

LEGISLATIVE ASSEMBLY OF SASKATCHEWAN
Second Session — Seventeenth Legislature
5th Day

March 1, 1972

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

WELCOME TO STUDENTS

Hon. G.T. Snyder (Moose Jaw South): — Mr. Speaker, I want to take this opportunity to introduce to you and to other Members of the House 65 students. I believe they are located in both the east and west galleries. They are accompanied by their teacher, Mrs. Evelyn Gardiner and Mr. Wayne Greenfield. These are Grade Eight students from the Empire School. They were to have been with us yesterday but the weather intervened and I think that they were fortunate in that the bill of fare may be somewhat more palatable today, Mr. Speaker. I want to take this opportunity to greet them and welcome them on your behalf.

Hon. Members: — Hear, hear!

Mr. E.L. Tchorzewski (Humboldt): — Mr. Speaker, I should like to take this opportunity to welcome a group of Grade Ten students from Muenster High School, who are accompanied by their teachers, Mr. Komarnicki and Mr. Rueve and by their bus driver, Mr. Grunsky. I am sure that all Members of this House will join with me in welcoming the students and wishing them a rewarding, interesting and informative visit to the Legislature and to Regina, and wish them a safe trip home.

Hon. Members: — Hear, hear!

INTRODUCTION OF GUESTS

Mr. H.H.P. Baker (Regina Wascana): — Mr. Speaker, on behalf of the Legislature I am very pleased to extend a warm welcome to a distinguished group in the Speaker's gallery, the New Comers' Alumni. I understand they are 60 in number and they are all from the city of Regina, escorted by Mrs. Glanzer. We are pleased to welcome them here this afternoon and I am sure they will appreciate proceedings in the Session today as others appreciate them during the term of this Legislature. We welcome this group most sincerely and may their stay here be both pleasant and fruitful.

Hon. Members: — Hear, hear!

Mr. W.A. Robbins (Saskatoon Nutana Centre): — Mr. Speaker, on behalf of the Assembly I wish to welcome a group of students who, I understand, are behind me in the east gallery, from Victoria School which is located in the Nutana Centre constituency in Saskatoon. They are accompanied by their teachers, Miss MacLeod and Mr. Beaumont. I believe they are Grade Seven students although I haven't had an opportunity to meet them as yet but I will shortly. I wish to extend a sincere welcome on behalf of all Members of the Assembly to them. I hope they will find the proceedings informative, educational and rewarding and that they will have a safe journey

home.

Hon. Members: — Hear, hear!

QUESTIONS

INSURANCE RATES

Mr. G.B. Grant (Regina Whitmore Park): — Before the Orders of the Day I should like to direct a question to the Hon. Attorney General (Mr. Romanow). I took some law classes although I am not a Rhodes scholar, but I did learn to add and subtract and I doubt whether he did. I am a little puzzled at his answers the other day to inquiries about the insurance rates for private passenger vehicles.

In January I purchased a 99-inch wheel base vehicle and purchased a licence that the rate in January was \$79 for the insurance and \$15 for the plates or a total of \$94. Today the figure is \$16 for the plates and \$89 for the insurance, making a title of \$105 or an increase of \$11. When I inquired about it the young lady at the desk was very accommodating. She said, "I'm sorry, Mr. Grant, there has been an increase in the charges." Now I should like to know, Mr. Speaker, whether the young lady at the desk at the Revenue Branch is telling the truth or whether the Attorney General is telling the truth. If he has made a mistake why isn't he big enough to stand up and admit that there has been a change in the fee and that, as I stated, a 1972 vehicle in January cost \$94 and today \$105.

Some Hon. Members: — Hear, hear!

Hon. R. Romanow (Attorney General): — Mr. Speaker, the only answer that I can give is essentially the same answer I have given to the House, and that is that the car rates for the 1972 model and 1973 model are, under 100 inch \$89, under 120 inch but over 100, \$95 and over 120 inches it is \$104. Now that is the top of the range category of insurance for the 1972 and 1973 category. That range is \$10 higher than the top of the range of the category the year before...

Some Hon. Members: — Hear, hear!

Mr. Romanow: — ...I have said that and always maintained the position, but I do say, Mr. Speaker, with respect, that basically we cannot compare the top of the category for 1972 and 1973 with the top of the category for 1971 and 1972. The answer is there, both the girl and myself are correct. I can only say that I am very sorry that the former Minister of Health (Mr. Grant) who sat on the Treasury bench and who asked this question for the Liberal Party, keeps on seeking to bring into disrepute the question of SGIO and the Accident policy.

Some Hon. Members: — Hear, hear!

Mr. Grant: — Mr. Speaker, I appreciate the reply and the honesty of the Member at this time.

Mr. Speaker: — This is the third day we

have had that same question on the floor and while the Chair will not get into the right or wrong of it, if there is any more debate I think we should have a substantive motion so that it can be debated and all Members can take part.

FIRING OF CIVIL SERVANTS

Mr. D.G. Stuart (Leader of the Opposition): — Mr. Speaker, before the Orders of the Day, I wonder if I could direct a question to the Premier.

Yesterday in his speech, as reported in the Leader-Post talking about firings of civil servants, he mentioned that one firing had resulted from drunkenness. Now I don't doubt that this is true but I wonder since this has cast a shadow on every civil servant who has left or been discharged and since he is the one who said one of them was fired for drunkenness, are anyone of those individuals going to get a job now since they have got a shadow cast over his reputation or her reputation? I wonder if he would be man enough now to table the name of that individual who was fired for drunkenness.

Hon. A.E. Blakeney (Premier): — Mr. Speaker, I most emphatically will not. I don't propose . . .

Some Hon. Members: — Hear, hear!

Mr. Blakeney: — . . . When an employee is discharged for what we think is dereliction of duty, I don't propose to add to his penalty by tabling his name in this Legislature.

Some Hon. Members: — Hear, hear!

Mr. Blakeney: — May I say to the people of Saskatchewan and to any prospective employers that if they wish to write to us to find out references about someone who worked with us we would be happy to give references and if they want specifically to ask us whether this particular employee was one who was discharged due to drunkenness we will, to the employer who has an interest in knowing and not to a person who simply wants to make some political capital out of it — to the person who is interested in knowing and has an interest in knowing — we will provide the information privately.

Some Hon. Members: — Hear, hear!

Mr. Stuart: — It is admittedly on the records that Mr. Blakeney is the man that made the charge.

Mr. Speaker: — Order, order! The question must only ask for information.

STATEMENT

ST. DAVID'S DAY

Mr. Blakeney: — Before the Orders of the Day if I might beg the indulgence of the House to call attention to the fact that today is the

1st of March, and it has been my duty on a number of occasions to call the House's attention to the fact that this is St. David's Day.

St. David was a Bishop who lived in Wales about 500 AD and he was invested by legend with many remarkable gifts. I won't go into them now, but I will say this – even in legend he slew no dragons, uprooted no snakes. He was a scholar and a man of learning, a man of peace who preached peace and brotherhood and practiced what he preached. Today, my purpose, Mr. Speaker, is through you to pay tribute to the people of Wales and particularly to the people of Welsh ancestry who are citizens of Saskatchewan. Place names like Bangor or Bryn Maw or legislative names like Mr. Lloyd and Mr. Davies – and there are others on both sides of the house – indicate the contribution which people of Welsh descent have made to the life and growth of Saskatchewan. In the traditional way I want, through you, Mr. Speaker, to pay tribute to them on this the day of their patron saint.

Some Hon. Members: — Hear, hear!

ADJOURNED DEBATE

ADDRESS-IN-REPLY

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

Mr. Blakeney: — Mr. Speaker, yesterday when I spoke in this House I had occasion to congratulate the mover and seconder, to congratulate the Member for Morse (Mr. Wiebe), and I today want to renew those congratulations and to add my congratulations to the Member for Souris-Estevan (Mr. Thorson) on his election to this Legislature and to the Member for Saskatoon City Park (Mr. Dyck) on his election as Deputy Speaker.

Yesterday I attempted to deal with the arguments raised by the Member for Athabasca (Mr. Guy) with respect to hiring and dismissals, his allegations that Saskatchewan graduates hadn't been given a chance. I showed, I believe that almost without exception, the people who were hired are Saskatchewan graduates, Saskatchewan men and women. They are university graduates of the University of Saskatchewan and I listed a few of them: Mr. Wilson, Mr. Koskie, Mr. McMillan, Mr. Phillips and Dr. Saddlemeyer, Mr. Bogdasavich, Mr. Shillington, Mr. Cooper, Mr. Rogoza and Mr. Svetkov – all people who, he said, we had hired from outside and all without exception graduates of the University of Saskatchewan. This is true of Judy Coburn and there are others. Certainly many of these people had come from outside Saskatchewan when they joined the Public Service, they had been forced out of Saskatchewan under the former Government. We might even call them the Brylcream boys and girls because they came back and we are glad they did.

I dealt with the charge that there had been wholesale firings almost daily and I pointed out that in the Public Service proper which has several thousand employees, there had been a total of 31 dismissals for all reasons in eight months. These dismissals had come for various reasons. As you would expect with a Public Service of several thousand there would be one or two in any month who would not meet the minimum standards and would have to be discharged. But out of these thousands 31

March 1, 1972

were discharged in eight months. A few more in Crown corporations, I think we can recall one or two. In the Power Corporation I can frankly recall only one and I needn't remind the Member for Athabasca (Mr. Guy) who it was. The wife of the Member for Athabasca was eking out the meagre salary of a Cabinet Minister acting as the personal secretary to the General Manager of the Power Corporation and she has left.

Some Hon. Members: — Hear, hear!

Mr. Blakeney: — I gather that I am subject to correction, I gather that she resigned.

Mr. A.R. Guy (Athabasca): — . . . under pressure.

Mr. Blakeney: — Mr. Speaker, of this 31 almost all or certainly a majority had a right to appeal under the Public service Act if they thought they were wrongfully dismissed. Not one has appealed, not one, be he an in-service employee or out-of-service employee. Contrast this, Mr. Speaker, with the statement made by the Leader of the Opposition (Mr. Steuart) at a Regina open line show last November, when he said that the Liberal Government in its first six months of office had dismissed between 100 and 150 employees. So much for the friends of the Public Service. We are more than willing to be judged by the Public Service of Saskatchewan on our treatment of them.

Some Hon. Members: — Hear, hear!

Mr. Blakeney: — Mr. Speaker, The Throne Speech sets out clearly the legislative action which this Government proposes to take to keep its election promises. Sometime before the election, Mr. Speaker, our party published a booklet setting out the program which we proposed to launch in the first four years. And immediately before the election we published our 1971 election program. It is our intention as a Government to move step by step to keep the promises set out in those documents. The Throne Speech last July was chapter 1, the Throne Speech of this Session is Chapter 2. In Chapter 1 we dealt with the immediate problems, the removal of deterrent fees, the repeal of Bill 2, the removal of the medical and hospital family tax for senior citizens. Those were promises made and promises kept.

Some Hon. Members: — Hear, hear!

Mr. Blakeney: — We promised to help the farmers and we passed The Family Farm Protection Act. We promised fair play for the mentally ill and we acted to remove the discriminatory charges against their estates. Now that was a good beginning.

Now we are taking further steps to carry out our election program. Let me set the general framework in which we see ourselves working. In listening to the temporary Member of the Opposition, the Member for Athabasca (Mr. Guy), it is clear that his party and our party have profound differences of approach to Saskatchewan, its resources, and its people. For he continues to talk about development as if the only kind of development was the massive resource base development financed by foreign capital. He assumes exactly the same things that he and his party said in

1964. Now, Mr. Speaker, these methods have been tried. They have been tried for seven years. He had seven years to make them work as had the Member for Prince Albert West (Mr. Steuart). He has had seven years to show how our population would grow, how our towns would blossom, how our businessmen would prosper if only we would follow their ideas. And with one or two exceptions, they have been seven years of spectacular failure.

Some Hon. Members: — Hear, hear!

Mr. Blakeney: — After seven years of the ministrations of the free enterprise Government of which they were Members, we were worse off than we were in 1964.

Take population. And we all remember the famous statement of the then Liberal Leader, that growth of population is the acid test of development. That, Mr. Speaker, is their test, not mine. But judged by their own test, how do they fare? How much did population grow under the impact of their development strategy? In 1964 the population of Saskatchewan was 942,000. By 1968, four years later, it had struggled up to 960,000. In 1969, it was down to 959,000. In 1970, down to 942,000 (where we were in 1964). In 1971, it had fallen even more, to 928,000. Under the full impact of their development strategy, the population of seven years of development. Counting the loss of natural increase, population in one year alone dropped over 30,000 people. Never in the peacetime history of Canada has any province ever lost that many people in any single year.

Surely, this catastrophic set back would cause the Liberal Party to reassess its position? But no, they keep plodding on. Like the Bourbon Kings of old they have forgotten nothing and they have learned nothing.

Some Hon. Members: — Hear, hear!

Mr. Blakeney: — But whether the Liberal Party has learned anything, the people of Saskatchewan have learned a bitter and a hard-bought lesson. They know that crude resource development isn't good enough. And we hope to offer a different strategy to them. We hope to offer a more sophisticated strategy. Let me outline some of the principal attributes of that development strategy.

