

LEGISLATIVE ASSEMBLY OF SASKATCHEWAN
Second Session — Seventeenth Session
9th Day

Tuesday, March 7, 1972

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

WELCOME TO STUDENTS

Mr. A. Matsalla (Canora): — Mr. Speaker, it gives me pleasure to introduce to you and to the Members of the Legislature a fine group of 36 Grade Eleven and Twelve students of the Buchanan High School. They are accompanied by their teachers, Mr. Ed Maksymiw and Mr. Paul Popoff and their bus driver Adam Shabbits. The fact that Buchanan is my hometown where I obtained part of my high school education gives me special pride in making this introduction. Due to bus trouble the students were unable to keep their tour of the RCMP Museum, but after leaving here they expect to visit the studios of CKCK. The knowledge and the practical experience gained from their visit here, I am certain, practical experience gained from their visit here, I am certain, will prove very beneficial and useful in their studies of our democratic process of government. I hope the entire trip results in a satisfactory and enjoyable venture. Mr. Speaker, may I say to them from us, "Nice of you coming, have a good trip home."

Hon. Members: — Hear, hear!

Mr. K.R. MacLeod (Regina Albert Park): — Mr. Speaker, I have great pleasure in introducing in the East Gallery and in the West Gallery, about 60 Grade Seven and Eight students from De Shaye School in Regina. This is a very fine separate school in the southwest corner of the city. The principal is Mr. Gerry Verhelst. The students today are accompanied by Mrs. Wilma Reitler and Mr. Dennis Bergerman. We wish them all welcome, we hope they enjoy their stay, and that the proceedings here are enlightening to them.

Hon. Members: — Hear, hear!

Mr. G.B. Grant (Regina Whitmore Park): — Mr. Speaker, Through you, I should like to introduce to this House 62 students in the East Gallery from St. Matthews School in the Whitmore Park area under the direction of Mr. Poston and Mr. Lund. This is a Grade Eight class and of particular interest is that we have Mr. MacDonald's daughter in their numbers and also Tim MacLeod, a nephew of Mr. Ken MacLeod. We welcome this group today and I am sure their visit will be most interesting and educational.

Hon. Members: — Hear, hear!

Mr. Speaker: — I believe one of the groups in the West Gallery is from Nutana South represented by Mr. Rolfes who is not in to introduce them. I should like to introduce the Assembly to that group and wish them a safe trip home.

Hon. Members: — Hear, hear!

QUESTIONS

COMPULSORY CROP INSURANCE

Mr. J.C. McIsaac (Wilkie): — Mr. Speaker, before the Orders of the Day I should like to direct a question to the Minister of Agriculture (Mr. Messer). Some days ago the Members of the House were presented with a report of one of the interim legislative committees that was operating this last summer, this one dealing with crop insurance and the Family Farm Protection Act and in it and as the result of some of the press comments upon the tabling of this report there is reference to a compulsory crop insurance plan for the province. Over the weekend I have had a number of my constituents and others express concern of this possibility, Mr. Speaker, and I wonder if the Minister who hasn't had a chance yet to speak in this debate had any comment to make on the Government's plan with respect to compulsory crop insurance.

Hon. J.R. Messer (Minister of Agriculture): — If my memory serves me correctly, the recommendation that was made by the special committee that was investigating the crop insurance program and The Family Farm Protection Act was asking the Department to give some consideration to or to look into a compulsory crop insurance program. The Department of Agriculture or the Government will endeavour to do that but we at this point in time have no intentions of launching a compulsory crop insurance program.

Mr. Speaker: — I would like to point out to the Members that that report is on the blue paper for consideration and full debate can be taken on that at that time.

MINIMUM WAGE AND 40-HOUR WEEK FOR FIREFIGHTERS IN SASKATCHEWAN

Mr. A.R. Guy (Athabasca): — Mr. Speaker, before the Orders of the Day, I should like to direct a question to the Hon. Minister of Labour (Mr. Snyder). I should like him to clarify once and for all for the House whether the fire fighters in Northern Saskatchewan are going to be taken under the minimum wage and 40-hour week or whether they are going to be discriminated against and left out of the minimum wage that is applicable to the rest of the province.

Mr. G.T. Snyder (Minister of Labour): — I thought the position was clarified yesterday, Mr. Speaker, when I indicated to the Member that the area north of Township 62 is exempt from the hours of work provisions and the minimum wage.

Mr. Guy: — A subsequent question, Mr. Speaker, it is my understanding then that the hourly wage of \$1.70 an hour will not apply to the fire fighters in the North similar to people in the rest of the province. Is that correct?

Mr. Snyder: — I'll try again, Mr. Speaker,

March 7, 1972

All of those areas north of Township 62 are exempt from the hours of work provision and from the minimum wage provision. Shall we try it again, or is this sufficient?

ANNOUNCEMENTS

SASKATOON WINS CANADIAN LADIES' CURLING CHAMPIONSHIP

Hon. J.E. Brockelbank (Minister of Public Works): — Mr. Speaker, before the Orders of the Day I wanted to take this opportunity to report on a successful expedition carried out on behalf of the Government of Saskatchewan. Last week on Monday, February 28, I was at the opening of the Canadian Ladies' Curling Association in Saskatoon. At that time I took greetings on behalf of the Province of Saskatchewan to the opening of their curling. I should have reported to the House yesterday, that the Saskatchewan team won the Canadian Ladies' Curling Championship for this year. This marks a repeat performance of them winning the same event last year in Newfoundland.

Some interesting sidelights to this event, the person who is the Second on the team also was involved in another Canadian Championship. The Saskatoon team, again, won the Ladies' Canadian Championship in 1970 with essentially the same group of curlers except that they had a different skip in 1970. It seems that this team has brought a great amount of honour to the Province of Saskatchewan and particularly to the city of Saskatoon in winning this Canadian Ladies' Curling Championship for the second year in a row.

Hon. Members: — Hear, hear!

MOOSE JAW CENTRAL COLLEGIATE WINS PROVINCIAL HIGH SCHOOL GIRLS CHAMPIONSHIP IN CURLING

Hon. G.T. Snyder (Minister of Labour): — I should like to take the opportunity, too, Mr. Speaker, to join with the Member for Saskatoon Mayfair and bring to the attention of the House the fact that the Moose Jaw Central Collegiate girls foursome skipped by Pat Crimp with Third Coleen Rudd and Second Gillian Thompson and Lead Debbie Hunter won the Provincial High School Girls' Curling Championship on Saturday in Swift current. I know all Hon. Members will want to join with me in congratulating them and wishing them Godspeed and good luck in their future endeavours.

Hon. Members: — Hear, hear!

FIRST THREE SEMI-TRAILERS ARRIVE AT MOKTA MINE SITE

Hon. E. Kramer (Minister of Natural Resources): — Mr. Speaker, before the Orders of the Day, I should like to announce that yesterday the first three semi-trailers arrived at the Mokta Mine site 162 miles north of Turner Lake, east of Lake La Loche. This pushes the road 162 miles farther in northwestern Saskatchewan — that is road access — than ever before. It is interesting to note that there was 167 miles of road built. Crews engaged on that did it and for the meagre

sum of \$200,000 overland. A total of 40 men were employed on this project. It was all overland on high ground, only ten river crossings, the major one being the Clearwater River and about five miles of muskeg. This is going to provide winter access in addition to the Mokta Mine site to a good many areas that will be open for commercial fishing where formerly they were only accessible by plane. These semi-trailers are now on the way back and we feel that there will be literally tons and tons of freight go over this new road this winter. I want especially to congratulate the members of the Department of Natural Resources construction crew for having carried out this project in one of the worst winters, under the most extreme conditions that any crew could have worked under anywhere in northern Canada. I think they should be credited with a tremendous feat done in record time and for a record cost of only \$200,000. Mr. Speaker, I am mighty proud that this branch, this particular construction branch was the one that every effort was made by the former Government to wash out and down grade during the seven years they were in office.

Some Hon. Members: — Hear, hear!

Mr. D. Boldt (Rosthern): — Mr. Speaker, I am indeed pleased to hear that the Government is building highways in the North. The Minister claimed that we were eroding the Department of Natural Resources. It is interesting to note that this Government has set up two highway crews. Apparently, the Minister of Highways is not capable of building all the highways in Saskatchewan. It was the former Government's policy that there would only be one department building highways, not two. You can see the duplication. I want to thank the Minister for building a highway to the free enterprise system that has tried to develop, despite severe difficulties, our industries in the North.

Some Hon. Members: — Hear, hear!

ADJOURNED DEBATES

ADDRESS-IN-REPLY

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

Mr. M. Feduniak (Turtleford): — Mr. Speaker, I should like at this time to pay tribute to a Member of this Legislature. This is Mr. Russ Brown who has made a great contribution to this province. I should also like to convey my condolences to Mrs. Russ Brown and the Brown family.

Mr. Speaker, I want to congratulate the Mover and the Seconder in the manner they moved and seconded the Throne Speech.

Mr. Speaker, the Province of Saskatchewan has entered its second hundred years of participation in the Confederation of Canada. Yet as the seventies begin this country is still confronted with major defects in our social and economic system. Mr. Speaker, the failure of present policies are revealed in the mass unemployment of workers, the desperate plight of such primary producers as our farmers and the hardships endured by

March 7, 1972

the neglected poor, the squalor of the slums and the pollution of the environment. In acute form it is underscored by our inability to provide meaningful opportunities for our youth.

Mr. Speaker, before outlining the intentions of the Government for this term. I want to review some general philosophical considerations that underlie the development of programs and policies by this social democratic Government. It is the goal of this Government to direct Saskatchewan's economy towards the needs of all of our people rather than those who possess power because of their wealth and influence. Mr. Speaker, we are committed to win the fight to root out the inequity and to achieve a human society that responds through the democratic process to the actual needs of all our citizens. Mr. Speaker, our Government firmly believes that society's first obligation is to alleviate the condition of the people of Saskatchewan and the rest of the people in Canada who are now living in conditions of economic, social and cultural misery.

The policies of the old line parties have shown that when in office, they are the spokesman of the privileged and the elite. The results of their policies are all too obvious in the inexcusable disparities in income, education, housing, health and social development throughout this land. The results have also meant the existence of far too many alienated groups in Canada, native people, pensioners, the rural poor, the urban poor, and perhaps the most tragic group of all, young people and students who are completely dissatisfied and disillusioned with the economic and social order. Mr. Speaker, the essence of this social democratic Government is to promote the equality of the human conditions. This objective to seek greater equality for all the people is the common theme of all our government's policies. It is evident in our approach to health and social development programs.

It is evident in our revitalized goals for rural and northern development programs, in our agricultural projects, public housing construction, in our natural resources and mineral resources policies, in our urban reorganization plans based as much as possible on ability to pay. Mr. Speaker, in order to achieve needed reforms, a pattern of nation wide economic and social criteria must replace the narrow tenets of individual profitability that now guide most of our public decisions.

Social philosophers have been warning us that society faces a glut of private goods and a famine of public goods. The truth of this warning is self-evident. Today our stores are jammed with every kind of merchandise. Liberals attempt to place arbitrary limits and ceilings on the great social programs such as medicare, hospitalization and education. Even when our gross national product increases each year, we are told that there are not sufficient funds for policies and programs aimed at eliminating regional disparities and for bettering the condition of the one quarter of all Canadians who presently exist on poverty incomes including the three quarter of a million unemployed.

Mr. Speaker, no other country in the western world has allowed so much of its natural resources, of the ownership of its industry and of the decision making power of its economy, to fall into foreign hands as Canada has done.

Some Hon. Members: — Hear, hear!

Mr. Feduniak: — Saskatchewan is no exception. The Liberal administration in the seven years previously not only invited and promoted foreign control but doubled the Saskatchewan citizens' taxes and paid the foreign investors to come in, in many cases to destroy completely our natural environment. Mr. Speaker, I'll give you the Gray Report on foreign ownership and control of Canadian industry, the following:

Electrical ownership 70 per cent, control 78 per cent; Chemical ownership 66 per cent, control 80 per cent; Transportation ownership 82 per cent, control 80 per cent; Metals ownership 51 per cent, control 51 per cent; Machinery ownership 62 per cent, control 54 per cent; Pulp and paper ownership 53 per cent, control 48 per cent; Utilities ownership, control 4 per cent; Miscellaneous ownership 50 per cent, control 59 per cent.

Mr. Speaker, when our party took over the administration of Saskatchewan in 1944 they inherited a province which was heavily in debt. It was in a pathetically depleted condition. Many of you here no doubt remember the state of affairs Saskatchewan was in. Twenty years of our Social Government's policies put Saskatchewan in a very favourable position. In every department and in every area Saskatchewan was in a very healthy condition, socially, economically and financially. Mr. Speaker, Saskatchewan had the highest credit rating in Canada. Then in 1964, Mr. Speaker, the Liberals told the people that if they were elected, Saskatchewan would become a province of cream and honey. The people of Saskatchewan gave them the chance and in the short seven years of Liberal rule Saskatchewan's economy took a severe beating on all fronts, which set it back many years. Now it is going to take some time to bring it back to where it was, but with the planned social democratic programs our Government is proceeding with, we are confident that Saskatchewan will once again be on the top in Canada.

Some Hon. Members: — Hear, hear!

Mr. Feduniak: — Mr. Speaker, I am going to deliver a report on the Saskatchewan industries for 1971 by the Saskatchewan Industry Department. I should like to opposite Members to take note. The Department recorded 43 new industries established in Saskatchewan. The economic situation in Saskatchewan improved considerably in 1971 over the previous year. Net farm income, the key factor in the economy, has reached \$398 million in 1971, a substantial increase over the \$190 million in 1970.

Mr. Speaker, the Liberals have always been saying that as long as Saskatchewan had a socialistic government no outside investors or our own would invest in Saskatchewan. Mr. Speaker, all investors, Saskatchewan and abroad, once again have faith and confidence in Saskatchewan. Since our Government took over, we have acquired 43 new investors in Saskatchewan who are proceeding with new plants and projects. Out of these 43 I have the totals of money they have invested. For 22 of them it amounts to \$72,325,000. I do not have the figures for the other 21.

March 7, 1972

Mr. Speaker, these new projects in Saskatchewan are going to employ hundreds of our unemployed, and perhaps help to bring back to Saskatchewan some of the 100,000 people we lost in the last seven years.

Mr. Speaker, when I look across to the opposite side and see the remnants of the Liberal Party, it reminds me of Custer's last stand. Now there must be a good reason for this to happen. I assume that there are at least some Members across there that are intelligent enough not to blame the Members on the right here for their defeat. They played the role of the wolf in grandmother's clothes, especially the bonnet, it was very becoming. They played the role very well just like they did in 1964 and in 1967 but this time they made an unusual error, had they kept their mouths closed and not revealed the big teeth they had, they might have fooled the people once again. This time they boobed, so on June 23, 1971, the greatest majority of Saskatchewan citizens rejected them in no uncertain terms.

Mr. Speaker, and I don't see him there, they can also thank their Member from Athabasca (Mr. Guy) who supposedly believes in justice and democracy, and is one of the gang responsible for the unscrupulous gerrymandering of our constituencies until they made our province look like a Chinese puzzle. There is nothing farther away from democracy than this distribution which gave the Liberals 4 to 1 advantage in some areas. Mr. Speaker, I must commend the Member from Athabasca for having the nerve and courage to be able to come in and sit in this Assembly with such a record.

Some Hon. Members: — Hear, hear!

Mr. Feduniak: — Mr. Speaker, I am very pleased that our Government took immediate action implementing some of the election promises by removing deterrent and hospitalisation fees. By removing the financial burden on the mentally ill and their families and by legislating complete medicare to our senior citizens 65 and over, the very people who pioneered this province. They are the people who worked hard and made it possible for us to enjoy the fruits of their efforts and sacrifices, to whom we owe so much.

Mr. Speaker, our Government took action involving millions of dollars in public works programs. They also took full advantage of the winter-works program, and this amounted to over \$10 million. Other steps have been taken to create more new jobs, particularly for the young people.

Mr. Speaker, when I listened to the Member from Athabasca (Mr. Guy) on Tuesday last week, and incidentally since I have listened to many more of these Members the same thing applies to them, and when he made remarks in regard to what our Government has done, he must have had his head buried in the sand since 1971, because he and they are apparently not aware of what has been happening and what has been done in Saskatchewan in the last eight months.

Mr. Speaker, I will support the motion.

Some Hon. Members: — Hear, hear!

Mr. A. Matsalla (Canora): — Mr. Speaker, at the outset I want to add my congratulations to the mover and the seconder of the Speech from the Throne. The Hon. Member for Kerrobert-Kindersley, Mr. Alex Taylor, expressed himself very eloquently and noted his feelings in a philosophical manner. He very simply indicated what he believed would develop justice and harmony in today's society.

The Hon. Member for Humboldt, Mr. Ed Tchorzewski, spoke with sincerity in a very convincing fashion. He explicitly impressed upon this House that this new Government is embarking on a social and economic program that will definitely narrow the gap between the 'have' and the 'have nots' in the province.

Since the election of the New Democratic Government in Saskatchewan our province seems to have taken a lift. There was jubilation right across the province. There was jubilation amongst a great majority of people, I might even say among some of the Liberals and Conservatives, an expression of relief, an indication that the Liberal policies are unbearable, and a rejection of Federal Liberals and Otto Lang and of their retrograde agriculture policies.

The Speech from the Throne of Thursday last, Mr. Speaker, points towards a dynamic move-ahead program for Saskatchewan. Out of the jungle corporate society of the old Liberal Party to a new horizon of 'people first' with a New Democratic Government under the courageous and most capable leadership of Premier Allan Blakeney.

Some Hon. Members: — Hear, hear!

Mr. A. Matsalla: — Mr. Speaker, Saskatchewan voters saw nothing new or exciting in the Liberal Party on June 23rd last, and today the image of the party has become blurred and confusing. The question arises, is the party to the right? Is the party to the left? Is it middle-of-the road? Or is it off the road completely? We see that the old guard is still at the helm, really no new ideas nor any desire for change. I might say that the newly organized group '171' will have a tremendous struggle for development, and it is likely that the old Liberal establishment wouldn't take the risk of having '171' reach the maturity stage.

Mr. Speaker, the New Democratic Party is different. The NDP provides every opportunity for open discussion, whether in government or out of government. It is open to new ideas and changes at all times.

Mr. Speaker, the Leader of the Opposition (Mr. Steuart) in a statement to the Press indicated that the only thing he liked about the Throne Speech was that it was only 18 minutes long. He couldn't have understood it because anyone with a right mind would have expressed satisfaction and optimism. It suggested the implementation of many of the commitments made by the NDP in its New Deal for People program. I want to tell the Leader of the Opposition that it is not how many words are said, but it is what and in the way they're said that is of significance.

The Throne Speech, Mr. Speaker, indicates that considerable attention will be given to the agriculture industry. The

March 7, 1972

establishment of a Land Bank program will be of significant importance to Saskatchewan. Much has already been said by speakers before me. I only want to re-echo that the Land Bank program will play a vital role in keeping people on farms and in keeping our small towns and villages as viable, rural communities.

Legislation to give farmers some assurance in the prices for feed grains is another move by the Government to assist the farming industry. In the last few years we have seen feed grains sold at fire sale prices, at prices that didn't even cover the cost of producing the grain. We believe that a form of floor price on the marketing of feed grain will have a favourable effect in stabilizing the price of feed grains and the income of Saskatchewan farmers.

Mr. Speaker, the people of Saskatchewan, I am certain, are happy to hear that chiropractic health care will become an insured service under our medical and hospital insurance program. The Liberals talked about this program in an on and off fashion, but never did anything about it. Lots of talk but no action. Provision of this service means the implementation of another election plank of this New Democratic Government. This service is in addition to the fulfilment of at least three planks of the 1971 summer session: the removal of deterrent fees, the granting of free hospital and medical cards to our elderly people, and removing charges previously assessed against estates of the mentally ill.

I ant to say, Sir, that this New Democratic Government has done more in meaningful health services for the people of Saskatchewan in a period of less than one year, than the previous Liberal Government in seven years. Now I am certain that you will agree with me, Sir, that that's performance.

Now, time won't permit me to review the entire Speech from the Throne. But I do want to say that considering what was done since this Government took office on June 30th last, and what could be expected at this Session, this Government under the bold leadership of Premier Blakeney is moving ahead to give the people of Saskatchewan a better deal all the way through.

Mr. Speaker, the Liberals over the years have been attempting to brainwash the people of the province about the dangers of socialism but they have failed, and failed miserably. The people didn't believe the Liberals; their intelligence far surpassed the Liberal scare tactics. Conversely, a great majority of people today, are questioning corporate capitalism and fascism, and are developing very strong doubts about the wisdom of a society oriented to corporate capitalism.

Mr. Speaker, I should like to quote from the Prairie Messenger, a Saskatchewan Catholic Weekly, February 22, 1972 issue to document in this Legislature what a certain churchman, Bishop Sergio Arceo of Cuernavaca, suburb of Mexico City, had to say. The article carries the headline, "Socialism, Catholicism Compatible". The Bishop said, and I quote from the article:

As Christians we must show our solidarity with efforts to redistribute wealth to the poor so that they may share in the national abundance. We must protest against the poverty that selfish capitalism generates among the

underprivileged. To me, Socialism is the economy of the poor.

Mr. Speaker, may I quote from the edition, 'The Hope of a New World' by the last Archbishop of Canterbury. William Temple, to document his views on the shortcomings of the present capitalist system. I quote:

So long as we rely on the profit motive as the mainspring of production, so long we shall be in a condition always verging towards faction within and war without.

Hear we have, Sir, two high churchmen clearly indicating the failure and ills of a capitalist society, and pointing out the need to move towards socialism in order to build a society that will share the affluence of the nation and of the world.

In the like manner, the Speech from the Throne documents a program based on a democratic socialist philosophy and to which this Government is committed. Its implementation will be democratic socialism in practice.

Mr. Speaker, I should like now to say a few words in behalf of the people in the Canora constituency.

First of all, I want to say 'thank you' to the Government for the erection of a new special-care home in the town of Canora. The nursing home approved as a 30-bed structure, in the spring of 1971, was extended to 60 beds by this Government to adequately meet the nursing care needs in our area.

I want to place on record, appreciation from our constituents for the construction of the No. 5 Highway west from Canora. Some recognition here should be given to the previous administration for starting construction last year, an election year. However, I might say that surveys on this highway started way back in 1966. Our constituency is pleased that this Government and the Minister of Highways have decided to continue construction with a definite plan to connect the highway at Watson to Saskatoon. This has been long overdue.

The people in the northern part of my constituency in the Hazel Dell, Rockford, Endeavour and Stenen areas are happy to receive the long-awaited-for telephone service, originally petitioned for sometime in 1966. I want to commend the Minister in Charge for placing this project on a priority list of the Unserved Area Telephone Service program.

Now that I have handed out some bouquets I wish to impress upon the Government and the Minister of Natural Resources (Mr. Kramer) the need for making better use of our forest resources in the Porcupine Provincial forest area, the timber rights of which are now held by the Simpson Timber Company. It has been brought to my attention that timber of pulp quality has been harvested sometime last summer and is still in the forest. It would appear that the harvest of timber is greater than the capacity of the mill at Hudson Bay. The question arises, why couldn't arrangements be made to have the harvested timber cut into dimensions lumber by small sawmill operators who have been displaced since the sale of timber rights by the previous Government? By doing this, the small sawmills could, as well, conveniently accommodate the farmers in the area with timber permits. And, of course, through the return of the sawmill operators, many of the small farmers in the area, who at

March 7, 1972

one time supplemented their farm income with winter jobs in lumber camps, could be re-employed.

