

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

**Tuesday, January 30, 1973**

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

**WELCOME TO STUDENTS**

**Hon. J.E. Brockelbank: (Saskatoon-Mayfair)** — Mr. Speaker, it gives me great pleasure this afternoon to rise and through you to welcome to this Chamber a large group of students from the city of Saskatoon. They are drawn from the constituencies of Saskatoon-Riversdale and Saskatoon-Mayfair. Fortunately for me their collegiate is located in Mayfair constituency, therefore, I have the opportunity to welcome them here. They are from an old and distinguished collegiate in Saskatoon, Bedford Road Collegiate. There are about 78 of them here. They are located behind me and in the Speaker's Gallery. They are accompanied today by three of the staff of Bedford Road, Mr. Hughes, Mr. Wilson and Mr. Serienko. I am sure that every Member of this Chamber joins me in welcoming them here today, hoping that they will find the speeches this afternoon constructive and informative. I hope they will leave this Chamber, Mr. Speaker, more impressed with the democratic system and the need for the democratic system than they were before they arrived.

**Hon. Members:** Hear, hear!

**Mr. B.M. Dyck: (Saskatoon City Park)** — Mr. Speaker, may I add my welcome to the students of Bedford Road Collegiate and their teachers, Mr. Hughes, Mr. Serienko and Mr. Wilson. I had the privilege of teaching at Bedford Road for a few years and I know many of these students personally. I hope that if they don't find this afternoon's proceedings at least informative, that they will find them entertaining. I should like to see them back here again.

**Hon. Members:** Hear, hear!

**ANNOUNCEMENT**

**Chiropractic Services**

**Hon. W.E. Smishek: (Minister of Public Health)** — Mr. Speaker, before the Orders of the day, on behalf of the Government I want to make an announcement that will be of interest to the Members of the Legislature and to the citizens of the province.

Effective February 1, 1973, chiropractic services will become an insured service in the Province of Saskatchewan.

**Some Hon. Members:** Hear, hear!

**Mr. Smishek:** — Mr. Speaker, the program will be administered by the Saskatchewan Medical Care Insurance Commission and will

cover office and home visits and emergency visits and x-ray services. The Government estimates the program will cost \$1,184,000 in the first year of operation. The agreement between the Government and the Chiropractor Association is for a one-year period.

Mr. Speaker, in keeping with our Government's philosophy the Saskatchewan Plan will be unique in Canada, being the only one which does not impose limits on number or dollar volume of services an individual or family may receive. It is comprehensive, there will be no deterrent fees or deductibles.

**Some Hon. Members:** Hear, hear!

**Mr. Smishek:** — Any resident of Saskatchewan covered by Medical Care will be eligible for benefits under the new program. Mr. Speaker, I am delighted that the Government has fulfilled another promised made by our party to the people of Saskatchewan during the 1971 election campaign in its New Deal of People.

**Some Hon. Members:** Hear, hear!

**Mr. Smishek:** — Mr. Speaker, the agreement introduces a unique method of payment to the chiropractors expected to provide service under the Plan. It involves three important factors.

Firstly, a contract payment based on the number of years in practice since graduation and upon the number of services provided by each chiropractor. Chiropractors will receive a base contract dependent on years in practice on the following basis. Up to two years \$3,000 per year; after three years \$4,000 per year; after four years \$5,000; after five years and over \$6,000 per year.

These contracts will be dependent on a chiropractor providing a minimum of 2,250 services a year. If the chiropractor provides fewer services than the minimum amount of the base contract the contract will be reduced on a pro rata basis. Secondly, a fee for service basis of payment for office visits, with a decreasing payment as the number of services are provided per patient. The first service \$6; between two and four visits \$4, subsequent visits \$3. After hour visits, home visits and emergency visits will be paid on the following basis. Between 8:00 a.m. and 8:30 p.m. \$5 each; between 8:30 p.m. and 8:00 a.m. \$6 each; and emergency visits \$6 each.

Thirdly, a special formula will be used in the payment of x-ray services. The formula involves a total annual payment of \$150,000 distributed to chiropractors on the basis of utilization patterns. A continuing review of services will be carried out and after six months of operation they payment of x-rays will be adjusted in according with the utilization pattern.

Under the joint agreement a special Chiropractic Review Board will be set up to study and review the utilization of services provided and the associated costs throughout the first year of operation.

Mr. Speaker, may I also point out that in our audience, Dr. Kristianson is sitting in the Speaker's Gallery. He is the President of the Saskatchewan Chiropractors' Association and

I do extend him a warm welcome.

**Some Hon. Members:** Hear, hear!

**Mr. D.G. Steuart (Leader of the Opposition)** — Mr. Speaker, I should just like to say on behalf of the Opposition that we welcome the announcement by the Minister of Health today, especially I think it is very fitting the timing of this announcement. I am glad to see that they are carrying on the old tradition of the Liberal government in making the announcement, that is, and I know that many, many people in the Province of Saskatchewan will welcome this addition to the Medical Care Insurance Program, because they have been laboring for a long time under an added burden, those people who look to chiropractors for their health needs.

**Mr. Smishek:** — Mr. Speaker, make note that this is a real announcement. It will work. It is not an announcement of a heavy water plant or a . . .