First, we don't believe that population is the acid test of development. We should like to see our population grow but not at any cost. It would be fair neither to this generation nor to the next to get industry by permitting uncontrolled and wanton exploitation of our natural resources. We want to see those resources developed but developed in such a way that our environment is protected and that our renewable resources are conserved. We'll promote resource development, let there be no mistake about that. But we believe that very soon our resources will be attractive enough that we can develop them without massive public subsidy, without the massive public subsidies which were poured into the pulp mill development and which right now are being poured into the pulp mill development.

Some Hon. Members: — Hear, hear!

Mr. Blakeney: — We will offer support for

March 1, 1972

development, but we don't believe that such development warrants massive, on-going public subsidies. We don't believe that it is necessary to pour millions of dollars of the taxpayers' money every year into one development of our resources.

We believe that much more could be done to promote industries based not on resource development, but rather on manufacturing goods for people here in the prairie basin.

Consider the success which we have achieved here. I look around Regina, for example, and I invite others to look around Regina. The Member for Albert Park (Mr. MacLeod) he doesn't see much of Regina when he tours his constituency and I invite him to see some more of it. I see that the major industrial employers of this city are still the steel mill, the cement plant and the potash plant at Belle Plaine, all established in 1964. I see no comparable plants brought here in the seven years of industrial famine under the Liberal development strategy.

Some Hon. Members: — Hear, hear!

Mr. Blakeney: — True, the potash plant is a resource-based plant, but the other two are not. The other two are based upon the market which is available for their products here in the prairie basin and they are prospering.

It will be the aim of our Government as it was of the pre-1964 Government that brought those plants to Regina, to do solid research, research on the needs of the prairie basin, needs which could be filled by a plant based here in Saskatchewan and then actively to promote the development of such a plant by public, by private and by co-operative means as seems most appropriate.

We believe that the previous Government neglected this approach. They had no adequate research staff in the Department of Industry. When I took over the Department of Industry I found that there was literally no research staff.

And I recall, Mr. Speaker, just how some of those plants came to Regina. I remember the cement plant, how the research staff of the Department of Industry, the old Industrial Development Office, believed that there was a place for a cement plant, put together a package and went out and found someone to develop it. When I took over the Department of Industry, there was no research staff that could put together such a package. They had salesmen but no product to sell.

We believe very profoundly that opportunities for secondary industry, properly researched and properly presented, will be taken up, either by private industry or, in appropriate cases, by the Government.

There are many products which are now imported into the prairie basin, imported from distant points, which could be manufactured here. And as freight rates increase and as our population in the prairie basin becomes more industrialized and more urban, the opportunities for the manufacture of more products grow almost daily. It is these opportunities, which we believe were not exploited by the previous Government and which we hope to develop.

We hope to promote the further development and the further processing of raw materials before they are exported.

Admittedly, this isn't easy. We fight established industrial patterns and established freight rate patterns but we believe that progress can be made. We believe that our tourist industry can and must be developed in the years ahead to a far greater extent than in the past.

In short then, our development strategy is not one based solely on big resource based industries. We believe rather in a balanced approach. We believe in resource development. We believe in processing more of our raw materials. We believe in encouraging the manufacture of goods for the prairie basin market. We believe in developing the tourist industry. We believe that this strategy will work far better than the Liberal strategy which proved such a spectacular failure judged by their own acid test. The Liberal deal failed by any test. We will offer a New Deal to the people of Saskatchewan in balanced development.

Some Hon. Members: — Hear, hear!

Mr. Blakeney: — Mr. Speaker, our Government believes that its first priority is the stimulation and development of the agricultural industry. We don't deny the importance of other industry but we think that great potential for development still lies with our basic industry — agriculture. And we make no apology for this. We are well aware that under Liberal farm policies, Federal and Provincial, our farmers have endured some of the toughest times since the 1930s. As for provincial farm policies, we intend to change them and we are in the process of doing so.

We intend too, to press Ottawa to change Federal farm policies, to adopt some policies which offer a measure of security and stability for our farmers.

We all know that our farmers face two or three basic problems. They need an assured market for their products, they need an assured price for a basic minimum amount of their product, they need some help in controlling the steadily rising costs of production.

We don't pretend that our provincial farm policies will solve all or even most of the problems of farmers. But just because we can't solve all the problems or even most of the problems is no reason why we should do nothing.

Our agricultural policy can be stated simply. Where provincial action is appropriate we propose to act, where federal action is appropriate we propose to press for federal action in the toughest and most effective way open to us.

Let me turn first to marketing problems. Unquestionably, the marketing of grain and most other farm products is a federal responsibility. We intend, however, to act in the area open to us. We intend to build and strengthen relations between ourselves and potential purchasers of our products. We will work to promote the marketing of our livestock products. We joined in the promotion of Western Canada Agribition. To increase livestock production and sales, legislation will be introduced to expand livestock veterinary services. Markets for rapeseed will be expanded. We believe that our proposed change in The Margarine Act will do this. We have been concerned about the slow but steady decline in the production and sale of our dairy

March 1, 1972

products under Members opposite when they were in office. It is a pretty sad commentary on the farm policies of Members opposite when we in Saskatchewan have to import our butter from New Zealand, our cheese from Ontario and our powdered milk from Quebec.

Some Hon. Members: — Hear, hear!

Mr. Blakeney: — In the past seven years we have seen our available quotas from the Canadian Dairy Commission go down and down and down. We propose to take steps to preserve our quota, to encourage the expansion and modernization of our dairy industry.

Still dealing with markets, we propose to press the Federal Government and the railway companies to improve the grain-handling system because we believe that it is absolutely vital that Canadian farmers be able to get their products to market. This Government says that Canada must have a grain-handling system that can do the job, not when it is working at 100 per cent capacity but when it is working at much less than 100 per cent capacity. All of us know that there will be hold-ups because of delays in the arrivals of ships or derailments or strikes or snow slides or difficult weather on the Prairies and other things. The system must be able to operate and deliver our grain in spite of minor hold-ups. We must have a system where every small hold-up doesn't create a crisis as is now the case. This problem may not concern some of the Members, they seem to take it very casually. I notice that of all the resolutions that I find on the blue paper and on the white, not one of the resolutions, not one of the motions, not one of the questions asked by Members opposite deals with the grain-handling system. But we on this side of the House believe it is important.

Mr. C.P. MacDonald (Milestone): — Where should we direct that question?

Mr. Blakeney: — We believe that action should be taken now, Mr. Speaker. The Member for Milestone asks where should he direct his comment. I suggest he should direct them to the Federal Government.

We believe that action should be taken now, not solely and not primarily to deal with existing difficulties, but they are serious enough, but we must surely get ready to deal with the difficulties that are going to come. Surely, it is clear that grain sales through the Port of Vancouver are going to continue at a high level. It is clear too that we don't have the grain-handling system to do the job. Now is the time, before we have yet another crisis, to get on with the job of beefing up the grain-handling system. We intend to say that to the Federal Government and to the railways and to keep saying it and to make common cause with other Provincial governments and with farm organizations until some action is taken.

I have said that the two major problems of farmers are markets and prices and I have outlined some of the action we propose to take about markets. Let me turn to prices. Here again, there is not a great deal that the Provincial Government can do about the prices of farm products, but what we can do we will. We propose to continue the Milk Control Board for our dairy producers. And we propose at this Session to introduced new legislation to help stabilize the price of feed grains which

are grown and marketed within Saskatchewan. This won't be easy to do but we think it is worth a try.

There are other problems of farming. One of the most difficult is how older farmers can pass along their farms to the next generation. We are all familiar with that problem. The average age of farmers is getting older and older. In the next ten years many, many farmers will wish to retire. The last 20 years have been tough years for farmers. In order to stay in farming they have had to get bigger and bigger. They have had to buy more land still more land. For many farmers their entire life savings are tied up in their farms. There is no pension. There is no money with which to retire. The money that they can retire on has got to come from the sale of their farms. They need cash. But who can afford to pay cash for four or five or six quarters of land? Certainly, not the sons of these farmers or any other young man in his twenties. The danger is that the older farmer will be forced to sell for cash and that the only person who will have the cash is a person who is already a large operator or a corporation farm company. In either case, the probable result is one less family farm.

We believe, Mr. Speaker, that this trend is bad for Saskatchewan. We believe that Saskatchewan will be a better place to live if we have the largest possible number of economically sound family farms.

Some Hon. Members: — Hear, hear!

Mr. Blakeney: — We reject the Task Force ideal of the big corporation farms, professionally managed and worked by hired labour. We favour smaller, family operated farms. We say they are equally good on economic grounds and far, far better on social grounds. We are, therefore, proposing legislation to establish the Land Bank Commission. The Hon. Mr. Messer will be outlining the proposal in detail. I want to talk about a few of its objects. Its objects will be to provide a market for land which retiring farmers want to sell, to provide a retiring income for retiring farmers, to allow young farmers to enter farming with a minimum of capital, to relieve farmers of the annual pressure of meeting capital payments for land purchases, and to reduce speculation in farm land.

We don't offer the Land Bank as a panacea for all the problems of farmers. It certainly is not. But we think it will play a useful role and perhaps a vital role in preserving just as many as possible of our family farms in Saskatchewan.

Some Hon. Members: — Hear, hear!

Mr. Blakeney: — We think the time has come to act. That was a promise which we made and a promise which will be kept.

We are aware that many of the problems of farmers lie within the legislative authority of the Federal Government and we will continue to press for action on that score. Mr. Speaker, we are not just going to shout at Ottawa. That is easy and it is cheap and it is relatively ineffective. We will try to propose reasonable alternatives to the Federal policy. And having put forward reasonable alternatives we will try to mobilize support for them. We will make common cause with the other

March 1, 1972

Prairie governments, with the farm organizations, to get, not headlines, not headlines about sham battles with Ottawa, but concrete results for farmers. And I am going to ask this House and the people of Saskatchewan to judge the results for themselves. The Provincial Liberals used the leather-lunged approach to Ottawa for seven years. They bellowed and they threatened and they hurled personal abuse at Mr. Trudeau and personal abuse at Mr. Lang. And what did they get, they got headlines, but the farmers of this Province found that headlines don't buy anything. They can't be cashed.

Now our approach is different. We took a firm stand on the proposed Grain Income Stabilization Bill, but we did more than protest. We put forward an alternative, an alternative containing certain principles. The Minister of Agriculture rallied support for those principles and he got support from the Government of Manitoba, the Government of Alberta and the Saskatchewan Wheat Pool and the Canadian Federation of Agriculture and the National Farmers Union.

Some Hon. Members: — Hear, hear!

Mr. Blakeley: — That firm and united stand coupled with the voice of the farmers expressed in the Assiniboia by-election turned back the Grain Income Stabilization Plan.

Some Hon. Members: — Hear, hear!

Mr. Blakeney: — We have taken a firm and principled stand for a two-price system for wheat. We have taken a firm and principled stand for other support policies. And what have been the results of this kind of responsible action? Perhaps we haven't got so many headlines, but the farmers have got cash, hard cash

Some Hon. Members: — Hear, hear!

Mr. Blakeney: — ...cash for hog producers, cash for grain producers, through the two-price system. These, Mr. Speaker, are results. And it is results which the farmers want. It is results which we hope to deliver to the people of Saskatchewan. This Government, Mr. Speaker, puts agriculture first. Not first in Press releases but first in results.

Some Hon. Members: — Hear, hear!

Mr. Blakeney: — Not first in rhetoric but first in programs and first in performance.

Some Hon. Members: — Hear, hear!

Mr. Blakeney: — Mr. Speaker, that is and will be our policy for farmers. Mr. Speaker, a few minutes ago I spoke about our Government's strategy of balanced development. Nowhere is the concept of balanced development more important than in the North. The northern environment can't take the abuse to which man has subjected the land and the water and the air, in the southern parts of this continent. The natural balance is

much more precarious. We, I think, have to abandon the notion that northern Saskatchewan or northern Canada is a wilderness storehouse to be cut and to be mined and to be conquered. If we try to conquer the North we shall find that we have destroyed it. And in our inventory of northern resources we must keep in mind the growing value of natural wilderness area, in a continent which is becoming ever more crowded. Above all, in our view, Mr. Speaker, the development of the North must be primarily for the benefit of the people who live there. Not to swell the profits of distant and anonymous corporations but to give benefits to the people who live in northern Saskatchewan

Some Hon. Members: — Hear, hear!

Mr. Blakeney: — We believe the people of the North should have a much greater voice in making the decisions which affect them. This new approach to northern development can't, we believe, be implemented by a dozen agencies all operating out of Regina or Prince Albert. We think it requires a coordinated effort using new methods and an on-the-ground approach. Therefore, Mr. Speaker, we propose to introduce legislation at this Session for Northern Development for providing most government services to northern residents. It will have special responsibility for developing a greater measure of self-government in the North. Its people will be located in the north, on the scene. We believe, Mr. Speaker, that through this Department we can come to grips with some of the pressing problems of the North. We believe, Mr. Speaker, that through this new organization we can start to give in a true sense, a New Deal for the people of the North.