I am hopeful, Mr. Speaker, the Government is considering making 314 highway from Buchanan south to meet No. 14 at Springside a dust free road. I want to impress that this road provides a popular access to the Good Spirit Provincial Park and is a well-travelled connection between the two major across-the-province highways, Numbers 5 and 14.

For a few moments, Mr. Speaker, permit me to digress to discuss the subject of retirement as I see it. The problems related thereto, the present situation, and the proposals for solution.

For some time now I've been wondering what society can do and perhaps should do in the field of retirement. I feel convinced that society has a definite role in preparing and assisting people for retirement. When speaking of retirement, Mr. Speaker, a number of problems would have to be faced. They could be social, economic and psychological in nature.

Mr. Speaker, possibly the greatest of all problems facing us today, as a nation, is unemployment, the lack of jobs and economic security. I want to place special emphasis here on the severe manner unemployment affects our young people. This has been specifically noted in the Speech from the Throne.

Our young people today are very frustrated with the way things are. We stress and we encourage all sorts of education and training programs. We have our young people go through schools and training courses. But we fail to provide them with a future of meeting meaningful challenges and one of social and economic security. We leave them in despair to join the ever-filling ranks of the unemployed.

It is regrettable, Sir, that society should continue with a situation such as this. Education, skills, technical and scientific abilities are wasted while our nation suffers in its development, advancement and productivity. One of the simple theoretical solutions to this complex problem is to create new and more jobs. But it is not my intention to discuss the solution from that angle, Mr. Speaker. I want to look at it from the perspective of making room for employment for our youth, through early retirement of the elderly.

Up until now, many of our elderly people remain at jobs until 65 years and older. I must admit that a few go beyond their retirement age because they simply want to be occupied and don't mind the routine of work. But most people at jobs in their 60's and 65's, are forced to continue work for a variety of reasons.

From an economic point of view, Mr. Speaker, lack of adequate income for retirement is possibly the main reason for not retiring at an earlier age. Most of our present pension and superannuation plans are designed for retirement ages of 60 to 65. Early retirement is almost impossible except in cases of disability. And, if a pension is made payable before the eligible retirement age, the recipient is subject to a penalty and a reduction in pension.

Mr. Speaker, to work to ages 60 and 65 and even on to 70, has been accepted for some time as a way of life. The elderly

are afraid of retiring. They are afraid of having nothing to do. The shock resulting from sudden withdrawal from the day to day environment does have a psychological impact on a person, and it may adversely affect his mental and physical health. This point is significant. People reaching an elderly age are not ready for retirement. They did not prepare themselves for it. And, our society, at this point and time had done very little, if anything, to prepare people for retirement.

Mr. Speaker, now that I have outlined the problems related to unemployment and early retirement, I want to suggest proposals as a solution to the problems.

We must start now universally and on a graduated scale to reduce the retirement age to 60, within the next five years, and then down to 55 in the following five years. To start with, in preparation for retired life at these ages, both economically, psychologically, retirement should be on a voluntary basis. But, as time goes on, it may be desirable to make every early retirement a compulsory aspect of every employment.

To start with the Government may be required to subsidize the funds beyond the normal contributions. However, if we assume a drastic reduction in unemployment much of the subsidy money could come from the Unemployment Insurance and Welfare Funds. Eventually with greater contributions which would normally come from employees and employers and governments, pension funds could be maintained at a satisfactory level. I am not a pension actuary and I'm not a whiz at figures, but I believe that something could be worked out on the basis of my proposal.

Mr. Speaker, early retirement means many more years for leisure time. Fifteen to twenty years of retired life could be very satisfying and worthwhile if one is prepared for it. The leisure period could be productive in many ways, from social and community activities to travel and recreation. There may even be a place for a part-time job.

I want to suggest, Sir, that Governments should take a lead in setting up adult education programs designed for people to prepare for early retirement. The program could be a part of our present adult education system. This is also an area where labour and management could co-operate in sponsoring and promoting such programs.

In summary, I want to emphasize that it is not only desirable, but that there is a need for early retirement. Besides providing our elderly with more leisure and opportunity to do what is most satisfying to them, early retirement would significantly contribute to solving our severe unemployment situation and open jobs for our young people.

I may be called a dreamer and a wishful thinker, nevertheless, I feel strongly that something could and should be done in this area.

Mr. Speaker, from my remarks this afternoon, I am certain you will gather that I am satisfied with what the Speech from the Throne aims to do for the people of Saskatchewan.

I will be supporting the main motion.

Some Hon. Members: — Hear, hear!

March 7, 1972

Mr. J.C. McIsaac (Wilkie): — Mr. Speaker, I'm pleased to have the opportunity to participate this afternoon in the Throne Speech debate.

I wish first of all to congratulate you, Sir, on your appointment as Speaker and I wish also publicly to extend my congratulations to the new Member for Souris-Estevan (K. Thorson) and to the new Member on our side of the House, the Member for Morse (J. Wiebe). And I want to wish both of them well in carrying out their responsibilities as elected representatives.

I want to welcome too, unlike the Member for Turtleford, (Mr. Feduniak), I want to welcome my friend, the Member for Athabasca (Mr. Guy) in the House, Mr. Speaker.

Some Hon. Members: — Hear, hear!

Mr. McIsaac: — He's a native of my constituency. He comes from the village of Senlac of the Wilkie constituency and I know speaking for all of the people up there, regardless of what party they support, they're happy to see him here too and we hope to see him here many more years in this Legislature.

Some Hon. Members: — Hear, hear!

Mr. McIsaac: — You know, Mr. Speaker, it has been interesting to follow this debate, beginning with the remarks of the mover of the motion, the Hon. Member from Kerrobert-Kindersley (Mr. Taylor). Now, he reminded me of a delegate from an underdeveloped Asian country wringing his hands at the terrible state of the world today.

The Member from Canora (Mr. Matsalla) who just took his seat, decrying socialism and capitalism and comparing the problems in the country of Mexico, to the problems of Saskatchewan.

You know Members opposite continue to decry the problems of today's world, the old socialist cries of despair are still with us. One would have thought that after a resounding election victory we might have had some optimism, some hopefulness and some hope for the future and some enthusiasm for fullness and some hope for the future and some enthusiasm for Canada and for Saskatchewan, in particular, from the Members opposite. Some positive thinking for a change, Mr. Speaker.

Despite their election victory, however, the NDP still prefer to deal in doom and gloom and they still prefer to harp on the negative. But what do these people have to offer? Themselves, Mr. Speaker.

The Speech promises a host of new Government departments and agencies. In the apparent belief that the Government knows best, we shall see more agencies, more civil servants and more boards to look after the needs of our less than a million people, here in Saskatchewan.

Now the only obvious advantage from this proliferation of Government, Mr. Speaker, will be the hundreds of people who will be fortunate enough to gain employment in some of those agencies, and it is my conviction and my contention that the

taxpayer who will be supporting these expanded Government services, will not reap benefits in any way related to the additional costs.

Some Hon. Members: — Hear, hear!

Mr. McIsaac: — Some of the Members on this side of the House have pointed out in this Debate, the Member for Athabasca (Mr. Guy) for one, the number of people already hired by this Government at salary levels that are the envy of farmers and labourers in this province.

Some Hon. Members: — Hear, hear!

Mr. McIsaac: — Seemingly, the hiring of more civil servants is the only answer in the Throne Speech to the unemployed in Saskatchewan. No mention of any effort to attract industry, or to create job opportunities in other fields.

Now, Mr. Speaker, of all subjects referred to and not referred to in the Throne Speech, I think it is particularly revealing when it comes to dealing with the field of education. Now to say it's anaemic is an overstatement and to say it is bloodless, in this regard, would certainly be more accurate. Four short paragraphs, in the Throne Speech, dealing with education and all of them dealing with Liberal programs and Liberal policies.

Some Hon. Members: — Hear, hear!

Mr. McIsaac: — A bursary program (initiated at the last session of the Legislature) we are told, will be expanded. In this regard, Mr. Speaker, the Speech leaves the erroneous impression that the NDP introduced the scheme. Now this, they certainly did not. It would, however, be correct to say that they implemented it, but the legislation was there, the regulations were there and the program was in the process of being developed at June 23rd.

Now, we welcome the fact that the NDP has carried on and proposes to expand one of the many good Liberal policies left with them. The speech tells us also that there will be an expansion of the institute at Moose jaw and at Saskatoon. Enrolment in these schools, Mr. Speaker, I think you will be interested to know, increased almost four-fold under the seven years of Liberal rule, and every single year some expansion of these schools has taken place. The first phase of the Regina Institute began under the Liberals and naturally we expected them to complete that. Hardly an earth-shaking announcement to say that there is going to be continued expansion in these three particular schools.

The announcement of a sixth regional library is another continuation of a program that was completely revitalized by the former Liberal Government. It was the Liberals who gave Saskatchewan the best regional library system in the country today, Mr. Speaker, and I'm happy to hear that the NDP will be maintaining and continuing this particular program.

Some Hon. Members: — Hear, hear!

March 7, 1972

Mr. McIsaac (Wilkie): — Now their record, Mr. Speaker, in education as I say, is very interesting. Before the election, during the course of the campaign everywhere in the province on school issues, most of the issues that they raised were imaginary and distortions of fact. Some of the more radical Members of the NDP among the teachers, brought politics into the classroom at the Grade Two and Three levels. Following the example met by the Member for Cut Knife (Mr. Kwasnica) in this House, in previous years, everywhere they went they condemned every effort made by the Liberal Government to implement curricular reforms, to bring about new approaches to the problems in education, to the problems in providing good programs for the people of this province. They criticized our efforts to equalize costs, to reduce the disparities that had grown into the school system, disparities, for example, Mr. Speaker, that saw per pupil costs in rural areas vary from the neighbourhood of \$400 to \$500, in some units, to almost \$900, or nearly twice that in other rural units.

Now they were successful, in the course of that campaign, Mr. Speaker, and the success, of course, is attested to by the fact that about a third, I believe, of the members opposite belong to the teaching profession. Well, what has happened since the election on June 23rd? Where have their 15 Members been, Mr. Speaker, since June 23rd? Now, we've heard from several, one yesterday, the Member from Nutana South (Mr. Rolfes), and he was talking about the changes in the Teachers' Superannuation Act. Certainly, there were changes made that benefited all of the thousands of teachers in this province under the Liberal rule. The change was made to calculate pensions on the best six teaching years, rather than the best eight, the maximum upon which they can draw pension was raised to \$11,500. Improved pensions were provided for older teachers in the province. Teacher pensions in Saskatchewan are today comparable to that offered in practically any other Canadian province and certainly improvements can be made and should be made in the future and we look to you people to do it. We look to you people to do it. If the Member for Nutana South doesn't like the reduction factor applying to teachers who retire below age 65 he should talk to his Minister because it can be changed by an Order-in-Council. It doesn't need legislation. You've had eight months to do it.

Mr. Rolfes: — I did.

Mr. McIsaac: — Just change it. Talk to your Minister. I don't blame the teacher Members opposite, Saskatchewan the Member from Nutana for being a bit unhappy because the teaching profession is expecting a great deal from this Government. And so far they have been greeted largely with indecision in matters respecting education. Trustees and the taxpayers of this province are still waiting for that mill rate of 25 that they went up and down every road in the province promising, in the course of the election. Now it's four years time, now it's four years time. They didn't say that in the course of the election campaign, Mr. Speaker, but now we learn it's a four-year program.

Now, Mr. Speaker, in the last eight months the Minister of Education (Mr. MacMurchy) has held dozens of press conferences

on a wide variety of topics. In only one of these press conferences has he announced a single new policy and that was the intention of the Government to establish a new Department of Post-Secondary and Continuous Education. The Minister still occasionally gets his responsibilities mixed up, Mr. Speaker. It was pointed out yesterday in appointing a board of inquiry in the Moosomin dispute he seemed to be acting more in his capacity as Provincial President of the NDP than as the Minister of Education.

Some Hon. Members: — Hear, hear!

Mr. McIsaac: — Now let's look at a few of those press conferences and press releases of the Minister. Just a couple because time doesn't permit to deal with all of them.

He announced sometime last year a great reorganization of the Department of Education. Well what were the facts and what happened?

Three people were fired, one transferred, and that's the been the extent of the reorganization in the Department of Education. It was a sham reorganization, Mr. Speaker, designed for one purpose only, designed to fire a few people at the request of the NDP constituency executives and nothing more or less.

Mr. McIsaac: — We are to have a new Department of Post-Secondary Education. This I thought was an interesting press conference, Mr. Speaker. I think it was reported in the Leader-Post on December 8th when the Minister announced the formation of a new department. Almost at the same time in one of the Saskatoon papers his colleague from Saskatoon University was talking about abolishing the governing structure of the university. Well, I suppose there is nothing like giving the new department a complete full job to do right from the ground up.

Now the question of pupil-teacher ratio has been the subject of perhaps more press releases by the Minister and the Government than any other single topic. He doesn't have a pupil-teacher ration today but instead we have a teacher-pupil ratio. He is going to include an amount for teachers in the per-pupil amount of the new grant formula. Mr. Speaker, despite what my friends opposite say there will always be a ratio of staff to students whether you are talking about a school or a school system or the entire province. The Minister and the Government are not kidding anybody if they try to pretend that there is no such relationship. If the new grant formula for school support is to be based entirely on a per student cost, then obviously an allowance for the instructional costs has to be calculated in there in some manner. I suggest to you, Mr. Speaker, that the new formula if it is based strictly on per-pupil costs will prove a much more rigid one than any plan or any policy or any regulations of the former Liberal Government.

Some Hon. Members: — Hear, hear!

Mr. McIsaac: — If the Minister and the Government are able to come up with a grant formula based on expenditures per pupil, it will only be because of the successful efforts of school boards and

March 7, 1972

and the former Government to bring about greater equality in spending of the tax dollar. I suggest, Mr. Speaker, that the Government and the Minister will have a great deal more success in dealing with the problems of education by dealing with them honestly and stating facts and not fantasy.

Another policy which is supposed to have been buried or supposed to have been interred by the Minister is budget reviews, the policy of reviewing school board budgets. In the last few weeks, school boards tell me that there is a new procedure, a new process now in effect, one that is called instead, budget analysis. This is an interesting process, Mr. Speaker, very interesting. One board tells me that they have been asked to reduce the amount budgeted for teachers' salaries by so many thousand dollars. Another tells me that they have been asked to reduce their staff by so many and still another reports that they were asked to reduce spending on janitorial services and to increase spending on teachers' salaries. All of this by department officials. Now it is quite possible, Mr. Speaker, that in all of these cases the suggestions made by department officials are completely valid. My point is, Mr. Speaker, who is the Minister and the Government trying to kid when he says that budget reviews are no longer with us.

The Department of Education most certainly does have a role to play in working directly with school boards of this Province, to improve education, to ensure that new policies are implemented when they are announced and put forward, to ensure that the total tax dollars and there are many being directed to education, is spent to the best advantage. Experience here, Mr. Speaker, and elsewhere in Canada has shown that provincial departments of education do not accomplish these and other objectives by adopting a wait and see consultative role as proposed by the Minister sitting in the office waiting to be called. Or setting up, for that matter dozens of other little committees to look at the whole problems of education in piece-meal fashion. I refer here to the study announced to study whether or not kindergartens should be implemented in the Province. Another study has been set up to deal with the question of community colleges and there have been many studies on both of these points. I suggest, to the Minister it is time to look, if he will, at the overall question of education.

Some Hon. Members: — Hear, hear!

Mr. McIsaac: — Mr. Speaker, I wish the Minister and the Government well, very sincerely so, in dealing with the complex problems facing education today in this province and across the nation. I say again it will help immensely if the —mi faces squarely up to issues and doesn't use double talk in discussing these issues when he has his press releases on various topics on education. May I say also, Mr. Speaker, this applies to many of his backbenchers who entered this debate and skirted, skirted I say, many of the issues of education.

Last night the Minister's remarks were interesting, Mr. Speaker. He dealt I think for about 20 minutes about the problems of the Thirties and various other things and never once really referred to any of the problems of education.

There are many other aspects of proposed government policy, Mr. Speaker, that I should like to comment on but time does not

permit. As you can see by my comments I will not be supporting the motion, Mr. Speaker.

Some Hon. Members: — Hear, hear!

Mr. E. Kaeding (Saltcoats): — Mr. Speaker, it is my pleasure also at this time to congratulate the newly elected Members of the Legislature, Mr. Kim Thorson from Souris-Estevan, Mr. Wiebe from the constituency of Morse. I am sure that they will represent their constituencies with vigour and good judgement.

I should also like to express again at this time the sympathies of this House with the passing of the former Member from my constituency of Saltcoats, Mr. Asmundur Lopston on February 28th, 1972. His 20 years of service to the people of this Province will long be remembered.

I should also like to congratulate the Premier, Mr. Blakeney and the Cabinet on the speed and dedication which they have shown in quickly preparing legislation to bring about those reforms and programs which were so overwhelmingly endorsed by this Province last June 23rd. The legislation as outlined from the Speech from the Throne will go a long way to provide for our citizens the kind of progressive programs they have a right to expect.

In particular I should like to applaud the major programs being proposed by our young and energetic Minister of Agriculture (Mr. Messer). It is refreshing indeed to have a young and capable Minister who not only is able to co-ordinate and develop new programs, but who can so ably articulate the thoughts and desires of our farming community. The problems facing agriculture are many and complex and are such that one part of the province working independently can have very little impact on the overall national program. Since virtually all programs relating to pricing of our major farm products are controlled at the Federal level, it is imperative that the greatest possible degree of co-operation take place among the agriculture ministers of Western Canada and of our major farm organizations.

Last evening when listening to the young Member from Lumsden (Mr. Lane) I wondered whether someone had accidentally tripped over the cast on his leg causing him some considerable pain. I am sure that had he not had a severe pain of some kind he would not have made some of the rash statements he did. I was most interested in his philosophy on co-operation. You know we here in Saskatchewan have always been proud of the fact that we have some of the most co-operative minded people in the world, as is evidenced by the large numbers of co-operatives and credit unions in this country, large and small. I have personally been involved with co-operatives for as long as I can remember and I thought I know the philosophy fairly well. When the Member from Lumsden stated, as he did, that the only time to co-operate is when it is to your advantage, I knew I had missed something. I knew then why the Department of Co-operation fared so poorly under the Liberal administration.

In this connection, I would warn farmers no matter what commodity they specialize in to resist the temptation to fragment their energies by quarrelling amongst themselves. We have a much greater job to do in formulating an overall farm program which will gain acceptance on the Federal level. It is the height of folly to suggest that one commodity group should pit

March 7, 1972

itself against another with the hope of some temporary advantage in the market place. In spite of the objection voiced by the Member from Lumsden I most heartily commend the Minister of Agriculture (Mr. Messer) in taking the initiative in arranging meetings with his colleagues in our sister provinces to work out a common approach in matters of mutual interest to all of us in agriculture. As indicated from the Speech from the Throne there are a large number of new programs being introduced at this Session to assist rural agriculture in the form of the Land Bank, Grain Marketing Control Act, Bills to assist the dairy industry and others which will assist farmers in a substantial way to adjust and improve their position. However, it has been very evident from the past number of years that the real and pressing problem in agriculture is the ridiculous imbalance which has come about between the cost of production and the prices paid for farm products. Until some major action is taken on the Federal level to recognize this imbalance and a real attempt is forthcoming to appreciably correct it there can be little real improvement in net farm income.

The announcement of the two-price system for wheat is but one of the steps required, but we welcome that. I am concerned, however, when I hear statements, some of them made by what we would like to believe more responsible farm leaders, to the effect that the only real problem is volume of sales, that if we could somehow obtain sufficient volume this would solve most of our problems. Well, Mr. Speaker, I have run a farm business long enough to know that volume alone does not solve anything. It is volume times price which determines whether there will be a net farm income at the end of the year. If I am producing wheat or barley or hogs or any other commodity at a price which does not meet the cost of production then it doesn't matter how much I sell I still do not end up with a net income. For this reason I urge this Assembly to give full support to the united efforts now being made by our prairie agriculture ministers to negotiate with the Federal Government a real and meaningful grain stabilization program which would include as part of its formula some guarantee of net income stabilization with provisions for meeting increasing costs. I most strongly support efforts to renew an international wheat agreement which would establish an international price for wheat reflecting more realistically the cost of production. It is interest to note here, that several years ago when the world capacity to produce potash rose greatly in excess of effective world demand that potash producers throughout the world quickly moved to set up marketing quotas and effectively stabilized their industry at a profitable level. I believe that agricultural producers around the world will have to consider similar action if they wish to retain control of their industry.

The new and improved crop insurance program being made available for the first time in many areas and covering all major crops should prove to be another good management tool in the hands of our farmers. With the phasing out of The Prairie Farm Assistance Act all farmers in Saskatchewan will not be able to avail themselves of income protection of their grain crops. We welcome the continuation and expansion of programs to encourage diversification into livestock and other grains. Certainly any move away from a major dependency on wheat is a move in the right direction. Along with diversification, however, comes a responsibility to ensure that markets exist for these products. Here again is a natural area for co-operation among our prairie government. Trade missions to the

United States and the Eastern world could very profitably be sponsored by joint effort.

One area which seems to have been overlooked and which could very well do with some major assistance in the sheep breeders industry. Over the years some of our farmers have been encouraged to go into this industry and certainly statistics would indicate that there is room in Canada for a very substantial increase in lamb production. However, the recent discontinuance of the Federal wool subsidy and quality premiums have been a severe blow to those producers. I would urge this Government give some very serious consideration to programs to assist this industry along the lines now established for other livestock and the dairy industry. This should help to establish a more reliable supply of mutton and lamb, thereby stabilizing a market demand for what we know to be a very tasty product.

The constituency of Saltcoats which I am proud to represent has always been highly diversified and as the years go by the trend towards diversification continues. We have probably the highest livestock population of any comparable area in Saskatchewan. The last number of years have been the construction of many large family size hog operations and cattle feedlots. The demand for more and more community pastures indicates the build-up of beef herds. With the possibility of a bulk milk manufacturing plant in the Yorkton area we shall see the development of several good sized dairy operations. This creates a very substantial demand for feed grains and thereby lessens the dependency of our farmers on wheat and other cash crops, although our production of wheat is still very high.

The advent of the potash mining industry in our area has further diversified income potential in what was always predominately an agricultural community. The influx of new people has injected new vigour into the surrounding communities and has resulted in a larger and a better service of facilities in our towns.

We have, I believe, reached the levelling off stage in this development, in fact some painful retracting has taken place in the last two years. However, we are finding businessmen in several of our towns who are looking towards developing new and potentially profitable industries and services. With some assistance from government programs I am sure many will be successful and will help to establish and help stabilize our labour markets.

Small businessmen in our rural communities will be pleased to hear of the new programs being developed to assist them. A small business representative service patterned along the lines of our agricultural representative service should do much to assist with advice on legal matters, budgeting, marketing and other problems, and will be welcomed I am sure. A program to financially assist small industries in rural communities will also be most welcome.

Having been fortunate enough to have served on the legislative committee on agriculture this past year I was greatly impressed by this method of searching out the very best possible way to establish rural programs. I would strongly urge this Government to consider such a committee to enquire into the best possible ways of assisting small businessmen and small industries in this Province. Only by going to the grass roots can we

March 7, 1972

assure the survival of many of our small communities.

