

**LEGISLATIVE ASSEMBLY OF SASKATCHEWAN**  
**Second Session — Seventeenth Legislature**  
**4th Day**

**Tuesday, February 29, 1972**

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

**WELCOME TO STUDENTS**

**Hon. J.E. Brockelbank** (Minister of Public Works): — Mr. Speaker, during this introduction of students I wish to apologize for being so anxious to introduce this group of students from Saskatoon. They are from Bedford Road Collegiate and they are accompanied today by their principal, Mr. Grassly and one of their teachers, Mr. Sorienko. I am sure that you, Mr. Speaker, and all the Members of the Assembly welcome them here and hope that they will be able to take something home of value from the debates this afternoon. However, I am in the unfortunate position of not being able to guarantee the quality of the debate this afternoon. Consequently, they will have to take their chance. I am sure they will enjoy themselves this afternoon. We all want to welcome them here and wish them a safe journey back to Saskatoon.

**Hon. Members:** — Hear, hear!

**Mr. B.M. Dyck** (Saskatoon City Park): — Mr. Speaker, I should like to add to the remarks of the Hon. Minister of Public works in welcoming the students of Bedford Road in Saskatoon. I had the privilege and pleasure of teaching in that collegiate for a number of years. There is a fine group of students coming from that collegiate and I hope they have a very interesting and informative afternoon.

**Hon. R. Romanow** (Attorney General): — Mr. Speaker, before the Orders of the Day, I should like to welcome the members of King George School. I believe they are taking Grade Eight. They are accompanied by their teachers Mr. Stall and Mr. Christianson. King George School is in the heart of my riding. Many of the members of my family went to King George School. It is one of the very well known older schools in the city of Saskatoon. While I am on my feet, I should like to join in welcoming the students from Bedford Road Collegiate as my Hon. Colleague, the Minister of Public Works has done. Bedford Road Collegiate is my old alma mater. That tells you a lot about Bedford Road Collegiate, but it's a good school. I'd like to welcome them all here.

**Hon. Members:** — Hear, hear!

**QUESTIONS**

**OPERATOR'S LICENCES**

**Mr. D. Boldt** (Rosthern): — I wish to direct a question to the Attorney General regarding the operators' licences that are now being billed. Will the 25 year and under be paying the same fee as those who are 25 years and over?

**Hon. R. Romanow** (Attorney General): — The situation with respect to the 25 year olds and under is, Mr. Speaker, that there will be no change but the whole matter is under review.

### **FEE FOR LICENCE PLATES**

**Mr. Boldt:** — I'd like to ask the Minister in Charge of SGIO another question. If I bought a car just before Christmas, a new one, and I paid \$94 for the licence plates, if I bought them now, would I pay \$10 more and if I do is that an increase?

**Mr. Romanow:** — Mr. Speaker, in reply to the Hon. Member, as I indicated yesterday, there is a new category which involves 1972 model cars and 1973 model cars only. In that regard the fee insurance rate is \$104. May I say, that is the situation with auto rates. They remain unchanged except as stated earlier in the House.

**Mr. Boldt:** — Mr. Speaker, the Minister has informed us wrongly because there were 1972 cars.

**Mr. Speaker:** — Order! We can't have a debate on Questions. Members can put questions and the Minister may answer. If Members are not satisfied with the answer they can put a substantive motion on or raise it at a later time. We can't have a debate on Questions on Orders of the Day.

### **AUTOMOBILE ACCIDENT INSURANCE FUND**

**Mr. C.P. MacDonald** (Milestone): — Mr. Speaker, I wonder if the Attorney general has a reply to my question yesterday which he said he would take under consideration, about the automobile Accident Insurance Fund. What is the legal requirement for the Automobile Accident Insurance Fund and what is the state of that fund as of January 1, 1972?

**Mr. Romanow:** — Mr. Speaker, I should be pleased to answer that question if the Hon. Member would put it in writing.

### **STATEMENT**

#### **MOVEMENT OF GRAIN AT THE WEST COAST**

**Hon. J.R. Messer** (Minister of Agriculture): — Mr. Speaker, Members of this House will know that last Friday the Attorney General and myself went to the Coast to take a look at the grain handling situation there. I have a statement that I should like to make. It might just be a bit longer than normal and I ask the indulgence of the House in making that statement.

In the Vancouver Province on February 29, it was stated that 19 ships were waiting to be loaded with grain or were in the process of being loaded with grain. At that time, both national railways were struggling with slides in the Rocky Mountains and the Fraser Canyon allowing only limited volumes of all grains to be loaded at the facilities on the West Coast. The fundamental reason for

the shortage of export grain in the Vancouver terminals has been the inability of the railway to deliver grain from the Prairies to the West coast. The physical problems of weather and the winter weather in particular, the unreasonable number of slides that they have encountered in the last while has compounded this problem.

There are three lines entering the Vancouver area which can handle export grain. These are the Canadian Pacific which hauls about 55 to 60 per cent of all the grain, the CN and the Pacific Great Eastern Railway, which is owned by the Province of British Columbia and which interchanges with the Canadian National at Prince George. While the Canadian Pacific may find some difficulties in handling this CPR grain via CN and the Pacific Great Eastern into Vancouver, no such problem exists for the CNR. The Pacific Great Eastern is capable of handling 400 full cars of grain or approximately four trainloads per day from Prince George into Vancouver and 400 empty cars from Vancouver to Prince George.

During the last three weeks of January when both national railways were blocked by slides not one car of grain was diverted from the CN at Prince George into the Vancouver area. In the same period of time the Pacific Great Eastern got only four hours of stoppage. In the last several weeks in February the CN has diverted a few cars via the Pacific Great Eastern into Vancouver. Using an average of 2,000 bushels per car, 400 cars per day would be the equivalent of 800,000 bushels per day or 4,800,00 bushels in a six day week. The Canadian Wheat Board claims that it is now 18 million bushels behind in shipments into the port of Vancouver. Surely, in such a situation loaded grain cars can be diverted to the CN and to the Pacific Great Eastern in the national interest to maintain our market commitments out of the West Coast.

In summary, the immediate problem is to utilize all of our railway facilities regardless of the corporate interests so-called or the individual railway companies in order to maintain our commitments to our foreign customers. When we look ahead at total exports of Canadian grain amounting to somewhere in the order of 900 million to one billion bushels per annum, it is quite obvious that the physical facilities are just not now available. At the present time, 300 million bushels per year appears to be the limit of grain exports through the West Coast. This figure would have to be increased by 200 million bushels if the one billion bushel export figure is to become a reality. The absolute limit of handling capacity at Vancouver is considered to be 700 cars per day unloaded and cleaned. If we are looking forward to unloading 500 million bushels, we must have additional storage at Vancouver, and additional cleaning capacity at Vancouver or at the interior terminals on the Prairies. There are, of course, other factors such as the volume of storage taken up by screenings in Vancouver. The great variety of grades which occupy valuable space which many consider as not essential for large export sales and, of course, the increased physical capacity of the railway system itself.

We are convinced that more storage for both clean and track run grain must be established in Vancouver. We are convinced that the CPR should be linked up with the Pacific Great Eastern Railway to assure alternative access when the Fraser Canyon is closed by slides. These recommendations are not the answer to the total problem of movement of bulk commodities through the Vancouver area but they should be considered immediately by the grain trade

and the Federal Government and we are taking action in that regard to see that they are considered and pursued.

**Some Hon. Members:** — Hear, hear!

**Mr. T.M. Weatherald** (Cannington): — I believe that we are entitled to a reply from the statement made by the Minister. We welcome the statement made by the Minister and we concur that the situation in Vancouver points to the tremendous movement of grain that is taking place in this country at this time due to Otto Lang and the Wheat Board.

**Some Hon. Members:** — Hear, hear!

**Mr. Weatherald:** — We also agree, Mr. Speaker, with his statement when he suggests that we need an improvement in our handling facilities and an expansion. As for the other information that he provided for the House, this could all have been gained and has been available through a telephone service just about anywhere from your Legislative Office without a trip to Vancouver. It's been available for a long time to the Saskatchewan Wheat Pool and the Wheat Board or just about any elevator you want to get it from and did not require a trip to Vancouver. The minister has made a trip to Vancouver and he has made a statement on a lot of information that I can get in ten minutes from our back room here.

**Some Hon. Members:** — Hear, hear!

## **ANNOUNCEMENTS**

### **COMPLETION OF ICE ROAD TO THE GULF MINERALS MINE SITE**

**Hon. N.E. Byers** (Minister of Highways and Transportation): — Mr. Speaker, before the Orders of the Day, I would like to make a brief announcement. I wish to inform the House that the 155 mile long winter ice road to the Gulf Minerals mine site on Wollaston Lake in northern Saskatchewan has been completed. It is estimated that 8,000 tons of equipment, materials and supplies will be hauled over the road to the mine site during the winter months. Preparations for the road began January 6, 1972 and it was open to traffic on February 15. Beginning 154 miles north east of La Ronge near Oliver Lake, the road traverses 120 miles of lake ice and 35 miles of land portages. In addition, a 15 mile access road has been prepared to the Wollaston post settlement and a two mile ice road to the settlement at South End has also been prepared. Travel distance from Prince Albert to the mine site is 460 miles. Preparation of ice roads has been very difficult this winter due to early heavy snowfalls and very difficult sustained cold weather conditions. The road has been prepared for high volume five axle truck operations. It will service some northern communities as well as the Gulf mine site. Preparation of the road has involved the removal of snow on a 100 foot width.

**Some Hon. Members:** — Hear, hear!

## ADJOURNED DEBATES

### ADDRESS-IN-REPLY

The Assembly resumed the adjourned debate on the proposed motion of Mr. A. Taylor (Kerrobert-Kindersley) for an Address-in-Reply:

**Mr. A.R. Guy** (Athabasca): — Mr. Speaker, before adjourning the debate yesterday, I congratulated you on your appointment. I had reminded the House that the election of the NDP last June was to provide a New Deal for People and I reviewed some of the recipients of the New Deal to date and came to the conclusion it was mainly those with NDP membership cards that have seen the benefit up to this time. I then asked the Premier to put an end to the purge of the civil service which has seen almost daily firings of civil servants at an hour's notice without warning and without cause. Replacements, unfortunately, are usually defeated NDP candidates and some long time supporters who are appointed at unbelievable salaries with no consideration for experience, training or ability. No exams are required, the Public Service Commission is not consulted and salaries are set at the whim of the Minister. I suggested that our civil servants are not receiving a New Deal under the new Government.