Some Hon. Members: — Hear, hear!

Mr. Blakeney: — We will certainly analyse the growing tourist potential for the North. Dollar for dollar we believe the investment in the tourist industry will bring more benefits than any other type of northern investment. Furthermore, unlike giant pulp mills, development of the tourist industry will not destroy the traditional ways of making a living up there, will not destroy trapping, won't destroy fishing, won't destroy small sawmill operations. Tourism is a development which if properly handled can flourish side by side with the way of life of people who live in northern Saskatchewan. Mr. Speaker, we look forward to significant development of our tourist industry, not only in the North but through the whole province.

Special promotions are planned in 1973 to honour the 100th anniversary of the Royal Canadian Mounted Police. The origins of this famous force are rooted in the West, particularly in Saskatchewan. We invite all Canada, indeed all North America to join us in this celebration. Mr. Speaker, the Party on this side promised to give a new direction, and a new development to northern Saskatchewan and to its tourist potential. At this Session we will take the first long steps to keeping that promise.

Some Hon. Members: — Hear, hear!

Mr. Blakeney: — Mr. Speaker, yesterday we heard quite a bit about the

pulp mill at Athabasca. And I want to say a bit about that so-called pulp mill project. I want to report to the House on the arrangements which provide for the winding up of the proposed Athabasca pulp mill project. Members opposite have suggested in the way we dealt with these negotiations, and in the Choiceland negotiations, that we oppose resource development. Mr. Speaker, there can't be one shred of doubt in the minds of any Member of this House where we stand on the matter of resource development. We made this perfectly clear in the campaign, in policy statements and more particularly in the last session of this House. I stood here just about one year ago, I was on the other side then, and laid out the criteria which we would apply, the criteria which we would apply to the Athabasca deal or any other similar pulp deal. Our policy is on the record and we stand by it.

Let me recall just two of those criteria. I said first of all that the deal had to be financially prudent and I said secondly that it must protect our forest and our water and our air against pollution. Do these criteria or any of the others which I outlined last year mean that we stand opposed to the development of our forest resources? Of course not. Do they mean that we close the door to outside capital? Of course not. They are concerned with how we develop our resources, and for those who benefit. They are concerned with long-term costs and long-term benefits. We believe that our criteria are reasonable. I think the people of this Province who heard us outline them at every whistle stop in Saskatchewan agreed with us last June.

Some Hon. Members: — Hear, hear!

Mr. Blakeney: — Let me review in detail, in the light of just two criteria, this pulp mill deal. Was it financially prudent? Before I assumed office on the basis of the meagre information disclosed by the former Government, I said it was not. Now, that I have had the full opportunity to look at all the material, I am even more convinced that this deal was financially imprudent, very imprudent from the point of view of the people of Saskatchewan.

Some Hon. Members: — Hear, hear!

Mr. Blakeney: — The direct cost of this mill, excluding working capital would have been about \$160 million. The whole project would have totalled about \$170 or \$180 million. The province would have been required to guarantee unconditionally \$107 million in bonds and in addition the province would have been required to invest or to guarantee directly or indirectly another \$42 million. This includes such things as the railway branch line, power, roads and other services. That is nearly \$150 million at risk by the people of Saskatchewan to build and service a \$170 or \$180 million project. It is still difficult to determine exactly the net risk that the developers — Parsons and Whittemore — would take but at the most generous estimate it would not exceed \$30 million. \$150 million by the province, \$30 million by the developer.

What about the equity? Parsons and Whittemore would get 70 per cent of the equity, the Province of Saskatchewan 30 per cent of the equity. If the mill were to fail, for whatever reason, the province would lose \$150 million, the developer

possibly \$30 million. In all likelihood much less than \$30 million. And the possibility of financial failure is a very real one. I have been advised by people who claim to know that it is entirely possible that not one pulp mill in Canada will make a profit in 1972. We can't be confident that the present depression in the pulp industry, and certainly that's what it is, will not be one of long duration, at least at some level. That mill could easily have failed. It would be a marginal mill at best. And if it failed our loss would be \$150 million. If it succeeded the profits would be — Parsons and Whittemore 70 per cent, the Government of Saskatchewan 30 per cent. Mr. Speaker, when I call that financially imprudent, I am using very moderate language. Now my friend opposite will say, "Oh, but you are counting all of the costs, you are not giving us the whole picture." He will say, "You've got to take risks if you want development." I agree with him. But if the people of Saskatchewan are going to take the major share of the risk, isn't it only fair and just that the people of Saskatchewan get the major share of the profits?

Some Hon. Members: — Hear, hear!

Mr. Blakeney: — But, I am sure that he would find that sinful. For the public to reap profits from their own resources, that is not right. "But, oh," he will say, "you haven't measured all the benefits. What about the jobs to be created?"

That is an important question, because I will concede with anybody in this Province that we certainly need jobs. So let's look at the jobs. The Prince Albert pulp mill employs in the mill and in the forests about 800 men, that is before their last lay-offs. One might expect the much larger Athabasca mill to employ more. But besides being bigger, it would have employed much more sophisticated technology. Consultants to the former Government estimated a work force of about the same size as Prince Albert, 800. \$150 million risk to produce 800 jobs. That is nearly \$2,000,000 a job. Now that is not financially prudent.

The Member for Athabasca (Mr. Guy) is once more telling us how this mill would have created so many jobs for the people of the North, particularly the Indian and the Métis people of the North. Mr. Speaker, don't believe it. How many Indian and Métis people are working for the Prince Albert mill? After six years of operation, how many? Is it 400, half the work force? Or 300 or 200 or 100? In the mill and in the woods at Prince Albert there are no more than 75 or 80 Indian and Métis people employed. Less than 10 per cent of the work force. \$150 million to produce new jobs for Indian and Métis people. Hardly a prudent risk, Mr. Speaker. No, Mr. Speaker no matter how thin you slice the costs and how thick you slice the benefits, it would have been financially imprudent for this Government to continue with the Athabasca project.

Some Hon. Members: — Hear, hear!

Mr. Blakeney: — But let me turn to my second criterion, protection against pollution, and this the Parsons and Whittemore contract certainly did not do. Consider this. Pulp mills are notorious polluters. The Hon. Jack Davis is quoted as saying that half the water pollution in Canada is caused by pulp mills. Control

March 1, 1972

of pulp mill pollution poses some of the most serious industrial pollution questions both public and industrial. The Athabasca mill would have been situated on the Beaver River, part of a very small drainage system which drains ultimately into the Churchill River. During the winter months the volume of the effluent from the mill would have been just about equal to the flow of the water in the river. Just picture that. Down stream from the mill — half water and half malodorous, black, chemical pulp mill waste. Provincial and federal pulp experts, particularly pollution experts said that at least four major studies would have been necessary before we could say whether or not we could control that pollution.

Yet the former Government, the remnants of which sit on the front bench, Mr. Speaker, the former Government charged ahead without getting those four reports or indeed without getting any of the reports. It was in such haste that it shoved aside its own consultants, its own officials, it ignored serious warnings from the Federal Government and it signed on the dotted line. The studies hadn't been done. Long before the necessary studies could have been done the mill would have been committed and irrevocable.

Now just how serious that would have been is revealed by a recent newspaper report. I am referring to a report in The Star Phoenix of February 19, 1972, that's just 10 days ago. Let me read just a portion of it. Talking about this same project:

The Beaver River is not large enough to assimilate the effluent from a major pulp mill, a Federal Environmental official Friday told delegates attending the Canadian Society of Wildlife and Fishery Biologists, meeting here. K. P. Lucas, assistant deputy minister, with the Federal Environment Department, said the river, which eventually discharges into the Churchill River system, would not have been large enough to absorb the pollution from a proposed 1,400 ton a day kraft pulp mill. 'There was not a chance that the federal guide lines would have given proper protection to the Beaver,' he said.

Now, Mr. Speaker, under these circumstances it is entirely possible that if this deal had been allowed to continue in the way that the Liberal Government bound us to do by agreements, the people of Saskatchewan would have been faced with two options, almost equally bad. 1. A \$180 million mill and a railway line in a town site unable to operate because of pollution, empty and silent, or 2. A continuing public subsidy of an elaborate and expensive effluent treatment operation as the price of keeping that \$150 million mill in operation. This is very likely the result if we had gone forward.

Mr. Speaker, I charge the former Government with shameful irresponsibility.

Some Hon. Members: — Hear, hear!

Mr. Blakeney: — I charge them with that irresponsibility for attempting to commit the people of Saskatchewan in a deal with so many pollution uncertainties. I charge them with irresponsibility

because they ignored their own consultants, they ignored their own staff, they ignored Federal advisors. Mr. Speaker, we could not proceed with that deal. In discharge of our clear duty we had to reject that pulp mill and we did.

Some Hon. Members: — Hear, hear!

Mr. Blakeney: — Now, let me emphasize that we didn't take this action lightly. We are well aware that only the most persuasive reasons can justify the departure from an agreement legally executed by the Government. Despite the fact that we warned both Parsons and Whittemore and the Government of the day that our Government would retain its freedom of action, we would not have taken the action of department from signed agreements if any other satisfactory solution had been open to us. We believe the reasons for doing so are most persuasive and we believe we have the support of the great majority of the people of Saskatchewan in calling a halt to that project.

Some Hon. Members: — Hear, hear!

Mr. Blakeney: — Now this brings me to the matter of compensation and let me set out the facts as clearly as I can. When we took office some expenses were clearly committed, and they were committed to people outside the Parsons and Whittemore organization. \$35 million had been borrowed — had been borrowed at long-term rates of interest of 8¾ per cent and it was invested at short-term rates of interest of about six per cent. That will have to be repaid. Until it is repaid, at the earliest possible date, this June, we shall lose between two and three per cent on the money for one year. That is nearly \$1 million in interest alone.

Other expenses were incurred to brokers and lawyers and printers and trust companies, and all of these including the interest added up to about \$1.7 million. This had to be paid regardless of whether or not we paid one dollar to the Parsons and Whittemore organization. As far as Parsons and Whittemore were concerned, they satisfied us that they had entered into contractual arrangements with other people to the tune of about \$25 million, in furtherance of the proposal to build a pulp mill.

In addition, they had spent very large sums of money in direct expenses and they had built up an organization which had to be dismantled. They had a legally valid claim in contract for several, perhaps many, millions of dollars. And after considering all the possible alternatives open to the Government, we agreed to a settlement with Parsons and Whittemore, involving payment by the Government of Saskatchewan to \$4.4 million.

Now \$4.4 million is a lot of money. It is entirely likely that we could have saved all of that money, or most of that money, except for the one astounding act by the Liberal Government in June of 1971. Let me tell you again what I found when we took office. Among the dozens of agreements signed between the former Government and Parsons and Whittemore, I found one dated June 14, 1971.

Now I'll have to set the scene for the significance of this agreement but I want you to keep that date in mind, June 14,

March 1, 1972

1971, nine days before the election. Among the basic agreements in the Athabasca deal is one called the Infrastructure Agreement. It contains a number of provisions about matters to be provided for or resolved in order to make the mill operate. It dealt with the railway line, it dealt with the access to the forest and so on.

Let me speak of two aspects of that agreement. One had reference to cutting rights — rights to cut timber on the Federal Cold Lake Air Weapons range. The other had to do with arrangements made to construct a railway branch line between the mill site and the Canadian Pacific Railway. Specifically, Mr. Speaker, the Infrastructure Agreement provided that if these matters were not satisfactorily resolved, if either party was not satisfied with the arrangements, then either party, that's Parsons and Whittemore or the Government of Saskatchewan, could call off the whole pulp mill deal. Here was an opting out clause, which became operative if either party was not satisfied with the cutting rights arrangements or with the arrangements of the railway branch line.

Now what was the situation on June 14? The cutting rights issue on the bombing range was not resolved. And so far as I am aware, it is still not resolved. But the situation with respect to the railroad was even more striking. There was an agreement between the parties and the CPR to build a railroad, but that agreement was void, Mr. Speaker, not operative, useless, not binding on the CPR or any other party, unless legislation was passed through Parliament by June 30th. And on June 14th it was virtually certain that the legislation would not be passed, indeed, could not be passed. So on June 14th it was virtually certain that on June 30th the Government of Saskatchewan would have an option to get out of the pulp mill deal without payment to Parsons and Whittemore.

Some Hon. Members: — Hear, hear!

Mr. Blakeney: — Now, Mr. Speaker, I think we made reasonably clear in the election campaign that we would get out of the deal. If we could have done anything else to make it clear we should have done so. And yet, even though this was a real issue during the campaign — and who can deny it, certainly not the Liberal Party who had television show after television show defending the deal — this was a key issue in the campaign. We had made our differences with that party clear — and yet nine days before the vote, they precluded the right of the Government of Saskatchewan to opt out of that deal.

Some Hon. Members: — Hear, hear!

Mr. Blakeney: — Shortly put, Mr. Speaker, the facts are these. The Liberal Government knew that on June 30th there would be no railway agreement. The Liberals knew that if there was no railway agreement the Government of Saskatchewan could withdraw from the Parsons and Whittemore deal. They knew, or suspected, that they were losing the election. In the face of all these facts, nine days before the election, they signed an agreement that seems to say that the Government of Saskatchewan was satisfied with the railway agreements which would be non-existent in another 15 days — agreements which would have required the CPR to build the line but on July 1st would no longer bind the CPR.