The largest potash mines in Canada are situated in my constituency with two mines just six miles apart and capable of producing over three million tons of K₂O annually. Another mine is situated just across the Qu'Appelle River in the Moosomin constituency. Anything that affects the operation of these mines therefore is of the greatest importance to our communities and to the labour force of approximately 1,000 men employed there. Because of the huge overcapacity which exists in our potash mining industry at the present time, it is extremely important to make some sort of order insofar as production is concerned. I therefore support the stand taken by our Government to continue the pro-rationing program until such a time as demand is more in balance with supply.

Some Hon. Members: — Hear, hear!

Mr. E. Kaeding: — A stable production pattern at our mines guarantees a stable labour force and permits the mining companies to do some long-term planning. However, since these companies have been able to increase their gross revenue from \$69 million in 1969 to \$145 million in 1971 with very little increase in production as a result of substantial minimum prices established under this program, it would appear reasonable that some of this additional revenue should accrue to the citizens of this Province in the form of substantially increased royalties.

It would appear that a serious problem has arisen in several of these mines insofar as safety and working conditions are concerned. A large number of complaints are coming from workmen as to unsafe working conditions in the mills. There seems to be some reluctance on the part of the workmen whether well-founded or not, not to air their complaints to supervisors for fear of reprisals. Charges are being made that when the mine inspectors inspect these plants they are steered around danger areas by company guides. As a method of correcting this problem I should like to propose that a mandatory safety committee be set up at each industry employing 20 persons or more, made up entirely of employees, who would report directly to the Minister of Mineral Resources once a month. This would safeguard the position of those charged with these duties and would act as a check to ensure that mine safety inspectors' recommendations are being carried out.

One further area of concern is proper pollution control. I have been assured by the management of these mines that all required precautions are being taken to see that the environment is being protected and I am persuaded that for the present this may be so. However, our constituents are understandably nervous over the huge build-up of salt waste sitting immediately on the banks of the Cut Arm and Qu'Appelle Rivers. Whether by accident or design, all three of these mines are situated within one mile of these water sheds. It is absolutely imperative that these water sheds be protected. Any rupture of the dike system during a period of heavy rainfall or spring run-off could create a catastrophe of major proportions.

I am very happy, therefore, that our Government will be establishing a Department of the environment, whose duty it will be to protect the public in all these cases.

In conclusion, Mr. Speaker, I believe that the proposals as contained in the speech from the Throne are good ones and I can assure you that I will be voting for its acceptance.

Some Hon. Members: — Hear, hear!

Mr. P.P. Mostoway (Hanley): — Mr. Speaker, as the Member for Hanley constituency, I am most delighted in having the privilege of replying to the speech from the Throne.

Also at this time I want publicly to thank the good people of Hanley constituency for electing me as their Member to this Assembly. It is a position that I will endeavour to fill to the best of my ability in serving them. As you may or may not be aware, Mr. Speaker, Hanley constituency can lay claim to a variety of things. Good and not so good farm land; three potash mines; two provincial parks; a nursing home for senior citizens; fine schools and, yes, an opera house, and probably the world's smallest post office. Therefore it can be expected that a variety of concerns and commendations should be brought to my attention. And on these I shall elaborate very shortly.

First, Mr. Speaker, I should like to commend the boys and girls who actively participated in the opening of this Session. Cubs, Guides and Scouts. You looked good! And the Inter-collegiate Band, you played wonderfully. I should also like to congratulate the following Assembly members, the Hon. Members from Souris-Estevan (Mr. Thorson) on his election and Cabinet appointment. The Hon. Member from Saskatoon Mayfair (Mr. Brockelbank) on his Cabinet appointment. The Hon. Member from Morse (Mr. Wiebe) on his election. The Hon. Member from City Park (Mr. Dyck) on his appointment as Deputy Speaker.

Mr. Speaker, I should also like to congratulate the Hon. Leader of the Opposition (Mr. Steuart) on his being elected Leader of his party. With reference to his insistence on trying to deny Members their rightful radio time, may I presume that when he comes back from hospital, and after a successful operation, that his attitude will be come co-operative than before. I hope so, -ms because such tactics as his only serve to make a mockery of the workings of this House. And, Mr. Speaker, I should also like to remind him that on being elected his party's Leader, he mentioned something about going out and searching for grass roots. Well, Mr. Speaker, may I suggest the inconsistency of the whole situation. If it is grass roots that he wants, he should ask his federal counterpart from Saskatoon-Humboldt who knows a good deal about grass roots as he helped plant a lot of them a few years ago. May I also suggest that if he and the other Members opposite really want to know what people think, they have at least 171 ways to find out. May I also remind him that if they ignore this swelling dissent in their party, it could very well prove to be lethal to them.

Mr. Speaker, this people-oriented Speech from the Throne will no doubt give new hope and encouragement to all segments of Saskatchewan society at a time when wars, economic doldrums and artificially created divisions of people are the rule. In this regard the Speech is a good one, one that indicates that this Government is well aware that for the past number of years the citizens of this Province have been short changed in

March 7, 1972

beneficial legislation which protects and encourages people. And if the Hon. the Leader of the Opposition does not agree that the Speech is a good one I can only assume that it is because there are no sugar plums in it for those giant concerns which he seems so dedicated to help at the expense of Saskatchewan people.

No, Mr. Speaker, no sugar plums here but rather bread and butter legislation geared to the needs of Saskatchewan people.

Some Hon. Members: — Hear, hear!

Mr. Mostoway: — Mr. Speaker, Hanley constituency is mainly rural although it takes in a portion of Saskatoon. Now one of the major concerns I wish to draw your attention to is the difficult situation most farmers find themselves in. Why does it take the Federal Government so long to recognize that farmers must be afforded the same kind of national and benevolent concern that is afforded almost every other industry in our country? Why not the same regard for the prairie agriculture industry as is given big business of Eastern Canada?

Do political contributions play a big part in this situation? Many people would seem to think so. At any rate if farmers are not given the —protection to which they are entitled it will cost our country dearly in terms of displacement of people, the drying up of dependent communities, and the cost of social services which will surely have to be supplied to those who will be the victims.

Mr. Speaker, permit me to bring to the attention of this House the plight of many farmers in regard to irrigation. As you are probably aware it has not been too many years ago that government said, “Full steam for irrigation.” No in-depth long-range planning was ever carried out. Many farmers seem to be caught between the devil and the deep blue sea. Some went for irrigation and some did not. Now many of them find themselves in an almost intolerable situation. It is my hope, Mr. Speaker, that this Government help these farmers to find ways and means of producing suitable crops and possibly livestock in this irrigation area.

It is also my hope that in the disposition of their produce serious consideration be given more active government participation. In regard to the proposed Land Bank Commission I think this Government should be commended. I know there are those who will laugh it off as being impractical or sneer it off as a giant hoax. But let me remind you the same thing was said years ago when our party started a program of rural electrification or even Medicare.

No, Mr. Speaker, it will not automatically solve the farming situation but it will be a start. It is far better to start a new concept than to sit idly by.

Mr. Speaker, last fall in the Hanley constituency many small and local meetings were held to listen to and inform constituents. Let me relay to his House some of the concerns expressed at just one such meeting. One was in regard to crop damage by migrating water fowl. No doubt farmers throughout this Province share this concern. Farmers feel, and rightly so, that it is they who feed these birds for the benefit of

all, all except farmers. Farmers want a new deal whereby in the future they will be compensated for crop depreciation by water fowl. In this regard I am pleased to learn that this –problem is receiving prompt priority by both the Provincial and Federal Governments.

Another think that seems to cause irritation is the manner in which a certain organization goes about securing certain rights in regard to water facilities for these water fowl. There is no need for high pressure tactics in dealing with the people of Hanley constituency or any other area in Saskatchewan. They are approachable but they don't like being pushed around.

Mr. Speaker, we are all aware that unemployment in Canada is at an all time high. In this respect our province is no exception, therefore, I believe that this Government should be commended for its acceleration of a public works program to relieve unemployment. Not to be forgotten are the many community projects which are not going on with the participation of the individuals and municipal, provincial and federal levels of government.

Mr. Speaker, permit me to tell you that I am sure our young people are happy to know that a new and better summer employment program for students will be implemented this summer.

Mr. Speaker, when talking about unemployment there is a strong collective opinion which I have been asked to air. It is an opinion of utter disgust held by many. You ask, if they, too, will be eligible for a federal government job if they incite others to treasonable actions, go into hiding for months, emerge with much fanfare and then announce a change of heart. Mr. Speaker, when the Federal Government hired just such a person recently it didn't go too well with too many people in my constituency.

And while I am on the topic of unemployment, since when did the Unemployment Insurance Commission put the onus on the unemployed to enforce the law of the land? Since when are the unemployed expected to go gallivanting all around the country to make sure they are eligible? I say this is a job that should be done by those hired to do the job and not the unemployed.

Mr. Speaker, I am pleased to see that this Government recognized the need to further expand the student bursary program, which, no doubt, has enabled many students to further their post-secondary education. No, I don't wish to play down the need for encouraging academic excellence, but I would like to say that many of our students feel that in this regard more emphasis might be put on the family's ability to pay.

In our province we probably have one of the finest educational systems in the world, thanks to sound planning put into practice by able people years ago and today. Now the point that I should, like to raise again is the irrelevance of some of our school courses. It is not so much that I condemn the existence of courses we already have, but rather I condemn the lack of new and relevant courses. And here I refer to such courses as might better help our students to appreciate their rights, privileges and involvements when they finish their

March 7, 1972

formal education.

I am also pleased to inform this House that the people of my constituency were very pleased when the Government removed the tax on the sick. Mr. Speaker, it is my hope that in the near future many of our physically handicapped young people will be able to take advantage of a Cheshire Home. In this regard I commend all that has been done by various individuals and organizations. I know, Mr. Speaker, that the people in my constituency welcome the establishment of an Independent Electoral Boundaries Commission. Gone forever, should be the tendency to gerrymander which reached its ultimate in absurdity at the last provincial election.

Some Hon. Members: — Hear, hear!

Mr. Mostoway: — I am glad to see that there is unanimous opinion there. Proposed legislation to provide new services and assistance to small businessmen will be met with approval, I have no doubt. Needless to say many of these concerns have been hit hard by the economic slump of recent years. Now, Mr. Speaker, I interpret this proposed legislation as a public recognition by this Government of the importance of the small businessman to the economy of Saskatchewan.

Mr. Speaker, I am very concerned about the large number of people in this province who have never shared our so-called 'Good life society'. Some are old, some are not, some work outside, some inside, some in the kitchen. Theirs is a routine of hard work day after day. There are no spare dollars here. No organization speaks for them. Therefore, the rest of society often tends to forget about these people because society assume silence means contentment. Nothing could be further from the truth. Therefore, Mr. Speaker, I am sure the citizens welcome this specific mention made in the Throne Speech to extended consumer protection through a Department of Consumer affairs, provision for a Human Rights Commission and an Ombudsman will be welcome too. Through such things, I am sure, this Government will make a good start on providing the sort of protection that these people desperately need.

Mr. Speaker, may I bring to the attention of this House something that I have found extremely disturbing. It is the insinuation by some Opposition Members that those who embrace New Democratic philosophy are Maoists, Stalinists or whatever you will, people lurking in the shadows ready to betray our country. Now, Mr. Speaker, I consider this inference by some, and I stress some Opposition Members, as a slur on the honour and integrity and good name of the citizens of our province and I urge these same Opposition Members to publicly apologize for this uncalled for accusation.

Some Hon. Members: — Hear, hear!

Mr. Mostoway: — Mr. Speaker, I will support the motion.

Mr. D.F. MacDonald (Moose Jaw North): — Mr. Speaker, it is a pleasure as the Member for Moose Jaw North to speak in this debate.

I should like first of all to congratulate my new seatmate the Member from Morse (Mr. Wiebe) on his recent election. Mr. Wiebe is a very welcome addition to this side of the House. Congratulations are also in order for the new Member from Souris-Estevan (Mr. Thorson) both for his joining this House and also for joining the Cabinet.

I should also like to commend the mover and seconder for their contribution to this Debate. I appreciate the comments made by the Member from Kerrobert-Kindersley (Mr. Taylor) when he touched on the uselessness of partisan bickering. It is obvious, however, that he wasn't speaking on behalf of his caucus or his Cabinet, or most of all, of his Leader. If the Member is earnest in this matter then I think he has a lot of work to do and I wish him good luck in his task.

Mr. Speaker, I am not at this time going to take time to tell you about all the good qualities of the constituency of which I represent. I am, however, going to talk a great deal about Moose Jaw. I don't apologize, in fact I feel quite justified in taking the time of this Legislature to discuss the problems of Moose Jaw. I feel that these problems are to a large degree, and will become to a larger degree, a responsibility of the province as a whole.

As I read and reread the Throne Speech I became very disappointed at the lack of programs to assist us in solving our problems. I was grateful to see that measures will be proposed to assist in dealing with the growing problems of urban centres. I anticipate here legislation dealing with urban transportation, police protection, roads and so on. I was also happy with the intention to continue expansion of our technical institute at Moose Jaw.

On the whole, however, the Throne Speech did not show any hope of measures that will get to the bottom of basic problems. The basic problem of Moose Jaw, and possibly of other small centres, is the lack of economic development. This is a problem that has been surfacing for 20 years or so but in the past year has reached drastic proportions. Moose Jaw has served this Province very well. The city has been the very hub of transportation of the province. It became the first really industrialized city of the province and now because of the changing transportation system, because of the obsolescence of our early industries and because of new methods of production, Moose Jaw finds itself without a sufficient industrial base. On top of this during the first half century of our city while we were serving and to a large degree supporting this Province we were ignored by the government. We didn't get money for a university, we didn't get money for government agencies. Apparently it appeared we were able to stand on our industrial base. Only in the last few years did we finally get the Saskatchewan Training School and the Technical Institute and then last year we were grateful to see the repair depot built. However since the time this Province was formed Regina and Saskatoon have been subsidized by government spending. The close proximity of Moose Jaw to Regina has served to drain potential from our city and magnify the problem. May I just quote figures prepared by the Economic Commission in Moose Jaw to illustrate my point. These statistics are in government spending on buildings during the last five years. Spending in Moose Jaw \$4.6 million, spending in Saskatoon \$49 million, spending in Regina \$63 million.

March 7, 1972

Mr. Snyder: — Who was responsible for this?

Mr. MacDonald: — I would ask the Minister of Labour (Mr. Snyder) to please listen. I think this has been one of the problems we have had in Moose jaw as we have had straight political representation.

Some Hon. Members: — Hear, hear!

Mr. MacDonald: — This certainly isn't a political speech, admitting these facts and I think this is the problem we have had in Moose Jaw. We are a proud city with a love of our community and everyone agrees that it is a great place to live but it is fast becoming impossible to live in it if you have to find a job to support yourself. Moose jaw has suffered a loss of population of 2,000 people. We need new jobs and we need them now. Mr. Speaker, I can't really see any new jobs in the Throne speech and this disappoints me. We were offered a great program before June 23rd and I call for some action on these promises. We heard about the new development fund to overcome a sagging economy and loss of jobs in Moose Jaw. We heard about an immediate start on the Moose Jaw River Valley project. Most of all, Mr. Speaker, we heard about the construction of a provincial office building. This was a building planned while the present Government even owns the site where it is to be built. The promise was for an immediate start on construction.

Mr. Deputy Speaker, this wasn't just another local promise dreamed up by a local NDP candidate. On June 5th, 1971, Mr. Blakeney confirmed this immediate start and he even told us that it would cost \$1.5 million. However, when questioned on January 14, 1972, about the building the Premier didn't have a reply. He said a government committee on priorities, planning and program development was currently studying the question. Mr. Speaker, I know the priorities, and the people of Moose Jaw know the priorities and even the now Premier knew the priorities on June the 5th. So lets get on with construction and provide decent facilities and a few jobs in our city.

We have heard a great deal about decentralization of government by the Members opposite in the past years. There is no mention of any such plans in this Throne speech. We in Moose jaw have watched the fantastic new buildings go up in Regina. We have watched the telephone building and the power corporation building and university buildings go up. And with these buildings go hundreds of jobs. I think it is fair for Moose Jaw to urge decentralization, I think it is fair for Moose Jaw to want a government agency such as SGIO. I discussed this particular SGIO agency with a cabinet minister. I referred to the great stimulus it would provide to our city. He agreed that it certainly would be nice but he though it might be impossible because of the hardships of relocation of employees. He pointed out that there were considerable problems even with such a small situation as our new repair depot. This may be so, Mr. Speaker, that it is difficult to move 40 miles to a new city but I suggest that people in all walks of life are forced at times to move with their jobs. Decentralization is well overdue.

On January 14th, 1972, the Cabinet was in Moose Jaw. I think the city of Moose Jaw explained very well what the solutions to the problems are. There is nothing in the Throne Speech to indicate the Cabinet took any notes. The answer of course is jobs. The Throne Speech indicates the seriousness of unemployment but offers no solution. It mentions employment for students in the summer will be continued. It mentions winter works projects will be continued. These programs certainly don't alleviate the lack of permanent employment. I noticed last night on television that my namesake, the president of the CLC, Don MacDonald, said exactly the same thing, that this was no answer, piece-meal job production.

It mentions public works will be increased but this will be more than offset by the intention to cut back on highway construction. The lack of any program or philosophy under the heading of industrial development in this Throne Speech is most disheartening. Mr. Speaker, the Government has shown that it intends to take no responsibility in the field of finding jobs. Just the other day Ontario brought in its Throne Speech. Priority number one was unemployment. They outlined measures that they were prepared to take to find new jobs for their people. Priority number two was to improve economic conditions. Their priority is jobs, they don't intend to just sit back and holler at the Federal Government. The Ontario Government is prepared to go out and produce jobs for their people, the Saskatchewan Government is prepared to do very little. We got an indication of this Government's intention when the first speaker, the Member for Kerrobert-Kindersley (Mr. Taylor) rose in this debate. He loudly berated the Federal Government for unemployment. He referred to vicious and barbaric acts. Yet he, a Member of the Government with power to act, failed to bring forth any positive measures to produce jobs. I think, Mr. Speaker, that these terms, 'vicious' and 'barbaric' are going to be turned around and used to describe this Government for its inactions and its negative actions. I don't think that there is a provincial government in Canada with less right to criticize anyone else's employment program. It is sheer hypocrisy for our Premier or his Government to criticize anyone until he puts his own house in order. There is absolutely no doubt in my mind that providing a favourable industrial climate is the only answer for providing jobs. Mr. Speaker, the Government of this day in Saskatchewan is not producing a favourable industrial climate. Both the Premier and the Minister of Industry (Mr. Thorson) have made weak attempts at saying that private development capital is welcome in this Province and then followed up these statements with threats. Our Attorney General (Mr. Romanow) has made some very uncalled for statements and threats. The Minister of Health (Mr. Smishek) and the Minister of Labour (Mr. Snyder) have added comments that would hardly be expected to produce a favourable industrial climate.

At the NDP convention, the Waffle group made it clear that private development capital is not welcome in this Province. I think that until the Government makes clear its intentions and philosophy we will see no development of any kind and no jobs. If this Government has decided to take the disastrous route of nationalization and government or public control of industrial land resource development than why won't it make this intention clear. If the Government has decided to develop industry and resources by means of government intervention or co-operation with private capital then it should make this clear. If, however, the Premier and the Industry Minister (Mr. Thorson) are

March 7, 1972

serious about welcoming private development capital then they have a fantastic job to do in convincing these people and they better get at the task. It surely is no secret that people in the other provinces in Canada and, in fact, people of most countries of the world distrust the motives and intentions of our present Government. It is no secret that companies that have been negotiating with the city of Moose Jaw for development of industry in our city stopped almost completely their negotiations on June 23rd, 1971. These people are waiting for our Government to make clear its intentions. Moose Jaw will be able to attract industries related or allied to our agriculturally based economy. These are the same industries that some people in the Saskatchewan Government are still talking about nationalizing. City council in Moose Jaw made it abundantly clear to the Cabinet that given a favourable industrial climate it was assured that his type of industry would locate in our city. So, Mr. Speaker, I ask this Government to give us this favourable industrial climate or else get on with some other plan. We need jobs and opportunity now.

I should like to say a few words about the Roumanian tractor plant. If it comes where will it go? Our Premier made the statement that he would try to influence the Roumanians to locate in Moose Jaw because as he said this is the area that needs the plant. He also said that the choice would have to be left up to the Roumanian company. I should like to argue this point with the Premier as I understand the likely situation is that the Provincial Government will be a partner. Perhaps to the tune of 49 per cent. Therefore if the Provincial Government contributes this much capital and the Federal Government provides a large grant under the DREE program then I think the Premier should have the right to say where this plant will locate. If foreign capital is welcome in Saskatchewan and I certainly welcome it, it should be welcomed under our rules and our terms. It should go to the place that needs it most and therefore will bring the most benefit to the province as a whole. It seems that only a short time ago Saskatoon was crying about the problems of a city as it gets too large and unwieldy and that there was an optimum size for a city. They admitted that further growth would be a problem in Saskatoon and now today, Mr. Speaker, Saskatoon is demanding the tractor plant that so many other localities could use to more benefit. I repeat in this Legislature that Premier Blakeney can do and should do much more than just try to influence the Roumanian company to locate in an area that as he says most needs the plant.

I should like to say a few words about, about the actions of the Minister of Labour (Mr. Snyder). The Throne speech contains what appears to be an innocuous lie saying that steps have been taken to improve the lot of working people. This, of course, relates to the 40-hour week and the raise in minimum wage. I would agree that these actions have improved the lot of some working people. However the method and timing of actions by the Minister of Labour (Mr. Snyder) leave a great deal to be desired.

Some Hon. Members: — Hear, hear!

Mr. MacDonald: — The result of these actions by the Premier have had profoundly adverse effects in rural Saskatchewan. Some of these situations have been pointed out to the Minister and I am sure many more things will be added by Members representing the rural ridings.

I should like to point out some of the problems that have occurred in a smaller city like Moose Jaw. One of the first things that became apparent was the loss of jobs attributable to the actions of the Minister of Labour (Mr. Snyder). Many jobs were lost at a time when unemployment in our province was at the highest point since the 1930s. The timing of these actions by the Minister came when the financial picture of this Province and this country and our city was not good. The time came when we could least afford further unemployment. It is now obvious why the Premier has asked this Minister to carry the two portfolios of Welfare and Labour. I would suggest that there are a number of people who will be applying for welfare because of the untimely actions of the Minister of Labour. I am sure the working people are able by virtue of still holding a job to take advantage of higher wages and shorter hours are quite happy and I am certainly happy for them also.

What about all the people who don't have a job left? Has the Minister improved the lot of these people? Creating unemployment is just one facet of the total picture. It has been suggested that employers should become more efficient. Well, improved efficiency is the answer for some hard pressed small employers and increased prices have become the answer for others. The consumer pays the heavy price in both cases. Our community pays the heavy price of decreased services available. The stock answer is that the employer should be able to absorb the increase by profits. I would welcome the Minister to check the small employers in Moose Jaw who are not even able to pay their tax arrears. Sympathy has been shown for small employers such as the big oil corporations. Sympathy is not enough for these service station operators. Telling them that it is not this Government's fault that they now have to work longer hours themselves at even smaller profits but that it is the big oil companies' fault is not good enough for them.