I also suggested that the Province could not afford the overwhelming number of Executive Assistants and Special Assistants that have been gathered from all parts of Canada and the United States. I pointed out that where the former Premier had three, the Premier today now has seven of these Assistants. I concluded that it was not a New Deal for a province of 900,000 people to have to pay out more than \$100,000 to the Premier's staff, \$134,000 for Ministers' Assistants, and \$180,000 or better for the Premier's Planning and Research Council. This total close to one half million dollars paid to the friends of the Government certainly does not provide a New Deal when our university graduates and our civil servants are excluded from this organization.

**Some Hon. Members:** — Hear, hear!

**Mr. Guy:** — Finally, before adjourning the debate, I brought to the attention of the Members of this House a situation which the Opposition views with grave concern. On November 3 the Saskatoon Aid Centre Society was incorporated in this province with the main objective of maintaining detailed information on civil, fraternal, labour, professional and service organizations and to provide information regarding these groups. We submit that these objectives show the intent of this Society to keep a dossier on every individual in every public and private organization in this province. We do not believe that in a democracy that this type of activity is necessary or desirable and that certainly the taxpayers should not be called upon to finance it.

What was even more disturbing was the fact that two days after their incorporation, a request was made to the Government for a grant of money, and within twelve days this organization was granted \$5,365 of the taxpayers' money. I would suggest to other organizations in the province that have cause to go to the Government for a grant to insist that they get the same treatment and the grants are processed in exactly the same speed as they were in this particular case.

**Some Hon. Members:** — Hear, hear!

**Mr. Guy:** — There are five Directors of this Society, and since their articles of incorporation do not include the usual clause on what would happen to the money if they disbanded, it is conceivable that the society could disband tomorrow and the five Directors could divide up the money.

The fact that one of the Directors at the time of incorporation and at the time the grant was received was the NDP MLA for Saskatoon City Park (Mr. Dyck), we suggest, does not reflect well on this Assembly. There is nothing filed in the Provincial-Secretary's Offices as of this morning to show, indeed, that the MLA is not still a member of this Society. Since this practice leaves itself open to abuse and the suggestion, warranted or not, that MLA's are using their authority for private rather than the public interest, I ask the Premier and the Attorney General to give us the assurance that this organization will not infringe on the rights of any individual or organization in this province and that the MLA involved will not have access to the Government grant for his own personal use. Examples like this are certainly not in the best interests of this province.

Mr. Speaker, before I turn my attention again to the Throne Speech, I am going to digress for a few moments and make a few comments that I was unable to make earlier since the Government prevented me from taking my seat in the Special Session last summer. I want to say, first of all, that I am proud to represent the great constituency of Athabasca in the Opposition. Under the leadership of our new leader, Dave Steuart (Prince Albert West) I am sure that we will give the province the leadership they expect and show ourselves as a credible alternative to the present Government four years from now.

Now that the election is eight months behind us it is easier to look back and place the events of last June in their proper perspective. I believe many people are doing that today and are arriving at conclusions that were not so evident in the heat and emotion of the election campaign. I think it is fair to say that the Liberal Party today finds itself on the Opposition side of the House because we were prepared to lose an election on principle rather than win it by deceit and misrepresentation.

**Some Hon. Members:** — Hear, hear!

**Mr. Guy:** — We placed the issues clearly before the people and we appealed to reason and common sense. The NDP, not being able to sell their program on the same basis, opted for a campaign based on deception, emotion and giveaways. They tried to wreck what they couldn't contest, they bribed the taxpayer with his own money, they sold their souls to every self-interest group in the province for their votes, and they forsook the basic principles of honesty, truth and integrity for political expedience based on their hunger for power.

**Some Hon. Members:** — Hear, hear!

**Mr. Guy:** — Mr. Speaker, this is not only the assessment of groups outside the NDP, it is also the feeling of their own Waffle supporters, that the present Government was and still is prepared to forsake the principles of socialism and the dictates of their followers for political power. I cannot support the Wafflers' program for a socialist state in Saskatchewan, but I can

wholeheartedly support the straightforward and honest approach to politics which they take. I can sympathize with their feelings toward the present government and Premier Blakeney. If he is a Socialist, he should say so, if he is a free-enterpriser, he should admit that too, but after eight months, I suggest the people of Saskatchewan and his own supporters are entitled to know in which direction he intends to lead us.

The Throne Speech, unfortunately, does little to answer that question.

It is evident, unfortunately, that the Wafflers are losing strength and relevance in the NDP. Their humiliating defeat at their recent convention has left them demoralized. The deliberate appointment of John Richards as a Legislative Secretary and thus a supporter of Government policy have effectively silenced their most effective Legislative voice. So unless they have more courage to stand up to the NDP establishment than they have shown in the last few months, I'm afraid that their days appear to be numbered.

Mr. Speaker, if the people of Saskatchewan needed any further proof that the NDP won the election on misrepresentation, irresponsibility and political skulduggery, we have it in this document presented as the Speech from the Throne last Thursday.

For months we have been led to believe by speeches of Members opposite that a beautiful new world was ready to unfold in Saskatchewan. A world free of unemployment, pollution, student-teacher ratios, taxes and other burdens of a capitalist society.

Well, if there is such a world, other than in the pipe dreams of the socialist planners, it certainly isn't here in Saskatchewan. The Throne Speech, awaited with such anticipation spoke of no bright future, had no new solutions to our current problems and voiced no New Deal for Saskatchewan people.

The only expression applicable to the Throne speech is that it was a fraud and a hoax. It is fraudulent in both what it says and what it doesn't say.

The Government prefaces its Speech with "My Government will proceed at this Session to enact legislation in fulfilment of its four-year program". Well, if what is enclosed in this document is an example of the New Deal for People promised by the Socialists last June, it will be 20 years before their four-year program is complete and they will be removed from office long before that.

75 per cent of the programs listed are programs that were either underway or being planned when the Liberals were defeated.

**Some Hon. Members:** — Hear, hear!

**Mr. Guy:** — The other 25 per cent is merely a reorganization of departments which in themselves means nothing.

What is not mentioned is more significant than what is. Mr. Speaker, I submit the people of Saskatchewan are entitled to know what happened to the promises to reduce hospitalisation and medical care premiums, to reopen small hospitals, to lower automobile insurance rates and to reduce the mill rate for education. The Throne Speech is strangely silent in regard to these commitments.

The people of Saskatchewan also want to know the future of the Home-owner grant and the programs to wipe out unemployment and replace the jobs that were lost when industrial projects were eliminated. But again, the throne Speech has no answers.

I think all people in the province were pleased to hear the improved note of optimism expressed in the Throne Speech and in the remarks of the mover and the seconder yesterday. But it's hard to believe that the Premier and his colleagues who composed this speech were the same Members who in Opposition painted such a dismal picture for the future of this province just eight months ago.

The credibility and integrity of the Government would have been enhanced if they had admitted that the economic upswing that was achieved in 1971 was the result of the sound, business-like practices and policies of the former Liberal Government rather than the election of a Socialist government in June.

**Some Hon. Members:** — Hear, hear!

**Mr. Guy:** — In fact, the improvement that has occurred has put the lie to the dire predictions, the misrepresentation of fact and the prognostication of gloom and doom that the NDP spread during the election campaign as they attempted to discredit our province for their own political gain.

The upswing in the economy last year did substantiate the faith that the Liberal Government has in our province and showed that our programs for development, diversification, public works, and sound government were what was needed at that time.

There is no question that the policies of the Liberal government during the past two years as well as the effort of the Hon. Otto Lang and the Canadian Wheat Board were responsible for the fact that Saskatchewan showed improvement in farm and business income, retail sales and housing starts during the past year.

Even the Premier has admitted that. In fact, it was surprising how quickly the new Premier saw the improvement after the election. In September, he appeared in Toronto speaking in glowing terms of the upward swing that had taken place from January to June in the Saskatchewan economy. I hope that in view of this anaemic Throne Speech that he will be able to make similar claims in September of this year.

Mr. Speaker, had the Premier been honest enough to make his Toronto speech in June with his praise for balanced budgets, diversification of the economy and assistance to the potash industry which were all Liberal accomplishments, I submit we would still have been the government today. Instead, the now Premier at that time for his own political convenience deliberately misrepresented the true state of the Saskatchewan economy.

Mr. Speaker, in view of the definite improvement in the economy that was apparent to all and admitted by the Premier, it is fair, I believe, for the people of Saskatchewan to ask the question, "When are the major promises made by the NDP during the election campaign going to be carried out?"

I must remind that people of Saskatchewan that there is no excuse for the failure of the Premier and his colleagues to live up to their promises and their platform. Eight months have



provided the time. And if you remember, few if any promises had time limits imposed during the campaign. They were presented then as instant promises for immediate action.

The Liberal Government made sure that they had plenty of money. We left them a nest egg of some 490 million to start their programs and since then revenues have far surpassed the estimates of last spring.

And lastly a buoyant economy supported by unprecedented expenditures by the Federal government have provided a favourable atmosphere for expansion. The only ingredient that has been missing has been the determination and inspiration of the Government opposite.

One must ask why in view of these positive factors has the last eight months been one of dismal failure for the Government of Saskatchewan? Why has Saskatchewan stood still or reversed its advance? The blame must rest with the Premier and his Government

Mr. Speaker, never before has a government created an atmosphere of repression, fear, uncertainty and indecision in such a short time. Never has a government broken faith more surely with its electors. And never has a leader procrastinated, retreated and foreclosed on the legitimate aspirations of his people as has the present Premier of this province. Confusion and uneasiness has reigned supreme in both the public and private sectors of our economy.

The Premier and his Cabinet have completely abdicated their responsibilities to a bureaucracy of assistants, planners and researchers who in turn have turned the function of government over to committees, task forces, probes, public and private inquiries. At a time when positive action by our elected Government is required we have indecision, conflict of interests, bureaucratic red tape and confusion unparalleled in our history.

Mr. Speaker, the Throne Speech says, "Immediately upon taking office my Government took emergency action to create jobs." What a complete distortion of the facts! The truth is that the Government took emergency action to reduce the number of jobs. They cancelled the two largest industrial developments in the history of this province that would have created tens of thousands of jobs and they passed labour legislation that will mean the loss of thousands of permanent and part time jobs in our cities and smaller communities.

They have practically eliminated any hope for our unemployed and our students to attain work this summer. No alternatives have appeared or have been suggested in the Throne Speech to help these people.

Their public works program has been a joke and a disaster. To date there has not been one tender called nor one dollar spent that was not in the Liberal government's budget and work priorities last spring.

**Some Hon. Members:** — Hear, hear!

**Mr. Guy:** — They speak of a provincial winter works program. There is no such thing. If it was not for the Federal Government's winter works program and the co-operation of local governments,

there would not be any projects in Saskatchewan this winter.

**Some Hon. Members:** — Hear, hear!

**Mr. Guy:** — The Federal Government is administering the program, providing most of the funds and approving the projects. The local governments initiate the projects, share the cost and supervise the work. The provincial role has been nothing but that of criticizing the Federal and local governments.