Now, Mr. Speaker, lest there be any doubts about what these agreements say these agreements have been tabled in this Legislature, the amending agreement No. 1 and the railway agreement. These agreements make clear that if that agreement had not been signed on June 14th by the Provincial Treasurer and the Member for Prince Albert West (Mr. Steuart), nine days before polling day, the people of Saskatchewan would very probably have saved over \$4 million.

Some Hon. Members: — Hear, hear!

Mr. Blakeney: — Now, if there is any adequate explanation for this conduct I haven't heard it. And, if the Member for Prince Albert West, the Leader of the Opposition, decides to enter this debate I invite him, on radio, to tell the people of Saskatchewan just what his reasons were for signing that agreement.

Some Hon. Members: — Hear, hear!

Mr. Blakeney: — I want the people of Saskatchewan to judge that conduct. I want them to know that the payment of over \$4 million to Parsons and Whittemore is a direct result of the deliberate and calculated actions on June 14th, nine days before the election, of the Party which sits on your left, Mr. Speaker.

Some Hon. Members: — Hear, hear!

Mr. Blakeney: — They, and they alone, must shoulder the responsibility.

Mr. Speaker, I would like to report to the House and to the people of Saskatchewan on other aspects of our program; our program for working people, our program for co-operatives.

We promised in our 1971 election program to do something for working people, we promised to repeal Bill 2. That we have done. We promised to increase the minimum wage, that we have done. We promised to overhaul The Workmen's Compensation Act. We will be doing that.

I have long felt that the Workmen's Compensation Act has become outmoded and that a major overhaul was needed. Some Members may recall a debate a couple of sessions ago, when this matter arose, and Members from both sides of the House stood in their places and outlined in no uncertain terms what they thought was wrong with the Workmen's Compensation Act and its administration.

Soon after we assumed office the Minister of Labour appointed a Task Force to review the whole Act. The job of review is by no means complete. But, we do have some interim recommendations and we propose to act.

Our legislation, will among other things, increase the maximum salary on which contributions are to be made; it will deal with the level of existing pensions; it will deal with other changes necessary in the Act. The Minister of Labour (Mr. Snyder) will be outlining these changes to the House at the appropriate time.

We look upon this as a first step in revamping and

March 1, 1972

improving the entire Workmen's Compensation scheme. We think it is long overdue. And when it is complete, it will clean up yet another area of neglect of the rights of working people by the previous Government.

Some Hon. Members: — Hear, hear!

Mr. Blakeney: — Mr. Speaker, we pledged ourselves to act and we will act.

Since we met here last summer, there have been two provincial by-elections. They have been brought into this debate by the Member for Morse (Mr. Wiebe). The by-elections were in the constituencies of Morse and Souris-Estevan. The new Member for Morse retained the seat formerly held by the late Mr. Thatcher, my colleague the Minister of Industry and Commerce (Mr. K. Thorson) retained Souris-Estevan for the New Democratic Party. So we see there is no change in the total standings. But, Mr. Speaker, let's take a little deeper look at those by-elections, fought by my friends opposite, on the grounds that the Liberals should be elected to strengthen the Opposition. Well, I am certainly not unsympathetic with that election plea. After hearing from the Member for Athabasca (Mr. Guy), I am sure that everyone would agree that they need somebody over there, just anybody.

Some Hon. Members: — Hear, hear!

Mr. Blakeney: — But what happened in those by-elections? The NDP improved its position in Morse by cutting the Liberal margin roughly in half, from 719 to 376 and in Souris-Estevan we increased our share of the popular vote from 50.8 per cent to 54.4 per cent. An increase of 3.6 per cent.

Mr. Speaker, if we were to apply that shift in popular support, 3.6 per cent, to the result of the general election in June, the Liberal caucus would be able to meet in the Whips office, all sitting down.

Some Hon. Members: — Hear, hear!

Mr. Blakeney: — The present Member for Athabasca would not be sitting in the House, nor would the Member for Cannington (Mr. Weatherald). The present Member for Lumsden (Mr. Lane) would be able to recuperate from his unfortunate accident in more comfortable surroundings.

Some Hon. Members: — Hear, hear!

Mr. Blakeney: — The House would not be graced with the presence of Members from Milestone (Mr. MacDonald), or Moose Jaw North (Mr. MacDonald), or Rosetown (Mr. Loken), or Rosthern (Mr. Boldt), or Wilkie (Mr. McIsaac).

Some Hon. Members: — Hear, hear!

Mr. Blakeney: — Mr. Speaker, if we were to project the results of December across the Province, the Opposition in this House would

not be 14 or 15 (if we count the temporary presence of the Member from Athabasca (Mr. Guy).

Some Hon. Members: — Hear, hear!

Mr. Blakeney: — No, Mr. Speaker, it would not be 14 but it would be five — all in the front row, I trust. But, Mr. Speaker, I have no desire to decimate still further the ranks of the Opposition, but I commend to Members opposite some sombre thoughts as to why they have fallen so low. I am told that there are many reasons. I am told that there are 171 reasons.

Some Hon. Members: — Hear, hear!

Mr. Blakeney: — Mr. Speaker, there was another by-election last Fall in the Federal riding of Assiniboia. Word was passed that the Provincial Liberal Party was once again speaking to the Federal Liberal Party and that the campaign was going all-out.

The Hon. Otto Lang became an instant hero and this was quite a change. The Hon. Member for Prince Albert West (Mr. Steuart) got along fine with the Hon. Otto Lang and they stormed the countryside in support of the Grains Income Stabilization Plan. Mr. Speaker, the storming was not effective. The farmers and the townspeople of Assiniboia weren't buying, Mr. Speaker. They weren't buying. Nor will the people of Saskatoon-Humboldt be buying, Mr. Speaker, later this year.

Some Hon. Members: — Hear, hear!

Mr. Blakeney: — They won't be buying, they will be sending the Minister of Justice back to law school.

Mr. Speaker, in the Speech from the Throne this Government states its belief that co-operatives and credit unions have an important part to play in the life of this Province. It is a long time since that idea appeared in a Throne speech. In the seven lean years, seven gaunt years, these Saskatchewan-based organizations got scant attention from the Members opposite. If the choice was between a giant bank controlled in Eastern Canada or a local credit union, they chose the bank. They felt that the question was somehow solved if we had a Saskatchewan businessman or a Saskatchewan lawyer as one of the directors in the bank, one of 35 or 45 or 55 directors.

We, on this side of the House, believe that Saskatchewan people should control their own financial affairs and we believe, wherever possible, our local credit unions should be used and fostered and strengthened. We believe, too, that co-ops are an essential and unique part of Saskatchewan, from the giant agricultural producer co-ops, like the Wheat Pool, to the little co-op hall. They are a way of life. They are a way that Saskatchewan people have developed to control their own destiny. We believe that these Saskatchewan organizations deserve an even break from their Government and, Mr. Speaker, we intend to see that they get it.

Some Hon. Members: — Hear, hear!

Mr. Blakeney: — Let me review our stand on

March 1, 1972

co-op taxation. It is in sharp contrast to the stand of Members opposite, particularly the stand of the Member for Prince Albert West (Mr. Steuart).

You will recall, Mr. Speaker, more than a year ago, Mr. Benson, the then Minister of Finance, put out a White Paper on taxation. It proposed new ways to tax businesses and to tax individuals. And it certainly proposed a new way to tax co-ops. A way which would have taxed co-ops as if they were private companies organized for profit. The White Paper not only proposed new ways to tax co-ops, but also threatened higher taxes for the oil industry. What did Members opposite do when they were the Government — did they come to the defence of the co-op movement? They did not. They remained silent on that issue. Instead they leaped to the defence of the international oil companies; these oil companies which, Mr. Speaker, by any standard, paid far, far too little in tax.

Let me tell you something about these international oil companies that the Members opposite rushed to the defence of, to protect them from oppressive taxation. We are told by the financial press and by the Liberal Party that the big companies pay their fair share of tax and then some. Let me quote the Financial Times of Canada, published in Toronto. I can assure you it is not a New Democratic newspaper. In June 1971 it published tables showing just how much of the book profits some companies had to count to pay tax on. Now, Mr. Speaker, I am not talking of what percentage of tax they pay, I am talking about what percentage of their real profits, their book profits, they had to count on which they had to pay any tax. I am talking about how much they were allowed to take off their real book profits by capital cost allowance depreciation, depletion allowance and all the other accounting gimmicks.

Well how do they get on? The retailers don't get on too well. They have to pay taxes on 90 per cent of their book profits. The manufacturing companies do a little better. They are taxed on 63 per cent of their book profits. But how about the oil companies? Do they pay tax on 63 per cent of their book profits, or 30 per cent, or 20 per cent, or 10 per cent? No, the oil companies pay taxes on 5.7 per cent of their book profits.

Now even if they paid a tax rate of 50 per cent, they still paid less than \$3 of every \$100 in tax. If you have a lad working for the minimum wage — and I have a lad who is 16 years old and he has his first job and probably working for the minimum wage — he will be paying a greater percentage of his earnings in income tax than the major oil companies pay of theirs.

You remember the fuss recently about the Home Oil Company in Calgary. Remember Mr. R. A. Brown and the Home Oil Company wanted to sell to an American company. Should he get \$10 million for this company or \$15 million? The Calgary company was started in the 1940s. Do you know how much corporation tax that company has paid while it started from scratch and is now worth \$10 million or \$15 million? Not one dollar! Not one dime! Now these are not my figures. These are figures compiled, first as I recall, by the Hon. Eric Kierans. And whatever Eric Kierans is, ex-Liberal Cabinet Minister, ex-president of the Montreal Stock Exchange, he is not a socialist. But he recognizes rampant favouritism when he sees it. He is one who believes that we should not be giving mammoth tax concessions

to international corporations to come and exploit our oil resources. He is one who believes that we should help our home-grown industries, and our co-ops are some of these. Compared to Members opposite, Eric Kierans is a rabid left-winger.

When we came into office at the 1st of July, Mr. Speaker, Mr. Benson had already introduced a bill in Parliament to tax co-operatives and to tax them heavily. There was no protest from Members opposite. The Provincial Treasurer was silent. Almost our first act was to go to the Finance Minister's Conference at Ottawa on July 12th and record our strong objections to that treatment. And we kept recording our objections. At the Finance Minister's Conference in July, at the Finance Minister's Conference in November, at the Premiers' and Prime Minister's Conference on November 15th.

Mr. Speaker, we were joined on these later occasions in our protest. We were joined by the Government of Quebec, by the Government of New Brunswick, by the Government of Prince Edward Island, by the Government of Manitoba. Liberal Governments in Quebec and Prince Edward island had something to say for co-ops. The Tory Government in New Brunswick had something to say for co-ops. New Democratic Governments in Manitoba and Saskatchewan had something to say about co-ops, but not the Saskatchewan Liberals.

The Provincial Treasurer in that Government, now the Leader of the Opposition (Mr. Steuart) had not one word to say when he was in office in defence of our co-ops.

Eventually Mr. Benson relented and amendments were introduced which removed the threat to our co-ops. Mr. Speaker, we are proud of the part our Government played in protecting our local businessmen. We are proud that Saskatchewan, Canada's premier co-operative province, finally spoke out for co-ops.

Some Hon. Members: — Hear, hear!

Mr. Blakeney: — Mr. Speaker, I want to assure this House that this Government believes in co-ops, believes that they are a good way for our people to control their own destiny.

As the Throne Speech makes clear, while we are in office the co-operative movement will receive fair treatment from the Government of Saskatchewan.

Mr. Speaker, when the Chief Electoral Officer appointed by the Party opposite vacated his office a few months ago we discovered a peculiar thing. There was virtually no record of any correspondence in that office after 1964. The official records were there. His expense accounts were there, but apparently only half a dozen people wrote any letters to him in seven years. So we didn't find much by way of correspondence. In the bottom drawer of an old filing cabinet we did find a few odds and ends. We found a couple of Liberal Party membership lists, and we found forms from Liberal constituency associations appointing returning officers. And we found — and this is the interesting bit, and I know that this will be appreciated by the Member for Lakeview (Mr. McPherson) — some of the documents and summary sheets which were worked on in the gerrymander of 1970.

March 1, 1972

Mr. Speaker, these papers show that the Party opposite did everything in its power to thwart democratic representation in this House by distorting the electoral map. They show that the Liberal Government of that day, by twisting the boundaries and by creating pocket boroughs in Liberal territory, calculated that they could win at least 40 seats without increasing their minority popular vote.

Fortunately, Mr. Speaker, they left out one thing in their calculations, the people of Saskatchewan.

Some Hon. Members: — Hear, hear!

Mr. Blakeney: — Their cynical plans were wrecked, Mr. Speaker, by an angry population who were repelled, repelled, Mr. Speaker, by this blatant disregard for the principle of representation by population.

Some Hon. Members: — Hear, hear!