Did the action of the Minister of Labour improve the lot of people on fixed incomes? Transit fares have gone up, mill rates will also go up, services will go down. People on old age pensions, welfare recipients, unemployment insurance recipients, all now have to pay higher costs and are receiving fewer services. I am sure the Minister is aware of these facts because I've had calls from lots of his constituents. The Minister has instituted measures which aid one group and cause problems for many others and this is my complaint. He offers no solutions to the problems he created, he does nothing to ensure jobs for those he put out of work, he does nothing to ease the increased tax burden on local taxpayers. I believe the only attempt he has made to ease any situation was when he informed special care homes that increased grants might be made to cover the increased costs that his actions had imposed on them. Why single out this one particular case? What about increased cost of our transit systems? What about increased costs in parks and recreation programs? Why does the Minister not offer solutions to the plight of so many fixed income local taxpayers and consumers? The answer to so many of our problems, Mr. Speaker, is jobs for our people. I can see absolutely no solutions to this problem in the Throne Speech and I do not intend to support the motion.

Some Hon. Members: — Hear, hear!

March 7, 1972

Mr. E. Kramer (The Battlefords): — Mr. Speaker, it is a pleasure and a privilege for me to be rising to speak in this Debate. Before I go into the text in detail of my speech I should like to congratulate the Premier for the Throne Speech and the hope that is contained for Saskatchewan people. I should like to congratulate the mover and the seconder and the newcomers who took their places in the House and all of those who have so creditably spoken. I cannot congratulate the people who performed here the last day or two or three. The performance indicated to me that they were afraid to face the consequences of their actions, afraid to allow an orderly debate to go forward over the airways. Mr. Speaker, it seems to me that this group of people with their asinine behavior certainly are fortunate to have two veterinarians in their midst to take care of them.

Some Hon. Members: — Hear, hear!

Mr. Kramer: — These tattered remnants of the Liberal Party sitting over there complaining about not having, having the gall to complain about not having enough time and not being treated fairly, Mr. Speaker, the only mistake we made according to the performance they have given thus far — we should have given them all the time. The public would have known better what they can bring forth.

I should like to point out that there are only eight Members sitting on that side of the House who are democratically elected by the people. The rest of them have no right, no democratic right to sit there. Three Members from Regina, one Member from Moose Jaw, the Member for Prince Albert East, everyone of them are illegitimate children of the gerrymander, not to mention the cuckoo bird that does things in other people's nests.

Some Hon. Members: — Hear, hear!

Mr. Kramer: — These people have no right whatever to complain about the treatment they have received and especially very little right considering their behavior and their trampling on human rights for the last seven years. Their pleas will fall on the deaf ears of the people of Saskatchewan who are listening.

Mr. Speaker, we were entertained yesterday, and I notice that the Member for Moosomin (Mr. Gardner) has scurried for cover. He's not in his seat, I wish he were.

Mr. Weatherald: — I'll tell him.

Mr. Kramer: — You tell him when to sit. Don't worry I've got a few things to say to you too, Tom. Mr. Speaker, I should like to ask the Hon. Member from Moosomin who has developed this tremendous interest now that he is in Opposition in the protection of wild life in his constituency and throughout the province. The Hon. Member accuses me and the Government in being lax and not taking proper precautions to protect the game in his constituency and throughout this Province. I'd like to know where he was last spring when the regulations were being set by his former Government of which he was a Member. Where was he when his Member reported the proposed regulations to his caucus?

Where was he? Where was his interest in wild life then, Mr. Speaker? Where was this great champion of the environment then? I don't know, his interest may have been somewhere around the city but it certainly wasn't out in the woods in Moosomin. The Member very well knows that these regulations were set prior to this Government taking office and very little could be done. Once those regulations were in effect, the invitations were out to people from across the border to make the best of a bad situation. It is a well-known fact, Mr. Speaker, that the former Government refused to take advice of any kind from civil servants and that civil servants who attempted to give advice or attempted to stand by a principle didn't gain any popularity and, in fact, some of them were dismissed for standing on a principle.

Some Hon. Members: — Hear, hear!

Mr. Kramer: — An Hon. Member said yesterday in this House that principle was something that the Liberals thought of as a sum of money and I can't agree more. The Hon. Member refers to the greatest slaughter of moose since the last buffalo hunt. Maybe there's something significant in that. I think possibly he shouldn't be too critical of those old whiskey traders and buffalo hunters because I understand that when they killed the last buffalo they got together and formed the early beginnings of the western Liberal Party, and we've been suffering from that malady every since.

For the information of this House, Mr. Speaker, the Hon. Member for Cannington (Mr. Weatherald) sat on his fanny and did nothing about this, the man who now proposes to take such an interest in wild life and conservation. I thought better of him, because he is a part of the Wild Life Federation and he certainly ought to have been conversant with what was going on. Here I have in my hand the Order-in-Council which permits the regulations, setting out the regulations. Just a minute — it says something about Virginia deer and there's a Latin name *Ocetilius Virginianus* or something to that effect. It reminds me of some of the Members opposite. We have this Order-in-Council dated (significant again, Mr. Speaker) Thursday, June 24. The Member for Moosomin talked about the greatest slaughter of moose in history. That was the day after the greatest slaughter of Liberals in the history of this Province.

Some Hon. Members: — Hear, hear!

Mr. Kramer: — In here it mentions a little item that says from the 15th day of November 1971 to the 11th day of December 1971, both days included that in Greenwater Provincial Park and in Moose Mountain Provincial Park only three deer shall be taken. Signed by the late Ross Thatcher on the 24th of June last year. A little later than usual but signed. And the Member opposite who is not in his seat who was afraid to stand by his statements knew it, knew it, Mr. Speaker. He gave this information to the House yesterday knowing full well because he has spoken to Members on this side of the House indicating that he knew it was the fault of the former Government but he chose to make political capital...

Mr. MacDonald (Milestone): — How do you change it?

March 7, 1972

Mr. Kramer: — How do you change it. We'll change it.

Mr. MacDonald: — When?

Mr. Kramer: — Don't worry. The Member for Milestone was pounding his desk and cheering yesterday when he knew very well because he sat in and okayed these regulations. He sat there and gave his consent to them. Mr. Speaker, it's no use crying crocodile tears now. I am sure that they are the kind of people that when they go to a funeral they carry an onion in their handkerchief.

Some Hon. Members: — Hear, hear!

Mr. Kramer: — Here we have the special moose season, that great slaughter of moose, once again Moose Mountain Provincial Park only, the first time in history as the Member said, okayed by the former Government – regulations set and invitations sent out by the former Government, Mr. Speaker. I take pleasure in tabling this Order-in-Council for the information of anyone who might have reason to doubt it. Let there be no further doubt from now on who was responsible for the slaughter.

Some Hon. Members: — Hear, hear!

Mr. Kramer: — Mr. Speaker, upon taking office we had to take stock of what was left of our province after seven years of Liberal Government. We found that our farmers were in desperate straits; that many of our people were forced to leave our province; and that many thousands were unemployed. Our educators were distressed about the lack of concern regarding the quality of education in our province and the effect this would have on our young people. Whole communities had dried up. Many businesses had been forced out in the rural areas. The people in our northern communities had suffered too. Due to poor conservation and management practices commercial fishing had declined in northern lakes. The fur market dropped. Most of the mink ranchers in northern Saskatchewan were forced out of business and we found that most people living in our northern communities were dependent on handouts and social aid. This, briefly, Mr. Speaker, is what we inherited after only seven years of Liberal Government. In all sincerity I say, it would have been tragic if they had been returned too office for another term.

Upon taking office we also found that communications between the Liberal Government and the public service had all but dried up. Practically the whole public service was petrified with fear, communication had become a one way street, everything from the top and nothing from the field. Nothing from where the people lived. And nothing or practically nothing from the people who knew where and what the problems were and the possible solutions for these problems. Things were done without consulting the people affected and more often than not without the advice of people in the administrative branch concerned. Most often the Liberal Government made judgments on what appeared to be political expediency rather than on the basis of what was economically practical and in the interests of the people who pay the bills, the taxpayers.

It is not the first time I have mentioned this little item in this House and I mention it again because it is one of those historic monuments that we hear of. And so it was that the Liberal Government recently retired came up with the gems of the Primrose Path in north-western Saskatchewan, officially know as Highway 104. Two million dollars worth of highway going from nowhere to nowhere, northwest of Canoe Lake, a useless whim of the former Government solely a publicity stunt to provide access for non-existent industry before the 1967 election. Futile attempts have been made since by the former –go to encourage operators in that area and they have ended in bankruptcy and disaster.

Even after that thousands of dollars worth of subsidy were put into such fields as the Department of Education. They ad a program there last year, Mr. Speaker, teaching Indians how to carry on axe, and paid the operator of the mill \$1.25 per hour in order to try and keep him in business so they could say there is something going on along that Primrose Path. And it all ended in dismal failure. I was there last fall at the site of that mill and the smouldering ashes remained, nothing more, just as the smouldering ashes remain of what is left of a Liberal Party over there on your left.

The Member for Athabasca (Mr. Guy) spoke of monuments to the last Liberal administration. Many of the things he spoke about were more monumental than monument – monumental failures. Things like the Anglo-Rouyn Mine which he boasted of and the tremendous public subsidy that went into that venture is something that I want to tell about. The public paid \$5 million for a road between that mine to La Ronge and Flin Flon. The public paid this colossal amount of money to provide access out of the province, of course, with the ore only one place to go, on, over and out. Now, -Mr. Speaker, it should be remembered that Mr. Berezowsky, the former Member for Cumberland, protested the promotion of this mine and was ridiculed by Members opposite when they were the government, when Mr. Berezowsky suggested that the mine was only a peanut mine and didn't warrant the attention and publicity that it was given. It turned out that the Hon. Member was wrong. It was not even a peanut mine. The people of Saskatchewan and the taxpayers who provided the money for the road subsidy didn't even get the peanuts. You know what they got, Mr. Speaker? Ordinary interest on \$5 million a year alone is about \$350,000 per year on that debt. Did we get a million dollars back out of it, did we get half that much? Oh, no.

I asked the former Minister of Mineral Resources in the House last year and the year before to inform the Legislature what the mine had provided for the Provincial Treasury. The former Minister refused to answer saying it was not in the public interest. Well, as it turns out the whole mess wasn't in the public interest. The reason for keeping the truth from the public, however, was because it was not in the interest of the Liberal Party to reveal it. Did they get a half a million back out of that? Did they get their interest for one year back? No. they got less than \$100,000 out of that mine, Mr. Speaker. Exact sum - \$94,342 during the total time that wonderful industrial venture was in operation. A monument – one of the monuments to remember the Liberal Party by and I table this in honour of the late and unlamented Liberal Party, Mr. Speaker.

March 7, 1972

\$94,342. Put that in your records. The people of Saskatchewan didn't even receive peanuts, Mr. Speaker. Since the inception of that mine, \$5 million plus was spent and they received a measly amount of less than \$100,000 worth of revenue and a great big hole in the ground. Monument to the Liberal management of the resources of this Province. Monuments, yes, monuments to the wheelers and dealers that seem to have the Liberal Party in their pockets both in Saskatchewan and Ottawa.

At the same time profitable, publicly owned corporations which provided millions of dollars over the years to the Provincial Treasury were sabotaged and washed down the drain. The Saskatchewan Timber Board was wrecked, stripped of its resources for the benefit of friends of the Liberal Party from outside the province. It would not have been so bad if the former Government had had the intestinal fortitude to have washed it out completely but they stripped only the profitable parts and left a bill of expense as a legacy, a quarter of a million dollars a year losses for us to face now that we are in office. Quarter of a million dollars last year, a quarter of a million dollars the year before from a venture that was profitable and put over the years some \$8 million into the Provincial Treasury, Mr. Speaker. I ask you, why did they sell the profitable operations at Reserve and commence to phase out at Carrot River and Reserve on the one hand, and then proceed to build a new saw mill for a marginal operation at Big River? The story of the fiasco of the Big River mill is another monument to the lack of foresight and business management of the former Government.

They reported to us last year in Crown corporations Committee that a new mill was being constructed and that it would cost \$159,000. When we investigated and examined the operation last summer, we found that the costs of that mill were already close to twice that amount, in fact, more than twice that amount. That, in itself, would not have been so bad. The problem was that after spending half a million dollars on the sawmill, it wouldn't work. This mill which was scheduled to produce 80,000 board feet per eight hour shift still has to reach 30,000. It may be impossible to believe, Mr. Speaker, that the former Government proceeded with this expenditure without a feasibility study. The only feasibility study was a sort of a three page memo from the former manager who is no longer with us. Other submissions from experienced people indicating that that mill if it was built properly would have cost over \$600,000 were ignored. But for political expediency again, in an effort to defeat my colleague from Big River, they thought, 'we've got to build a mill'. So they chose to throw one together in the most haphazard fashion imaginable. And I want to say this, Mr. Speaker, in the building of that mill, if there was a wrong way of doing it, they found it. All the way from the debarker at the front end to the sawdust burner at the other end. It was a mess of bottlenecks of mismanagement. No general contractor, 14 sub-contractors, and the left hand not knowing what the right hand was doing. I am sure that the Member for Regina West would shudder. I'll take you up there sometime and show you what the accomplishments were. If there was a wrong way to do anything, they found it. The sawdust burner, \$14,000 sawdust burner, Mr. Speaker. Remember it is

not taking the offal from an 80,000 board feet shift, it is only taking 30,000 or less. In two months it collapsed from the heat. \$14,000 down the flue and a new one had to be installed. That's only one little item. That's the good business management that we used to hear so much about. Man, man I would hate to see it back!

Things like the so-called farms at Beauval and LaLoche. They created a couple of deserts up there, they thought they were going to create a farm. Down there they created mile after mile of drifting sand. Somebody should have told them that you just can't seem to hold that sand down once you take the woods off it. It's another monument through the weakness and stupidity of some politicians.

The Premier outlined very well the situation regarding the fiasco of the Athabasca mill and the reasons for getting out of that scheme. The \$6 million expense that the people of Saskatchewan are faced with to get out of that deal is another monument through the absolute failure and foolhardiness, the recklessness of these people opposite who would risk anything in order to maintain power.

All this talk of environment, I have to repeat. The Premier quoted from the statement by Mr. Lucas, who is assistant deputy in the Federal Department of the Environment, working for the Hon. Jack Davis, who said just as recently as last January that there was not a chance that Federal guidelines would have given proper protection to the Beaver River which it must be remembered flows into one of the greatest assets that Saskatchewan has, the great pure chain of the Churchill water shed. In my opinion, Mr. Speaker, the Churchill will in the future be a boon if we are smart enough. If we pay enough attention to conservation to maintain that in a pure form, because it is the last pure stream of water on the entire North American continent. The people opposite would like us to follow the path, the Primrose Path of the people south of the line, who have turned three quarters or more of their water bodies into cesspools. I say, Mr. Speaker, it is fortunate that we called a halt, not only because of the pollution, that was only small. The financial deal was still the main concern and should be the main concern. No way could we go for this.

There was another reckless irresponsible action they took. Mr. Landegger, might as well say Mr. Landegger, because he is Parsons and Whittemore this, that and the other and three or four other companies, but it is all one man and his two sons, who was campaigning very vigorously on television for one thing and another singing the praises of this party opposite for his own best ends. Small wonder, I don't know what kind of deals, what kind of angles were going on there, but they insisted that certain, and this was Karl, that certain very important sections of the forest regulations particularly concerned with the protection of the environment were re-worded and omitted from the Agreement, from the Forest Management Licence Agreement.

Since Section 45(c) was omitted, what does the elimination of Section 45(c) do? 1. It has taken away our authority to reserve areas for game preserve and game management. 2. It has prevented us from setting aside wilderness areas, Mr. Member from Cannington and 3. It has prevented us from

March 7, 1972

taking any action in water shed control. These were deleted from the agreement, Mr. Speaker. These people, in order to satisfy one entrepreneur who wasn't prepared to put up one dollar of his own money, were prepared to sell the birthright of the people of Saskatchewan and the people of northern Saskatchewan. And they did. We, the people of Saskatchewan, have to pay \$6 million to retrieve that birthright. The monopolistic aspect of the Parsons and Whittemore Forest Licence Agreement has to be considered. Parsons and Whittemore of New York would have had by virtue of this agreement, the controlling interest in the Prince Albert Pulp Company with its forest management area comprising 18,000 square miles and in Athabasca Forest Industries with a management area of about 23,000 square miles a monopoly hold on the forest resources of some 41,000 square miles and that, Mr. Speaker, is over 26 million acres of Saskatchewan. Or, to put it another way, Parsons and Whittemore would have had a virtual monopoly on 70 per cent of the accessible portion of our provincial forests.

We were prepared apparently, or the former Government was, to do all this and more as a publicity stunt hoping that the people of Saskatchewan would buy that kind of a deal. There are many more things that I could be saying. I am being a little easy as you will notice, Mr. Speaker, throwing away page after page of good material here, in the interest of the time of the gentlemen opposite.

In substance that deal, Mr. Speaker, would have committed the province to expenditures amounting to something more than \$155 million. For this, Saskatchewan would have received a 30 per cent equity in a pulp mill which would have cost \$117,700,000 to construct. If we convert the 30 per cent equity into dollars we find that the former Liberal Government was prepared to pay a possible \$155 million in order to get the \$7.2 million equity in an enterprise. They call that good business. We call that plain political hanky panky and a good way to commit economic suicide. All of these added up, they are all here, calculated, \$155 million worth of absolute stupidity.

It is much the same story at the Prince Albert pulp mill. The Hon. the Leader of the Opposition (Mr. Steuart) who has found it convenient to be absent for the next while, speaking in the House in this Debate, said, "Now that the NDP had the pulp mill it doesn't smell so bad." Well, I was up there the other day and it smells just as bad as it ever did when the winds are wrong. I will state the facts regarding that deal and let the Members of the Legislature judge as to the validity of the statements made by the Leader of the Opposition. This is what we put up, we the people put up. The Member for Prince Albert West, one of the illegitimates who sits in this House, the winner of the nothing position of the year, got up in this House and said that it doesn't smell so bad, and that we could sell it if we didn't like it. I am not suggesting just what we do about it, but let's see what we have committed ourselves to and what we have paid thus far. 200 miles of haul road, built and improved at a cost of \$14 million. Some of these roads and improvements would have been built eventually, even if there were no pulp mill. Roads and improvements which must be considered entirely due to the pulp mills costs of which are not recoverable and therefore a subsidy cost, and I'll be generous here, a minimum of \$5 million to \$6 million of that \$14 million that was spent by the Province on pulp mill roads. That is, if you want to use your pencils \$5,500,000.

Saskatchewan Pulpwood Company lost, remember Saskatchewan Pulpwood Company was a subsidiary of the Forest Products, and that probably is the reason why the Timber Board and Forest Products wasn't washed down the drain. They wanted to use it as a mulch cow. Saskatchewan Pulpwood Company's total loss to August 31, 1971, when the operation was taken over by the Prince Albert Pulp, was \$3,750,000. One half of this is to be absorbed by the Prince Albert pulp and is to be repaid to the Government but only at the rate, Mr. Speaker, of one-twentieth of that debt per year, without interest and only — remember this — only if Prince Albert pulp mill has a profit after taxes on 10 per cent of the shares. A wonderful deal. A good Liberal deal. A good businesslike deal, tremendous, cheers. This means the repayment provision may not be worth very much, and it isn't because they reported recently that they were losing money.

So we can wash that down the drain, so we'll call that. We'll hope to get \$750,000 of that \$3,750,000, and call it \$3 million. Reduced stumpage price for pulpwood. The company is required to pay for stumpage, ground rental and fire prevention, a total of 70 cents per cord for spruce and 60 cents per cord for jack pine or an average of 65 cents. Regular rates for anyone else, stumpage alone in this area is \$1.75 per cord for spruce, and \$1.35 per cord for jack pine or an average of \$1.55. You get that all and figure the saw timber that goes into it, and you have \$597,000 annually in subsidy totalling again after four years another \$2 million subsidy for our friends from New York. Fire protection for this area costs annually \$400,000. Multiply that by four and you have got \$1,600,000. Surcharge on power from the SPC to the City of Prince Albert and not collected from Prince Albert Pulpwood Company, \$40,000 per year, that's a small item of \$160,000 over the last four years. The Government agreed to supply all the seedlings for the reforestation of cut over areas. The minimum cost \$100,000 per year, the cost to date \$400,000. The total subsidy, Mr. Speaker, for this private enterprise venture, all this money that was going to be brought in, all this foreign capital that was going to be invested. The people of Saskatchewan invested thus far in subsidies to keep it going, \$14,260,000 plus DREE grant of \$5 million, which in total now adds up to nearly \$20 million in subsidies for this great private enterprise. Man, they believe in socialism all right, but socialism for the rich, just like for the just society at Ottawa, just for the rich.

An Hon. Member: — Sell it for \$20 million!

Mr. Kramer: — Well, if we needed advice from you, you should have given that advice to your treasury benches when you were in the Government.

We didn't even in calculating this subsidy, Mr. Speaker, I didn't even reckon the interest ...

Mr. Weatherald: — Go ahead and sell it!

March 7, 1972

Mr. Kramer: — Chirp away there Tommy, that's fine. You'll hear more.

Mr. Speaker, as high as these subsidies are you haven't heard it all yet. As high as these subsidies are they are not the worst feature of this deal. The Government guaranteed the repayment with interest of \$50 million borrowed by Prince Albert Pulpwood Company in the United States. When these notes were affected, they were dismissed by the Government as unimportant, it was emphasized that they were not loans they were just guarantees. Whether they be loans or guarantees makes little difference, except that if they are loans it means that you have already found the money. If they are guarantees you may be forced to find the money when you are least able to do so. The important feature about such loans or guarantees is, what portion of the total financing do they make up? Let's put this down a little closer to layman's language, it's very easy to toss around these figures of millions. If you lend a neighbour \$10,000 with which to start a business for himself, and he does not invest any of his own money in this business, your loan will not be very secure. If he gets into difficulties and has to have more money to make the business go you would have to decide whether to let the business go broke and take a loss of some part of your \$10,000 or to risk additional money required. Your neighbour having invested nothing has nothing to lose if the business does not go. You would, in fact, be responsible for making a success of his business if you want to recover your loan. Therefore, you would not make such a loan unless your neighbour was prepared to invest substantial money himself. If he himself invested \$5,000 you would be fairly safe. For one thing he would not be likely to drop the business and walk away without making a good effort to save his own investment. If he did walk out after investing your \$10,000 and his \$5,000, it is much more likely that you could recover your \$10,000 by selling the business and he would sustain the loss. Whether you loaned your neighbour \$10,000 or guaranteed a loan by the bank your risk of loss is the same.

In the case of the Prince Albert Pulp Company the total contract price for the buildings and equipment was \$52,184,000, \$50 million was borrowed on the guarantee of the Government, for which the Government received \$1,500,000 or three per cent. The Government also invested \$3 million in the purchase of shares, Parsons and Whittemore invested \$7 million in shares. Parsons and Whittemore however had the contract to build the mill, supply the equipment and install it. On a contract of this magnitude, Mr. Speaker, a profit of \$7 million on the supply of equipment on the construction and installation, as well as consultant fees and other costs, could be \$10 million profit, \$12 or even \$15 million. Therefore, Parsons and Whittemore were to invest no more, at least no more than the profit they would make on the construction of the mill. They had nothing to risk in undertaking this project, they had nothing to lose regardless of how it turned out. If it turned out successfully they would gain, but if it failed, they had nothing to lose. The Government carried all the risk, it guaranteed \$50 million and it invested \$3 million, a little more than the total capital cost. If things did not go right the Government would have to make good on its guarantee of \$50 million and lose its investment of \$3 million, but Karl Landegger would lose nothing.