**Some Hon. Members:** — Hear, hear!

**Mr. Guy:** — It is true that the Provincial Government has provided several million dollars in additional funds to the Federal program but they have accepted no responsibility, initiated no new programs and have shown little imagination to solve the unemployment crisis.

**Some Hon. Members:** — Hear, hear!

**Mr. Guy:** — The fact is, Mr. Speaker, that although unemployment is still too high in Canada, there has been a slight decline across Canada in all provinces except Saskatchewan.

**Some Hon. Members:** — Hear, hear!

**Mr. Guy:** — Today Saskatchewan is the only province in Canada where unemployment is higher than it was at this time last year. There has been no New Deal for the unemployed.

The Premier's answer to the overwhelming criticism of inefficiency that was levelled by the Federal and local authorities was to appoint a new Minister of Public Works. He immediately blamed the officials of his department for the mess the Government was in. This was most unjust and unfair to blame civil servants for a lack of program, policy and direction that is the Cabinet's responsibility.

**Some Hon. Members:** — Hear, hear!

**Mr. Guy:** — Now, Mr. Speaker, if there has been one area where the Government has been a total failure it has been in the field of industrial development. Nowhere has this been shown so obviously as in the Throne Speech.

It is true that legislation was promised for merchants and small businesses. This will be of little value as there will be no merchants and small businesses left at the rate they are closing up.

There was a sentence of referring to oil leases which is not new nor popular with the oil industry. And there was a sentence referring to a new road to the Uranium Mine at Wollaston Lake which if Members opposite were truthful they would have added that the construction of the road has been delayed for two years past the completion date set by the former Liberal government.

Those three sentences, Mr. Speaker, were the sum total of the New Deal for industrial development proving what we have been

saying for a long time that the NDP and industrial development do not mix.

In fact, their record to date shows that to them industrial development is how many industries they can chase out of the province rather than how many new ones they can attract. One must say that they have had amazing success in this regard.

Mr. Speaker, the Liberal Government for seven years made the diversification of our economy by industrial development our top priority. In spite of many adverse factors prevalent in Saskatchewan the record of the Liberal Government in attracting industry was amazing.

**Some Hon. Members:** — Hear, hear!

**Mr. Guy:** — The Prince Albert Pulp Mill, the extension to the steel plant, the potash mines, Anglo Rouyn, Gulf Minerals, the Weyburn Distillery, MacMillan Bloedel and Simpson Timber complexes are just a few that will always stand as monuments to the success that we achieved.

The thousands of jobs provided and the increased provincial revenues which were translated into new programs and tax relief for our people are all testimony to the benefits of industrial diversification.

When the election was called last June Saskatchewan was on the verge of two of the greatest industrial developments in our history. The Athabasca Pulp Mill and the Choiceland Iron development were virtually assured after many months and years of negotiation.

In these two major developments, Mr. Speaker, lay hope and promise for thousands of Saskatchewan people. The unemployed, those living at poverty levels, those on welfare, our students graduating from university and trade schools and those wishing to exchange the vagaries of an agricultural life for the security of a weekly pay cheque or a business of their own for the first time saw a future filled with employment opportunities in their own province. The taxpayers saw the possibility of tax relief as the tax base was widened. The Premier has returned these people to the depths of despair.

Instead of a province flexing its industrial muscles as Canada enters a new period of economic expansion, we have a province where the door to investment and new industry has been closed and overnight the welcome mat of the Liberal government has been replaced with the sign “Keep Out — Development Not Wanted”.

This barrier that is being erected to surround the socialist state of Premier Blakeney will forever commit our province to unemployment, welfare programs and the receipt of Federal subsidies and assistance.

The cry that is being echoed by Saskatchewan people is “Why?”. Why is our Government shutting out industrial development? Why is our Premier threatening industry? Why are they anti-American? These are questions which the Throne Speech should have answered but did not.

The facts are that since the election the war on industry has been waged with unbelievable success. The first predetermined attack on industry by the Premier was his announcement that the Athabasca Pulp Mill was cancelled. While this was not surprising, it didn't make sense. The people of the Meadow Lake area had shown by the re-election of a Liberal Member that they wanted it. The Indian and Métis people in the area where the mill was to be located voted overwhelmingly in favour of it and most of the trade unions in the province were in favour of it to create employment. Still the Premier cancelled it. Why?

His claims about the effect on the ecology, the problems of reforestation and the financial deal were all his to control as head of the Government. He could have held public hearings and renegotiated with Parsons and Whittemore as he had asked us to do. But he refused to do any of that. He coolly and calculatingly cancelled the deal and the only assumption that can be drawn under the circumstances was that it was a pay off to the Wafflers and anti-American elements in his Party for their support and silence during the election campaign.

The cancellation of the mill was a sad day for Saskatchewan but it was only the beginning. The Premier showed what a shrewd financial genius he was when he announced that not only he rid Saskatchewan of a pulp mill but he had paid \$6 million in cold, hard cash to do it. Premier Blakeney, the imported financier from Nova Scotia said a cash outlay of \$3.6 million to acquire a 30 per cent interest in the largest pulp mill in the world which would provide thousands of jobs, millions of dollars in revenue to the province was a bad deal, but a cash a good deal for Saskatchewan. He has taken more than \$6 from every man, woman and child in Saskatchewan to make a sacrificial offering on the altar of anti-Americanism as repayment to the Wafflers.

**Some Hon. Members:** — Hear, hear!

**Mr. Guy:** — He said to the unemployed, the underprivileged and our students, “You are going to pay \$6 million for a New Deal for People that will ensure that you never get a job.”

After his predecessors in the NDP had spent 20 years trying to get a pulp mill for Saskatchewan and his counterpart, the NDP Premier of Manitoba had spent \$100 million trying to save their mill this brilliant, financial genius, the Premier of Saskatchewan, pays \$6 million to destroy the one that he had.

**Some Hon. Members:** — Hear, hear!

**Mr. Guy:** — With an industrial policy like that it is no wonder that he didn't wish to mention it in his Throne Speech.

Well, with the demise of the pulp mill the Premier and his then Minister of Mineral Resources, Mr. Bowerman, turned their attention to the destruction of the Choiceland iron complex. The fact that Canadian and Saskatchewan firms were involved did not deter our illustrious Premier.

After a series of press releases to condition the Saskatchewan people he dropped the axe and another potential employer

and a revenue producing industry was gone.

And it was the handling of this project that led directly to the demise of the member for Shellbrook as Minister of Mineral Resources. He couldn't get it through his mind that the Premier didn't want an iron mine. On September 10 after the deal had been cancelled. Mr. Bowerman headlined in the press that he still saw the development of the Choiceland iron mine. In November the Premier says the Government was not negotiating but the Minister of Mineral Resources said the Government had not made a firm decision. The Premier said, "I don't agree with the Mineral Resources Minister's views." However, the Mineral Resources Minister never gave up. On December 23 he tried again by stating the Provincial Government will likely make a decision early in the new year. Well, that was too much for the Premier. A few days later a decision was made all right. It was a decision that Mr. Bowerman was no longer Minister of Mineral Resources. And nothing more has been heard of the Choiceland iron mine since that time.

With these two major resource developments of the former Liberal Government killed and no new ones on the horizon, the Premier then turned to harassment of industries already established in the hope that they too would leave the province taking their jobs, their royalties and their tax payments.

The first to be attacked was the petroleum refining industry. I think we all agree that it was regrettable when Imperial Oil announced that they would be phasing out their Regina and Winnipeg operations within three or four years. But it is not surprising in view of the attitude of the NDP Government. I company will listen to the threat of confiscation and nationalization so long. For six months they waited for a statement of policy from the new Government but it was not forthcoming. Instead, not a week went by that the Wafflers did not demand the Government take over the oil industry. And with the Wafflers success in stopping the pulp mill and the iron mine is it not any wonder that Imperial Oil decided to get out of the province where they were not wanted. Mr. Speaker, I submit that Imperial Oil has not been the first or will not be the last to flee from the threat of socialist oppression. No, instead of trying to allay the fears of Imperial Oil, the Premier resorted to the big stick. But his threat of a boycott of Imperial products got nowhere. He succumbed to the demand of the Saskatchewan Federation of Labour, the Wafflers and the Communist Party of Saskatchewan to threaten the nationalization of the industry. One of the Legislative Secretaries speaking on behalf of his Government said, "The only alternative is for the Provincial Government to control provincial refining." And as an additional threat to the industry he concluded payment of compensation should be conditional on co-operation by the petroleum industry. If the companies tried to thwart the Government's attempts to nationalize the refineries, no compensation should be paid. Mr. Speaker, in view of this intimidation, is it any wonder that the oil refining industry is moving out of the NDP provinces of Saskatchewan and Manitoba?

With the oil refining industry practically eliminated the Premier and his Government next turned their attack to the potash industry. Here the harassment started before the election with a plank in the NDP platform calling for the nationalization of the industry. On June the 8th, the now Education Minister, Mr. MacMurchy told a meeting in the heart of the potash country at Lanigan that a New Democratic Government will immediately lift the prorationing on potash. But again, Mineral Resources'

Bowerman blew it. He forgot the policy and what a terrible job the Liberals had done. He told a meeting of potash producers on December 9th that prorationing was a great success and that his Government would maintain it and also the floor price. In fact, the Minister got carried away to the point that for a moment he forgot whose terrible policy it was when he said, "We believe that because of our assistance through prorationing and price stabilization legislation the Province is entitled to some increase in revenue." Now we in the Liberal Party are, of course, pleased that the NDP has accepted our program. However, we are rather sceptical as are the potash companies in view of the recent public meeting in Yorkton where a Legislative Secretary outlining Government policy said, "The two most important priorities of the NDP Government are to develop socialist alternatives for resource development." They singled out potash and oil as two examples where this alternative is required.

What the NDP finally decide to do, of course, will be their decision. We wish they would make their intentions clear because the threat hanging over the industry is harmful to our province. As was pointed out by the potash industry at the December meeting, customers are holding off on purchases as a result of speculation as to the government's aims and the industry is floundering as a result of the Government's failure to make its position known. Mr. Speaker, it was to be hoped that the appointment of a new Minister of Industry and Mineral Resources would stop this threatening and harassment of industry. I picked up the Leader Post on February 16 and I read the headlines, "Minister Says Free Enterprise Is Welcome." I quickly read to see what province it came from because I didn't think it could come from Saskatchewan. To my surprise I found that the new Minister had assured the Canadian Petroleum Association that free enterprise was welcome in this province. You know, Mr. Speaker, for one fleeting moment the hope was born that the new Minister had convinced his Premier that resource development was welcome. But the hope died as quickly as it was born as the new Minister continued, "However, I warn you that if you do not carry out more exploration of the Crown land you hold under exploration permits someone else will, perhaps the Government." It is obvious that Industry Minister Thorson was not speaking Government policy when he welcomed free enterprise to the province. Mr. Speaker, the examples I have cited are only a few but they are typical of those that occur week after week, month after month. The threats, the intimidations both in words and in actions make this the most anti-investment, anti-business and anti-industry Government in the history of this province. The industry already lost plus the failure of the Throne Speech to emphasize industry and resource development will give cold comfort to the thousands of unemployed, the hundreds of university students looking for summer jobs, the welfare recipients in the underprivileged areas of our province whose only hope for a new deal lies in the development of our resources.

