an end to 21 years of prepaid hospital care in the Province of Saskatchewan. They were not content with just committing this one dastardly deed, they also announced that they were going to put an end to six years of free medical care in the Province of Saskatchewan. This was a cruel and inhuman blow to the people of Saskatchewan, not only because it was a severe tax imposition on the citizens of this Province but because it was a major erosion of the two most humane and most important plans legislated by the former CCF Government.

The introduction of these deterrent fees constituted a deliberate sabotage on the part of the Liberal Administration on these two important health service programs.

Mr. Speaker, in 1968 when we debated the deterrent fees, reference was made at that time to the Thompson Committee including in its report a recommendation on deterrent fees. I think I must remind the House that I was proud to be a member of that Committee, and it was during the three years of study on medical care that I became more deeply convinced of the necessity to establish a publicly administered and financed comprehensive health service for the people of Saskatchewan.

I also became convinced that you cannot have a health service program which has built-in deterrent fees. It was for this

reason that I submitted a dissenting report, declaring my firm opposition to deterrent or utilization fees.

I assure you the Committee spent considerable time in discussing deterrent fees and made the recommendation only after a great deal of soul-searching. I am sure the Hon. Member for Regina Lakeview (Mr. McPherson) who was also a member of that Committee will concur with me that the Committee gave this matter a great deal of thought. I was particularly pleased, Mr. Speaker, that the Hon. Member for Regina Lakeview who in 1960-61 supported the idea of deterrent fees, after ten years of thought and consideration stood up in his place this afternoon and he voted against deterrent fees.

Some Hon. Members: — Hear, hear!

Mr. Smishek: — I congratulate him. It takes time to learn but there's always a hope.

Mr. Speaker, the Thompson Committee report did identify a number of distinct disadvantages associated with deterrent fees. I think it will be useful for the Members of the House and particularly our newer Members to take note of some of the arguments that the Thompson committee presented in regard to deterrent fees and their disadvantages. The Committee said this:

They are discriminatory in two ways: they tax those who have legitimate needs for services; they fall with unequal weight on persons of different incomes. They discourage persons from seeking preventive care and they deter persons from seeking early treatment. They are a nuisance to both the physician and the patient. They are expensive and they are difficult to administer. Their application does not recognize that the provision of some medical services are initiated by the patient while others are provided at the order of the physician.

Mr. Speaker, the Thompson Committee did, as I have already noted, make a recommendation concerning deterrent fees but the conditions that they specified were a far departure from those imposed by the Liberal Administration.

I should like the Members to take note of the Thompson Committee's recommendation. First of all, the Committee said that they should be small in amount, that they would not apply to referred specialist services, that they would only apply to the first three visits in any one illness. The doctor would have the right to waive the utilization fee. Records of receipts of payments of utilization fees should be kept by the physicians and recorded with his claim to the Commission for payment. The payment to physicians by the Plan would be reduced by the amount of the utilization fee. Utilization fees should be directed to those items of service which are initiated by the patient only.

In addition, because of the wide difference of opinion as to the desirability of deterrent fees and the lack of experience in applying them, the Committee recommended that the whole question should be reviewed within three years of their introduction. Mr. Speaker, I am proud that the CCF Government of that day had the foresight to see that any disadvantages that might have accrued outweighed the advantages and therefore did not accept the recommendation of the Thompson Committee in respect of deterrent fees.

Mr. Speaker, rising costs was the main reason the Liberals claim for bringing in this sick tax. They said that the financial position of the plan would be jeopardized if drastic action was not taken immediately. Of course, it is a fact that the costs of medical care are going up. This I do not deny. In 1963, the first year of operation of medical care insurance, the gross payment for the full year was \$21.4 million, the comparable figure in 1970 was \$33 million. There are many good reasons for this, Mr. Speaker. Since 1963 a number of new classes of beneficiaries have been added to the case load of the Commission; 25,000 Saskatchewan Assistance Plan beneficiaries were added effective April 1, 1966. This figure grew to over 60,000 in 1971; 2,177 War Veterans' Allowance recipients were added as of July 1, 1968; 32,000 Indians residing in reserves were added as of January 1, 1969. Costs were bound to go up because of the increased case load. There have also been a few changes in respect of insured services provided for and paid for by The Medical Care Insurance Commission. For example, refractions by physicians became an insured service in July of 1968, and refractions by optometrists were insured as of September of that same year. Naturally these additional services did contribute to some increased costs. I might remind the Members of the House that providing for these additional insured services was not particularly the will of the Liberal Government of Saskatchewan, it was a requirement that was imposed by the Federal Medical Care Act and became a legal condition.