Mr. Blakeney: — Mr. Speaker, those of us in Opposition had year after year urged that the government create an electoral boundaries commission. Two years ago when they brought in this redistribution we pressed our appeal. The appeal was rejected, scornfully rejected, by the Member for Prince Albert West (Mr. Steuart) and the Member for Regina Lakeview (Mr. McPherson), and the Member for Athabasca (Mr. Guy). Not on principle, Mr. Speaker, not on any defensible ground — and I invite anyone in this House to reread that debate. The only grounds which were offered was that they proposed to use their power to gain every crumb of political advantage that they could scrape up no matter how low they had to stoop to do it.

As I said, they were thwarted in their attempt to cling to power. But we have some legacies of that gerrymander in the House today, Mr. Speaker, some people who wouldn't be here if there hadn't been that gerrymander. The Member for Prince Albert West (Mr. Steuart) is one of them; the Member for Moose Jaw North (Mr. MacDonald) is another; one of the Member for Regina Albert Park (Mr. MacLeod) and Regina Whitmore (Mr. Grant) and you take your pick, Mr. Speaker.

I wonder if they will again oppose the creation of an independent constituency boundaries commission. Perhaps they will, Mr. Speaker, knowing that any fair redistribution threatens the political careers of some of their party stalwarts. I can assure you of one thing, Mr. Speaker, the party on this side fought for electoral reform when we were in Opposition and we intend to fight for it when we are in Government, and we intend to fulfil that promise.

Some Hon. Members: — Hear, hear!

Mr. Blakeney: — Mr. Speaker, I note that I am getting some belated applause from Members opposite. There will, Mr. Speaker, be an independent constituency boundaries commission this year. We intend to make sure, Mr. Speaker, that Saskatchewan has had its last political gerrymander.

Mr. Speaker, the Speech from the Throne states clearly the

desire of this Government to expand and improve our Automobile Accident Insurance Plan. In the mid-1940s the Automobile Accident Insurance Plan was launched by an earlier CCF Government. It was then the world's most advanced plan. Characteristically it was introduced under a shower of abuse from the Liberal Opposition. "The greatest hoax ever perpetrated on the people of Saskatchewan," is one of the more moderate comments. But the plan prospered, Mr. Speaker. The idea of compensation without fault, an essential part of the Saskatchewan plan, was gradually accepted. The idea that a person who was injured in an automobile accident should be compensated out of a common fund, and not have to spend years in costly and exhausting lawsuits, was accepted by the public. Mr. Speaker, it was a good thing that it was accepted because it was only the fear of public wrath that kept the previous Government from selling out the auto plan to its eastern insurance paymasters.

Some Hon. Members: — Hear, hear!

Mr. Blakeney: — Mr. Speaker, I don't believe the Leader of the Opposition will deny that his Government had active discussions with the All Canada Insurance Federation — that is the name of the trade organization for private auto insurers — with a view to selling out the Saskatchewan plan.

Right here, Mr. Speaker, I want to compliment the Member for Rosthern (Mr. Boldt) because I don't think that he ever went along with those plans. Fortunately, Mr. Speaker, the survey taken by the Members opposite, to test public reaction to the proposed sell-out, showed that the Saskatchewan public liked the auto insurance plan. So that the then Deputy Premier and the Member for Regina Whitmore Park (Mr. Grant), and others who were anxious to sell out the auto plan didn't dare to go ahead with their proposals as much as they would have liked to.

But while they didn't dare sell out the auto plan they did the next best thing. They made no improvements in the plan in seven years. Between 1944 and 1964 there had been many new improvements, many coverages added. I am free to admit that more could have been done. But between 1964 and 1971 there were virtually no improvements. Clearly the idea was to allow the auto plan to wither until it was rejected by the public. That plan failed!

In 1944 Saskatchewan created the world's best auto insurance plan. We intend to see that very soon our insurance plan is once again the best automobile insurance plan in the world.

Some Hon. Members: — Hear, hear!

Mr. Blakeney: — This year we will improve benefits, provide more money to the totally disabled, more money for widows, more money for dependent children. The Attorney General (Mr. Romanow) will outline these plans fully at the appropriate time.

Let me say this, Mr. Speaker, the insurance plan will be protected. It will be improved. I can give the people of Saskatchewan full assurance that the money that they pay in their automobile insurance premiums will go either to the victims of auto accidents or will pay salaries and expenses right here in Saskatchewan and will not go to fatten the profits and the payrolls of auto insurance companies in Toronto and New York.

Some Hon. Members: — Hear, hear!

Mr. Blakeney: — Mr. Speaker, we believe that the Saskatchewan people like that insurance plan. We believe they want to keep it and we intend to see that they get what they want.

Mr. Speaker, this Session will see major new programs in two other areas — Consumer Protection and Human rights. We, on this side, believe that the individual in today's society is engaged in a pretty unequal contest, whether he is matching wits against a great corporation or a high-powered salesman, or indeed, a big government. Here they also face a bewildering array of government programs, and I know that anyone even if he is pretty well educated is frequently confused as to what government agency to go to and what government program he can take advantage of.

We believe that more needs to be done to protect consumers. We believe more needs to be done to open up government to make it available for the citizen. We think that more needs to be done to redress the wrongs done to individuals who sometimes are ignored by bureaucratic action, public and private.

May I say that the previous government, under the then Attorney General, the Hon. D. Heald, made an excellent beginning in several areas of consumer protection. I said that when he was Attorney General and I am pleased to say it now. We intend to extend and improve that beginning. In doing so we will fulfil several of our election promises. The entire area of consumer protection will be given new impetus, new impetus by the creation of a Department of Consumer Affairs. There will be specific legislation to deal with pyramid selling and all that means — and it has been a great, great hardship on many small retailers. There will be legislation to protect persons from damage from undisclosed personal information in the secret files of credit reporting agencies. Legislation to improve credit transactions. My colleague, the Attorney General (Mr. Romanow), will say more about these bills. We will establish a Human Rights Commission as we promised. We will set up the office of Ombudsman, who will be responsible not to Cabinet, but to this Legislature as we promised. We will make it easier for people to get answers to their questions about government programs and services, or to make the right contact with a person in the government.

People will be able to call toll-free from any part of the province to a central government information referral centre. This centre or government hot-line, if you will, will be staffed by persons specifically trained to give information. They won't give all the answers but for the most part they will confine themselves to telling the person what official they should talk to, but I hope that they will be trained to steer inquirers to the particular agency able to deal with the specific problem. That, too, Mr. Speaker, will fulfil an election promise.

We intend to go beyond those measures of protection. Important as they are, they will be a real help only to people who are part of the mainstream of our society. We believe that we must find some new ways to help some people who are bypassed by that mainstream, bypassed because of chronic poverty or cultural factors or historic factors. These problems aren't easy. We propose to tackle these problems of self development in several

ways, by improving the field services of government departments, by beefing up the Department of Co-ops to see that it can do something with disadvantaged groups, by creating a new Human Resources Agency to bridge the gap between the special needs of these disadvantaged groups and present government services.

In the process we propose to liquidate the existing Indian and Métis Department, not because we have anything against the Indian and Métis people, but because we believe that this Department has unwanted implications of segregation which are bitterly resented by many of our native people. This too, Mr. Speaker, will fulfil an election promise.

Mr. Speaker, I could go on and discuss our program for the environment, our program for education, our program for health, there will be opportunities as the bills come in. I think, Mr. Speaker, there is no doubt on any fair reading of this Throne Speech that this Throne Speech and the program which it outlines does indeed offer a new deal. It offers a new deal for agriculture, a constructive deal after seven years of leather-lunged failure. A new deal for development after seven years of sound and fury and failure. A new deal for the old, a new deal for working people, a new deal for students, a new deal for co-operatives, a new deal for consumers.

This Speech opens up new vistas for Saskatchewan. I should like to think that this is the first step along the way to building a Saskatchewan where all of us could work together, work together to build a better province in a better country, work together to build a better country in a better world. I believe that this is the path on which we are going. I believe this is the way in which we have set our course. I invite all Members of this House to join with us along that course. I invite them to support this Throne Speech which offers a really new deal for the people of Saskatchewan. I will support the motion.

Some Hon. Members: — Hear, hear!

Mr. D. Boldt (Rosthern): — Mr. Speaker, I first want to congratulate the Member for Morse (Mr. Wiebe) in taking his seat in this House for winning the by-election. I am not going to congratulate the Member for Souris-Estevan (Mr. Thorson), I don't believe in being a hypocrite. I don't like to see him in the House. I wished Mr. MacDougall had taken his place. I am not going to congratulate the mover and the seconder of the Throne Speech Debate, because all they were discussing was Federal policies...

Some Hon. Members: — Hear, hear!

Mr. Boldt: — ...not Provincial issues. I want to congratulate the Member for Athabasca (Mr. Guy) for really stirring up the Premier yesterday. He really got the Premier stirred up and for the benefit of the people sitting in the galleries I want to tell them that I have never seen a more acrobatic performance from any Member in this House than that of the Premier. If you closed your eyes, you know sometimes you wouldn't recognize which end he had up. Almost like Flip Wilson. I should like to tell Allan he is really too old to be a hippy and too young to be a crazy old man.

March 1, 1972

Mr. Blakeney: — You ought to know!

Mr. Boldt: — Today he talked about the firings, he talked about the firings of which this Government is guilty. I am not going to criticize this Government for firing some individuals, if there are 31, or 61 or 101. The fact remains that the Premier didn't tell the truth to the people of Saskatchewan when he said there would not be any firings when they were elected last year.

Some Hon. Members: — Hear, hear!

Mr. Boldt: — Let me point out to the Premier an editorial from the Star-Phoenix dated January 21, 1972, which points this out very vividly. I want to read:

As far as is known the legislation inspired by the Socialist Government of the pre-Thatcher days is still on the books. Today it is honoured more often in the breach than in the observance by the new NDP Government under the leadership of Premier Allan Blakeney, a Rhodes Scholar.

The editorial goes on:

It is still the old story, to the victors the spoils. Strange how once in power the NDP Government acts like old party-line governments only more so. Indeed the older parties in power gave up the practice because their own party supporters objected. The present Federal Liberal Government notably has given posts to former Saskatchewan CCF civil servants, not on the basis of political affiliation and practice but on the basis of ability on the job. Surely it is time for Messrs. Blakeney and company to end their purge.

Yesterday the Premier stated in this House, and the statement appeared in the Leader-Post today, and I quote from it:

Not one single person used their right to appeal.

It is interesting to note that the Premier once again is not aware of what is taking place in the Departments or agencies for which he is responsible. It is my understanding that the Public Service and the classified service and a government agency and an order-in-council position have appealed in regard to their dismissals for various reasons. It is also my understanding that settlement has been reached out of court by at least one civil servant who was employed in an agency directly under Mr. Blakeney. Also the Hon. Premier has again purged the civil servants when he stated that 31 persons were fired from the Civil Service, one of whom he stated was a drunk. Why would he state that? Mr. Speaker, until the illustrious do-gooder Premier states who that one drunk is all persons who have been fired when being interviewed for future employment will be asked the question, "Are you the drunk that Mr. Blakeney fired."

Surely, Mr. Speaker, today we hear the Premier talk about the Throne Speech and what he is going to do for Saskatchewan. What does he say? We believe, I believe and we hope. Question number 1, we hope to do this, we hope to do that. He didn't say, we will do this, we will do that.

Let me say a word about the accusation about automobile insurance that we the Liberals were going to sell the Saskatchewan Automobile Insurance Company. Surely, I said before in this House that when we formed the Government there were a good number of companies wanting to buy out the Automobile Accident Insurance. They phoned us, they wanted interviews, and it was only courteous on the part of the former Premier to invite them to come. Why doesn't Mr. Blakeney go and ask these insurance companies what answer they got from Mr. Thatcher? Why doesn't he do that? There is nothing in the records and no insurance company will tell Mr. Blakeney or anybody in Saskatchewan that the former Premier and the Government were willing to sell the Automobile Accident Insurance. Not one! What did we do in 1964 when we took office when the fund was just about bankrupt? When we left the Government in 1971 there were \$10 million in reserves, and there was no reason for the Minister of Industry to raise the license fee to clear up all the wrecks in the Province, there is lots of money in SGIO.

Some Hon. Members: — Hear, hear!

Mr. Boldt: — As a matter of fact, the Government of the day in their election campaign said, through the Member from Regina North East (Mr. Smishek), "When we form the Government we will reduce the premiums by 25 per cent." They have gone up! What did he say to the young people? From the young people in Regina, he said, he received hundreds and hundreds of letters from those under 25 that they were discriminated against by the Liberal Government because they had to pay a \$7 operator's licence while those over 25 had to pay \$5. Why didn't they reduce that to \$5?

I know exactly why you are giving the benefits to those that are injured, to those that are involved in an accident. I agree 100 per cent with it. I am not opposed to it, but one of the reasons they are doing this is because here is \$10 million and instead of paying some of these people out of welfare, they are taking it out of the Automobile Accident Insurance Fund. That's the reason!

Some Hon. Members: — Hear, hear!