Now it is noted that little is said in the throne Speech regarding Dominion-Provincial relations. Again, with good reason, as next to industrial development and unemployment, it is in this area that our Premier has been a dismal failure. Whether we like it or not Saskatchewan is still dependent to a large extent on its relationship with Ottawa. During the seven years that we were the Government Saskatchewan was respected as a spokesman for Western Canada and we continually gained status as an equal partner in Canadian Federation. Unfortunately, this is no longer the case. The NDP have never felt themselves part

of the Federal-Provincial community and they have never been concerned about the role Saskatchewan will play at the Federal-Provincial Conferences. The only concern of the NDP Government under T.C. Douglas, W.S. Lloyd and now Allan Blakeney has been how much they can milk out of Ottawa to apply to their own provincial socialist program. They go cap in hand like a poor relation contributing nothing to the discussion but a demand for money.

The Finance Ministers' Conference held in January was a typical example. For years the present Premier berated our Government for our lack of success at Federal-Provincial Conferences. He claimed that he could do better and he finally got the chance. Prior to the conference the Premier and Provincial Treasurer said he was going to take a hard line. When he came home, Mr. Speaker, virtually empty handed, I think the best comment appeared in the Carillon, the Regina Campus newspaper and certainly one that Members opposite cannot refer to as a pawn of the Liberal Party. They stated:

Premiers stand a cheap PR stunt. The Premier's statement of taking a hard line stand is really nothing more than a cheap and phoney political tactic since, if the former Liberal Government could achieve few results at similar conferences, what can the NDP Government achieve?

And the people can say, "Amen," to that!

The disinterest of our new Government towards Federal-Provincial relations was made perfectly clear by Premier Blakeney at the time President Nixon imposed the 10 per cent surcharge on Canadian exports to the United States.

The seriousness of the situation was quickly seen by the Federal Government as Trade Minister Pepin called an urgent Federal-Provincial Conference to deal with the problem. Premiers, Finance Ministers and Trade Ministers converged on Ottawa from all over the country.

Did Premier Blakeney go? No, he did not. Did he send a Cabinet Minister? No, he wouldn't do that. Did he send a Deputy, did he send anybody with the knowledge to speak on behalf of the Province? No, instead he sent a backbench MLA, a man whom he did not even consider for his Cabinet, to speak for Saskatchewan on this urgent occasion. Not only did it show Saskatchewan's lack of concern on a vital issue but it was a deliberate affront to Ottawa to send anyone below Cabinet rank to attend a meeting of this magnitude. Let us hope in the future that the Premier, if he is unwilling or unable to attend, he will at least send one of his Ministers to speak on his behalf and avoid any further embarrassment to our province.

Mr. Speaker, as MLA from Athabasca, I am particularly concerned with the policies and programs of the present Government for the development of the human and natural resources of Northern Saskatchewan. Until 1964 I was dismayed at the failure of the former CCF Government to adequately develop these resources. For the last seven years I was proud to be a Member of a Government that placed northern development and assistance to Indian and Métis people as a top priority in its program. It was satisfying to see the economic and resource development, the roads and airstrips, the new schools, the training and educational

programs and the numerous other new programs to provide job opportunities and better living standards for our northern people.

The results of seven years of Liberal Government in developing our North and providing new hope and opportunity to our people of Indian ancestry has been an inspiration to all of Canada and will stand as one of the major accomplishments of Premier Thatcher and his Government.

Today, I am seriously concerned that this era of progress is over. I have however noted with interest the reference in the Throne Speech to legislation which will make possible sweeping changes in the Government's approach to the people of the North and the problems of northern development and which will replace the Indian and Métis Department with a new Human Resources Agency.

The idea of a Department of Northern Affairs is not new but one that has been considered for years. As a northern Member whose area would be primarily affected I am fully aware that there are both advantages and disadvantages from such an approach. I wish to say at this point that it is not our intention to prejudice these two pieces of legislation. We on this side of the House recognize that the problems of our Indian and northern people are many and varied in scope and require support and co-operation of all Saskatchewan people. The legislation will be judge solely as to whether it is in the best interest of the people concerned. However, I must say that preliminary policy statements and actions taken during the last eight months by Members opposite make me less than optimistic that the NDP have a new and satisfactory approach to northern problems and our Indian and Métis people. At present there is little to show that the attitude of the NDP towards the North has changed since they were the Government before.

The appointments of the member from The Battlefords (Mr. Kramer) as Minister of Natural Resources and the Member for Shellbrook (Mr. Bowerman) as Minister of the Indian and Métis Department was unfortunate in view of their previous association with northern Saskatchewan.

Northern people have not forgotten the accusation by the minister of Natural Resources when he was in Opposition that northern pilots, Indian and Métis and others, deliberately start forest fires so they can be paid to suppress them and his contention that money spent to fight fires north of the timberline was a waste of money. The Minister of Indian and Métis Departments and the new Indian Northern Affairs Department has a similar record. They recall after he was no longer a civil servant his commercial fishing business on Reindeer Lake which tried to put co-op fisheries out of business. Also the appointment by these two Ministers of two defeated NDP candidates for Meadow Lake and Athabasca as their assistants, either appointed directly or through contract, has not helped the feeling of uncertainty that no new relationship will be forthcoming.

I had hoped when the Minister announced last fall that he was going to appoint an advisory council that the members would be truly representative of the North and not picked on a basis of politics, but it appears that this was not to be the case. Three of the four members on this northern council have been associated in one form or another with the NDP organization. There is only one who is non-political as well as being the only person of Indian ancestry. One would have been more impressed if the mayors or councillors from La Ronge and Uranium City or the chairman or members of local community authorities had been



appointed to this first council since they are elected officials in their areas.

To add insult to injury the Minister also appointed a southern Indian to represent the Federation of Saskatchewan Indians thus overlooking dozens of northern chiefs and councillors who are quite capable of acting on this council. Under the circumstances it is not surprising that the Métis Society has refused to appoint a member at this time due to the lack of consultation and promise of financial assistance. And although Mr. Bowerman has tried to create the impression that northern people are to be consulted his statements and actions contradict him.

On several occasions he has admitted that the Advisory Council have already begun planning local programs and early in February he announced that the acting Deputy Minister of the Indian and Métis Department had left for a ten day tour in the North but no public meetings were anticipated. Mr. Bowerman said that the discussions were for the purpose of briefing Advisory Council members of Government policy.

It is the consensus of northern people, Mr. Speaker, that six people appointed by the Minister should not have the responsibility to plan local programs but it should be done by the people or their elected representatives in the area concerned.

I think the thinking of our Government concerning our Indian people was best summed up by their Minister, Mr. Bowerman, when on December 22 he told a press conference:

The main portion of the Indian and Métis Department work would likely be taken over by the Welfare Department.

With those words, Mr. Speaker, the Indian and Métis people of this province have returned to the poverty, despair and hopelessness that existed before the Liberals took office in 1964. That is why I say that the reorganization and creation of new departments will not achieve a New Deal for our northern and Indian people unless they are accompanied by new policies and new approaches to the people at the same time.

I was pleased to note today that the road to Gulf Minerals has been completed. This was a program that has been carried out the last couple of years under the Liberal Government and has gone ahead this year in the same way. Perhaps a little later in its completion but we all know that sometimes weather conditions play a part. My major concern at this time was a statement that was made the other day by one of the Waffle members that even Gulf Minerals, the independent company up there, was going to be brought under the scrutiny of the Government opposite. So it would appear that in that case there is another industry that's going to be harassed from start to finish.

Mr. Speaker, I believe that it is obvious from my remarks that the election of the NDP Government has not brought a New Deal to Saskatchewan as promised. Instead it has brought waste and extravagance, it has brought despair to our civil service, and to our business community, to the unemployed, to university students and to the underprivileged. The Throne Speech does not come to grips with any of the urgent problems facing our people but is more concerned with enhancing the political image of our Premier and his government. For that reason I must oppose the motion.

**Some Hon. Members:** — Hear, hear!

**Mr. J. Wiebe** (Morse): — Mr. Speaker, I first want to congratulate the mover and the seconder of the Address-in-Reply to the Speech from the Throne. Taking into account the numerous amount of backbenchers I think they and their constituencies can be justly proud with the honour which they have both received. I also want to congratulate them on an excellent job of oratory, but I had the feeling from their remarks that they were not very proud of the Throne Speech as they both spent very little time in dealing with it.

Mr. Speaker, I must say how pleased I am to have been afforded the privilege to serve the people of my constituency and in turn the Province of Saskatchewan in this Legislature. I should like as well to congratulate the Hon. Member from Souris-Estevan (Mr. Thorson) in his success at the polls and also in his new responsibility as Minister in charge of Industry and Commerce. I trust, Mr. Speaker, that he will show the same zeal and drive in attracting new business and new job-producing industries to this province as he showed during his recent campaign.

As well, Mr. Speaker, I should like once again to thank my constituents in Morse for the confidence and trust they have shown in me and in my Party and to say that the responsibility which they have given me will be uppermost in my mind. It is a responsibility, Mr. Speaker, of representing a constituency which after 16 years of CCF representation gave this Province its first Liberal Premier in 20 years. It is a responsibility, Mr. Speaker, which during the past 11 years has been outstanding representation by one of the greatest men this province has ever produced. A man with outstanding qualities and dedication to the people of this province and to this Legislature. A man of whom I was very proud to have had as our representative and an association with this man which I valued greatly.

During the past 11 years which included four provincial general elections, the constituency of Morse has been exposed to all forms of political tactics on behalf of the NDP in their vigorous attempts to unseat the Liberals in Morse and hopefully cause the former Member to suffer personal defeat. We were deluged by an onslaught of NDP workers and high party brass that converged on the Morse constituency like locusts during election time. This vigorous attempt by the NDP has left Morse with probably the best-organized and politically knowledgeable electorate in this province. This, Mr. Speaker, had a great deal to do with my winning the by-election in Morse.