Who then was responsible to see to it that the timber supply was adequate, that the project was an economic one, that adequate markets could be found, that financing was adequate? To what extent Parsons and Whittemore satisfied themselves on these questions I cannot say. The important thing is that they had no need to satisfy themselves on these questions, and the answers to these questions were a matter for the Governments concerned and not that of Karl Landegger. Mr. Speaker, I felt it was my duty to place these facts on the records of this Assembly so that the people of our province can have an opportunity to evaluate the situation fairly, having at their disposal the facts in this case. It was upon the advice of the people of this Province, Mr. Speaker, the positive directive program to exploit our forest resources of northwestern Saskatchewan on an orderly, planned and selective basis. Trees that are suitable for lumber are now going to be used for lumber. Trees that are suitable for power poles, telephone poles are to be cut for that purpose. And materials suitable for pulp are to be used for that purpose.

Mr. Speaker, I think it is to the credit of the Woods Manager of Prince Albert Pulp Company that he sat down and discussed the total forest problem when he found somebody who was interested in the maintenance of the forest. He even made suggestions about how this should be done. No one had ever suggested this before. The only suggestion was that we make it just as easy for Prince Albert Pulp Company as we could to make as many dollars as we could and to treat the forest in any way they chose fit. There was no authority, no control. I've mentioned subsidies. There are other subsidies that were made. Who can weigh the subsidy of bad forest practices over four years? Who can put a price on the total pollution as of last winter on the North Saskatchewan River?

Now, Mr. Speaker, when we spoke of trees that were suitable for lumber and for power poles and telephone poles we were speaking of materials that are related to industrial growth and, in turn, more jobs for Saskatchewan people. In the Premier's remarks Wednesday last we were told of the decline in population under Liberal administration and that had to be the exodus of the century. Mr. Speaker, I believe statistics give reason for this decline. While Liberals stood with their mouths open, talking when they should have been listening, roaring about their great efforts to introduce development of industry in Saskatchewan, the percentage at the same time, strangely enough, the percentage of the amount of money, the total budget, spent on developing industry went down to one third of what it was under the former New Democratic administration. Similarly, this happened in the Department of Co-operatives, Mr. Speaker. Budgets went down on those things that were worthwhile to people, things that counted.

I have said only half of the things that I should have like to have said. Because of the fact, Mr. Speaker, that this Speech from the Throne has been rather, should I say mixed up and messed up due to reasons beyond our control, I am going to save the departmental reports for the Budget Debate. I am pleased with the Throne Speech Debate. As I stated earlier in my remarks, upon taking office we had to take stock. We had to set up priorities based on the needs of people and this is being done. The Throne Speech puts forth a whole new blueprint for progress with new programs to assist our farmers and our

March 7, 1972

workers, by legislation to establish a Human Rights Commission, an Independent Electoral Boundaries Commission, a Department of the Environment, a Human Resources Development Agency, and many other exciting new programs. Because the Throne Speech is both dynamic and realistic, putting forth programs designed with people in mind, I am proud to support the motion.

Some Hon. Members: — Hear, hear!

Mr. H. Owens (Elrose): — Mr. Speaker, I rise to thank his Honour the Lieutenant Governor for the Speech from the Throne wherein he outlined the program of this Government for this Session of the Legislature, and also to support the motion in the Address-in-Reply. Mr. Speaker, I sincerely congratulate the mover of the Address-in-Reply, my neighbour in the country, the Member for Kerrobert-Kindersley (Mr. Taylor) and the seconder, the Member for Humboldt (Mr. Tchorzewski) on their excellent presentations to this Assembly. These two gentlemen have proven to this Assembly and to the people of the Province of Saskatchewan that the voters in their respective constituency made no mistake when they chose them as their representatives in this House.

Some Hon. Members: — Hear, hear!

Mr. Owens: — I would also congratulate the Member from Souris-Estevan (Mr. Thorson) and for Morse (Mr. Weibe) for their success in the recently by-elections and who now sit in this Assembly. Mr. Speaker, I would be particularly rude if I failed to congratulate the Member from Prince Albert West (Mr. Steuart) for winning the leadership of his party. I was disappointed and I am sure many of his supporters were also disappointed when he did not follow the tradition of being the first speaker from the Opposition as their leader in the Address-in-reply. This was not a case of 'let George do it' but I dare say if the leader of Group 171 had been chosen as the Leader of the Opposition, George would have done it.

Some Hon. Members: — Hear, hear!

Mr. Owens: — Mr. Speaker, I would also congratulate our Premier and our Attorney General who on the second day of sitting moved the emergency resolution in recording our extreme anxiety in the slow movement of grain and the export position and requesting the Government of Canada and its appropriate agencies, particularly the Ministry of Transport and the Minister-in-Charge of the Canadian Wheat Board to take immediate action to rectify this situation. This matter is of particular importance to the constituency of Elrose which I have the honour to represent in this Assembly. The Elrose area is almost entirely a grain growing area, among the best if not the best in Saskatchewan. So the movement of grain or the lack of the movement of grain from the farm determines the state of the economic situation to not only the farmers but the businesses of all types in the several towns and villages that service the community.

Mr. Speaker, the Throne speech indicated that this Government is particularly concerned about the economic conditions of our predominantly agricultural communities and the movement of farmers, especially young farmers, off the farms, with the result that farmsteads are disappearing and are becoming less in number while those remaining are growing ever larger. The

Government is prepared to do something about this trend and reverse it if possible.

The proposal to establish a Land Bank Commission has been accepted with province wide enthusiasm from the older farmer wishing to retire to the young people who wish to continue farming and would like to increase their farm units and the young people who are not now farming but would like to make farming their livelihood. At least they have a hope of realizing their dreams. In the one case, retirement with comfort and dignity, and in the other, a hope for a future and security.

This transformation takes much planning and considerable time with many of the details yet to be finalized. The future of Saskatchewan depends on how well we plan and the planners are determined Saskatchewan will have a future, a tremendous future. Mr. Speaker, much has been said and great concern has been shown for our farmers and our farms. Might I point out that many of us have great concern about our smaller urban centres, the towns that service our rural communities. What about their future and probably more important, what about the small businessmen who are the back bone, as it were, of these centres? I believe a pattern is being set. Some of the smaller villages are bound to die but the towns that remain, truly established service centres, have every reason to be optimistic. These centres are generally as affluent as the community they serve and with, hopefully, more farmers earning a higher standard of living, the towns will surely prosper. Furthermore, our Government is committed as mentioned in the Speech from the Throne to undertake a study of the problems and needs of the small businessman with a view to formulating a program of assistance. This is the first time, to my knowledge, any government has pledged to aid this segment of our society and should with the co-operation of application fulfil a long overdue need.

Mr. Speaker, I mentioned earlier that the constituency of Elrose was a predominantly grain growing area in the short grass country of the province. Although being barren of any large area of tree growth, there are several cases of beauty and the people have used their ingenuity, energy and resources to transpose these spots into picnic and recreation areas. Several parks both local and regional are well established. One of great natural beauty and interest is Coldwell park in honour of our M.J. Coldwell.

The building of the Gardiner Dam across our South Saskatchewan River just a few miles upstream from Outlook created the great man made lake, Lake Diefenbaker, a lake area of the Saskatchewan which is now a Mecca for power boats and water skiers. This lake borders the Elrose constituency on the south and the east and along its shorelines picnic parks and boating areas are already established and others are being planned. Several parks are well populated with summer homes of the local residents. The potential of recreation is unlimited and with the assistance now available for future development from some of the departments of government this resource will in the future be one of the greatest, most used recreational areas in Western Canada.

Mr. Speaker, the final report of the Special Committee on the Crop Insurance Program and The Family Farm Protection Act has been presented to this Assembly. It was my privilege to be a member of this Committee and I would at this time like to

March 7, 1972

thank the Members of this Assembly for giving me this honor. It was a wonderful experience to travel to so many communities in Saskatchewan and to meet so many fine people. We sometimes get the notion that the folks at home are the only really nice folk, but a journey around Saskatchewan convinced me that the people of the Province of Saskatchewan are all fine and friendly.

Some Hon. Members: — Hear, hear!

Mr. Owens: — The fine people deserve a new deal and it is my hope that when the Legislature completes the study of this report, it will agree with the Committee that it offers a New Deal for Saskatchewan farmers.

Mr. Speaker, this Government promised the Saskatchewan voters the return to democracy where representation by population was not merely a nice phrase but a reality. The legislation to establish an Independent Boundaries Commission is being composed at this Session as indicated from the Throne Speech. The voters of Saskatchewan can expect constituency boundary reorganization before the next provincial election.

Mr. Speaker, last spring prior to the election in June the New Democratic Party produced a small pamphlet that was called “The New Deal for People”. This pamphlet contained the proposed program for the party and was distributed throughout Saskatchewan and enthusiastically received by the people of Saskatchewan. Here was a bold and imaginative idea and contained a bold and imaginative program. The program and the idea caught the present Opposition off guard, without program and without an idea. So their campaign was a rip up, tear down attack on the New Democratic Party and our New Deal for People and they are still at it.

But, Mr. Speaker, there was one thing the Opposition overlooked, the people of Saskatchewan. The people of Saskatchewan remembered, they remembered the Government prior to 1964 and the promises they made and fulfilled. They remembered the worry of hospital and doctor bills and the promise to provide prepaid hospital and medical services and the promise was fulfilled and the worry of individual health costs was lifted in spite of extreme harassment from the Opposition. They remembered the kerosene lamps and the promise to build a power corporation to provide electricity not only to the cities but the small towns and villages and into the entire rural community. And the promise was fulfilled in spite of the cry of the Opposition that it couldn't be done. They remembered the coal and wood stoves and the successful exploration for natural gas and oil and the promise to build a natural gas distribution system to supply modern heating to all the major cities and towns and many of the smaller villages throughout Saskatchewan. And the promised was fulfilled in spite of the Opposition warning that it would be prohibitive. They remembered the little red school house and the lack of educational opportunities for rural children and the promise to revamp and rebuild the education system so that an opportunity for an education was available to all children regardless of the parents' financial status. And the promise was fulfilled. They remembered the roads and the struggle to travel through mud, snow and dust and the promise to build a highway grid that could be used twelve months of the year with comfort and speed. And the promise was fulfilled. And they remembered the small voice of labor

and the complete lack of labor legislation and the promise that labor legislation second to none would be enacted. And the promise was fulfilled. I could go on, Mr. Speaker, and on and on in the many other areas of government prior to 1964.

But now let us consider what the people remember since 1964. Mr. Speaker, they remembered a time of delay and divide, a time of destruction and despair, a time of confrontation and controversy, and they decided they had had enough. On June 23 they elected to this Legislature 45 men, yes, Mr. Speaker, 45 men dedicated to the philosophy of the New Democratic Party and determined to implement the proposals of the New Deal for People during their first term of office.

Some Hon. Members: — Hear, hear!

Mr. Owens: — Mr. Speaker, Saskatchewan people remembered and Saskatchewan people spoke in no uncertain terms when they gave the New Democratic Party the mandate to use their foresight, their imagination and their planning to put our Saskatchewan in the forefront and fore position, progressive legislation for Saskatchewan.

Mr. Speaker, I support the motion.

Some Hon. Members: — Hear, hear!

Hon. G.R. Bowerman (Minister of Indian and Métis): — Mr. Speaker, I want to extend my congratulations to those who have already spoken in this debate. I want to extend my congratulations to the new Members who have joined us from the constituencies of Estevan (Mr. Thorson) and Morse (Mr. Wiebe). I especially want to make mention of my congratulations to my colleagues both from Estevan and Saskatoon Mayfair for their appointments to the Cabinet, and the Hon. Member from Prince Albert West (Mr. Steuart) for his appointment as Leader of the Opposition and to the Hon. Member for Saskatoon City Park (Mr. Dyck) for his appointment as Deputy Speaker. Of specific mention, Mr. Speaker, I should like to congratulate the two Hon. Members from Kerrobert-Kindersley (Mr. Taylor) and from Humboldt (Mr. Tchorzewski) who moved and seconded the traditional Address-in-Reply to the Speech from the Throne. The material and the content of their speeches and the direct, clear and articulate manner of their delivery has already done much to improve the level of debate in this Legislature. They and their constituents are to be commended for their victory at the polls and for their conscientious determination to represent their constituencies well.

Some Hon. Members: — Hear, hear!

Mr. Bowerman: — Observing the level of action and debate which has emanated from Opposition benches leads one to believe that those who sit to your left, Mr. Speaker, still do not have the message from their election defeat of June 23rd.

I want to suggest to you that one of the main contributing factors of the Liberal Party and its government's defeat was its constant arrogance and its belligerent attitude toward the people of Saskatchewan and toward this Legislature. Their

March 7, 1972

frequent outbursts, sarcasm in this House, their total disregard for parliament and traditional agreements of this Legislature serves, once again, to notify to the people of Saskatchewan that although the Liberal Party of Saskatchewan may have changed some names, some of the faces in its leadership and in its organization, nevertheless its concepts and its philosophy and its disregard of all those who failed to share its views will leave no doubt in the minds of Saskatchewan people that it is the same old political machine that has prevailed in this province for 60 or more years, and in Canada for over a century.

I would predict, Mr. Speaker, that if the Saskatchewan Liberal Party continues to play this arrogant, politically partisan role, as it has done for the past decades, it will see itself so thoroughly defeated by the electorate of this Province, that it will lose its complete creditability as an alternative to any government that is formed in this Province. I suggest that it will become a mere legend in our provincial history.

Some Hon. Members: — Hear, hear!

Mr. Bowerman: — People of Saskatchewan on June 23rd said very plainly and with eminent distinction that they had enough of the political bickering and they called upon the Legislators to get down to the job of running the government and get on with the business of government.

My seatmate mentioned the Big River mill, and before leaving my constituency or the area of my constituency, I should like to draw to the attention of the House a matter about which he gave a few comments. I want to add to those comments dealing with the Big River sawmill and the colossal blunder of the former Government in its efforts to reconstruct the Saskatchewan Timber Board sawmill operations at that centre.

Many of you in this House will be acquainted with the unfortunate loss by fire of the Saskatchewan Timber Board sawmill at Big River in 1969. Two or three announcements were made by the former Government of Saskatchewan with respect to rebuilding this mill. The final announcement required a special trip by the former Premier, to a Liberal nominating convention in my constituency of Shellbrook. That announcement involved a \$250,000 sawmill and chip-making operation, which was to be constructed and was to be in operation by May 31, 1971.

It is my information from the Minister of Natural Resources (Mr. Kramer) to date that we have spent, and as he has already indicated, we have spent over one half a million dollars in the construction of that mill and it may be necessary to add another \$200,000 or \$300,000 to bring that mill to a full operating basis.

I needn't describe for the people of Big River, but surely I should point out to the Members of this Legislature, especially those who not sit to your left, Mr. Speaker, never in the history of saw milling in Big River, or lumbering in Saskatchewan, has there been such an utterly ridiculous waste of taxpayers' funds with such little comprehensible success as there has been in this particular operation.

The House recessed until 7:00 o'clock p.m.

Mr. Bowerman: — Mr. Speaker, when the House rose at 5:30 I was discussing the Big River mill and those things related to it. The actions of the Government in constructing the mill and some of the situations surrounding the conditions of operating in the Big River area now.

I want to point out to the Members of the Legislature, as was pointed out by my seatmate earlier, that the questions which were raised in the Crown Corporations Committee with regard to the feasibility study that was to have been done respecting the Big River mill was in fact not done. Although we were advised by the former Minister of Natural Resources that a feasibility study had been made and when we asked for the study to be given to the Members of the Legislature, of course, we were advised that it was not in the public interest that we should have this study. It is now found, of course, that such a feasibility study was not made by anyone. In fact it is quite evident that even little consultation or little advice was sought by those people who were aware of the mill that was being constructed there, what it would do or what it could be expected to do.

The think that I want to say to you now is that the absurdity of the situation at Big river is this: during the time that mill was being built, Mr. Speaker, the same Government was giving away or making arrangements to contract out the timber in that area which would serve the mill and make that mill feasible and economic. The timber which was left as a result of those negotiations was simply not adequate to provide sufficient wood for the Big River mill to be either economic or efficient in any way. Let me tell you the circumstances that exist in that area now.

There are logging trucks which are logging and hauling poles from 25 to 35 miles northeast of Big River, driving through the town of Big River past the door of the mill and on another 80 miles over to Meadow Lake in order to unload their logs. At the same time the trucks are going right past the door of the mill at Big River. The woods operations of the Big River mill are being conducted east of Big River. And so what you have is, you have logging trucks meeting one another and extending their log haul about 50 to 100 miles more than they should. This really is as a result of the negotiations which were undertaken by the previous government in setting up the mill at Big River.

I want to assure the people at Big River that the Government in Saskatchewan today, the Government which originally constructed the Big River saw milling industry is taking a totally and completely different approach towards securing for Big River and community the lumbering industry which is of such vital importance to their economy and so much a part of their heritage as a lumbering town.

I want too, Mr. Speaker, to comment now before I address myself to the Speech from the Throne, I want to make a few comments about the potash industry. This is a subject on which the Members opposite have had much to say and have quoted rather freely from only a portion of what I have said about the Saskatchewan potash pro-rationing and floor-price program. I would like to put the record straight, Mr. Speaker. Records which show that because of Liberal policies the Saskatchewan

March 7, 1972

potash industry has suffered by not getting a fair share of the world market.

Mr. Guy: — Oh!

Mr. Bowerman: — Oh, the Member from Athabasca says. You can tell that noise even if you couldn't see him. First of all let's look at the world's reserves of potash.

Of the proven reserves of potash Saskatchewan is estimated to have 40 per cent of the world's reserves. Russia is also reported as having 40 per cent of the world's reserves. The Western European countries are estimated as having nine per cent. East Germany is estimated to have eight per cent. United States has only three per cent of the world's reserves. Therefore, on this basis Saskatchewan having 40 per cent of the world reserves of potash one would naturally think with 40 per cent of the world's reserves that Saskatchewan would be producing something like 40 per cent of the world's production of potash. But such is not the case.

In the calendar year of 1970 Saskatchewan had a productive capacity from the mines in Saskatchewan of about 7.3 million tons of K20. But we had an actual production amounting to less than three and one-half million tons. In other words, Mr. Speaker, Saskatchewan potash mines were producing at 48 per cent of their capacity. In 1971 Saskatchewan mines had a production capacity of about 8.1 million tons and they will have actually produced in the year of 1971 about 3.9 million ton, again just about 48 per cent capacity. But this is what the Hon. Members opposite continue to say is a good deal for Saskatchewan.

This, they say, has stabilized the markets and this they say has stabilized world prices for potash. Mr. Speaker, I am the first to agree that pro-rationing and the Saskatchewan floor-price program have stabilized the markets and stabilized the world prices.

Some Hon. Members: — Hear, hear!

Mr. Bowerman: — There is only one problem with potash pro-rationing in Saskatchewan. That is that it applies to Saskatchewan only insofar as the production of potash is concerned, while at the same time the floor price in relation to potash provides a price umbrella for all of the potash producing companies of the world.

Let's take another look at the 1971 figures. Saskatchewan produced at 48 per cent with 40 per cent of the world's potash. Our mines are producing at 48 per cent of their capacity. United States with a production capacity of 3.2 million tons was producing at 84 per cent of capacity. Russia was producing at 87 per cent of its capacity. Western Europe was producing at 101 per cent of its capacity. East Germany was producing at 86 per cent of its capacity. Saskatchewan was producing at 48 per cent of its capacity.

We sit here in Saskatchewan with the world's largest reserves of potash and with the world's greatest capacity to produce potash and yet we have the world's smallest percentage of production capacity stabilized at 48 per cent. And that is

what stabilization did for Saskatchewan.

Mr. Speaker, the potash pro-rationing program as we now have it in Saskatchewan contributes to that situation. What happened to that great Liberal philosophy of the free-wheeling private enterprise system? What happened to the old position which you go by where production and demand are usually the bastions of the business ethic. We provide the legislation which has stabilized the world's potash industry and have guaranteed the floor price and in essence we have said to the world potash producers, we will not invade the traditional markets of the world. You will not have to cut back your production and allow Saskatchewan potash to compete against you. In addition, we will provide the price umbrella, which we have done.

What does Saskatchewan get for this legislation and for this floor price? While our mines are operating at 48 per cent of capacity and many operating at lower percentages than that, mines in every other major potash producing country in the world are operating at over 80 per cent of capacity and some of them as high as 101 per cent capacity. In fact they tell me that Carlsbad, New Mexico was operating at 110 per cent capacity. And yet Saskatchewan mines are held to operating at 48 per cent of their productive capacity.

That is the kind of scheme that the Liberals provided. That is the kind of legislation which was provided in the potash pro-rationing area. Let's look at the revenue to the mining company, and how it has risen over the years.

In 1969 revenue to the potash companies in Saskatchewan was \$69 million; in 1970 it approached \$116 million in gross revenue; and in 1971 we had more than doubled from 1969 to \$145 million. At the same time that Saskatchewan potash industry has basked in the sunlight of the minimum floor price the world producers of potash have continued to benefit from it in addition to our own companies. Sure they have liked the Saskatchewan programs. Why shouldn't they like the Saskatchewan programs? It has kept Saskatchewan potash out of their traditional markets, while at the same time they operate in our provincial world markets under our Saskatchewan floor price scheme.

That is what the Members to your left, Mr. Speaker, still call a good deal for Saskatchewan potash. How about the revenue to the people of Saskatchewan? How has it increased? The answer is virtually not at all. Here again are some of the facts with respect to the revenues to the province.

In 1969, as I have already mentioned, while revenues in the potash industry were in the neighbourhood of \$69 million through rentals, royalties, producing track taxes and other fees, the people of Saskatchewan received gross revenue of \$116 million, an increase of 41 per cent in the gross revenues. But what happened to the provincial revenues, Mr. Speaker? They dropped, they dropped 11.2 per cent down to \$2.5 million. Then in 1971 the potash industry received \$145 million in total revenue, an increase of 25 per cent over 1970 and an increase of 110 per cent over 1969 and the revenues to the province increased 33 per cent in that year, but the revenues to the province including rentals, royalties, mineral tax and other fees

March 7, 1972

went up only 13 per cent from 1969 to 1971. Therefore, Mr. Speaker, the situation is that between 1969 and 1971 the potash industry increased their revenues by 110 per cent, while the Province of Saskatchewan increased its revenues to the Provincial Treasury from potash at only 13 per cent.

Here we have an industry with close to \$1 billion of capital investment which is returning to the people of Saskatchewan \$2.8 million in 1969, \$2.5 million in 1970 and \$3.2 million in 1971. The end result, Mr. Speaker, is that even though our Saskatchewan companies are not faring well in relation to other potash companies around the world they are indeed faring much better than the people of Saskatchewan under the Liberal pro-rationing plan and under the Liberal deals.

The former Liberal Government under the guise of helping the potash industry and helping Saskatchewan, really went into agreements that prevented our potash industry from sharing business on an equitable basis with the potash mines in other countries. They entered into tax agreement that will prevent the people of Saskatchewan from getting a fair share of potash revenues until new tax arrangements have been worked out with those companies, and that is after 1980. To get an even break, this Government much sit down with the potash companies to lay the ground work for improved revenue for the Provincial Treasury as well as an improved deal for the industry itself.

The only way that we can do this is by getting a larger share of the international potash market. And because our legislation, on production and floor prices, which benefit world potash producers they must be prepared to accept and acknowledge that Saskatchewan requires its fair share of that world market. We believe that the people of Saskatchewan and the potash industry in Saskatchewan deserve a better deal than they got under the Liberal administration. The people in Saskatchewan and the potash industry in Saskatchewan are paying the price of stabilizing the world market and world prices in potash of prices 50 per cent more or we are at 50 per cent of our production which if we were able at least to equate ourselves with the other productive capacities of the world we would have upped our production by almost 50 per cent and increased our revenue from \$145 million to \$290 million. We believe that this is a burden that should be shared by the potash industry as a whole, by all potash producing nations. Therefore, we should be and we are willing, to establish for the Saskatchewan people a better deal in the potash industry than they now have.