Some Hon. Members: — Hear, hear!

Mr. Smishek: — In addition to all of this you will recall there have been increases in doctors' payment schedules and the percentage figure that is used as a basis for payment. This also resulted in a considerable increase in cost. Mr. Speaker, the point I am trying to make is that all of these changes have contributed substantially to increased costs, but they are costs over which the citizens of Saskatchewan have no control.

There was another important development associated with this program in July of 1968 and that was that on that date of July 1, the Federal Government started making contributions under The Federal Medical Care Act. It was unfortunate, Mr. Speaker, as we were going to get more money as of July 1, 1968, towards helping finance medical care and hospital care plan, the Liberals chose in that same period to introduce deterrent fees. In 1970, the sharable costs for the Medical Care Insurance Commission and the Swift Current Health Region totalled \$30 million, contribution under the Federal Medical Care Plan came to approximately \$19.6 million or 63.7 per cent of sharable cost.

I have also noted that the gross payment for the Medical Care Insurance Commission totalled \$33 million in 1970. Let's subtract the \$19.6 million received from the Federal Government and the \$5.7 million received from the medical care premiums; this leaves a net payment by the Government of Saskatchewan of only \$7.7 million or just 23 per cent of the total cost of the plan. The comparable figure for 1969 was \$8.6 million so in fact the net effect on the consolidated fund was a decrease of close to \$1 million over a period of two years. The comparable figure for 1963, Mr. Speaker, would have been over \$16 million that the CCF Government paid at that time. In other words, the net cost to the consolidated fund was over twice as high in 1963 as it was in 1970.

Mr. Speaker, are these the catastrophic increases my friends across the floor are telling us about these days. We knew right from the start that it would be inevitable that medical care costs would increase. I believe the Thompson Committee estimated an annual increase of 3 per cent. It was for this reason, Mr. Speaker, that we insisted on basing the financing of the medical care plan on progressive taxes rather than on regressive taxes as the Liberals did. You will recall, Mr. Speaker, that the medical care plan was to be financed from portions of four different tax sources, the joint hospital and medical care tax, the education and health tax, the corporation tax and the income tax. With the exception of the joint medical and hospital tax the revenues derived from these sources are increasing annually. It is true that the Liberals on taking office in 1964, increased the premiums by \$20 in the case of families and \$10 in the case of individuals from \$52 family premium and \$26 on individuals to \$72 and \$36 respectively.

For example, Mr. Speaker, in 1962-63, the education and health tax revenues to the province of Saskatchewan were \$38.2 million; in 1969-70 the comparable figure was \$63 million, an increase of almost \$25 million or 64 per cent in just a period of seven years. This gave the Government more money to finance programs, more of this money should have been used to also help finance medical and hospital programs.

Mr. Speaker, I think all of these facts show that the gloomy financial picture painted by the former Government in respect to the medical care plan is not nearly as black as they would have the people believe. Returning to the increased costs of the medical care plan, the area the deterrent fees should affect the most is the per capita utilization, for the number of services provided per beneficiary. Deterrent fees have nothing to do with doctor fee schedules, increases in the level of insured services or increases in the number of beneficiaries. If they are going to work at all they must work in some way to affect the per capita utilization.