Mr. Boldt: — All the Premier said today is we hope, we hope. Here we have a lawyer Premier, knowing all the problems of the farm. He says what they had done was put cash in the hands of the farmers and he talked about the hog producers. I am quite sure, none of those payments are out yet. They are not out, but he says, "We put cash into the farmers' hands." He said, "We put cash into the farmers' pockets. We put cash into the farmers' pockets by the two-price system." Well Otto Lang said these payments are going to be out two months from now. Surely the Premier should read some of the Press statements and some of the reports that come out of Ottawa so that he knows when these payments are coming. All the NDP did when they fought the stabilization, when four NDP members, I believe they are from the constituency of my colleague from Milestone, was they wanted to sue the Wheat Board, and all this Government did here, and including the Attorney General, as a result, kept \$40 million out of the farmers' pockets.

Some Hon. Members: — Hear, hear!

March 1, 1972

Mr. Boldt: — You didn't put a nickel back into the farmers' pockets.

I was not here at the opening, unfortunately, but when I listened to the Throne Speech on radio, by the Honourable Lieutenant-Governor of Saskatchewan, I really pitied him for being subjected to such agony of reading a so-called document, outlining government programs that do not even attempt to deal with the problems the Saskatchewan people are facing today.

The Saskatoon Star-Phoenix of Friday the 25th, comes out with headlines, "Throne Speech stresses employment measures." Really I couldn't see how my good friend Doug MaConackie could read into the Throne Speech that this was going to solve the unemployment problems. The same article points out what the reporter considers highlights. "Lowering the age of majority to 18." Will this create employment? One good thing it will do to some, and I say some, that instead of loitering on the streets and be seen as unemployed the Government prefers having them sit in the beer parlours so they can't be seen. "Increased assistance to small town businesses" seen as a highlight. I want to tell this Government and the Attorney General that the best thing this Government can do to assist small town businessmen would be to exempt him from the 40-hour week. This 40-hour week is hurting practically every small town businessman and the farmer. It will cost some businessmen an extra \$6,000 per year to meet this requirement. The Minister of Labour (Mr. Snyder) wanted to manipulate the businessman to hire extra staff, but instead most of them have opted for closing all day Saturday.

I have a clipping from the Humboldt Journal. I want to read it for the benefit of the Humboldt Member, I really don't know where he is. Is the Humboldt Member there Mr. Tchorzewski? I am quite sure you will agree that this is authentic. "Important Notice." This is business people of Humboldt. I quote:

Owing to the Saskatchewan Government's new labour laws which became effective January 1st, 1972, cutting back the work week from 48 hours to 40 hours with no reduction in pay and with the increase in the minimum wage from \$1.40 to \$1.70 per hour, the following dealers will be open from 9:00 am to 6:00 pm. Monday through Friday and closed all day Saturday.

The automotive dealers are: Achland Limited Bowman Division; Dust Motors, Cash Motors and Auto Body Limited; Farm Equipment and Industrial Equipment; Co-op Implements; Case, Hurrigan Campbell, Mid-Centre; Krueger Sporting goods, (you name them).

This new legislation has forced us to close one day per week. Since the banks, wholesale distributors, finance companies, credit unions and many other related businesses, close Saturday, we have decided Saturday is the most logical day for us to close. The implement dealers will open their parts departments on Saturdays as an emergency service during seeding, the month of May and during harvesting.

That's what you call helping the small businessmen. Closing out, helping the farmer.

Then I read further in the Star-Phoenix: "Chiropractic care and insured service." It sounds okay in the Throne Speech of February 24th, but when you look at the speech given by the

Minister of Health (Mr. Smishek) in Swift current on February 23rd and reported in the Saskatoon Star-Phoenix on February 24th, the headlines and I quote: "Soaring costs of hospitals, medical care, worries Smishek." Thirty seven per cent in two years. Doesn't the man know that these services are going to further increase the Medical Care Insurance Commission's bill. Apparently the Minister did not know last July that the abolition of the deterrent and utilization fees would increase the cost of the Saskatchewan Hospital Services Plan and the MCIC. If the Minister of Health would take time out to look at some of the headlines when we were the government no doubt he would find similar statements as such. "Soaring costs of hospitals, medical care worry Thatcher," or, "Worry Grant." In those days he just sneered and told us the Liberals put dollars before people. My how time has changed the Minister of Health! Just let him wait until the Regina Base Hospital is ready for operation. That will mean a minimum of \$15 million operating cost per year. If his officials have not advised him about the cost of operating a hospital by now, then let me tell him that the cost of operating that hospital for two years will equal the capital outlay of the structure. The people of Saskatchewan elected you as a welfare government and a welfare state it will be, and woe to the taxpayer. You will really be called upon to give a sickness service rather than a health service because every taxpayer is going to be sick.

Now the Minister of Agriculture (Mr. Messer) — the Cabinet Ministers aren't around except the Attorney General — but I should like to say a word about the Land Bank. The creation of the Land Bank is also highlighted in the Throne Speech. It comes as no surprise because we were all told about it. The setting up of this Commission does not guarantee that the Government will be able to pick up a quarter section of land or guarantee that the farmer will be willing to sell for the price and terms he will be offered.

The Land Bank Commission is in harmony with the 1933 Regina Manifesto. You want to erase capitalism in Saskatchewan. You Wafflers want to take over the resources. The agricultural industry is the greatest resource we have. If the Bill will do what the Minister of Agriculture (Mr. Messer) has said publicly then I can't imagine any young farmer as being such a fool as to enter into an agreement with the Government of leasing from the Land Bank Commission.

The Minister has stated that the rental fee will be cash and the rate will be from \$2.50 to \$10 an acre. The renter is to insure with compulsory insurance from the Crop Insurance Board and pay the taxes. I want to give an example. I am a farmer and my land is as productive as any in the Province. So we shall assume that my rental will be \$10 per acre. I wish you would listen to this, gentlemen. The rental will be \$10 per acre which amounts to \$1,600 per quarter section plus an estimated cost of another \$400 for insurance and taxes, I might be low on this, for a total of \$2,000. A good farmer summer fallows 50 per cent. So let us say I have 80 acres of wheat per quarter section. A ten bushel quota on 160 acres would give me the opportunity to sell 1,600 bushels of wheat at \$1.30 per bushel, which will net me \$2,080. I imagine the Minister expects me to buy fuel, repairs, fertilizer and all the rest for \$80 per quarter section, plus my existence.

An Hon. Member: — How do you pay your bills?

March 1, 1972

Mr. Boldt: — Socialistic arithmetic! It just can't work.

It is interesting to note that the Minister has suggested that the farmer who sells will not receive all in cash but is requested to settle for an annuity. But whenever that may be for the farmer who wants to purchase from the Land Bank the Minister insists it will be cash.

I suggest to the Government that the Land Bank might be successful in retiring some farmers but it will be a complete failure as far as establishing young farmers unless you change the terms of the lease.

The Throne Speech calls for increased mineral taxes. This, again, is indicative of your attitude toward industry. You were fortunate in being able to chase a few companies out of Saskatchewan after you took office. The others that are firmly entrenched in the province, you will attempt to tax out of the province.

Where is that great election promise? "We will industrialize Saskatchewan." Not one single industry has come to the province since June 23, 1971. And no one will.

An Hon. Member: — The Roumanians are coming.

Mr. Boldt: — The Liberal Government and the City Council of Saskatoon interested the Roumanian company to set up a tractor assembly plant in Saskatoon but the Premier goofed on that one too. It is interesting to note when the Saskatoon MLAs' and Cabinet Ministers' comment regarding this plan, Mr. Romanow says, "If, in fact, they will come, we should like them to come to Saskatoon." Let me assure you that even Socialist Romania will not be that naïve as to establish in Socialist Saskatchewan or Manitoba.

The construction of an all-weather road came as a surprise to me. Why all of a sudden this turn about face? How could you Wafflers agree to spending millions of dollars on a road that leads to a mine owned by one of the greatest capitalistic corporations in North America?

An Hon. Member: — Oh, shame!

Mr. Boldt: — It will cost you millions of dollars and you are going to build it for one capitalist corporation. Well, I will give credit to the Premier for having just a little bit of common sense. He really would have like to have kicked Gulf Minerals out of the province too but he has finally realized that our young people, many of them university graduates, are leaving the Province at a greater rate than ever before.

Let's just take a look at an article from The Star-Phoenix of Wednesday, December 22, and read what the Provincial iron workers and the construction trades have to say about this Government regarding the industry. And I quote from the Star-Phoenix of Wednesday, December 22:

The job outlook for the provincial iron workers and the construction trades generally is bleak, according to

Gus Saba, business agent for Local 771 of International Association of Bridge, Structural and Ornamental Iron Workers. Mr. Saba said about 100 of the 300 members of the iron workers union were unemployed now and this could climb to more than 200 over the winter. As in the past, skilled tradesmen are leaving the Province to look for work elsewhere. About 50 of the union's 300 members have already left, he said. He urged the Provincial Government to move quickly on the Choiceland Iron Ore Mine as a major provincial project which would put a number of people to work.

Not one industry of any significance that I know of, or even if it didn't have any significance, has established itself in Saskatchewan since June 23, and none are in sight. This Government's policy is to keep the unemployed on welfare at great costs to the taxpayer.

The Minister of Welfare (Mr. Snyder) has already indicated that he will increase the welfare staff to meet the increasing overload. Why, if you people want to put people to work would it be necessary to increase personnel in the Welfare Department? The social aider who has given up on employment seems now to be quite content with this Government. They are telling me that they feel their allowances will be increased substantially more than if the Liberals were in power so if we get these increases, why should we work?

This Government does not believe in industrial jobs, but rather, uses the welfare cheques for political purposes.

They have increased the Civil Service staff. Each Minister appears to have an assistant, an executive assistant. They have set up boards and commissions by the bushel. It is apparent that the NDP propaganda machine is operating at full capacity.

Let me say a word about education. First, let me chide the Premier, the Cabinet Ministers, the MLA teachers in the NDP caucus. When the lawyer Member for Souris-Estevan (Mr. Thorson) was elected, within several weeks he was appointed to the Cabinet. Where is the Saskatchewan teacher? Mr. Michayluk, where is your voice? Three lawyers in the NDP caucus and three lawyers in the Cabinet. Fourteen teachers in the NDP caucus and one Cabinet Minister out of that herd. Not the Minister of Education. But he is in the dirt department and a poor farmer is the Minister of Education. What a sell-out for the Teachers' Federation and its members. Surely, your Government got much more support from the teaching profession last June than you did from the legal profession? Why would the Premier discriminate against the teaching profession? Obviously he had good reasons. And the profession is mad at the Government. But I really enjoy this kind of controversy.

The NDP stated during the last election campaign that dollars would not stand in the way of better education. Students and teachers would not be mere assembly lines. Salary guidelines would be removed as well as the student-teacher ratio. As of February 24, the day of the opening, not one settlement had been made in the Province. Why they claimed to be the Messiah of the profession.

Let me read from an article in the Star-Phoenix of January 7th of this year of what Mr. Egnatoff, Chairman of the Public

March 1, 1972

School Board of Saskatoon had to say. "Egnatoff Sees Tough Year for Education."

He said it would be a difficult year financially and we are going to have to examine our priorities in the light of available financial resources. John Egnatoff re-elected Chairman of the Public School Board of Education predicted that 1972 would be the toughest year for education in Saskatoon for a long, long time.

Yes, sir, it is going to be a real tough year. Why is it so strange to the public and including some teachers that the profession and the Federation executive is so quiet and not critical towards the Government regarding the stalemate in the teachers' salary negotiations? If the Liberals were the Government, I am sure we would have been blasted by Dr. Sterling MacDowell and threatened with strike action by now. But now the Federation is extremely mild. Why? I can tell you why. Because they were bed partners in the last election campaign and they would find it too embarrassing publicly to criticize the government they sponsored and supported during the election campaign.

An Hon. Member: — Hear, hear!

Mr. Boldt: — One can draw a parallel with the coal miners in Great Britain and the Wilson Labour Government with the Teachers' Federation and the NDP Government of Saskatchewan. The Labour Government socialized the coal industry in Great Britain. When Labour was in power the coal miners' union was at a disadvantage for fair wage increases. Wilson was able to persuade the union not to ask for fair wage increased as this would increase the cost of living. When Labour was defeated last year the coal miners are not demanding from the Conservative Government the wage increases they were obliged to forego when Wilson was the Prime Minister. At no time under the Labour Government where the coal miners treated as fairly, as generously as under the present Conservative Government of Great Britain.

The Teachers' Federation executive will remain strangely silent, but underneath there is a maddening current. They are yet to proceed to come out in the open and put the NDP on the spot. That will not be too long, gentlemen.

Everyone realizes that the cost of education represents one-third of the Government's budget. No one will argue that one-third of the Government's budget. No one will argue that community colleges are not desirable. But when the Government will be faced with the financial cost of these colleges, as Professor Norman Ward indicated a few days ago on radio on February 24, the day of the Throne Speech, "The total cost of education could well require 50 per cent of the provincial budget." Mr. Smishek (Minister of Health) says the health costs will take 50 per cent of the budget. So we are going to have education and health take up 100 per cent of the budget.

The basic question the taxpayer must ask himself is whether it is worth educating our young people beyond the high school level if the Government is against industry moving into the province and hasn't the capital to invest in Crown corporations. Thus, job opportunities will be non-existent when the student graduates. This, of course, will unravel itself in the next few years and the Province by then will be totally broke.