Mr. Speaker, the deals that the Liberals have made in the potash are typical

Mr. Speaker, the deals that the Liberals have made in the potash industry are typical of the bad deals that they have made in all of their business operations. I suggest to you that the reason that there are 45 Members on this side of the House and 15 Members on the other side of the House, if they were all in their seats which they are not, is the fact that the people of Saskatchewan were tired and were fed up with the kind of deals that they were making for them.

Some Hon. Members: — Hear, hear!

Mr. Bowerman: — Deals like those in the potash industry which not only hurts Saskatchewan itself but did not assert the best position of Saskatchewan in world markets. We have before us, Mr. Speaker, a Speech from the Throne which is designed to

change that. The Throne Speech which outlines programs which truly represents a New Deal for People.

I want to turn now, Mr. Speaker, for a moment to deal with the Land Bank. I'm sorry to see that the agricultural critic is not in his seat. I want to speak for a moment about the Land Bank. I want to do so basically because I am a farmer and secondly, because I share with our Government and with the Minister of Agriculture a desire to do something to stabilize our Saskatchewan farm economy and the rural communities of our province. I would expect the Liberals to oppose the Land Bank. It is progressive legislation and it is typical for them to oppose anything which is progressive. Truly that has been their position in Saskatchewan, particularly in agriculture for the life of this Province and for the life of the nation of Canada. Not one of us on this side of the House is fooled nor have led Saskatchewan people to believe this legislation is the total answer to the economic ills of agriculture. I challenge the Hon. Members opposite to have their counterparts in Ottawa take one step, only one, equally as imaginative in long-term interests of solving the agriculture economy and we shall be to see prairie agriculture again lift its head from the economic stagnation of the recent past.

The agricultural critic, the Hon. Members from Cannington (Mr. Weatherald), both confused himself and the Legislature in the debate with a set of figures that he as a farmer couldn't or didn't believe I am sure in his attempt to discredit the proposed Land Bank legislation. While Saskatchewan farmers may lack some things they are usually fairly quick with a pencil. They will, I suggest, already have estimated the benefits of the Land Bank proposal to them. It is true that the only direct monetary benefit of the Land Bank will be the reduction of payments on principal as part of the farmers' costs but that, I suggest to you Mr. Member, is indeed a significant part of the costs of farming today. If the agricultural critic were here and would care to throw away his previous speech and take his pencil for a moment, you can do that if you wish Mr. Member from Regina Lakeview (Mr. McPherson), I can help you as well as the agriculture critic work through to the conclusion that payments on the principal for land are rather substantial indeed. For each figuring if you will take land at \$100 an acre, that's \$16,000 for a quarter section of land. All right, if you want to amortize it for 25 years, amortize it for 25 years on the principal alone and you'll have a cost figure of \$650 per year on the principal alone. If you divide that by 160 acres, Mr. Member, you'll find that that is \$4 an acre in today's farming and the cost of today's farming is indeed I suggest to you a significant cost price.

Mr. MacDonald (Milestone): — Are you kidding?

Mr. Bowerman: — No, I'm not kidding. It's just the way I look. It's the same way as you appear. A greater benefit to Saskatchewan farmers will be added flexibility to transfer and to exchange. The added benefit to Saskatchewan farmers will be the added flexibility to transfer and exchange farm land from father to son and from neighbour to neighbour's son and thereafter retaining in the rural areas of Saskatchewan a farming community and the possibility for the future of young farmers in the rural areas.

March 7, 1972

Yes, Mr. Speaker, the Throne Speech does mean a New Deal for Saskatchewan people and the Land Bank is just one of those examples.

Some Hon. Members: — Hear, hear!

Mr. Bowerman: — Mr. Speaker, the Throne Speech also calls for a new approach for Government administration, an approach which will mean a reorganization of government departments in such a way that we can respond more quickly to the changing conditions and respond more effectively to the needs of people. With the development of new departments this Government is becoming organized to deliver services to people more effectively and more efficiently than in the past. It is becoming organized to listen more closely to people and to what people want. That is what the Throne Speech offers, Mr. Speaker. I will be speaking in a few moments about the new northern department and about the Human Resources Development Agency for which I am responsible. Let me say this now, these two agencies along with the human Rights, the Ombudsman, the Culture and Youth, the Consumer Rights legislation, symbolize what the Throne Speech is all about. All these agencies are being structured to respond to the needs of people. All are in keeping with the promises we made to the people of Saskatchewan in the June election campaign. This will create, I suggest to you, a New Deal for the people of Saskatchewan.

Mr. Speaker, I believe it is because we have a Throne Speech with these positive programs which the Opposition finds so difficult to criticize and why they have taken their traditional course of throwing red herrings, hence our witness in this House a few days ago, the sham battle over the use and the delegation of radio time to all Members of the Legislature. Mr. Speaker, there has never been an Opposition in our history with so much to say and so little to offer in terms of constructive opposition.

I want to take a while, Mr. Speaker, to discuss, if I may, some of the ideas touching on the progressive new programs that have been proposed in the Throne Speech. They will seriously be debated in the weeks to come. I have placed particular emphasis on those programs which are people-oriented. Programs which are designed to help the people of Saskatchewan catch up. Programs which will help them to once again become the leaders in North America of social development which have been denied them during the past seven years and when we had a Government which thought a great deal about money and very little, indeed, about people.

I am proud to associate myself with those programs and I am particularly pleased that I shall be able to play a role by introducing programs and legislation to the House pertaining to the development of those segments of our society disadvantaged because of the many and varied pressures originating in our highly motivated, competitive and complicated society. I am most happy to suggest that such programs and legislation will not be based on race or culture but rather on the potential of the individual or groups seeking self-help objectives. Therefore, the Saskatchewan Indian and Métis Department will be replaced by a Human Resources Development Agency. Programs and legislation for Northern Saskatchewan will include the formation of a new department to serve the needs of Northern

Saskatchewan people. This is a much needed co-ordinating agency of Government which will provide services and programs which are not operating in Northern Saskatchewan by a variety of departments.

In talking about the phasing out of the Indian and Métis Department, let me assure the House, Mr. Speaker, that this is being done after much discussion with organizations representing the Indian people of Saskatchewan and with their approval. My position in this House has been consistent over the years, my position has been that Indian and Métis people must be consulted and involved before actions are taken which do affect their lives. I refer to Debates and Proceedings of the Second Session of the 16th Legislature that record reports which I said in the Debate of March 12th, 1969 when the principle of the Bill was before the House establishing the Saskatchewan Indian and Métis Department. I was critical then and I am critical today about the fact that Indian and Métis people were not consulted about the setting up of the Department in 1969. I believe it is a sad commentary on the record of the Liberal Government that despite requests for consultations as early as 1964, the facts are that the people of Indian ancestry offered advice and they offered the Government of that day ideas and their requests and these ideas were ignored.

The existing structure was established without their involvement or without their consent. It's an old story, Mr. Speaker. It is a story of white men, with white men's ideas with their values and social structure, sitting in the Ivory Tower, dreaming up solutions to problems about which we have little direct understanding. That's how the Liberals gave birth to the Saskatchewan Indian and Métis Department. It was, in a way, typical of their entire administration. They came up with an idea which they thought would be a good idea and they proceeded to force it upon the people of Saskatchewan. Not once did they recognize that the Aboriginal people of Saskatchewan would have a mature and a constructive set of ideas to present to them, not once did they recognize or suspect that the life styles, that the values of Indian and Métis people should be looked at seriously with a view to preserving those underlying values. When the Members of the then Opposition voted to support the establishment of the Indian and Métis Department we were assured consultation would take place and I suggest to you that it never did. Not once did your Liberal Government think that the Department could be used for anything other than to try to force Indian people into a mould that you had already provided for them. And your Government continued to criticize them publicly when they did not buckle to the demands of the Government. Is it any wonder that when the New Democratic Party took office that the Indian and Métis people of this province made haste to let us know that the Department was not doing the job which they thought it should and that some of the key people within that Department needed to go.

For far too long the Governments in Canada have put their thinkers to work designing our kind of solutions to Indian kinds of problems. This is not what we in the New Democratic Government propose to do. We look to the Indian people to tell us what direction they wish to take and we shall try to work out with them the ways in which the Provincial Government can help them to get there. We do not want to perpetuate the old ways of the present Federal and the by-gone Provincial governments to stand in the way of developing a new co-operative

March 7, 1972

and consultative approach. It will be essential for the future success that Indian and Métis people be involved in planning and administration of programs at all levels. Consultation and co-operation is the commitment that this Government has made to Saskatchewan Indian and Métis people and that is the big difference between this Government and the one which preceded us for seven years. It is that we believe Indian people of Saskatchewan have something meaningful to contribute and that they will be asked to do so. They have keen abilities and they have ideas which will be helpful in any program which is relating to them. That is why, Mr. Speaker, when over the months we have talked to leaders, to organizations and to individuals on reserves and in settlements, we have received constructive ideas and possible solutions to mutual problems. We have consulted with native people and we will continue to consult with them. It was on this basis of communication and consultation that it has been agreed upon to phase out the Saskatchewan Indian and Métis Department and to replace it with an agency which will deal with all the needs of the people who are disadvantaged.

At the same time special attention will be given to the needs of Indian and Métis people but the racial overtone of the era gone by will not be attached to the new department. It is true, Mr. Speaker, that the Métis society has expressed some reluctance, some reservation but I am assured by their leaders that the structure of the Indian and Métis Department must go for a new approach. The Federation of Saskatchewan Indians have given its full support to the elimination of the existing departmental structure for a Human Resources Development agency. Indian and Métis people of Saskatchewan agree that this organization must be changed. The Hon. Member from Whitmore Park (Mr. Grant) believes that our native Canadian people do not want to change. He has suggested that they are really not sure what they want and they should be able to have something to say about what they want. I want to quote him from the first paragraph of a story that appeared in the Leader Post December 27th, 1971, and it says:

Native leaders are pleased but the Provincial Liberals are disappointed by a statement this week by G.R. Bowerman, Minister-in-Charge of Indian and Métis Department, that the portfolio may be eliminated early in 1972.

The story goes on to mention how the Chief of the FSI gives wholehearted approval for the elimination of the Department. That the President of the Métis Society is generally in favour but calls for more consultation. But the Hon. Member for Regina Whitmore Park remains critical. Mr. Speaker, that tells the whole story about the Liberal approach to Indian and to Métis people.

Indeed one of the major reasons that the Hon. Member for Regina Whitmore Park (Mr. Grant) and his colleagues are sitting in disarray to your left, Mr. Speaker, is because they listen only to themselves rather than to the people of Saskatchewan. The Saskatchewan Indian and Métis Department will terminate during this Session. It will do so because it was ill conceived, because it cannot meet the needs of Indian people and because after consultation with the people directly affected this Government has been advised by them of better ways of meeting those needs.

Some Hon. Members: — Hear, hear!

Mr. Bowerman: — As the Throne Speech indicated legislation providing for the establishment of a Human Resources Development Agency will be introduced. We will be saying more about this agency at the appropriate time but I want to say now that our Government believes that it is urgent to meet the needs of people who find themselves in disadvantaged circumstances, whatever those circumstances may be. In establishing a Human Resources Development Agency we intend to do what the name implies. We intend to provide new opportunities for the development of Saskatchewan's less fortunate citizens. Let me emphasize that the Government does not intend to impose its ideas, its standards or its values on any segment of our society but we do intend, however, to try and better understand the needs of the various groups of people such as those who are trapped into the various forms of welfare, those who are disadvantaged by reasons of physical or mental handicaps, those who have been imprisoned and are having difficulty in adjusting back into society, those who are members of single-parent families. We do intend through the Human Resources Agency not only to learn about needs but to help people play an active role in meeting those needs themselves through the process of community development. In other words the Human Resources Agency will not be designed to develop programs which we might think are worthwhile but rather it will be designed to help people take advantage of the existing programs. The agency will also work with other departments of Government in the development of programs to meet existing needs and to explore new ways of coping with problems and responding more effectively to them.

Finally, Mr. Speaker, I want to make a few brief remarks about the new department to service the needs of northern Saskatchewan.

It has been felt for some time such a department is needed. The Government as early as 1959 asked the Budget Bureau to study such an agency. In 1961 the Budget Bureau presented a number of alternatives to the Government, among which it recommended giving a detailed account of how such a department might work and the centre for community studies to detail research in the North. It also recommended that all Government functions in the North come under one department. Even the task force on northern development which was established by the Government between 1964 and 1971 recommended a single agency to handle the affairs of northern Saskatchewan. Therefore, since assuming office, Mr. Speaker, this Government has followed through with its promise to the people of the North, a promise that was based on the express wishes of those people.

We shall be introducing legislation which will provide for a Department of Northern Saskatchewan that will take over the functions in the North that are now handled by many and varied departments. This will mean a major reorganization of Government in the North. We are confident it will also mean the development of smoother delivery of Government services to northern people and to the northern community.

Again the emphasis in this new department will be to consult with and to co-operate with the people of the North. Our aim in developing this new department for the North will be to involve the people of the North in the decisions that most directly affect them.

March 7, 1972

Some Hon. Members: — Hear, hear!

Mr. Bowerman: — We have already established a Northern Development Advisory Council which consists of northern people, plus representatives of the Federation of Saskatchewan Indians, the Métis Society of Saskatchewan and members of the various academic disciplines with a special interest in the North. While the first four members of the council were appointed to undertake local involvement these persons will be elected in the future. I do not wish to spend much time on this now, Mr. Speaker, because I hope to address the House in detail at the time the legislation is debated.

Suffice it, therefore, to say there are three main points which I believe are important. Firstly, that the new department of the North will be a single agency, handling virtually all the services now handled by the variety of the Departments of Government. Secondly, the people of the North will have a very positive role to play through local municipal governments and a northern municipal council. Decision making will be laced in the hands of northern people who will decide much of the program development. They will set their priorities for spending and will control much of the budgeting processes. Thirdly, the people who work in the North will have training especially for northern development. We hope they will be devoted to the North and its people and that they will be regarded not so much as operators of programs, but as people who will facilitate the wishes of northern communities.

Mr. Speaker, I'm very proud indeed to be able to support the Speech from Throne and I do so.

Some Hon. Members: — Hear, hear!

Mr. G.F. Loken (Rosetown): — Mr. Speaker, as I rise to speak I feel confident that much of what I have to say will be well received by the Members opposite due to the fact that the now Premier of Saskatchewan delivered an identical type of speech in this House during the Session of 1965. Therefore, it must be true, about the only difference will be more people with larger salaries and only one qualification, that is, dedication to socialism.

Some Hon. Members: — Hear, hear!

Mr. Loken: — Now, Mr. Speaker, Members opposite have been reluctant to tell us about whom they have hired since they assumed office and, of course, very reluctant to talk about whom they have fired.

I would think, Mr. Speaker, that the Hon. Attorney General would be happy to tell us about the hiring and firing system of the new Government, which has a New Deal for People. I am sure that Mr. Romanow would like to tell us about his ex-law partner from Saskatoon, Mr. Ching, who is now Deputy Minister of Labour, and Jean Gordon who is now secretary and member of the Mediation Board and who was his secretary in his Saskatoon law firm. And then there is that Ned Shillington, who, I think, was a candidate in the June 23rd election and lost but from the salary he now gets he is well compensated for his efforts. John Gardner

may have won the battle in Moosomin, but Shillington won the prize because Shillington is now being paid \$6,000 a year more than he would have received, had he won.

Oh yes, I almost forgot about another couple of Mr. Romanow's high-priced help namely, Francis Bogdasavich at about \$19,000 per year and, of course, Scoop Lewry whom he placed back in the local government at no less than \$12,000 or \$13,000 a year.

Some Hon. Members: — Hear, hear!

Mr. Loken: — The Hon. Mr. Romanow must be very proud of his accomplishments in the field of hiring and I will admit there are a few BAs and LLBs, etc., in the previously mentioned group. But I think as far as our Minister of Justice is concerned the main qualification was that they had NDP after their names, with the exception of Mr. Bogdasavich who, I understand, prefers to be known as a social democrat, whatever that means.

I didn't mention Barrett Halderman because he's only a student-at-law in Mr. Romanow's Department and his salary by comparison with the others is so minimal that I feel sorry for him. But I presume he will get a healthy raise once he is admitted to the Bar.

Oh yes, Mr. Speaker, the "Justice" Minister continued to be a purveyor of justice when on January 14, 1972 he had his Deputy Minister, Mr. Beaudry deliver a letter at 11:20 a.m. to Mr. John Nichol, director of Consumer Affairs in the Provincial Secretary's Department advising Mr. Nichol his services were no longer required after 12 o'clock noon.

Mr. Speaker, just 40 minutes to leave. I am dismayed, you might say disappointed that the Hon. Minister would not have the courtesy and fortitude at least to give Mr. Nichol an appointment which he had promised, not just verbally but in writing. Mr. Speaker, I suggest that a commitment in writing by the Attorney General of this Province should be valid and I expect it would be honoured. From the newspaper report of Mr. Romanow's reasons for dismissing Mr. Nichol there is no doubt it was because he was not an NDP supporter.

Mr. Speaker, I have here copies of letters from directors of Consumer Affairs across Canada which indicate that Mr. Nichol was considered to be an authority in Consumer Affairs and discharged his duties at all times in an unbiased manner in the best interest of the public at large.

Mr. Speaker, I have only touched on a few of the hiring and firing activities of just one Hon. Minister of the Crown. To cover the whole area as was done in 1965 by the now Premier, would take me on into the night, but I should like to make one point and that is that the salary paid to two NDP appointments, made by the Hon. Mr. Romanow, would be equal to the salary paid to six of the appointments that were alleged to be made in 1965 in the speech the now Premier made in this House on

March 7, 1972

February 22, 1965.

Mr. Speaker, it should be noted that the last promise on the last page in the NDP booklet of promises that was circulated during the election campaign reads as follows:

A new Democratic Government will enact legislation to provide for the right of all citizens to engage in political activity and seek political office without discrimination.

It is quite evident, Mr. Speaker, by the Attorney General's actions, that he and his Government do not intend to practise what they preach, or persons such as Jack Nichol who the Hon. Mr. Romanow says was politically biased and had to be fired, would not have been fired.

Now I should like to quote, Mr. Speaker, the definition of hypocrisy from Webster's Dictionary:

Hypocrisy means mimicry, a reply, acting a part, feigning, to play a part, pretend, a pretending to be what one is not or to feel what one does not feel, especially a pretence of virtue, etc.

Now I should like to make a few comments with regard to the new Department which I understand will be known as the Government Services Department, under the Hon. John Brockelbank.

Mr. Speaker, I am quite disturbed to see that under this Department will come the Government Purchasing Agency, the Queen's Printer and the Government Printing Office. The reason I am disturbed is in view of the statement made by the Hon. Premier (Mr. Blakeney), Leader-Post, December 23, 1971. He said that the Service Printing Company which is a subsidiary of the CCF Publishing and Printing Limited, and owned by the NDP will receive contracts from the Government for printing requirements. I note on the last return filed by the CCF Publishing and Printing Company Limited it shows the shares of this company as being owned by the NDP Saskatchewan section of the party and the chairman of the company to be Mr. J.H. Brockelbank, father of the proposed Minister-in-Charge of the agencies I previously mentioned.

Also, Mr. Speaker, I note from the return filed in regard to CCF Publishing and Printing Co. Ltd., that it shows Mr. Don Farris as being the secretary. I presume, Sir, that this is the Don Farris MLA for Arm River.

The relationship between the Government agencies, the Minister-in-Charge, the father of the Minister, the NDP MLA for Arm River and the party-owned company appears to me to be a little irregular for those of us on this side of the House to condone and feel confident that the majority of the electors of this Province do not endorse such a set-up.

Some Hon. Members: — Hear, hear!

Mr. Loken: — Mr. Speaker, in the past, little has been controversial in the area of the Purchasing Agency, but now there is cause for concern when we note that the NDP political healer by the name of Harvey Abells was appointed by Order-in-Council effective

February 1st, 1972 as purchasing officer number two in the Purchasing Agency at a salary of \$901 per month. This position I suggest, Mr. Speaker, would be better filled by a deserving civil servant who undoubtedly would be well qualified and would have applied for the position if it had been advertised.

Mr. Speaker, this is the type of demoralizing, questionable appointments that not only disturb the Members on this side of the House but cause much anxiety and insecurity in the civil service of this entire Province.

Now, Mr. Speaker, it has been the policy, I understand, to distribute as much printing contracts as possible out to weekly newspapers and small printers in rural Saskatchewan in order to supplement their earnings so that they may survive. I strongly recommend that the new Government continue this practice as I suggest that if there was any decision to be made as to whether a contract should go to a weekly newspaper, small printer in rural Saskatchewan, or to the Service Printing Company I would hope that it would not go to Service Printers if their price quote was cheaper.

Mr. Speaker, we in rural Saskatchewan are proud of our small newspapers and consider them a very integral part of our everyday living and will at every opportunity speak on their behalf.

If the Government is really serious about preserving the small villages, towns and rural Saskatchewan, they will heed my suggestion and give every assistance in whatever manner to help preserve those establishments to which I have referred.

Mr. Speaker, I would also suggest that there be no bias on the part of this Government when government-paid advertising is distributed to the media. I now refer again to the smaller newspaper and radio stations which are located in the rural areas of this Province and perform a most necessary function to the communities of which they are a part.

Mr. Speaker, the Queen's Printing Office is a very important agency and to the best of my knowledge it is most efficiently operated, but I have thought for a long time now that the public at large should be made more aware of the fact that copies of any statute or law of the Province is available to them. I would suggest that once again consideration be given to more publicity through this media as to where people can obtain these documents. Also, Mr. Speaker, I would recommend that these statutes be priced at absolute cost and if it was found reasonable and desirable, that they be free to community organizations such as local libraries, schools, etc.

Now, Mr. Speaker, I want to say a few words about the Speech from the Throne and I can assure you that I mean a few because the reaction that has come from my constituency is that there is nothing new that is worthwhile but they have made their views well known to me on the following items which they most certainly disagree with:

1. A Land Bank Commission.
2. Tampering with the control of feed grains.
3. Imposition of estate taxes and gift taxes.
4. Establishment of a human rights commission.
5. Establishment of an ombudsman.

March 7, 1972

Mr. Speaker, my people in the Rosetown constituency do not agree that unwarranted legislation should be placed in the statute books of Saskatchewan to further deter personal private initiative, we believe in freedom.

Mr. Speaker, it is evident I do not support the motion.

Some Hon. Members: — Hear, hear!

Mr. J.G. Richards (Saskatoon University): — Mr. Speaker, the Premier began his comments on the Speech from the Throne with a ten minute discussion about economic development in our province. I should like tonight, in the brief time that remains before we close this debate, to take up the Premier's remarks and to elaborate.

Let me begin perhaps somewhat abstractly but I assure you that I will very quickly get to a pragmatic consideration of policies that I think we should be pursuing.

Any respectable theory of economic development must have two fundamental elements. One element must be a consideration of markets and of comparative costs. Secondly, there must be analysis of the political power of non-market phenomena which determine economic development.