This by-election, Mr. Speaker, was no exception. The NDP Government regardless of the outcome of the by-election would still remain the government. They thought that finally they now had a chance to win back the Morse constituency. They brought the Premier, they brought his Cabinet Ministers, his backbenchers, Federal Members of Parliament, Executive Assistants, union organizers, constituency presidents and workers from all parts of this province. The only big gun which they didn't bring back into Morse was their National Leader. He was there in June but he fired one of the biggest blanks you ever heard. In a way, Mr. Speaker, you can't blame the NDP for not bringing him back, there is no point in re-using ineffective ammunition. The Member for Arm River (Mr. Faris) spent the whole month of November in Morse. From the statements he has made in Morse and which he has also made in the House, I should like to wish him the same success in Arm River in 1975 as he had in Morse on December 1.

Mr. Speaker, we won that by-election by 426 votes, but had the Premier, his Executive Assistants and organizers from all parts of this province been eligible to vote the NDP candidate would have won that by-election. Mr. Speaker, I am proud of my executive in Morse, proud because they single handily defeated the NDP political machine. The ammunition which they used was a record of the present Government and its proposals regarding agriculture and rural life in this province.

The Agriculture Minister and the new NDP candidate for Morse both speaking at the nominating convention declared that this by-election would be fought on provincial agricultural issues, fought on The Family Farm Protection Act and fought on the proposed Land Bank. Mr. Speaker, we took those issues to the people of Morse and they said No to the Family Farm Protection Act. They said No to the proposed Land Bank.

**Some Hon. Members:** — Hear, hear!

**Mr. J. Wiebe:** — The constituency of Morse is comprised of people involved in agricultural and rural life. The economy of Morse revolves around the agricultural industry. Mr. Speaker, the people of Morse told this government what they thought of its agricultural proposals. Mr. Speaker, as I said earlier, we won that by-election by 426 votes. The Conservative candidate polled 680 votes. In effect, Mr. Speaker, the NDP lost that by-election by 1,106 votes. This clearly indicates that those involved, connected and dependent on agriculture are opposed to socialism and to this Government's agricultural legislation.

Mr. Speaker, last Friday afternoon I had my first real opportunity to witness and take part in the proceedings of this Legislature. As the newest Member of this Legislature, Mr. Speaker, I was amazed at what I saw and what I heard. An emergency debate had been called to discuss the wheat situation at the West Coast. I must admit that I was royally entertained by the Members opposite. But I fail to see what we as a legislative body accomplished other than a bit of publicity and a weekend holiday to the West Coast for the Attorney General (Mr. Romanow) and the Minister of Agriculture (Mr. Messer).

**An Hon. Member:** — The Bobsey Twins.

**Mr. J. Wiebe:** — I am pleased to see that this Government is concerned about the wheat situation at the West Coast but I cannot see where it was justified in calling an emergency debate. I would rather have seen the Minister of Labour (Mr. Snyder) call an emergency debate on the unemployment crisis in this province...

**Some Hon. Members:** — Hear, hear!

**Mr. J. Wiebe:** — ...and this Government's inability to solve that crisis. As well, an emergency debate should have been called by the Minister of Industry and Commerce (Mr. Thorson) regarding the exodus of industry from this province and the closing down of business in this province.

It appears to me, Mr. Speaker, that this Government is only concerned about situations not in their jurisdiction and situations outside this province which they are not responsible for. They are unwilling to call an emergency debate or do

anything about crisis situations that affect their Government and the well being of this province. I hope, Mr. Speaker, that they will soon stop basking in the glory of their large numbers and start solving some of the problems which they have created here at home.

During my campaign there were a great many constituents who voiced their concern for this Government's hasty and unthoughtout legislation in The Family Farm Protection Act. They were amazed at some of the remarks made by the Premier during the campaign when he said and he appeared to take the credit for it that the farmers accounts in business places and with implement dealers throughout this province were quickly being paid off. He gave the credit for this to the Family Farm Protection Act. What cash did this Act project into this province? None. Then why was the Premier taking credit for something that his Government never did? I can and so can the farmers in Morse tell you where the cash came from to pay their accounts.

Mr. Speaker, the farmers in Saskatchewan sold more bushels of grain in 1971 than they sold in all of 1969 and 1970 combined. That's where the cash came from to pay those accounts. I see now from a recent article in the Leader-Post that the Premier is now claiming credit for the two-price system of wheat, the hog premium and the final wheat payment. You know it's just about as bad, Mr. Speaker, as one of my constituents whom I called on during my campaign. He told me that he had a difficult time deciding whether he would support me or not. I asked him why. He said that a couple of days ago a certain Cabinet Minister from the NDP Government had called in to see him and he had told this farmer that the reason the farmers were selling so much wheat was because the people of Saskatchewan elected an NDP Government and that the NDP, in turn, were selling this wheat.

Mr. Speaker, it appears to me that they will take credit for anything possible. The Cabinet Minister, however, could not have made a very good impression upon this constituent because when I asked him who it was all he could talk about was a legal domino. I think, Mr. Speaker, that when I left this fellow's yard he realized that it was Otto Lang and the Wheat Board that was selling this wheat and not this NDP Government.

Getting back to The Family Farm Protection Act, Mr. Speaker, I should like to ask the Minister of Agriculture (Mr. Messer) if this legislation was really necessary. In light of the hardship which it has caused the smaller farmer in his attempt to obtain the new credit which he so vitally needs to expand his farming operations. I maintain, Mr. Speaker, that it would have been good legislation at that time if this government had accepted this burden instead of placing it on the implement dealers, the banks and the credit unions. The farmers themselves realized that this was a bad deal and poor legislation. They showed their mistrust in this Government by not using this legislation. When asked how many farmers had taken advantage of this Act the Minister of Agriculture stated that literally thousands had taken advantage of this Act, but there was no way of knowing exactly how many.

Mr. Minister, what are the exact figures? The Administrator of The Family Farm Protection Act was asked this question by the Leader-Post. His answer, "To be on the safe side, I guess I could say less than a dozen so far." Mr. Speaker, was it really worth all the fuss? The farmers have clearly shown that it was

legislation that they could not use and according to the figures that no one in this government seems to know, they did not use this legislation. The farmers did not want this extra burden of having to make a double payment plus interest one year from now and in turn hurt their credit rating which is so vitally important to the farming industry of this province. I sincerely hope, Mr. Speaker, that the Agriculture Minister will allow this piece of legislation to die a natural death on July 31, 1972.

**Some Hon. Members:** — Hear, hear!

**Mr. J. Wiebe:** — Let's look at another New Deal that this government has given the farming community of this province — succession duties. We all know what it's all about. Mr. Blakeney said that it will help the small farmer. He announced during the final stages of the campaign that there would be an exemption in some cases of up to \$150,000. How is this bettering the smaller farmer? Under the former Liberal Government there was no such tax on small farmers. What do we consider a small farm or an average farm in Saskatchewan? I think that all of us would like to see the goal of one to two sections as the average farm. I believe that in the majority this is the case now. What would or could that average farmer's estate be worth today. This average farmer would be in a position today where his beneficiary would be assessed a succession duty tax. Mr. Speaker, not only must we be concerned about land prices and the values of estates today but we must also be concerned about what the values of estates will be five years from today. I can assure you they won't do down, Mr. Speaker, they will be going up. And anyone who is under the \$150,000 exemption today, two, three, four or five years from now their estates could be in a position where they would be assessed succession duty tax. Not only is this estate, Mr. Speaker, going to be required to pay succession duties but it will also be required to pay a capital gains tax. It would also be required to pay income tax on that estate for that year. Just exactly how much tax is the beneficiary whose husband or father had made a moderate success of his life going to have to pay in order to die?

Mr. Speaker, I feel that the succession duty tax is wrong and I feel that it is unjust and definitely unfair for any man who along with his family wishes to make a success of his life and his farm. What alternatives does his widow or son have? These taxes must be paid immediately. Where are they going to find the money to pay this? Is this, Mr. Speaker, where the Land Bank comes in? Is this individual going to be forced to sell his land to the Government and in turn become a share cropper and lease that land back from the government in order to pay his succession duty tax and have enough capital left over to continue farming? Mr. Speaker, I certainly hope not.

Mr. Speaker, while we are on the subject, let's look at the Land Bank. I wish to touch on a few points which concern me and which concern my constituents in Morse. One of our concerns is that the Premier and the Minister of Agriculture stated that they are not anxious to sell the land and would prefer a lease arrangement and under certain conditions where farmers could eventually after five years have the opportunity to pay for this land and buy it out and in turn pay cash. As you know, Mr. Speaker, it is very difficult for a young farmer to find the cash to pay out that land. Another concern of mine is the fact that there is a clause in the lease agreement which states, "Leases may specify the use which may be made by given parcels of land." Does this mean,

Mr. Speaker, that the young farmer will be told what to seed, when to seed, when to harvest and what and where to sell? Mr. Speaker, again, I certainly hope not.

Let's look, Mr. Speaker, at what it would cost a young man who wishes to start farming under this lease arrangement. Let's say, for argument's sake, that a good-sized farm unit is six quarters of land. The Agriculture Minister has stated that the rental fee will be from \$2.50 to \$10 per acre depending on the type of land and the cost of money. Let's take an average here as well of \$5 per acre. This then means that the young farmer must pay a rental of \$800 per year and on top of that he will be required to pay the taxes and also it will be compulsory for him to take out crop insurance.

Mr. Speaker, right now I want to deal only with the cash rental. He is leasing six quarters of land at \$800 per quarter which comes to \$4,800 per year which he will be required to pay in cash in order to farm six quarters of land. He is a young man just starting out and we can safely say that he will have 30 years of farming ahead of him. This then means, Mr. Speaker, that this young man during his farming career will pay to the Government \$144,000 just for the privilege of farming that land. He may be considering retiring after 30 years. The Minister of Agriculture mentioned that the main reason for this Land Bank is to provide the retiring farmer with an opportunity of retiring with dignity and financial security at a time of his own choosing. If this young man was not given the opportunity of purchasing that six quarters he will not have built up an estate, he will be broke. Mr. Speaker, after spending that \$144,000 on that land he will have nothing much to retire on. Mr. Speaker, this is one of my main objections to this Land Bank. I believe that the young men in this province should have the opportunity to begin farming, to have the opportunity to own that land and to have an opportunity of becoming a successful farmer and in turn to have the opportunity of acquiring an estate that will allow them to retire with dignity and financial security.