I should like to refer the Members of this House to the Medical Care Insurance Commission annual reports. It is interesting to trace the changes that have occurred in the per capita utilization. In 1964 the increase was 5.7 per cent over 1963; in 1965 the increase dropped to 2.4 per cent over 1964; it rose again to 4.5 in 1966 and then dropped to 3.7 in 1967. So that at the time the Liberals introduced their deterrent fee program the increase associated with the change in per capita utilization was in fact going down, Mr. Speaker. There was a rather significant drop in the per capita utilization in 1968. Instead of an increase the change between 1967 and 1968 indicated a 3 per cent decrease. These figures dramatically underline the inhibiting effect of deterrent fees. But it is interesting to note that in 1969 the trend started to reverse itself. The significant change took place in 1970 when the increase in per capita utilization went up by almost 9 per cent. Obviously a rebounding effect was beginning to take place. We could speculate at great length about the reasons for this change but I think the important fact is that deterrent fees did contribute to a substantial reduction in the number of services per beneficiary in 1968-69. I am sure that our low income groups were being deterred originally by these fees from seeking needed medical care. Perhaps when they had to choose between a trip to the doctor or a couple pounds of butter they chose to buy the butter. But as time went on and they could see how a medical condition which could have been nipped in the bud by one visit to a doctor developed into a more

serious condition, often requiring an admission to the hospital, they decided the next time, Mr. Speaker, to do away with the butter. I wonder, Mr. Speaker, how much of this 9 per cent increase in 1970 can be attributed to medical conditions being left unattended because the patient did not have the money to pay the deterrent fee. As I said before it is well known that early detection of illness and a prompt introduction of effective treatment can often prevent complications and chronic disability.

The introduction of deterrent fees was a part of the Liberal Party's policy of attacking the farmers and the wage earners of this Province. These fees are a most vicious form of class distinction. Deterrent fees tend to concentrate on the low income and the large family groups. If deterrent fees are to work in the manner hoped for by the Liberals they must discourage the would-be patient from obtaining medical services. Deterrent fees are not going to discourage the well-to-do persons from obtaining services but they emphatically will cause serious problems for the poor, for the couples trying to get by on old age pensions.

Medical deterrent fees have not reduced the overall costs of medical care programs, they have simply transferred much of the cost to the sick people of the province who have paid about \$10 million in medical deterrent fees since April 15, 1968. This approach runs counter to any humanitarian view of our society. It is also diametrically opposed to the Socialist principles of this Government. It is a total violation of the basic underlying principles of comprehensive health care insurance that this Government recognizes. We insist that every person in this Province irrespective of his means, sex or occupation shall have equal access to the best and the most up-to-date health services we can make available.

Some Hon. Members: — Hear, hear!

Mr. Smishek: — There is no place for deterrent fees in comprehensive health programs to promote health care, to prevent disease, to provide early diagnosis and treatment of disease and to promote rehabilitation. This is why we have placed this amendment before the Legislature during this Session.

The other amendment, Mr. Speaker, to this Bill when passed will provide old people or senior citizens with free medical care and treatment. I am, therefore, very pleased that effective January 1, 1972, they will be provided with free medical care as well as free hospital care. These are the initial steps, Mr. Speaker, that this Government is developing in improving health care for the people of the Province of Saskatchewan. I want to assure the Members here and all the people of this Province that many more improvements are already being considered by my Government. Our objective is nothing less than the development of the best health care service available in the world. We have the resources, we have the skills, we have the people and we have the desire to make this objective a reality, Mr. Speaker.

I want to conclude my remarks with a very brief but grateful tribute to all the workers in the field of public health care. They are serving the people of Saskatchewan in a dedicated and selfless manner that commands our respect and admiration. We have great confidence in their skills and in their abilities. I want to assure them that they can now have the confidence in

August 2, 1971

receiving the fullest co-operation and support of the Government of Saskatchewan in developing a health service that will be second to none.

Mr. Speaker, I now move second reading of this Bill.

Some Hon. Members: — Hear, hear!

MR. G.B. GRANT (Regina Whitmore Park): — Mr. Speaker, I rise to speak on this Bill and due to the lateness of the hour and the fact that the Minister of Health (Mr. Smishek) has made quite a lengthy statement on the Bill, I would ask leave to adjourn the debate.

Debate adjourned.

The Assembly adjourned at 9:25 o'clock p.m.