Now, what about the farmer and implement dealers of Saskatchewan under the Socialists? The implement dealers last summer were very concerned with the Family Farm Protection Act. They requested a meeting with the Minister of Agriculture (Mr. Messer) when we were here in session. When they did meet the Minister told them, "Look here fellows, I'll listen to you for 15 minutes, but regardless of what you say this Bill is going to go through." These implement dealers are generally small, rural businessmen. And you claim you want to help them.

Let me read from the Western Producer of January 27, 1972 on how this Family Farm Protection Act aided the small implement dealer. And I read from the Western Producer:

And inside our newsletter for the agro business executives it says that the Saskatchewan Family Farm Protection Act was responsible for a reduction in farm machinery sales of \$5 million in the Province during the first two months of its application. The Act was passed during the Special Session...

and so on. The December 13th issue of Agro Week published in Winnipeg by Morris W. Dorash contains an analysis of farm machinery sales for the three prairie provinces. It says that sales in Saskatchewan, which were ahead a year earlier by 78 per cent during April to June quarter fell back to just nine per cent in July to September. By contrast sales of farm machinery in Alberta were up by about 60 per cent between April and June and remained ahead by 26 per cent in July to September.

Then a few weeks ago the Minister of Agriculture (Mr. Messer) spoke to the implement dealers at their banquet. The Saskatchewan Government has threatened the implement dealers to bring in an Act similar to that of the Manitoba Legislature. The implement dealers of Saskatchewan are very much opposed to this kind of legislation. Some of the NDP supporters of the association were able to convince the Minister not to proceed with the intended legislation. It has been reported to me that the Minister pounded the podium and said, "Okay fellows, I'll give you one year to shape up or else."

An Hon. Member: — Oh, oh.

Mr. Boldt: — And some dealers left after this remark. That's the way you treat business, and you want to tell me in the Throne Speech you want to help small businessmen. Why don't you be honest?

An Hon. Member: — We are.

Mr. Boldt: — You get up and speak when your turn comes. This is the great way. This is the socialist way of helping the small businessmen. The Minister of Agriculture is desperately trying to drive a wedge between the farmer and the implement dealer. In past years they succeeded in lining up labour against management and they hope to be successful in lining up the farmer against the implement dealer.

I am a farmer and I want to have a pleasant relationship with the dealers as I have had up to now. The farmers don't want Government to introduce legislation that will further reduce our agencies.

March 1, 1972

Now let me read from this Manitoba legislation which the Minister is holding before the dealers of Saskatchewan. It says this:

The dealer and the vendor, company or supplier shall ensure repair parts for new machinery purchased, shall be available for a period of ten years and when the farmer orders these repair parts delivery of the parts ordered must be available to the farmer within 14 days unless because of strikes or other reasons.

This will no doubt encourage the implement dealers to return their repair parts on machinery that is ten years or older. Now there is another one here that really worries the implement dealers. I believe it is clause No. 5. "Time for supplying emergency repair parts" and it says, "time limit to 72 hours, except Saturday, holidays and Sundays, strikes or other conditions beyond control of vendor or dealer." They also tell us that he has got to have his shop open and yet the Government has implemented a regulation of a 40-hour week but apparently this does not apply to the implement dealers. I cautioned the Minister not to get too tough with the implement dealers, they are the farmers' best friends. What we need is co-operation, not division. At the session last summer the Minister remarked that the NDP Government would do more in six weeks than we had done in seven years for the farmers.

Some Hon. Member: — Hear, hear!

Mr. Boldt: — Well, you know those six weeks are mighty long. Well they had the opportunity of helping the rapeseed grower with the cost of controlling the Bertha army worm, but it turned out to be that they wanted the Federal Government to put up the major share. And all we hear about the arguments of the NDP, not what the Provincial Government is going to do for the farmer, it's what the Feds are going to do for the farmer. And yet during the election campaign they said vote NDP and the family farm will be saved and all the ills of the farmer will be abolished.

Some Hon. Members: — Hear, hear!

Mr. Boldt: — All this Government had for the rapeseed farmer was a mere one-third of the chemical and socialist sympathy. How much help? You haven't done one hundredth of a per cent for the farmer that the Liberal Government did for the farmer.

Some Hon. Members: — Hear, hear!

Mr. Boldt: — But anyhow the Minister of Agriculture (Mr. Messer), believes in travelling. He sure believes in travelling if it isn't over to Romania, it's over to Vancouver. When the farmer was busy battling the worm and the Wheat Board had trouble moving grain he took off for Rome. I don't know if he saw the Vatican or not, and other European centres. He even visited Romania, but he wasn't aware that the Romanian industry was trying to locate in Saskatchewan. Very surprised when he came back. Of course, Mr. Speaker, he didn't go out there to lure foreign capital to the Province, he went out there to have a good time at the taxpayers' expense.

Have we ever had a government that sent its Ministers all over the world so shortly after an election as this Government has done. Apparently they must have found the Departments in good shape to be able to afford so much time away from the office. In the seven years we were in office not once did the Liberal Government find it necessary to go to London, to see Lloyd's of London regarding SGIO, and it would even be less necessary, Mr. Attorney General (Mr. Romanow), now since about two years ago Lloyd's of London established an office right here in Regina. The president of this company comes to Canada on a regular basis. And Romanow could have saved the taxpayers some money by waiting for him to come to Regina, but no, this is the people's Government and travel they must to create an image. And here again is how they spend the taxpayers' money by flying to London when he could have seen the people here in Regina. Messer is over in Rome when we have agricultural problems here. They visit, they go to Vancouver at their whim, just trying to create an image.

Now, I want to say a few words about their press releases. I suggest to the Government that when they make news releases they should be just a little more consistent. The Premier contradicts the Minister, and the Ministers contradict the Premier and other Ministers. As an example, when Imperial Oil announced the closing of the refinery in Regina and the centralization of its operation in Edmonton, the Premier got annoyed and threatened to cancel Government business with the company. However, when the Saskatchewan Wheat Pool announces the purchase of the Federal Grain Elevator Company, Mr. Messer applauds the centralization and discourages competition. I think both are bad.

Let me say a word about this business transaction. I think it would be detrimental to the farmer. It is really none of my business what the Federal Grain Company does because I am not their member. But as a Pool member, it is my business. And I hope that the Federal Grain company shareholders are going to vote against the selling of the company. One point that I should like to emphasize is that the Federal Grain Company shareholders will have the right and the privilege to vote on the matter. As a shareholder of the Wheat Pool I shall not be able to voice my opinion as to whether I am in favour of purchasing the Federal Grain company or not. Apparently the Saskatchewan Wheat Pool is not that democratic. We have today 100 per cent monopoly Wheat Board purchasing wheat, oats and barley from the grain companies. For the Wheat Pool to become the sole buyer for these grains and the possibility of adding rape, flax and rye, would in my opinion prove to be very costly to the farmer. I believe, in all sincerity, and I am sure that most of you Members do, that if the Wheat Pool or the Co-operatives or the Credit Unions want to prove themselves, the only way that they can prove themselves is when they operate in competition with other buyers.

To support my argument, I believe the last Liberal Government, and the Palliser Wheat Growers Association did really shake the very foundation of the Wheat Board and the results of our criticisms have put new life, better salesmanship and a meaningful purpose into the Wheat Board. And it has now become a better agency for selling wheat and barley than it was heretofore. The Palliser Wheat Growers Association were the first to go to Vancouver to investigate the serious shortage of grain available for shipment overseas. They reported their findings to the Federal Minister, in charge of the Wheat Board and to

the Wheat Board itself. The Federal Minister immediately launched an investigation with the port officials, railroads and the Wheat Board. An announcement was made that the railroads and the port officials would attempt to reach a goal of unloading 800 carloads per day. Mr. Turner, of the Wheat Pool announced satisfaction, but the Palliser Grain Growers had been informed by the port officials that it was humanly impossible to unload 800 cars per day.

Now somebody is not telling the truth, and I am inclined to believe the port officials and the Palliser Group. The shortage of wheat at the West Coast ports, the blockage of railroads by snow slides was apparent to most farmers for about six weeks, but finally the Provincial Government, including the Minister of Agriculture (Mr. Messer) and the Premier and Mr. Romanow, decided for political reasons that they had better debate the issue in the House and send two Ministers of the Crown out to investigate in order to make the farmers really believe that they care. They were asleep for six weeks, they don't even know that we are selling wheat. Let me tell the farmers of Saskatchewan that if the railway unions or dock workers went on strike tomorrow the Premier and his Wafflers would support the strikers and not the farmers. The trip to Vancouver by the two Ministers at the people's expense was a cheap political stunt and I really marvel at their ignorance, their stupidity and their ineptitude. The Throne Speech, Mr. Speaker, does not come to grips with the serious problems of financing education in the Province, it has no proposals on how this Government intends to get industry into the Province and eliminate unemployment. The Throne Speech has all the earmarks of accepting the welfare state concept.

I, therefore, cannot support the motion.

Some Hon. Members: — Hear, hear!

Mr. D.G. Stuart (Leader of the Opposition): — I know you are anxious to hear me fellows but just relax. You are going to hear quite a bit of me before it is over. You know I listened to the Premier speak 20 minutes yesterday, Mr. Speaker, and I listened to him speak for 75 or 80 minutes today. And like the Throne Speech, it was a disappointment, just as I am sure it was a disappointment to the people who gathered in the galleries to hear him and to the people of the Province of Saskatchewan. It was a rehash of his old election speech and I suppose he can be forgiven. He won an election with it, or he thought he won an election with it. So he can be excused, he can be excused if he begins it again. But he went to the people of this Province with a proposition that this would be new kind of government, that he would be a new kind of Premier. Yet he brought in the Throne Speech, and what is it? A mish-mash of half-baked promises, some old good Liberal programs to be carried on and a couple of acts to be put on the books that will prove, I think, disastrous to the people of this Province, especially to the rural people of this Province. I am sorry Mr. Blakeney left as soon as I — oh, he is there, I just didn't notice him.

Mr. Messer: — Poor vision.

Mr. Stuart: — No, I would say that he is so small I couldn't see him,

but coming from me that might not be...but I do want to say — I'll get to you later, Walter. I do want to say this at the beginning of my remarks, Mr. Speaker, that I think that the Premier's bringing into this Chamber, especially on the radio at any time, the name of the wife of Allan Guy, Mrs. Guy, is cheap, it's cheap. Mrs. Guy was an excellent employee in the Saskatchewan Power Corporation.

Mr. Blakeney: — One should not...

Mr. Steuart: — Oh my, I am glad you said that Mr. Premier, because if you should not employ the wife of a Cabinet Minister in a Crown corporation, then should you employ the wife of a Cabinet Minister in the Department of Education, as Mr. Romanow's wife is now working in the Department of Education.

Some Hon. Members: — Hear, hear!

Mr. Steuart: — Now, check that with Mr. Romanow. Oh, there is a difference eh? There is always a difference, Mr. Speaker, when the Socialists do it. By your own words, Mr. Premier, you stand condemned and I am saying this, I have every respect for Mrs. Romanow and if the Department of Education or a branch of it or a funded organization of it wants to hire Mrs. Romanow, fine, I don't object. But I do object to the cheap political trick and the cheap snide efforts of the Premier bringing Mrs. Guy's name in, then saying it shouldn't happen while he condones it with his own Cabinet Minister. Don't stand up on a point of privilege Mr. Premier, it is not your point of privilege. You can tell when I am standing up even if they can't tell when the Premier is standing up. They might be able to, and you can sure tell when he sits down, Mr. Speaker, the hot air immediately subsides.

Mr. Speaker, when the Premier, Mr. Blakeney spoke, he talked about Choiceland. He got very enthusiastic the other afternoon and he said, "What did Mr. Steuart do about Choiceland, did he pick up the phone and make another deal or would he have picked up the phone?" I say, Yes, to try and save an industry, and industry that would have produced 500 or 600 jobs directly, many hundreds and hundreds of jobs and maybe even thousands indirectly, Yes, I would have picked up the phone. And I charge him with negligence. Why didn't he pick up the phone? So there were only nine days to make up his mind. If he had picked up the phone and phoned Mr. Steve Roman, or Mr. Daly of Choiceland, don't tell me that they wouldn't have given him two or three weeks, or a month or two months. Of course they would have. What does he do? In an effort to appease the radical Wafflers and to make a cheap headline he cancelled the mill, he cancelled the mill and he has been spending his efforts and the efforts of his experts around him ever since trying to get it back on the rails. I say to you he will probably fail but I hope the people of Saskatchewan especially of north-eastern Saskatchewan, that he succeeds. Now, he got up and he said twice that no one working for the Government, no civil servant had a peeve. This is a bit of tricky business on the part of the Premier and he knows it. Pretty tricky piece of business on the part of the Premier because he knows that an individual working for him in one of his agencies that he is responsible for, did appeal. One so far that we found. But you got up and said twice, nobody appealed. And yet you

knew, you knew that one had appealed. Now, let's be honest, Mr. Speaker, oh, he can be a little tricky...