I should like to read to you a letter which I received from one of my constituents and it reads as follows:

The following are some thoughts which occur to me regarding the Government's proposed Land Bank. You may already have considered most of them. As far as purchase goes, if the purpose and priorities listed are the way they say, I don't see too much wrong with it. But they mention the advisability of young leasing as opposed to buying thereby leaving said young farmers with cash for other purposes. Well said! However, in recent press releases the land would be let out on a cash rental basis to run from \$2.50 to \$10 per acre. Now a bit of calculation tells me that this amounts to as much as most farmers have to pay to the Farm Credit Corporation where this method has been used to acquire land. A bit of research should bear this out. I think of my own son who bought last spring through the Farm Credit Corporation, 860 acres. Payments amount to \$2,600 per year including interest and life insurance. He made no down payment at all. True, Farm Credit Corporation seem to insist on my signature on the Mortgage. Now if this was a rental deal from the Land Bank how much extra cash would he have for Anything else? At least after 30 years he will have an asset to sell and perhaps buy a house in town or whatever, whereas a person renting all his life could be a ward of the public upon

retirement. Maybe it wouldn't matter.

Mr. Speaker, not too many young farmers in Saskatchewan today are fortunate enough to have a father who is able to co-sign or guarantee their mortgage. But, Mr. Speaker, this Government can guarantee that note, this Government can say to this young man, "We will sell you those six quarters of land, you can obtain the money from the Farm Credit Corporation and we will guarantee the mortgage. This means then that after a period of 30 years this young man will own those six quarters of land instead of it costing him \$144,000 in rental fees it will have cost him \$78,000. This farmer, then Mr. Speaker, is in a position to sell those six quarters of land and retire with dignity and financial security. This type of legislation, Mr. Speaker, I can certainly endorse and I urge the Government to seriously consider it.

**Some Hon. Members:** — Hear, hear!

**Mr. J. Wiebe:** — During the June campaign and also during this by-election the Premier and his colleagues campaigned up and down this province claiming that they had a New Deal for People. Mr. Speaker, what has this New Deal meant for some of the people of the Morse constituency? The business community and the residents of the town of Herbert, one of the most expanding and growing towns along the No. 1 Highway, are quite concerned about his New Deal that the Department of Highways seems to be proposing for their town.

The previous Minister of Highways in the construction of the four-lane highway past Herbert realized the dependency which the town of Herbert has on vacationing and commercial travel along the Trans Canada Highway and agreed to their request in constructing two access roads into the business community, one from the east and one from the west. Under the present Government the New Deal now appears that they will be getting only one access road and the government has decided in its wisdom that the business community of Herbert no longer needs the revenue from the commercial and vacationing traffic. I sincerely hope, Mr. Speaker, that the new Minister of Highways (Mr. Byers) will look into this matter and show his concern for the people of Herbert and not apply his New Deal but give them back the old deal.

What has the New Deal meant for the ferry operator at Riverhurst? A young man with a growing family, it meant, Mr. Speaker, that only hours after the Government changed he was personally given notice that he was not to return to work for the 3:00 o'clock shift and was given until the end of the week to vacate the government house in which he was living. He was given no explanation as to why he was fired and he had no opportunity whatsoever to obtain a new job or to find a new home for his wife and family. This New Deal, Mr. Speaker, meant extreme hardship.

What has the New Deal meant for a widow at Central Butte? A woman who now has the responsibility of sending a daughter through university and a son through high school. A major portion of her income was derived from her appointment by the Government as motor license issuer for Central Butte and area. Mr. Speaker, I have in my hand a letter dated January 12, 1972 which she received from the Treasury Department, Taxation Branch which reads and I quote:

Dear Madam: This is to confirm that your appointment as motor licence issuer at Central Butte has been Terminated to take effect January 20, 1972.

This letter then, Mr. Speaker, goes on to name a gentlemen who will be her replacement and concludes with the instructions on how to make the necessary transfer and records. This letter, Mr. Speaker, gave no reason nor has she received a reason as to why her appointment was terminated. The gentlemen named in the letter as her replacement upon finding out that it was the Government that cancelled her appointment and not the widow herself refused to accept the appointment. And to this date, Mr. Speaker, there is no one in the town of Central Butte who will accept the appointment.

I commend the people of Central Butte for this action in this unheard of demonstration of ruthlessness. I congratulate them for taking this stand and in turn showing this government that they disapprove of such a discriminating act.

Mr. Speaker, I can see some slight political justification for firing the Chief Electoral Officer of this province but how...

**Some Hon. Members:** – Hear, hear!

**Mr. J. Wiebe:** – All right, gentlemen, let's get back to normal. Mr. Speaker, I should like to ask the Premier (Mr. Blakeney) what possible effect could these two jobs, the one at Central Butte and the one at Riverhurst, have on the security of the functioning and operation of this Government?

I call on the Premier when he next addresses this House, and in turn the people of this province, that he give some political justification or any justification at all in the firing of the young widow at Central Butte and why the young man at Riverhurst was told to get out of his house. And I ask the Premier to call a halt to any further indiscriminate and ruthless acts of this nature in the Morse constituency.

What has the New Deal meant for the small businessman and the weekly newspaper in Morse and throughout the province? I should like to read an article which appeared in a weekly newspaper in my constituency and I quote:

The new labour regulations which came into being on January 1, 1972 have thrown the business community into a state of confusion. The small businessman is again hit and just when they thought they might pull out of the downward trend over the past two years. Costs of goods and services will have to go up to meet the new regulations and no one gains in the long run. Now the Government of Saskatchewan changed and only one Queen's Printer order has been had since June. A small one. Now the 40-hour week which the staff already had and a boost in wages. Unless there is a definite upswing in the economy as some economists are predicting it is difficult to see the wisdom in the new Act.

I must as well, Mr. Speaker, add my voice to the concern that is expressed by the small businessman about the 40-hour week and the new minimum wage legislation. What has happened because of this legislation? To the small businessman in rural Saskatchewan it has meant an extra burden in operating costs.



It has caused him to cut back on the services so vitally needed in rural Saskatchewan. The 30 per cent increase in wages which he is not forced to pay has to be passed on to the consumer who now has to pay a great deal more for his goods and services. One example of this legislation and there are many similar cases, is the operator of a lunch counter on No. 1 Highway. Because of this legislation the operator of this lunch counter has to let one of her employees go and now relies only on her family to operate the lunch counter. This in turn means extra work for the family. What happened to the young lady who lost her job? She could not find work in Saskatchewan but I am happy to say that she was able to find employment and is now working in Dawson Creek, British Columbia. Is this an example of how this government proposes to stop the population drain?

Mr. Speaker, I have no quarrel with labour and the extra benefit which they now receive. I do, however, feel that the Government could have taken a more gradual approach. In this government's wisdom in helping labour, I feel that they should also then be prepared to give some financial assistance to small businessmen in Saskatchewan which could help them over this difficult period and would allow them still to provide the services so badly needed in rural Saskatchewan and in turn put a stop to the laying off of employees and the necessity of them leaving this great province to find work.

It appears, Mr. Speaker, that the New Deal for small printing shops and weekly newspapers is a drastic cutback in job work from the Queen's Printer. In 1964 only \$3,500 was given to these small printing shops and weekly newspapers. Where is this money going now? It is going to help refinance the NDP by this Government which is now placing its Queen's Printer orders with the NDP owned Service Printing Company. Mr. Speaker, this is literally stealing from the taxpayer of this province to further the political aims of the NDP. I hope, Mr. Speaker, that this Government will soon stop applying this New Deal only for itself and start a program and New Deal that is beneficial for the people of this province.

Mr. Speaker, I have other remarks which I should like to make in regard to the Throne speech but I see that my allotted time is gone. In closing...

**An Hon. Member:** — Keep on going.

**Mr. Wiebe:** — I can keep on going as long as I like? Good.

I should like to point out then, Mr. Speaker, some of the issues and concerns that the electorate in Morse expressed to me regarding the effect that this Government has had on the rest of the province and on its economy. They expressed their concern about the alarming rate of unemployment in Saskatchewan. Let's look at some of the causes. The cancellation of the Meadow Lake Pulp Mill along with the Choiceland iron ore mine development whipped out thousands of jobs in the depressed areas of this province. Cancellation has also prevented the multi-million dollar expansion of the Inter-Provincial Pipe Line Corporation plant at Regina with a loss of over 2,000 jobs. Without new industry to provide jobs for our young people this province will die. We need industry to shift some of the strain off agricultural production.

In June of this year Saskatchewan had one of the lowest employment rates in all of Canada. What has Premier Blakeney done to improve the unemployment record? Mr. Speaker, I suggest he has done nothing. All that he and his Government can do about the unemployment record is tear up and down this province blaming Ottawa and the Federal government for the increase in unemployment. Can't he realize the cancellation of the pulp mill had something to do with it, the closing down of Husky Oil in Moose Jaw had something to do with it. What has he done to find jobs for these men and women who have been displaced by the exodus of these companies and with the cancellation of the pulp mill?

Mr. Speaker, he has done nothing. All that he has done is cry to Ottawa and has been attempting to put the blame on Ottawa for our higher unemployment figures. The jobs and subsequent jobs that would have been created had this Government not cancelled the pulp mill would have been enough to create another city in this province the size of Swift Current.

Mr. Speaker, I have another letter that I have received from one of my constituents and I should like to read it to you at this time:

You will have received a brief prepared by Mrs. Dow regarding the situation at the Brownlee School. I am writing you in support of this. We were given to believe that this Government would do everything for the small schools in rural communities at no extra cost, rather a reduction in the mill rate. We were promised the sun and all we want here in Brownlee is the moon and the stars. There is no doubt that the closing down of one room is just the beginning of a complete closure. How can this possibly do anything for a small rural community? Our young settlers are surely beginning to wonder. We feel that we have to get some action on this matter now or we will have another Francis-Sedley situation on our hands.

Mr. Speaker, I have had many letters such as this and from various communities throughout my constituency. I ask the Minister of Education (Mr. MacMurchy) what shall I tell my constituents? Should I or will the Education Minister say that his Government only made those promises in order to get elected and the small rural communities of this province and that they have no intention whatsoever of fulfilling their promises that they made to the people of this province.

They said that the student-teacher ratio has been done away with. In its place we now have a teacher-student ratio and the onus is on the school trustees. The life of that schoolroom at Brownlee, Mr. Speaker, does not depend on the trustees, it depends on the grant which this government will give to that school unit.

Again, Mr. Speaker, I ask this Government to keep its promise and apply this New Deal to the people of Brownlee.

**Some Hon. Members:** — Hear, hear!

**Mr. Wiebe:** — Mr. Speaker, that concludes my remarks for the afternoon and I should like to say that I will not be supporting the main motion.

**Some Hon. Members:** — Hear, hear!

**Hon. A.E. Blakeney** (Premier): — Mr. Speaker, I first want to join with the others who have already in this debate extended their congratulations to the mover and the seconder of the traditional motion.

I am very, very happy to do that. I have been amazed and more than pleased by the capacity and confidence displayed by so many Members of this House.