Let me give a very simple, a very practical example. Potash exists under Saskatchewan, in beds 400 million years old, extending beyond the borders of Saskatchewan into Manitoba and North Dakota. It is a simple question of comparative costs, Mr. Speaker, dictating that mines come to Saskatchewan, rather than Manitoba or North Dakota. The potash deposits are closer to the surface in Saskatchewan. However, Mr. Speaker, it is not enough merely to conduct exercises in comparative costs if one is to understand economic development. It is not enough to understand comparative costs to explain why, in the fiscal year 1970-71, Saskatchewan potash production declined from 3.9 to 3.5 million tons. It is not enough to understand comparative costs to explain why the sales revenue, despite that decline in production, increased from \$82.9 million to \$126.5 million. It is not enough to understand comparative costs to explain why, with this 53 per cent increase in dollar value of potash sales, there was an 11 per cent decline in the royalty revenue that came into the Provincial Treasury. To understand those phenomena, Mr. Speaker, one has to understand the power that the potash cartel exercised over the previous Liberal administration. One has to understand the phenomena of power, and that if we are to have economic development in our province, we're going to have to use the power that resides with the Provincial Legislature, on behalf of the unorganised, on behalf of the ordinary people of Saskatchewan.

Mr. Speaker, I am not trying to enter into a partisan diatribe, to claim that we all have virtue, to claim that the Members of the Opposition were in error in everything that they have said or done. That is foolishness, and it is a game into which, I am afraid, we often degenerate in this House. Under the leadership of the late Mr. Ross Thatcher, the Members opposite concentrated, with sincerity, on the first element in the theory. They emphasized the role of the market place, the role of comparative costs. Their philosophy was that if one left the market to do its job one would arrive at the best of

all possible worlds. Mr. Speaker, there is a great deal to be said here. The Liberals with relish pointed to the mistakes and the foibles that we at times committed during the 20 years of CCF administration because we on occasion ignored comparative cost and market considerations.

However, what the Liberals threw out by the front door — in failing to consider the second aspect of the question, non-market power — they sneaked in via the back. Thus let us refer again to the great private entrepreneurs of the potash industry who, by 1969, were reeling on the edge of bankruptcy. Then, Mr. Speaker, Liberals understood the reality of power independent of the market place — the power of a well organized industry. When the Liberals considered development of the forest industries, it was not simply a question of opening up the forest, and letting entrepreneurs, such as Mr. Landegger come in. Mr. Landegger exercised a great deal of power over the previous Government and he used it to work out deals with the Government which amounted, of course, to public assumption of the capital risk involved.

Let me now come to a more immediate case — the oil industry. On September 30th last, Imperial Oil announced its intention to phase out its refinery in Regina. Mr. Steuart's (Leader of the Opposition) response at the time was that nothing could be done except, and I quote, "Sit down with the company, and like reasonable men, try to negotiate terms whereby Imperial Oil will stay in Regina." Mr. Steuart argued that it was impossible for the Provincial Government to exercise any power over this kind of decision. His position was that we had to accept, in effect, a colonial posture towards such a huge multi-national corporation. After all, Mr. Speaker, Imperial Oil, as a subsidiary of Standard Oil of New Jersey, the 'mother of trusts,' is a prime example of the multi-national corporation operating in a cartelised industry and earning monopoly profits. Is the Leader of the Opposition's position that nothing can be done to challenge such corporate power — right? I pose that not as a rhetorical question, Mr. Speaker, but as a very serious question which we, in this Legislature, and which we, the people of Saskatchewan, must decide. It is not going to be my decision; it is not going to be the decision solely of the Government.

What are the results of accepting this kind of situation? I can quote you certain facts and figures, Mr. Speaker. I can quote you that, for example, per capita personal income in Saskatchewan fell between 1968 and 1970, from 90 to 70 per cent of the Canadian average. We are roughly in the same relative position as Quebec. I could quote you the peak population estimate of 962,000 in October of 1968, and the 34,000 decline by June of 1971. These figures, Mr. Speaker, I could quote to you as indices of the problems that face us because we are powerless. I could quote figures to indicate that — although the Liberals would have had it that they were diversifying our economy — employment in manufacturing declined from a peak in 1966 of 15,700 jobs to a 1971 level of 15,000. I could quote the fluctuations that have occurred in per operator net farm income. In 1970, it was \$2,760 approximately; in 1971 it fortunately increased substantially over 1970. But these are just economic statistics that anybody can pull out of the data. The crux of the question is 'is that good enough? Do we have to accept it? Is there any alternative?'

March 7, 1972

I submit there is an alternative but if we are to pursue it, it will entail risk. It means resurrecting the ideological roots of prairie protest out of which the CCF grew, out of which the farm movements grew, out of which our party, the New Democratic Party grew. It means government as public entrepreneur in an aggressive way that we have not been accustomed to. I am the first to admit that to enter into the area of resource development and other fields of private business is risky. But private entrepreneurs take risks, and if we are going to replace private enterprise with public enterprise we too are going to have to take risks.

For many many years we in the CCF and NDP had a firm belief that there would ultimately be a democratic socialist government in Ottawa, and that we could postpone until such time as there was a democratic socialist government in Ottawa, the assumption of public entrepreneurial risks. I admit it is more difficult to initiate Crown corporations at a provincial – as opposed to federal – level, because of the smaller size of the market, because of the more restricted financial resources of a province, because of the restricted legislative authority of a provincial government in a federal system of divided authority between federal and provincial governments. However, Mr. Speaker, I think the time has come when we have to take these risks at the provincial level.

I might draw very briefly for the House some analogies with Quebec. Much of the separatist movement in Quebec should not be interpreted solely in terms of a cultural separatism, in terms of preservation of French culture. It should also be interpreted as an attempt by Quebecois to control the patterns of economic development within their own province. They feel that they must be able to make decisions at a provincial level because the Federal Government – whether it has been in the hands of Conservatives or whether it has been in the hands of Liberals – has opted for a continental policy of – as quietly as possible but as quickly as possible – selling the Canadian economy to the United States.

Mr. Speaker, let me now pose some questions in detail about alternative policies we might apply to the provincial oil industry. I shall be sketching; I shall not be painting the definitive answers. But if this Legislature is to be serious about the challenge of socialist economic development policy, these are the kinds of questions that we must tackle.

To give perspective, consider briefly the case of Libya. Libya is a poor country with a population in the same order of magnitude as Saskatchewan – 1.9 million. However, the Libyans, have extracted from the oil companies in their country an average of \$1.80 in taxes per barrel of crude produced, whereas we in our province have only been able to extract 30 cents per barrel. I submit, Mr. Speaker, Members are worried about our small size preventing us from doing anything here in Saskatchewan, we ought sometimes to think of the experiments and the struggles of people in other parts of the world – from Mexico to Libya – who have been prepared to take on the giants of the international oil cartel.

Of course, the situation in Saskatchewan is not identical to that in the Middle East. Our crude production costs are higher. To quote the Organization of Petroleum Exporting Countries, crude oil costs a maximum of 25 cents per barrel to

produce in the Middle East. It costs \$1 to \$1.25 per barrel to produce on the Canadian prairies, and it cost \$1.75 per barrel from the United States Gulf state wells. Members will be aware of the Texas Gulf price system, the oil-cartel controlled price structure for crude petroleum. It sets prices high enough to assure the profitable utilization of high cost United States oil wells. Texas Gulf prices, applied across the continent, mean that in the lower cost more efficient Canadian oil fields particularly excessive profits are being earned. Given the average well-head price of crude petroleum in —s at \$2.50 per barrel in 1971, and given a production cost of \$1.25 a barrel, annual profits on Saskatchewan crude production are in the order of magnitude of \$100 million.

Let us look at the profitability of the industry from another point of view — the costs involved in producing a gallon of gasoline. I quote from a very reputable authority, the McKenzie Report, a report commissioned by the Alberta Government. It estimated crude production costs (Involving extraction costs from established fields and exploration costs) at approximately four cents a gallon. To refine crude into the finished product adds another three cents per gallon. To distribute a gallon of refined product to the retailer costs five cents. For the dealer mark-up allow eight cents per gallon. The per gallon road tax in Saskatchewan is 19 cents. We have, Mr. Speaker, a total cost per gallon of 39 cents. Members are aware that the retail price of gasoline in the province is approximately 52 cents per gallon, thereby leaving 13 cents per gallon as an unaccounted mark-up taken by the oil industry. I may be somewhat in error on these estimated figures. I am not trying to claim them as definitive. However, Mr. Speaker, I would suggest they are indicative of the fact that we are facing an industry with a degree of monopoly and high profitability, and that there is room for, to put it mildly, improvement.

What can we do at a provincial level? I should like to quote from a resolution passed at the previous annual convention of the New Democratic Party:

Be it resolved that the Provincial Government enter the oil industry by establishing an integrated oil company run as a Crown corporation.

The resolution proceeds to spell out ways and means whereby that should be done. Nationalization of the provincial oil industry is a reform to which, Mr. Speaker, this Government must give very serious consideration. It is the kind of major reform the kind of challenge that people of our province expect of this Government. It should not, of course, preclude other interim reforms such as increasing provincial oil revenue by increasing the royalties charged to the companies. “Why should the Government risk so much for so little?” it has been argued. There are, after all, only 160 people to be thrown out of work by closing down the Imperial Refinery in Regina. In response, Mr. Speaker, a job is a job, and it is worth saving 160 jobs. More significantly, if we can gain provincial control over the oil industry via an integrated Crown operation from well-head to gas pump, we will not only maintain jobs, we will control a highly profitable industry which will either yield considerable revenues to the Treasury, or lower gasoline prices, or do a combination of both.

How does one do it? How does the Provincial Government

March 7, 1972

undertake this kind of operation? We shall need to be concerned about crude production, about refining, about retail marketing. These are highly complicated problems and no one is suggesting that we rush in overnight, but let us start thinking about some of these kinds of things that are so important to the people of our province.

Some Hon. Members: — Hear, hear!

Mr. Richards: — Oil exploration in this Province declined by 1971 to 40 per cent of its level in 1965. There is a great need for a provincial exploration corporation — hopefully as part of an integrated Crown oil corporation — which would undertake rigorous oil exploration in the lower pre-Mississippian levels. There is a need to control, of course, drilling leases and to allocate sufficient to any Crown corporation. There is a need to begin the planning of new refining investment within Saskatchewan.

The decision made by Imperial to close three prairie refineries and develop in Edmonton, the decision by Gulf to close its refinery in Moose Jaw and its refinery in Saskatoon, the decision by Husky to close its refinery at Moose Jaw — all of these decisions, Mr. Speaker, were not solely based upon “economies of scale”, upon considerations of comparative costs. There were also, serious political considerations relating to the power exercised by the oil industry over the Alberta Government, a friendly government which — oilmen can be assured — will not try and tax the excess profits of the oil industry on behalf of Alberta people. If we are prepared to challenge this pattern of resource development, we must obviously plan for refining investment within Saskatchewan. This might be an appropriate time to pay some small tribute to the Regina co-operative refinery, the only sizeable Canadian-owned refinery in the country.

Some Hon. Members: — Hear, hear!

Mr. Richards: — In the depths of the 1930s, a time of depression when the Provincial Government and Saskatchewan people had far fewer technical resources at their command than they do now, the farmers of this Province had the courage to risk entry into the refining industry. Surely now, with the provincial refining industry threatened because of the arbitrary lack of concern by the oil industry in regional development within Saskatchewan, we must follow the example offered by farmers in the 1930s. Hopefully in co-operation with the Regina Co-op refinery we must plan new public refinery investment within the province.

Of the three levels — crude production, refining, retailing — it is at the retail end, Mr. Speaker, where there are the most serious problems. Those of you with any knowledge of the oil industry will know about the plight of the lessee operator, the modern-day serf of the oil industry. Referring back to the Alberta study on gasoline marketing, the McKenzie Report, to which I referred for cost figures per gallon of gasoline, I want now to cite from it the statistics on the average turnover of lessee operators in the 1960s — 31.3 per cent. In other words, a lessee operator lasts an average of five years. It is a riskier business even than farming, Mr. Speaker.

Lessee-operators don't get away unscathed when forced out of the business. Each invests an average of \$5,000 to \$10,000 in his service station and he loses most of it if forced out. The oil industry exploits the desires of people to have some independence. It has created in this modern-day serf a person who has neither the benefits of owning his own business, nor the security of having a union – a collective organization – to argue on his behalf. The lessee-operator is a man forced to sell one product and only one product – that of the oil company from which he leases his station. He is a man forced to open at hours dictated to him by the oil industry. He is a man whose economy future is, as I have indicated by the high mortality figures, very, very unsure. Given the retail marketing structure created by the private cartelised oil industry, it will be hard to create a more rational marketing system. But, Mr. Speaker, we are going to have to do it.

Part of the problem has been the over-extension of investment in retail service stations. However, we have, as a government, some obligation that, in the fight with the international oil cartel we protect the rights and interests of these present-day serfs, the lessee operators.

We have a sufficient market within Saskatchewan to achieve all the needed economies of scale. We can get the needed technicians and technology. Mexico after all successfully nationalized its oil industry in 1938 at a time when its annual oil production was 50 per cent of Saskatchewan's current level. It has been profitable ever since.

The problems are not primarily economic comparative cost concerns, Mr. Speaker. The problems are primarily political and legal. Will, for example, the oil lobby be able to pressure the Federal Government into making an attempt to rule ultra vires any Provincial legislation which we might have to enact within Saskatchewan relating to the oil industry? Then consider the strictly political problems we will face in economy warfare with the giants of the oil industry. It is a sobering thought to realize that the annual sales revenue of Imperial Oil in 1971 was \$1.9 billion – approximately four times the total provincial revenue of the Saskatchewan Government. It will not be easy, Mr. Speaker, to organize against the level of economic warfare that the oil industry – with its financial resources – could wage against us.

Provided we realize that nationalization of the oil industry is not only a question of comparative costs, that we realize it is also a political struggle against the oil cartel to be waged on behalf of the people of Saskatchewan, we can win. We, too, have our weapons. At the turn of the century how did we develop in Canada paper mills to process raw pulp that previously had been manufactured into paper in the United States? We didn't get them because the Americans wanted to invest in Canadian development. The Americans wanted our raw pulp. We got Canadian paper mills because certain provincial governments imposed selective duties on pulp with rebates to those who processed the pulp into paper within the provincial boundaries. By the use of negative sanctions, political weapons available to provincial governments, we first developed paper mills with Canada. The Americans grumbled. The Americans protested. The great dragon to the south manoeuvred and did many flips, but it finally accepted the inevitable,

March 7, 1972

the right of sovereign Canadian people to determine the pattern of development of that particular resource. The same must happen now, Mr. Speaker, with oil.

Even members of the Liberal Party such as Walter Gordon the ex-federal Minister of Finance and other members of the Committee for an Independent Canada, have accused Canadian governments of being gutless in the pursuit of Canadian interests when bargaining with powerful multi-national corporations.

In conclusion, Mr. Speaker, let me state to the Members on this side of the House that although oil nationalization is a challenge that will not be easy, although it is a reform that can be effective only with a great deal of popular support on behalf of the Government, it is a challenge worthy of the traditions of our part, and the CCF out of which it came.

Some Hon. Members: — Hear, hear!

Mr. C.P. MacDonald (Milestone): — Mr. Speaker, in rising to take part in this Debate, I join with other Members of the House in expressing congratulations to those new Members, newly appointed Cabinet Ministers and so on.

I want to start off by saying that I enjoyed the economy dissertation by the Member for University Mr. Richards) and I thought that perhaps I might also give him a very simple illustration on an economic lesson. He used the idea of the market place, the law of supply and demand. He referred to economic power and the need for political action. And then, of course, he used the illustration of Imperial Oil. He said that it had lost 160 jobs, and a job is a job.

Now I want to point out another thing that brought economic power, that certainly influenced the market place and the law of supply and demand. It cost an awful lot of jobs to the province of Saskatchewan and it wasn't Mr. Steuart who was silent, it was Mr. Blakeney who was silent and the Member of the NDP. Of course I am referring to the recent sale of Federal Grain to the Saskatchewan Wheat Pool.

All of us know, I don't think anybody in this House is objecting to the Saskatchewan Wheat Pool but believe me I am objecting to Saskatchewan Wheat Pool virtually obtaining a monopoly on the wheat distribution and buying services in the Province of Saskatchewan. I will tell you another thing. That a number of members in the Wheat Pool also object to that virtual monopoly because every farmer, including farmers on that side of the House, know that in a non-competitive delivery point you get the poor service and the poorest boxcars. I also want to tell the Member for University that the Saskatchewan Wheat Pool didn't buy old elevators and that pile of lumber, they bought economic power in the Bracken formula, so that they could get the allocation of boxcars from the Federal Grain Company.

Do you know what it cost the Province of Saskatchewan? Three hundred and fifty jobs! Not 160! Did Mr. Blakeney or Mr. Richards or did anybody on that side of the House stand up and object? Not a word!

Now, Mr. Speaker, when you talk about political power

let's talk about political action and let's talk about when a job is a job because there are going to be 350 people looking for a job. There are going to be thousands of Saskatchewan farmers that are not going to be able to have good competition in the delivery service in the Province of Saskatchewan.

I want to talk now about the three main issues in this Legislature. First of all, Sir, I think and I wasn't going to mention the first, but after the Member for Shellbrook (Mr. Bowerman), the Member for North Battleford (Mr. Kramer), the Member for Saskatoon, the Member for Hanley (Mr. Mostaway), all got up and talked about the distribution of radio time. I think I should bring up another point which illustrates the reason the Member on this side of House objected to the arrogance and the attempt to muzzle the Opposition of free speech in this House.

I don't have to tell you that the House Leader dictated, first of all, not only the amount of time that we could have but, second, he also dictated to us as to when we were going to speak, in that order and how long each Member could speak. Mr. Speaker, I should like to give another example. This arrogance to these gentlemen over there I should like to tell you, I should like to tell you Mr. Minister of Health (Mrs. Smishek) and I will give you a little advice, a little caution. Do you know something? You should make sure your mind is engaged before you put your mouth in here.

After listening to you fellows all that time now you listen. First of all I want to tell you that it isn't only the Attorney General (Mr. Romanow) who acted with arrogance, it is also the Premier (Mr. Blakeney). I should like to refer you to the Commonwealth Parliamentary Association. The first day the Premier stood up in this House and announced that the Member for Regina North West (Mr. Whelan) was on his way to England to represent this Legislature in a Commonwealth Parliamentary Association meeting.

I want to tell you, the Members on that side of the House, that is the first time in the history of this Legislature that a man has every been designated to go without a meeting being called, without the Association getting together, without a consultation with this side of the House. I should like to read you the minutes of the 1970 meeting. First of all: The 20th Parliamentary Seminar on Procedure resolved that the Opposition name the delegate. Who had moved it? Mr. Davies. 2. Resolved that the Government name as delegate a Member of the Legislative Assembly to the general conference in Malaysia. And that gentlemen was the gist of this meeting.

The Opposition named a man to go to England and the Government at that time the Liberals, selected a man to go to Malaysia. Then without even as much as a phone call, without calling a meeting the Premier turned around and disregarded the minutes of that meeting and selected a man from the new Government and sent him to Malaysia. He then turned around this fall and without calling the Members of this Assembly together, without calling the Parliamentary representatives on both sides of the House, selected another man and sent him to England.

I want to tell you that when we were the Government every year we alternated the trip to England. When the Parliamentary Conference was in Canada if you go back over the last eight

March 7, 1972

years there were exactly the same number of Members on the Opposition side as on the Government side who went on those trips. Ten each. I am going to tell you something – that is three in a row for the Government and I could care less. But I am going to tell you that if you think the Opposition is going to stand by and let you people muzzle it, and with that kind of arrogance, without even any kind of consultation – I am going to tell the Premier and I am going to tell you that the Government of Saskatchewan and the NDP doesn't run the Commonwealth Parliamentary Association.

That is a free Parliamentary Association for all the Members of every parliament in the British Commonwealth, politics precluded.

Now, Mr. Speaker, I want to talk about the second issue and that is the Land Bank. You know I really got a charge out of the Member for Shellbrook (Mr. Bowerman) and I should like to tell him to go and sit with the Member from Nutana (Mr. Robbins) and find out what the definition of amortization is. When you amortize \$64,000 over 25 years and come out at \$4 per acre, I am afraid your mathematics is a little different than mine and certainly different from the Member from Nutana.

I want to tell you, Mr. Speaker, if there is any piece of legislation that will come into this Assembly that will have an impact on the life, the social, the moral and the economic situation in the Province of Saskatchewan it is the Land Bank. I am going to tell you, Mr. Speaker, the only information we have on the Land Bank is the discussion of the Minister of Agricultural (Mr. Messer) and the booklet that he has presented, the clippings from around the province. I am going to tell you if that's the scheme that the NDP are presenting to the farmers of this Province I say it is the biggest political hoax, the biggest political gimmick that has ever been offered to this Province in many, many years.

Some Hon. Members: — Hear, hear!

Mr. MacDonald: — Mr. Speaker, all that it offers to the farmers of this Province is a return to feudalism and serfdom, the same kind of serfdom that the Member for University (Mr. Richards) referred to when referring to the oil lessees. Offering economic serfdom to the farmers of this Province and it takes us back a thousand years and I will tell you why.

First of all, Mr. Speaker, it does five things. First of all it is an unthinkable bad financial deal for any farmer on a straight dollar and cents basis. 2. It offers to the farmer who enters into any agreement perpetual poverty as long as he lives. 3. It will result in inflation of land prices. 4. It will mean retirement in poverty for any man who enters into a rental agreement. And the most important one, 5. It will mean that every farmer who enters into an agreement will be a sharecropper, a serf, which will mean state ownership of the agricultural land of Saskatchewan.

I want to say, Mr. Speaker, that the NDP are stealing a good idea from the Federal Government.

Some Hon. Members: — Hear, hear!

Mr. MacDonald: — Yes, that is right. The Federal Government conceived an idea of a Land Bank then they turned it into a socialist nightmare. And another interesting thing, Mr. Speaker, they are taking advantage of an economic situation in Saskatchewan where all of a sudden net farm income has dropped, markets have gone down, there have been very low quotas. If the NDP had proposed this five years ago or perhaps five years hence they would be run out of Saskatchewan.

Mr. Speaker, most of the people that come to the Province of Saskatchewan came for one reason — to own a parcel of land, a piece of property, a home. Mr. Speaker, now the NDP objective is to own that land and to remove it from the opportunity of private ownership and the individual pride that goes with it.

Let me tell you about another thing. Mr. Speaker, there is a problem in the community. Certainly it is low incomes. Certainly there is another problem and that is the transfer of land from one owner to another and particularly from father to son. But I am going to tell the Members opposite the answer to the family farm is not state ownership. It is the markets of Japan and China and Russia. Let me start off with a bad financial deal.

First of all, Mr. Speaker, from what chairman Messer says, as my colleague from Moosomin (Mr. Gardner) calls him, rents will be from \$2.50 to \$10 per acre. Well I am going to give you an illustration of land in Wilcox because it is considered the most productive land in Saskatchewan. I went down to the Family Farm Corporation and they gave me an idea of what land was valued at and it means at the market price. They said \$100 per acre approximately. It would be between \$90 and \$110 so let's take the median.

At \$10 per acre rent that's 10 x 640 acres which equals \$6,400 per year. Let's take an average farmer. You say that you are going to start the young fellow. He is going to start at 20 years of age and farm until 60, or start at 25 and farm until 65. You multiply 40 x \$6,400 and you get over one quarter of a million in rent. And when that man leaves that farm he has paid through NDP socialist policy in this Province a quarter of a million dollars and he hasn't one penny of equity. He walks away with an old age security cheque and perhaps a little that he might have put into the Canada Pension Plan.