Mr. Blakeney: — I will rise on a point of privilege. He is alleging that I stated falsely, and I have with great clarity pointed out that of those in the Public Service, and I said that several times, and as you know the person you are referring to is not in the Public Service.

Mr. Steuart: — I said, Mr. Speaker, that he implied, he implied and, of course he did, because everybody in this Province, most people work for the Government or in the Public Service even though technically they are not. All I said, Mr. Speaker, was, it was a bit of tricky business on the part of the Premier but we are getting used to it. Well, then it got kind of interesting, he started to boast about all industries that got in when he was a civil servant back in the old days in the 50s and then became a Cabinet Minister, thanks to Clarence Fines. About the steel mill they brought, now that is a good one. The steel mill is successful and I'm glad it is, I am happy it is successful. It is a very interesting parallel, it is a very interesting parallel. Yes, we said it wouldn't be successful and it was. But we were wrong. Just as you are wrong in the pulp mill. Mr. Blakeney had something to do with that deal. I'll point out one thing, the Government of that day took almost all the risks, they lent the money, they guaranteed their notes, they guaranteed their loans, they took almost 90 per cent of the risk and they never got five cents worth of equity. That steel mill is a success today and because of the stupidity and the inept bargaining, dealing with the former Government and the Premier at that time, a Member of that Government, they could have had equity but they don't own one five cents worth of equity shares in the steel mill.

Let's talk about the cement plant. He stood up and he boasted about the cement plant, he said that was another of our great deals. Maybe he hasn't heard about the cement plant, it closed down in November of 1971. It produced in November of 1971, went out of production in December and in January and in February. A tremendous success story! It was a success story as long as we were the Government when things were moving in this Province. It is just another one along with Birds and others that have folded up since these people became the Government.

Then he said we are going to do some study...Oh, he said, we are sorry for the people of the province whom we haven't supplied jobs for. Oh, and they have, I am sorry, haven't supplied jobs for. Oh, and they have, I am sorry, with the Federal Government — 13,000 man hours. That sounds tremendous, 2,000 jobs for six months. Big deal! Well, he says, we are going to make a study, going to find out things we need here in the prairie basin, wherever that is. Then, we are going to bring in a manufacturing plant. You know where that takes me — back to little Tommy Douglas. He did the same thing. Remember back when they did the same study, they found out they needed shoes in the prairie basin — people wear shoes. And they used boxes in the prairie basin, so we started a box factory and we started a shoe factory. People wore woollens and we started a woollen mill. Then we started a brick plant and a spray plant and a hide plant. Where are these today? You are

going to have them all back. The box factory is still sitting up in Prince Albert just waiting for you people to go back in and start it again – you lost a couple of hundred thousand dollars. It went broke. I don't know where the hide plan is or the woollen mill is. The brick plant folded up under you but we revived it under private enterprise now. I understand it's alive and well down in Estevan.

Well it looks as if we have come full cycle again — back to the old Crown corporation experiment. I wish you much more luck with your venture. I should remind you this time though don't go international. Remember the last time they went international? They opened that insurance company down in Montana. No wonder they hate those dirty Yankees, Mr. Speaker, because the last time we had an NDP Government... Wake up those backbenchers as I am going to tell them a little story that maybe they haven't heard. Under Mr. Blakeney and some of the old timers, Mr. Wood, Mr. Meakes, they went into the insurance business down in Montana. Oh, man, they were going to clean up. What did they insure? A shrimp boat down in the Gulf of Mexico. One of their better deals were some trawlers, Russian trawlers in the Black Sea. They actually insured those trawlers. I don't know if they insured anything in Cuba. A couple of bars down in the state of Montana and one or two in North Dakota. Anyway before they got out of there they had lost hundreds and hundreds of thousands of dollars, \$3.5 million as a matter of fact, those Yankee traitors had taken the hide off them. Then they sneaked back here and did they admit it? No. They brought it back up with the Government Insurance, the SGIO, they buried it altogether and tried to hide it. We dug it up and found it. Well, I hope you don't go international, fellows, your record outside of this Province, your record in the province is horrible — your record outside the province is just plain lousy.

Well, he mentioned the grain-handling. I agree with the last speaker, the Hon. Member for Rosthern (Mr. Boldt) who said that when they stopped the session the other day he suggested to them that they grow up and wake up, they are the Government now. Stopping the session for an emergency debate just to put it in the Debates and Proceedings of the House. If there is something the Opposition wants to bring up in debate they can then on occasion speak under the normal rules, but stop the debates of the House to get to a matter of so-called urgent business. As I pointed out then you had weeks and weeks and months that you didn't see fit to do anything. You did it for a grandstand play and you sent roaming Roy and happy jack out there to come back and make a report. Let me tell that Government opposite, Mr. Speaker, that in any legitimate effort to improve grain-handling facilities at the West Coast or to spur the railroads on to give us in Saskatchewan a better deal, we'll join with them. And I suggest that they look at all sides. Look at highways. We tried an experiment to help out one of the potash mines when we allowed them to truck potash from the potash mine at Esterhazy down and put in on an American railroad.

Mr. Michayluk: — What about Redberry?

Mr. Steuart: — I don't know anything about Redberry but I will talk about Redberry if you want me to. I suggest the Government take a look at that. If we are going to get a better deal from the railroads for Saskatchewan people we've got to supply them some

March 1, 1972

opposition. Then again I say of course handling facilities are not adequate to the tremendous job done by Otto Lang in the Federal Government in moving our wheat. Anything that could be done to improve those facilities would receive our support. Mr. Blakeney says that our approach to Ottawa was leather lunged and maybe it was. He said it wasn't all that successful, maybe he was right. Well, all I have seen so far of Mr. Blakeney and his approach to Ottawa was to cry and whine. I hope it succeeds but so far we haven't seen any results.

Mr. Speaker, the Premier talked a great deal about the pulp mill. He has challenged me to talk about the pulp mill tomorrow on the radio. I will talk about the pulp mill tomorrow on the radio, I will be very pleased to. I will tell the people of this Province again to remind them that the Prince Albert pulp mill upon which the Doré Lake pulp mill was patterned was and is a good deal for the people of this Province.

Some Hon. Members: — Hear, hear!

Mr. Steuart: — I will challenge Mr. Blakeney and the Members opposite if they feel, Mr. Speaker, that in the negotiations — and I was the chief negotiator for the government with Parsons and Whittemore, or the CPR and the Federal Government or anyone else — that I acted in an improper manner, or that I did anything that was immoral or improper that actually cost the people of this Province millions of dollars. If they really believe this, then I deny it categorically and I say it is a cheap political trick, a red herring to try to cloud the issue for them and their failure to produce industrial development of any kind or even any hints of industrial development. I challenge Mr. Blakeney to have a judicial inquiry if I have done something wrong then let the people know about it. As far as the people of Saskatchewan are concerned, listen to Mr. Blakeney, he makes an accusation again at me; listen to Mr. Romanow, he repeats the accusation. They listen to me, I deny it. And I deny it today and I'll deny it tomorrow.

Mr. Feduniak: — What about...

Mr. Steuart: — You'll get your chance way back there in the back bench. I don't think you'll every get your chance to get up closer from the back bench but you'll get your chance eventually. Let Mr. Blakeney then put the cards on the table and have a judicial inquiry. If I have done something wrong then let the people of this Province know about it. If I have done nothing wrong, and I haven't, then let the people know about it so they will know exactly what Premier Blakeney and his Ministers are trying to do. They are trying to divert the attention from their failure and put it on my shoulders.

Yes, I will talk about the pulp mill. If the Prince Albert pulp mill is such a bad deal, isn't it an amazing thing, Mr. Speaker, suddenly we don't hear any more about river pollution. River pollution and the Prince Albert pulp mill was all we heard. They made a bacteria count, this count and that count and they had their friendly professor from Saskatoon sticking this in the water and their nose in the water and other things in the water and running back here. They were getting up and announcing, John Richards and his group were announcing, and mind you they were busy polluting the Saskatchewan River themselves, but

they were very busy pointing the finger at Parsons and Whittemore. They went up to Prince Albert and all the little NDPers were going around sniffing, "What's that smell? Oh, that's the pulp mill, doesn't it stink." Suddenly it doesn't smell anymore. It still smells to me, it smells like money up in Prince Albert. All of a sudden it's their mill, there is no more pollution. It's like clear cutting, the great fearless Minister of Natural Resources, he says, "We'll do away with clear cutting." Well I'll tell you what clear cutting is. Clear cutting is where you take about a 300, 400 or 500 yard strip and clear it. A 500 or 600 yard strip and you cut everything down. Now they have changed it, they say what we are doing now is selective cutting. They take the same strip and they cut her clean only they select the strip so now it's selective cutting instead of clear cutting. There is absolutely no change, not one change at all in the cutting practices of the Prince Albert pulp mill. There is no change in pollution, no change in anything. And I say to the Government if that pulp mill is such a bad deal why don't they offer to sell their share. They can sell their shares to Parsons and Whittemore tomorrow for \$15 million or even \$20 million. They only paid \$1.5 million for it. The subsidy we put into the Saskatchewan Pulp Mill Limited was \$3 million of which half will be recoverable. But even take the whole loss that's \$4.5 million, 200 miles of road — well you are building a road for Gulf Minerals up North, you are not going to get anything back. You will get all your money back, yes, Mr. Michayluk and you will get off the guarantee. So you will be off the guarantee, you will have no equity and you will have made a profit. So if that Prince Albert pulp mill is such a bad deal, why don't you get out of it.

Mr. Guy: — Not a profit.

Mr. Steuart: — Sure they'll make a profit, they have already made a profit, it pumps \$22 million a year into the economy of this Province. I'll tell you about the pulp mill in Doré Lake. We would have built it, it would have been successful. We would have replanted and renewed the forest. In fact it would have been a better forest in 25 years than it is today. We would have protected the pollution, no one said we would use the Beaver River in its present state. I saw its state with that individual from Ottawa. We would have dammed that lake, we would have dammed that river, we would have increased the flow of the Beaver River two or three times. We could not have produced one pound of pulp had we polluted the Beaver River or the Athabasca River or any other river. The Federal Government regulations and our own regulations wouldn't have allowed it. Mr. Speaker, of course we took a risk when we entered into that pulp mill. Of course, I could have not had the officials sign any documents we agreed to in May and signed in June. We were looking at things positively. We wanted that mill. Why? Why, did we want that mill? Well, I'll tell you why we wanted it.

An Hon. Member: — To win the election.

Mr. Steuart: — No, not to win the election. We could have done the weasel thing like you people, condemned it and taken a negative attitude. We wanted it because there are 8,000 people up there and they are rotting on social welfare. You, the friends of that people, you condemned them with that one act to another generation or two of what? Welfare, social aid, your control?

That's what you want. What have you got to offer to the people of northwest Saskatchewan? The Tourist Industry last year employed 60 part-time people. If you double it or triple or increase it by 50 times you wouldn't put a scratch on the unemployment situation in that area. You didn't have, the Premier and his Cabinet didn't have, the intestinal fortitude, the plain ordinary guts to go ahead with that pulp mill. So you backed away and you are trying to put out a red herring and put the blame on us.

Some Hon. Members: — Hear, hear!

Mr. Steuart: — Not only did you let down the people of northwest Saskatchewan, not only did you show that you are absolutely bare of any positive ideas for development in this Province but on top of it you cost the taxpayers \$6 million of their hard earned dollars to get out of the deal. A deal that you should have gone ahead with.

Mr. MacDonald (Milestone): — Put the inquiry on and find out.

An Hon. Member: — The facts on June 14 . . .

Mr. Steuart: — June 14th won't haunt me, June 23rd upsets me a little, I'll admit. And I'll tell you something, June 23rd upsets the people of this Province when they realize what they've done. If we could only get them all to come and sit here for two minutes and look at you. They would go back home, and you know that Gallup poll. They said if the people had a chance to vote today would they make the same stupid mistake they made on June 23rd. They would answer immediately — Never! We'd be back over there and you would be over here, about one-third of you. But anyway time passes and eventually you will have to go to the polls and if you haven't got anything better to offer than you have shown in seven months, and mind you seven months isn't very long I'll grant you. We are not about to judge you on a seven month record but you have shown some very, very sad indications, shown that you are not prepared to develop this Province on private initiative or private capital and you have not shown that you are prepared to develop it through Government capital. Gentlemen, you have got to go one way or the other. Right now your Premier has fallen between two chairs, he doesn't know which way to go. The people in this Province should say, Mr. Blakeney, make up your mind. Either go one way or go the other. Even his Wafflers are saying the same thing to him and in this I agree with them.

Mr. Speaker, I shall talk tomorrow about the pulp mill, I'll talk about the Throne Speech, and I'll talk about the unbelievable arrogance, the unbelievable arrogance that has developed on those benches in seven short months. Not the back benches, I don't think they are bright enough to be arrogant some of the, the rest of them are.

An Hon. Member: — Look at your group.

Mr. Steuart: — I am looking at them, a fine group of people. Not enough

of them mind you, but a fine group of people. The unbelievable arrogance! So with that, Mr. Speaker, I beg leave to adjourn the debate.

Debate adjourned.

The Assembly adjourned at 5:25 o'clock pm.