**Some Hon. Members:** — Hear, hear!

**Hon. Blakeney:** — Pleased, for obvious reasons, because I believe that the work of this Legislature is important and requires men who are competent and dedicated. Amazed because it is no easy thing to get a working grip on the complicated and difficult task of being an effective MLA. To display the mastery of the job so soon as did the Members for Kerrobert-Kindersley (Mr. Taylor) and the Member for Humboldt (Mr. Tchorzewski) is certainly cause for congratulations.

**Some Hon. Members:** — Hear, hear!

**Hon. Blakeney:** — I want to congratulate too, the Hon. Member for Morse (Mr. Wiebe). I congratulate him first on his election and secondly on his maiden speech in this House which I think all will agree was a very creditable performance. He invited and was greeted with some comment throughout the course of his remarks and I think we all were pleased and congratulate him on the way in which he handled the modest interruptions.

May I extend also my congratulations to the Member for Prince Albert West (Mr. Steuart) on his election as Leader of the Opposition.

**Some Hon. Members:** — Hear, hear!

**Mr. Blakeney:** — We join with many others in wishing him an enjoyable and at least on our part, a lengthy period of service in that office.

I turn now to the matter raised by the Member for Athabasca (Mr. Guy). I was puzzled by why the Member for Athabasca entered the debate at this early stage in the traditional spot reserved for the Leader of the Opposition. After hearing his remarks as a matter of fact, I was puzzled as to why he entered the debate at all.

**Some Hon. Members:** — Hear, hear!

**Mr. Blakeney:** — Assuming that those are the best arguments which can be mounted by the Opposition in answer to the Speech from the Throne — assuming that for a moment — we then had to ask ourselves why the somewhat mud-spattered gladiator from Athabasca was hurled into the breach at this time. Then as the Member for Prince Albert West suggests, it occurred to me, because if he waited until next week, he might not be here.

**Some Hon. Members:** — Hear, hear!

**Mr. Blakeney:** — By next week the law may have caught up with the Member for

Athabasca.

**Some Hon. Members:** — Hear, hear!

**Mr. Blakeney:** — By next week he may well be gone!

**Mr. Steuart:** — He'll be back!

**Mr. Blakeney:** — And if does come back as the Member for Prince Albert West suggests, he will, I think, be the first man who was ever unseated in a controverted election proceeding in Saskatchewan and re-elected at the subsequent by-election. So all I can say is that the track record for the boys who have followed that route is not very good.

**Some Hon. Members:** — Hear, hear!

**Mr. Blakeney:** — Well, the Member for Athabasca dealt with important matters of policy such as whether ministers should park their car at the front of the building or the back. He then went to allege that there had been wholesale firing from the Public Service but he very, very carefully stayed away from any names and he very, very carefully stayed away from any numbers as to how many people had been first. All I can say is that if I had the facts at this disposal I would stay away from the figures too. He did tell us that they were almost daily. I did a few calculations. There have been eight months since we assumed office, roughly 30 days in a month, 30 days has September, April, June and November, and we have 240 days. I asked myself how many people have been dismissed from the Public Service, but I don't have all the facts, but I have the facts from the Public Service Commission — all the people who are under the aegis of the Public Service Commission — and I got the complete list of those who were fired almost daily over 240 days and it adds up to 31. Four of those were temporary appointments, two of them were probationary appointments, and four were permanent appointments, 13 Order-in-Council appointments and eight labour service appointments. I want to point out, Mr. Speaker, that these are all the people who have been dismissed and we have some thousands of people in the Government of Saskatchewan.

**Mr. C.P. MacDonald (Milestone):** — Mr. Speaker, would the Premier mind tabling that document?

**Mr. Blakeney:** — I will be happy to table the information as soon as I finish my remarks.

I want to say that with a Public Service of some thousands of people there are necessarily going to be people who are dismissed for a variety of reasons. We have some here, one being drunk on the job, I trust you don't expect that that is unreasonable.

**An Hon. Member:** — That was a carry over.

**Mr. Blakeney:** — Others did not show up for work, others who did not return after vacation, one who tried to get into a fight with another employee during work and took a mop to him. I want to point out that it will be known that an out of scope employee of whom there were some 13 Order-in-Council appointments and possibly

one or two other permanent appointments were out of scope, have a right to appeal under Section 39 of The Public Service Act if they feel they have been unjustly dismissed. This I think does not apply to Order-in-Council appointments but applies to all others.

People who are part of the bargaining unit have a right to apply under Section 40 of The Public Service Act. I had occasion to enquire how many of these people who were unjustly dismissed used their rights to appeal, I find that not a single person used any of their right to appeal under Section 39 or Section 40.

**Some Hon. Members:** — Hear, hear!

**Mr. Blakeney:** — The reference by the Member for Prince Albert who sooner or later will enter this debate (when he screws up his courage), refers to an employee who is not covered by the Public Service Commission but by the Liquor Board.

I point out, Mr. Speaker, that of the several thousands who are under the Public Service Commission some 31 have been dismissed. That is hardly the “almost daily” routine that the Member for Athabasca wanted this House to believe.

The Member for Athabasca then went on to make some allegations about public servants who had been hired and of all those who came in from outside the province.

**Mr. Guy:** — I’ll name them!

**Mr. Blakeney:** — I’ll come to your names in a moment, Sir. It was indeed necessary for government to appoint a number of highly qualified people to the Public service. I want to ask this House why it was necessary. Because the previous Government drove out of this province dozens and dozens of top rate public servants.

**Some Hon. Members:** — Hear, hear!

**Mr. Blakeney:** — They pushed them out and they elbowed them out and they eased them out. I could give this House a list of 100 top public servants who were pushed out of this province by the former Government. Suffice it to say that some of them...

**Mr. Steuart:** — All NDPs.

**Mr. Blakeney:** — ...maybe they are all NDP and I’ll tell you where some of them are. Mr. A. W. Johnson, the Deputy of the Hon. Bud Drury at Ottawa, Mr. A. T. Wakabayashi as a senior official of Mr. Drury’s Department.

**Mr. Steuart:** — Who was that?

**Mr. Blakeney:** — Wakabayashi, your former Deputy.

**Mr. Steuart:** — We didn’t force him out.

**Mr. Blakeney:** — Some were forced out and some were starved out and some were elbowed out, but they all left under your Government.

Dr. Graham Clarkson who went to the Liberal Government at New Brunswick and hence back to Alberta. Mr. H. S. Lee, Assistant Dean of Graduate Studies at York University. Mr. D. D. Tansley, now Executive Vice President of the Canadian International Development Agency. He is now the second man of the Canadian International Development immediately under Paul Gerin-Lajoie, the ex-Liberal Minister of Education of the Quebec Government. These people may all be New Democrats but they find favour with progressive people of every persuasion across Canada.

**Some Hon. Members:** — Hear, hear!

**Mr. Blakeney:** — Mr. J. W. MacNeil, a senior officer with the Federal Department of the Environment.

**Mr. Steuart:** — Who?

**Mr. Blakeney:** — Mr. J. W. MacNeil, Jim MacNeil to you. Dr. Meyer Brownstone, now professor of Political Economy at the University of Toronto, I could go on and on.

**Mr. Steuart:** — The first five named were not pushed out.

**Mr. Blakeney:** — Mr. Speaker, these are only a few, only a few of those who left under the Government of the former Provincial Treasurer.

Mr. Speaker, I am sure that the Member opposite is glad that he got rid of some of them. All I can say is that we should be glad to have any one of them back, any one of them.

When we came to office we found a Public Service which was hard working and devoted but overworked particularly at the senior level. Now this was a foolhardy way to operate a government. Let me just cite one example. In spite of the growing importance of Federal-Provincial relations, of Federal shared-cost programs over the past several years, the previous Government had built up no organization, no organization to deal with Federal-Provincial relations, no organization to take advantage of Federal-Provincial cost sharing programs. Mr. Speaker, you don't get Federal money just because you are standing there. Plans have to be made to get the full benefit of cost-sharing programs. You have to plan and go after these funds. As a result of the Liberal penny-wise and pound-foolish attitude Saskatchewan lost millions of dollars in Federal assistance over the years.

This is not the way to service Saskatchewan's interests. One of our first actions as a Government was to put Saskatchewan in a position to get the best possible deal for Saskatchewan in cost-sharing programs. For example, when the Federal government announced its Winter Works Program, we immediately appointed a Provincial Co-ordinator at the senior level. A man with wide experience in municipal government, a wide experience in provincial government and also a person who left under the former Government. By this device we were able to get the maximum sharing with the Federal Government and we received over \$9 million in Federal sharing.

We appointed another full time co-ordinator to work with the

Federal Department of Regional Economic Expansion on developing projects in Saskatchewan, his name is Mr. Svetkov. His immediate task has been to tidy up all the loose ends left by the previous Government particularly in the Meadow Lake special area.

Personally I have seen the Minister of Regional Economic Expansion at Ottawa, Mr. Marchand, I have talked to his Deputy Mr. Love personally. I have personally talked in his office to the Assistant Deputy in Charge of Planning, Mr. Francis. I want to tell you that we are determined to plan and organize to see that Saskatchewan receives the full benefit from the DREE program (Department of Regional Economic Expansion) and all other Federal cost-sharing programs. This was something very largely ignored by the former Government. I make no apologies for getting top-flight people to do this job on behalf and on behalf of the people of Saskatchewan.

**Some Hon. Members:** — Hear, hear!

**Mr. Blakeney:** — The Member for Athabasca said, “All right, you can get these people but why bring in these people from outside, what is wrong with Saskatchewan graduates?” He named a few. I think I ought to comment on some of these people. He mentioned Mr. Kinzel, Mr. Kinzel is not a Saskatchewan graduate, he’s only been in Saskatchewan since 1855. He’s only been here since how long? Since four years before the Member for Kinistino (Mr. Thibault) was elected years to this House. Some of us don’t think time went back that far. When he came to Saskatchewan, how many of us were in this House? The Member for The Battlefords (Mr. Kramer) and Mr. Speaker and that’s all. All the rest of us have been elected since then, so it isn’t just a few days ago. Reference was made to the fact that he is an American citizen. He applied for Canadian Citizenship 12 years ago and was given Canadian Citizenship seven years ago and I am surprised that the Member for Athabasca, even in the case of the Member for Athabasca, that he is seven years behind the times.

Reference was made to Mr. Don McMillan. Mr. McMillan was born in Saskatchewan, his father was born in Saskatchewan, he is a graduate of the University of Saskatchewan. Reference was made to Ian Phillips. He is a graduate of the University of Saskatchewan. Reference was made to Mr. Saddlemeier, 41 years old, 39 of them spent in Saskatchewan. He is a graduate in law and in administration from the University of Saskatchewan, worked for the Industrial Development Bank, they transferred him to Edmonton, we got him back. Reference was made to Mr. Koskie. He was born in Humboldt, graduate of the University of Saskatchewan in Education, graduate of the University of Saskatchewan in Law. It is true some of these men when we hired them were not in Saskatchewan, some of them were working in Ottawa, some in Edmonton, some in Whitehorse. They are among the talented and able people who had to leave this province like so many others...