But I also happen to have, Mr. Speaker, the Farm Credit Corporation rates. For a man to borrow \$64,000 on the maximum of 29 years, do you know what he pays? First of all, Mr. Speaker, at 7½ per cent interest it is approximately \$5,400 a year. You multiply that by 29 years and it comes to approximately \$158,000 and if he goes under the Land Bank at \$10 per acre it will cost him one quarter of a million and he doesn't have a penny.

Let's take another illustration. Supposing now, for example, that he rented land for 20 years and he turned around and paid \$120,000 in rent and then he turns around and purchases it. Now figure out what he will pay at the \$10 rental fee and then at the purchase price on top of that after renting for 20 years.

Let's take another example. Let's take land valued at \$60 because I used a ridiculous example. That is how ridiculous

March 7, 1972

his proposal is. Let's take land valued at \$60 per acre and multiply that by 640 and it comes to \$38,400. He said that he is going to charge interest. The rate will be based on the interest and will not be subsidized. So let's take it at seven per cent. Now that is approximately \$2,700 per year. You multiply that by 40 years and it is about \$108,000. And that is rented at less than \$5 per acre. He says it is between \$2.50 and \$10. From Farm Credit, he would have to pay about \$5,280 approximately. When he purchases that after 29 years it is \$85,000 approximately. Mr. Speaker, the very frightening thing about it is that if he pays these rental rates that Mr. Messer is talking about on that kind of an illustration, the farmer would pay \$78,000 approximately and the Government would pay \$16,000. What happens if the Government owns the land. You know, Mr. Speaker, Mr. Blakeney stood up and said when we talk about the Athabasca Pulp Mill, it was a bad financial deal. Well, Mr. Speaker, we were amateurs, if you want to talk about a bad financial deal. First of all the farmer takes all the risk, the farmer does all the work, the farmer pays 80 per cent of the cost and he gets zero per cent of the equity, the Government gets 100 per cent of the ownership.

Some Hon. Members: — Hear, hear!

Mr. MacDonald: — Now, Mr. Speaker, the next thing the Minister of Agriculture says you know we are not going to subsidize the interest because the people of Saskatchewan would object to that. But he doesn't mind paying the principal, and he doesn't mind paying the administration costs, if that isn't subsidy I should like to know why. Why is he paying the principal instead of subsidizing the interest like The Guarantee Livestock Loan Act? Simply because if he subsidized the interest the farmer would have title to the land.

Mr. Speaker, I want to say a second thing, this just means that the farmer will be ensured of perpetual poverty. First of all let's take rent at \$6.00 an acre, let's take taxes at \$1.50, let's take crop insurance at 50 cents and that's the minimum that comes to \$8 per acre, a total of about \$1,200 per year per quarter. If the return on an 8-bushel quota is \$1,600 a quarter, that means he has \$400 with which to pay his fuel, oil, gas, depreciation, buy food and clothing for his family. If that isn't poverty, Mr. Speaker, I should like to know what is? Then, Mr. Speaker, he turns around and says \$60,000 is going to be the top assets. I should like to invite him out to Wilcox, I hope he changes that...

Mr. Messer: — Never said that at all.

Mr. MacDonald: — Net assets, pardon me. Let's turn around and take 320 acres of Wilcox land at \$100 an acre, that's \$32,000; let's take machinery at \$18,000 and there are not many farmers who can farm land today on \$18,000 worth of farm machinery; let's take 20 cows and 20 calves at \$10,000, that's \$60,000 net assets. Surely the principle of the Land Bank should be able to help farmers get an economic unit not strangle them at the existing position where they can't make a living today. On a half section of even three quarters, what farmer can make a living.

The third thing, Mr. Speaker, it cannot help but inflate land prices. Let's talk about those farmers who have more than

\$60,000 net assets. What about if they want to expand their unit and all of a sudden who are they competing with? They are competing with the Government of Saskatchewan to buy land. You know something, Mr. Speaker, if the Government of Saskatchewan takes 25 per cent of the land out of circulation how much is that going to inflate land prices because the scarcer the commodity, certainly the more expensive the product.

The fourth thing, he is going to retire in poverty. You know, Mr. Speaker, one of the great assets of the Minister's remarks were the fact that he was going to assist the farmers in Saskatchewan to retire in great dignity and security. That's right, Mr. Minister. But let's take a look, he's going to help the seller all right, he's going to help the seller, the seller doesn't need any help, he's got the equity, he owns the land and he can sell it today, he doesn't need Mr. Messer's help, the Minister of Agriculture's help. But let's look at the renter, he's already paid two or three times the value of the land in rent, Mr. Speaker, he has no equity when he retires, he retires on the old age security and the Canadian Pension Plan.

The fifth one, Mr. Speaker, which is really the bad one, is state ownership. First of all he says he is going to make it possible for farmers to buy it if they want. That's really good. But, Mr. Speaker, the farmer is going to pay over a period of time, he's not going to pay cash for the land that he buys, but any farmer who wants to buy the land has got to pay cash. Not only that, Mr. Speaker, if a young farmer takes over land on a lease he doesn't get an option to buy at a specific purchase price, he's got to buy the land at the market price. It might be less, but that isn't the history of land except in the last few years. Now, Mr. Speaker, let's take another sample. He turns around and he has got to pay cash...

Mr. Messer: — ...don't have cash...

Mr. MacDonald: — That's right! Why don't you pay cash? You don't want them to pay cash. Let's take another example.

Let's take a father who leases his land to the Land Bank and the Land Bank gives it back to his son. Ten years later the son decides he wants to buy the land. Mr. Speaker, maybe the Government bought the land at \$70 an acre, maybe 10 years from now it's worth \$90 an acre, the capital gain goes to the Government, not to the father and the son. Is that a good financial deal?

Let's have a look at some of the results. Mr. Speaker, one of the biggest problems is that the decision-making process in agriculture is going to be transferred to the Government. Any time the Government owns a large section of the land they are going to be involved in the decision-making process and it will not be the producer. What kind of an investment will that man make in buildings and equipment on his land when at the end of that period of time when he has to retire he doesn't know who is going to lease that land or who is going to get that lease? Is he going to put up a good home with good value that he can sell to the best buyer, that he can pass on to his son? What kind of buildings and equipment is he going to buy to settle on that unit?

March 7, 1972

Let's take another one. Mr. Speaker, another result that bothers me is the political interference. The NDPs around the province are trying to sell this program. Do you know who they are using to sell it? They are not using the Saskatchewan Association of Rural Municipalities or the local council, they are using the NDP organization in each constituency. They are having NDP meetings around the province. Mr. Speaker, I wonder what kind of policy on allocation it is going to be? Then he says, Mr. Speaker, we are going to have a local committee. Imagine the local NDP committee allocating land in Timbuktu in Saskatchewan and all of a sudden there are 25 farmers applying and they allocate it to one. What kind of hard feelings are going to be the legacy of that program.

Mr. Speaker, I am not going to say anything more about the Land Bank but I just hope the Minister of Agriculture will stand up and answer some of these questions that he has raised around the Province of Saskatchewan. He is the one man on the Government side who isn't talking about the Land Bank because he knows that those proposals that he put forth in the Press and around at those meetings are not acceptable to the farmers of Saskatchewan. I guarantee when he comes in with that proposal he'll have his reform there won't be \$10 rent, I'll bet you, Mr. Minister, because you know the Land Bank will get run out of Saskatchewan.

I want to talk about another problem, and that's unemployment. You know, Mr. Speaker, if there is anything that has been strange on that side of the House in their speeches, it has been the omission of the word 'employment'. A year ago in this House, Mr. Speaker, that's all we heard about, was employment. What are the facts? Do you know, Mr. Speaker, that this year in the Province of Saskatchewan there are 5.4 per cent of the people unemployed. One year ago there were 4.7. Do you know that the Province of Saskatchewan had the lowest unemployment in Canada. This year, Mr. Speaker, do you know what the situation is? Manitoba is lower, Alberta is lower, Ontario is lower and in an eight month period of government, there are more young people walking the streets of the Province of Saskatchewan unemployed than ever before in our history, at any time since the people rode the rods across Canada. Yes, Mr. Speaker, and is it any wonder? Is it any wonder that the Minister of Labour (Mr. Snyder) didn't mention employment and unemployment in the Province of Saskatchewan. Then he came out with a new program, the only real change he calls it 'Pep' instead of 'Step'. You know what the Throne Speech said, it's a new program, a new program. Mr. Speaker, here it is \$1.5 million the same as last year, \$150 a month subsidy, the same as last year, the same number of jobs. What he did he said we are going to include the Grade Twelve's. Well, we included Grade Twelve's but we didn't publicize it.

Some Hon. Members: — Hear, hear!

Mr. MacDonald: — That's right, Mr. Snyder could ask the Minister of Labour to check. Mr. Speaker, then the second program they talked about in the Throne Speech to help employment, they called it, Mr. Speaker, what was it? \$500 home builders' grant. But they said they were going to concentrate on low-income families. I don't know where that program came from but I remember it very well in this Assembly last year and the year before.

Then the only other thing they mentioned, Mr. Speaker, was 13,000 man-hours of 2,000 jobs for six months by supporting a Federal program. Mr. Speaker, never has a Throne Speech in Saskatchewan's history been more bankrupt on behalf of the working people of this province than this particular program in this Throne Speech for the working people of the Province of Saskatchewan. I am going to tell the Minister of Labour another thing. The NDP is supposed to be the friend of the working man, I am going to tell you that allegiance to the NDP isn't a friend. The only friend a man has got is his job. The only thing the NDP has done since they came to power is drive out industry, drive out jobs, cost the people of Saskatchewan job after job after job. There are more people on welfare today, more people on unemployment insurance today in the Province of Saskatchewan than at any time since 1939.

Mr. Speaker, what is it, what has the Premier of Saskatchewan done? Is it any wonder that the Member for Saskatoon University (Mr. Richards) demands political action. Is it any wonder, Mr. Speaker, that the Member from Saskatoon University is a little disturbed with the actions and lectures from your side of the House. He certainly wasn't talking to us because he knew he wasn't going to convince us. Mr. Speaker, if there was anything that was completely and unbelievably a disgrace it was the program offerings in the field of employment in the Province of Saskatchewan, it is the worst in modern day history, it is completely bankrupt of ideas or concepts. There hasn't been a single thing done by NDP to support the working man of this Province in this Throne Speech.

Mr. Speaker, I want to talk a little bit about education. I want to talk about salary negotiations. I am not going to repeat what my friend said this afternoon in reply to the Minister of Education. Our friend the Member for Saskatoon Nutana South (Mr. Rolfes) got up last night and talked about salary negotiations. Then, Mr. Speaker, the Minister of Education (Mr. MacMurchy) referred to salary negotiations. All I am going to say, Mr. Speaker, is if the one settlement in northern Saskatchewan is any indication of just what this Government is going to do for the teachers of Saskatchewan, then if I was the Minister of Education, I would get out of this House. I happen to have a copy of that agreement here, I hope that the Member from Nutana South, and the other 15 teachers will go back to the classrooms and tell their teachers about this salary agreement. I am going to tell you, first of all I am going to read you a clipping put out by the Minister of Education. It says:

An average of 7.2 per cent salary increase for teachers in Saskatchewan's northern school districts was announced Friday in the Legislature by Education Minister, Gordon MacMurchy.

Mr. Speaker, I want to tell you about the remuneration of teachers in northern Saskatchewan, they get it divided up into specific sections. First of all, there is an allowance for people that live in a geographic area in Saskatchewan where it is very isolated, where the winter is very severe and very few people are involved, where the cost of living is much higher because they have to fly in supplies, food and clothing. Therefore, the Civil Service, the Government of Saskatchewan, the Federal Government and industry gives those people what they call a 'northern allowance' that is made up in the difference

March 7, 1972

of the cost of living. It is not a part of the salary agreement. Now, Mr. Speaker, the 7.2 per cent is made up of the northern allowance, plus the salary agreement. Let me tell you what the salary agreement is. I am going to tell you something, Mr. Speaker, I hope the teachers will take this back, that this is the lowest improvement on a salary grid for teachers in the North American continent in the last 15 years. I'll read it to you, then ask the Minister of Education to stand on his feet and deny it. Here, Mr. Speaker, for example Class I. Teachers will get from \$4,750 to \$4,800 an increase of \$50 or 1.05 per cent. Is that not true, Mr. Minister of Education? Class II. Teachers will go from \$5,500 to \$5,650 an improvement of \$150 or 2.75 per cent. Mr. Speaker, when have the teachers in the Province of Saskatchewan got 1.5 or 2.73 in a salary grid improvement in this Province. It couldn't have been I suggest, Mr. Speaker, back in the 1940s. Let me look at Class III.

An Hon. Member: — ...look at it.

Mr. MacDonald: — Oh no, you look at it. Class III, from \$6,000 to \$6,225, that's an improvement of 5.7 per cent. Then we get into Class IV and the improvement goes from \$7,400 to \$7,700 an improvement of 4.5. Class V and VI is 4.65 per cent, but I understand there are no teachers in those classifications up there. Yet this is the Minister that walks around the province saying that 'area talks not working', tells the trustees to negotiate sincerely. Mr. Speaker, I hope that the Member for Saskatoon Nutana South puts that salary supplement up in his classroom. I hope that the Member from Cut knife posts that salary supplement in his classroom, because I am going to tell you I am going to post it in my teacher's room. Here, Mr. Speaker, this Government that was going to be the utopia, the education Mecca for every teacher in the Province of Saskatchewan then turned around and convinced teachers to go campaigning door to door and turned around to say that they would look after them. Then they turn around, Mr. Speaker, and give an average of 2.7, the lowest improvement in salary grid probably in the last 20 years in this Province and certainly in the last 10 years, maybe in North America.

An Hon. Member: — Maybe in Newfoundland.

Mr. MacDonald: — Probably Newfoundland. I hope the Minister of Education will maybe give his public statement on what was the reason for such a terrible increase to the northern teachers. I should also like to tell you, Mr. Speaker, and Members you know who negotiated that agreement? It was Mr. Amundrud and Mr. Waugh, two people from the Department of Education, directly working for the Minister of Education. This wasn't individual negotiators it was government people negotiating.

I want to talk about the Saskatchewan Government Insurance for a minute and a little statement the Minister of the SGIO made here the other day. When he got up...

An Hon. Member: — Who's that?

Mr. MacDonald: — That's the Attorney General, the Member from Riversdale. He got up the other day and made a statement, an announcement in this House. He said, "I want to tell the SGIO agents in the

Province of Saskatchewan that they don't have to worry about political affiliation, I want to tell you that as long as you do a good job on behalf of the Government Insurance Agency you won't be fired." What was the reason, Mr. Speaker, he made that statement because already he had fired SGIO agents for political affiliation. He stood up about one month or two months ago and said that any man that wasn't in agreement with the political philosophy of the SGIO and the NDP couldn't represent the Province of Saskatchewan. That's what he said. Now, Mr. Speaker, not only that but he turned around and said he's going to bring in improvements to the accident insurance policy in the province. Well I hope he does, Mr. Speaker, because we left him \$10 million in the Automobile Accident Insurance Fund, \$10 million from good Liberal management and good Liberal policies. And you know what the average is and what the policy of the SGIO is? Two million dollars in the Automobile Accident Insurance Fund. And last June when the Minister at that time, Mr. Boldt, the Member for Rosthern, left SGIO, there was \$10 million in that fund. They could have reduced the SGIO payments and premiums by 25 per cent according to their promise without any trouble. They could have turned around and reduced the cost to young drivers as they promised. So I just want to tell the people of Saskatchewan that when you look at the new benefits from the SGIO that they come from the Minister, the Member from Rosthern and his good management and the \$10 million surplus that the Liberals left.

Now Mr. Speaker, I want to talk for a minute about the pulp mill. I'm not going to get into the pros and cons of the pulp mill. It has been hashed out in this House. But I am going to say this, that when the Premier of Saskatchewan and the Attorney General misleads and makes false statements about the pulp mill deal, I think it's time that they are answerable to the people of Saskatchewan. And the Leader of the Opposition stood on his feet the other day and he called for a judicial inquiry into the dealings of the pulp mill. Well, Mr. Speaker, I think, first of all, the Premier and the Attorney General, the man in the charge of justice stood on his feet in this House and he said, "The paper signed June 14th cost the people of Saskatchewan \$4.4 million." And then in the same speech he said, "You know, the Athabasca pulp mill cleared the site." I've been up there. They bought trailers, they put in water and sewage, they ordered equipment, they spent thousands and thousands of dollars in negotiations. Mr. Speaker, the Attorney General said those were legal and moral contracts. I suggest to the Members of this House and the people of this Province that whether that paper had been signed on June 14th or not, those expenditures were incurred long before June 14th. They were a legal agreement between the legally elected Government of Saskatchewan and the Athabasca pulp mill. And you take those deals to any court in the Province of Saskatchewan and before any judge and you know as well as we know that those were legitimate compensations for expenses incurred long before June 14th. And either tell the truth or get a judge or justice of this court to stand on his feet and tell the people of Saskatchewan the truth because it is a shame to have the Attorney General, the Minister of Justice in this Province perpetrating that kind of inaccuracy. Now, Mr. Speaker, let the Government stand up and have that judicial inquiry, because you, the Attorney General, won't dare to do it. And I'm going to tell you another thing that was disgusting, Mr. Speaker, disgusting to say the least, to hear the Minister of Natural Resources (Mr. Kramer) stand on his feet today and belittle a

March 7, 1972

company and belittle a project that they are now doing business with and have part ownership in and to turn around and tell the rest of the investment community in this country and the investment in Saskatchewan that this is the kind of an attitude the Government – if you don't want the Prince Albert Pulp Mill, sell it.

An Hon. Member: — Yes, sell it.

Mr. MacDonald: — And I'll also tell you, Mr. Speaker, about the pollution that they cried about, something about the clear cutting that they cried about. Surely, the Member from Saskatoon University (Mr. Richards) who has enough guts to tell you people will want to know what you are doing about the clear cutting and the rape of the forests, what you are doing about the pollution in the North. Stand up and do something about it and be honest.

Mr. Speaker, I have one more comment on the Throne Speech, one more comment, one of the things about this document that was really astonishing. I said that the agricultural program was bankrupt of ideas, the employment policy, Mr. Speaker, there are about three ideas in here that are now. Mr. Speaker, the people of Saskatchewan will know them long after they are in position and they will regret the day. The rest of us, Mr. Speaker, to show you how bankrupt their ideas are, are all Liberal ideas. And I am going to go through them and ask you. First of all the PET Program of the Minister of Labour. Ask the Minister of Labour to stand up and deny that's a Liberal Program? The house builders' grant, ask the Minister of Labour to deny that's a Liberal program. Turn around, for example, the agribition, where did that come from? Ask the Minister of Agriculture to stand and deny that's a Liberal program.

Some Hon. Members: — Oh, oh. Whose idea?

Mr. MacDonald: — Ask the Minister of Agriculture to get up and deny that that's a Liberal program. Let's go into the idea, for example, let's take taxation. We don't want any credit for that estate tax. We heard the Member for Saskatoon University stand up and talk about those filthy, American, international corporations. Well, I'm going to tell you, Mr. Member from University, you'd better talk to the Premier because you know what that estate tax is going to do? It's going to hit every family entrepreneur or every individual entrepreneur in Saskatchewan. You sell your business because you've got to sell it to a multi-national corporation and get out of Saskatchewan because the multi-national corporation doesn't die. They don't pay estate taxes. And the person who owns a hotel or a business and he's a family entrepreneur, he's going to sell before he dies and he's going to sell to those filthy, American, international corporations that don't have to pay that estate tax. You'd better talk to that Minister. We'll have plenty to say about that in the Budget.

Let's turn now, Mr. Speaker, and talk about (I'd better get my specs on here), he talks about, for example, consumer protection. Mr. Speaker, we've got all those Bills, we've got all those Bills because we had them before June 23rd.

I want to talk to you, Mr. Speaker, about the human rights.

You know that's one piece of legislation that doesn't protect human rights. You just look at the Bill. And if any man in this House and on that side of the House is going to make the Attorney General the police commissar of the Province of Saskatchewan where no man has even the right to go to the courts for protection, you talk about protecting human rights.

Then we get into the Age of Majority. Who was the first one to reduce the Age of Majority in Canada? The Liberals in Saskatchewan.

And he talks about a Department of Culture and Youth. Whose was the first Youth Agency in Canada? The Saskatchewan Government of the '60s.

And here is another one. The Canada Winter Games, they are going to have Summer Winter Games. You know the funny part? That's from the Member for Riversdale who stood in this House two years ago and gave the Liberal Government that devil for building that mountain and spending money on skiing and recreation. Mr. Speaker, when he comes to the Estimates, I'm going to bring in my work program from last year that I had all prepared for him and see if he has made any changes. I've even got my speech.

And then he talks about, let me see, Municipal Affairs, urban grants. Who started the police grants? Who started urban grants for all the rest of them? The Liberal Government.

And then, Mr. Speaker, the one I laughed about the most was 1973 celebrations. You know, Mr. Speaker, I remember that Homecoming year.

Some Hon. Members: — Hear, hear!

Mr. MacDonald: — That's right. Every time I pick up the paper. Isn't that something, eh? That Liberal program and all those Liberal plans. Every time I pick up the Leader Post there's another editorial on the grants for Homecoming. Remember what they said about Homecoming? A political gimmick.

Now, Mr. Speaker, I'd like to review some of the other Liberal promotions — index, Diamond Jubilee, Centennial, Winter Games, Homecoming '71. Now they have decided they had better get in on this enterprise. So now they are going to have one in 1973. Mr. Speaker, that whole legislative program put out by the supposed bright New Deal for People is nothing more than a document of Liberal programs and extensions and a bunch of socialist garbage.

Some Hon. Members: — Hear, hear!

Mr. MacDonald: — Mr. Speaker, I want to tell the Minister of Agriculture (Mr. Messer) that we are going to support those Liberal measures that they are carrying on but we are certainly not going to support the socialist idea of Land Bank. We're not going to support the idea, Mr. Speaker, about the Member from

March 7, 1972

University talking about the oil industry. Well, I want to tell him what's happened in the oil industry since he became the Government. First of all, Mr. Speaker, the Minister of Industry (Mr. Thorson), he stood up and he went to the Saskatchewan Petroleum Association at a meeting in Saskatchewan, well - Mr. Speaker, I regret that I can't carry on, but as you can see, I certainly won't support the motion.

Some Hon. Members: — Hear, hear!

Motion agreed to on the following recorded divisions:

Yeas — 40

Dyck	Pepper	Faris
Meakes	Michayluk	Cody
Smishek	Byers	Gross
Romanow	Thorson	Fedunick
Messer	Kwasnica	Mostoway
Snyder	Carlson	Comer
Bowerman	Engel	Rolfes
Thibault	Tchorzewski	Lange
Larson	Richards	Hanson
Kowalchuk	Owens	Oliver
Baker	Robbin	Feschuk
Brockelbank	Matsalla	Kaeding
MacMurphy	Cowley	Flasch
	Taylor	

Nays — 14

Coupland	MacDonald (Milestone)	McPherson
Loken	McIsaac	Lane
Guy	Gardner	MacDonald (Moose Jaw N.)
Grant	Weatherald	Wiebe
Boldt	MacLeod	

Hon. R. Romanow (Attorney General): — Mr. Speaker, I move seconded by the Hon. Mr. Smishek (Minister of Health):

That the said Address be engrossed and presented to His Honour the Lieutenant Governor by such Members of the Assembly as are of the Executive Council.

Motion agreed to.

The Assembly adjourned at 9:08 o'clock p.m.