**Some Hon. Members:** — Hear, hear!

**Mr. Blakeney:** — ...during these last seven years. These seven lean, gaunt years of the Liberal Government.

But they are coming back, Mr. Speaker, they are coming back and I am proud that our Government can attract men of this calibre. They have much to contribute to their native province.

Some were not born in Saskatchewan, I don't know whether I can complain about this and I don't think the Member for Wilkie (Mr. McIsaac) can complain either. I'll say this, the people we hired are almost all Saskatchewan people coming home. We in our Government didn't move in the whole entourage of the MacLaren Advertising Agency as your Government did when you took power.

**Some Hon. Members:** — Hear, hear!

**Mr. Blakeney:** — We are pleased with the people we have attracted. We believe the people of Saskatchewan will be pleased that we have hired these people and we believe the people of Saskatchewan will be particularly pleased at the results which we are sure will follow.

Mr. Speaker, I won't deal with the salary figures used by the Hon. Member for Athabasca, they were a bewildering mixture of fact and fancy. The actual figures are on the public record and if the Hon. Member would like to have the, I suggest that he get either a new research man or perhaps he could check the records himself.

I turn now briefly to the Saskatoon Aid Centre Society. I had an opportunity very, very quickly to look at some records involved with respect to this Society and as I suspected this Society is not the sort of sinister thing which the Member for Athabasca suggested but it is a non-profit organization incorporated under The Societies Act to assist people who have multiple problems, for example, alcoholism, unemployment, family discord. The story is set out in the Saskatoon Star-Phoenix. Mr. Speaker, not only is there nothing sinister about the Society which, as I say, is non-profit, but there is nothing sinister about any individuals associated with it. No benefit could be gained by any member of that non-profit Society. That Society is an organization which by the provisions of The Societies Act itself cannot pay out or distribute any property to a member at any time during the existence of the Society and a Society which on winding up has no power to distribute any cash or anything else to its members.

**Some Hon. Members:** — Hear, hear!

**Mr. Blakeney:** — It is my submission that without that power a society cannot under any circumstances distribute funds to its members. To Members opposite, I suggest he check with his legal advisor, the Member for the pocket borough of Albert Park and I think that Member will advise him. The money, in my judgment, would escheat to the Crown. I think that the House would be better served if Members would refrain from making baseless charges which expressly or impliedly reflect upon the integrity and probity of a fellow Member.

**Some Hon. Members:** — Hear, hear!

**Mr. Blakeney:** — Mr. Speaker, the Members opposite have been suggesting once again that somehow we have driven out the iron ore development at Choiceland. And I want to have a word or two to say on this so-called development at Choiceland. I think it's time that the Leader of the Opposition and the Member from Athabasca told us where they stand on this project.



Now let's recall what this deal was. It was an agreement signed in May of 1971 by Choiceland Iron Mines, Denison Mines, IPSCO and the Saskatchewan Government. By the agreement the Saskatchewan Government would provide \$10 million for shaft-sinking before anyone else was required to put up one dollar. \$10 million of Saskatchewan money before anyone else put up another dollar. After the shaft is sunk, Denison would have a look at the ore. If it liked what it found, a plant would be built from money guaranteed by the Government of Saskatchewan. So up to the first \$10 million, Saskatchewan takes 100 per cent of the risk. After that, after the ore is proven, Saskatchewan would take about 90 per cent of the risk. Denison will invest little or nothing on a net basis. Denison would get 60 per cent of the equity, the Government of Saskatchewan would get 25 per cent of the equity. But let's leave those aspects aside for a minute. Let's look at the feasibility report — the feasibility report commissioned by the former Government. On the basis of that feasibility report ordered by them — not by us — and delivered to us in July, the cost of production would be \$43.04 per ton. Would you remember that figure \$43.04 a ton and the selling price would be \$43.70 a ton. A margin of 66 cents a ton. To us this was far, far too small a margin for error and for contingencies. The agreement went on to say this, it provided that once we, the Government of Saskatchewan, received the GECO feasibility report we had to make a decision, Yes or No in ten days. And if we didn't say No, let me make this clear, if we didn't say No, the Government of Saskatchewan was committed to sink a shaft at an estimated cost of \$10 million.

The GECO feasibility report was received on July 12, 1972. We were faced squarely with a decision. On the basis of that decision do we say Yes and commit the people to spending \$10 million without the private group obligating themselves to spend one dollar. Or do we say No? Should we say Yes in the face of the GECO report or should we say No? We said No.

**Some Hon. Members:** — Hear, hear!

**Mr. Blakeney:** — We have since been doing a great deal of work to see whether an iron development in Saskatchewan is feasible — that work is still going on — work which we say should have been done before any agreements were signed. But that's by the way. Our choice in July was to say Yes or No. Now the Leader of the Opposition is critical of our decision to say No. The Member for Athabasca was critical and I ask him if he had been the Government would he have said Yes or would he have said No. If he has said Yes then this gives us an idea of what they would pay for what they call development. If they would say No then we would know where they stood on that. What the House is not prepared to listen to, I'm sure, and what I think the people of Saskatchewan are not prepared to listen to, is one of these bashful maiden approaches: she wouldn't say Yes, she wouldn't say No.

The Member for Prince Albert West (Mr. Steuart) is fond of saying, "Well, I wouldn't have said Yes and I wouldn't have said No. I would have grabbed the phone and I would have made a different deal." Not good enough. That deal was made by the Government of which he was a Minister and of which the Member for Athabasca was a Minister in May of 1971. If it was a bad deal in May it was a bad deal in July. He can't tell us now that he would have renegotiated the deal. He can't tell us now that the deal they made in May was no good but he would have somehow picked up the phone and he would have made another deal in July and that

would have got us a mine. It won't wash.

On the basis of the May agreement which the previous Government signed and on the basis of the GECO feasibility report which that Government commissioned, no man in his right mind would have gone ahead with the Choiceland mine.

**Some Hon. Members:** — Hear, hear!

**Mr. Blakeney:** — Every businessman in Saskatchewan who has looked at that agreement, that GECO feasibility report, knows that on that basis you couldn't go ahead with the Choiceland mine.

The Leader of the Opposition knows that. The Member for Athabasca knows that and I think each of them should stop laying games with the public.

**Some Hon. Members:** — Hear, hear!

**Mr. Blakeney:** — Mr. Speaker, this Throne Speech sets out clearly the legislative action which the Government proposes to take. The Throne Speech makes clear that we propose to take action to keep our election promises.

Some time before the election, Mr. Speaker, our Party published a booklet setting out the program which we proposed to launch in our first four-year term. And immediately before the election we published our 1971 election program. And I'm glad we did. I'm glad we did because we know what we promised and we'll do our best to keep our promises. We can't keep the promises which Members opposite say we made, but we'll certainly keep the promises which we made.

**Some Hon. Members:** — Hear, hear!

**Mr. Blakeney:** — And it is our intention as a Government to proceed step by step to keep those promises. The Throne Speech last July was Chapter I. This Throne Speech that we are now debating is Chapter II. By Chapter I we dealt with the immediate problems. We promised to remove deterrent fees — we acted. We promised to repeal Bill 2 — we acted. We promised to remove medical and hospital family tax for senior citizens — we acted. We promised to help the family farm — we acted by passing The Family Farm Protection Act.

**Some Hon. Members:** — Hear, hear!

**Mr. Blakeney:** — We promised fair play to the mentally ill and we acted to remove the discriminatory charges against their estates. That was a good beginning.

We are now taking further steps to carry out our election program. Mr. Speaker, we promised in education that we would take steps to revitalize the education system in this province. We promised that we would do something about a bursary program. Year after year, for seven years, for those seven lean and gaunt years, the Party opposite was prodded and besought by the students, by the educators and by the Opposition to set up a bursary program for students. Year after year they refused to do so.

Other provinces set one up until we had the odious distinction of being the only province in Canada without a bursary program.

For seven years, Mr. Speaker, within seven weeks of assuming office we have implemented a student bursary program for the current academic year.

**Some Hon. Members:** — Hear, hear!

**Mr. Blakeney:** — It has meant that many, many young people have been able to go to University during this term instead of out looking for jobs in the rather chilly climate created by Mr. Trudeau and his war against inflation.

**Some Hon. Members:** — Hear, hear!

**Mr. Blakeney:** — I know that the Member from Milestone (Mr. MacDonald) and others will say that the pupil-teacher ratio still exists, Mr. Speaker. And it is quite true that someone, obviously, must decide how many teachers there are to be for so many students.

But the crux of the matter is, who makes the decision, who makes the decision — the Department or the School Board? We have restored that decision-making power to the School Boards, Mr. Speaker, where it belongs.

**Some Hon. Members:** — Hear, hear!

**Mr. Blakeney:** — The Minister of Education (Mr. MacMurchy) will have an opportunity to rise in this debate, I hope. When his turn comes he won't be quite as bashful as the Member for Prince Albert West (Mr. Steuart) and I know that when he does rise he will outline with some clarity the program of his Department.

**Some Hon. Members:** — Hear, hear!

**Mr. Blakeney:** — Mr. Speaker, to quote the Member for Athabasca (Mr. Guy) using a very, very fine phrase, "We have a New Deal for the sick in this Province." I've mentioned the abolition of deterrent fees and the removal of the hospital and medical care premiums for senior citizens. Interestingly enough, Mr. Speaker, there is no evidence, no evidence that because of the removal of these deterrent fees anyone is misusing our hospitals or our doctors' offices.

**Mr. Steuart:** — Closing the beds down...

**Mr. Blakeney:** — Those few opposite who were in the House when they voted for deterrent fees were not only morally wrong but they proved to be financially wrong as well.

**Some Hon. Members:** — Hear, hear!

**Mr. Blakeney:** — And I challenge them, I challenge them during this Legislature to defend the position they took just one year ago on deterrent fees. Mr. Speaker, at this Session we will be moving forward again in health care. We will be taking legislative action to facilitate the inclusion of chiropractic care as an insured service.

**Some Hon. Members:** — Hear, hear!

**Mr. Blakeney:** — We're working and making progress on a prescription drug program, on a hearing aid program. The Minister of Health (Mr. Smishek) will be saying more about this. We, in a few short months, will have a long series, Mr. Speaker, of promises made and promises kept.

**Some Hon. Members:** — Hear, hear!

**Mr. Blakeney:** — Mr. Speaker, I have a good deal more to say about the Speech from the Throne and about the remarks the Member for Athabasca (Mr. Guy) and others and I accordingly beg leave to adjourn the debate.

Debate adjourned.

The Assembly adjourned at 4:40 o'clock p.m.