**Mr. Speaker:** — Order, order! This is not a debate.

## QUESTIONS

### Quote of Premier's on Foreign Ownership of Land

**Mr. J. Wiebe (Morse)** — Mr. Speaker, before the Orders of the Day I should like to direct a question towards the Premier of the province.

In this morning's edition of the Leader-Post there was an article regarding a quote which he made on the recommendations of the Foreign Ownership of Land Committee. The article stated that his remarks at that press conference were on tape and that those remarks were recorded accurately.

Yesterday you misled this House and since you were correctly reported in the Leader-Post, I, once again, ask that you inform this House accurately as to what the draft recommendations reported were that you were referring to in that press release.

**Mr. Steuart:** — It was on tape.

**Mr. Speaker:** — Order, order! I don't think we can permit any Member saying another Member's statement given in the House are not accurate or anything else. One Member must accept another Member's statement within the House and we can't permit debate on whether a statement in the paper is or is not correct. That can be raised at an appropriate time on debates or bills. But we cannot permit saying that some other Member's statement was not correct because each Member is recognized to make a statement on his own validity within the House.

**Mr. C.P. MacDonald:** — Mr. Speaker, on a Point of Order. The Member from Morse was only reporting what the Leader-Post reported this morning as on tape. He was not referring to the debate of yesterday. He is asking a question about what the Leader-Post had on tape accurately indicating what the Premier's remarks were.

Surely the Member for Morse has the right to ask a question regarding an editorial or a news report in the Leader-Post this morning.

**Mr. Speaker:** — I think if members will check on the rules you will find that statements arising by others outside of this House cannot be raised in the House as matters of privilege. It is only statements of Members in the House that can be raised here and not statements made outside the House. I would have to rule it is out of order.

## ADJOURNED DEBATES

### Address-in-Reply

The Assembly resumed the adjourned debate on the proposed motion by Mr. H.H. Rolfes (Saskatoon Nutana South) for an Address-in Reply.

**Mr. D.G. Steuart: (Leader of the Opposition)** — Mr. Speaker, we will give the Premier ample time later this day to answer the question if he feels so inclined to.

Mr. Speaker, I should first like to congratulate and welcome back to our ranks the Hon. Member from Athabasca (Mr. Guy).

**Some Hon. Members:** Hear, hear!

**Mr. Steuart:** — In spite of every effort by the Premier, his full Cabinet, most NDP MLAs and a host of government employees, the good people of the North elected Allan Guy for the fifth time. He is a valuable addition to the Legislative Assembly in general and our party in particular.

I should also like, Mr. Speaker, to congratulate the group of dedicated men and women who brought the Silver Broom International Curling Championships to Regina. This has become one of the classic events on the international sports calendar and will bring honor and good sportsmanship to this city and province.

We all look forward to the visit of Her Majesty, the Queen and His Royal Highness, the Duke of Edinburgh in July. Their visit will, of course, be the highlight among those events being planned to celebrate the 100 anniversary of the founding of the Royal Canadian Mounted Police.

The Mounted Police have played a great role in the history of Saskatchewan and have earned the respect and admiration that most of us feel for them.

Mr. Speaker, the Throne Speech, outlining some of the Government's 1973 program, contains some proposals we welcome and will support. More housing for low income groups and the elderly is a move in the right direction and I am sure this program will have a substantial help from the Federal Government. If the Government is serious about its announcement to help young farmers, small businessmen and pensioners, we will, of course, give them our full support.

As a matter of fact, our farmers were given scant attention

in this document, mostly a rehash of existing programs and the arrogant announcement that measures will be taken to strengthen the compulsory Hog Marketing Commission with no vote of the producers. However, Mr. Speaker, the major thrust of the Throne Speech was the Government's plans for resource development. Shorn of all the fancy words and fine sounding phrases, the NDP Government is going to gamble the taxpayers' money on trying to find oil and gas wells and hard rock minerals. On top of this they are going into the timber industry in a major way.

Now what is wrong with this? Why shouldn't the Government develop our resources and keep all the profits for the Saskatchewan people? It sounds great, but let's look at all the facts and remember it's the hard-earned money of the taxpayers that the politicians are playing with.

First, the NDP have announced they will set up a Government owned and financed company to explore for oil and gas. The Premier says that the oil companies are taking too much profit out of Saskatchewan and not spending enough on oil and gas exploration.

From 1962 to 1971 the oil and gas produced in Saskatchewan was valued at a little over \$2 billion. Expenditures for the same period were \$1,333 million. While it would thus appear that the oil industry made a profit of \$670 million during this ten year period, I am told that this figure is before corporate taxes and without normal money costs being charged.

However, even taking off taxes and interest the industry showed a substantial profit in Saskatchewan during the past 10 years. Now to balance this picture fairly, I believe we should look at the balance sheet of the oil industry over the last 25 years.

During the late forties and all of the 1950s the oil industry spent far more money on exploration and facilities than they took out in sales. In fact, taking off corporation taxes and normal interest, the oil industry has shown only a modest profit over the past 25 years in Saskatchewan.

I point this out not in defence of this industry but to allow a clear judgement of the wisdom behind the Government's move to go into the exploration business. If the oil industry is raking in huge profits from our oil and refusing to spend enough on exploration then by all means let the Government move in. The record does not show that they have made these huge profits when their total investment is taken into consideration. But there is no question that exploration has gone down very seriously these last four years.

It began to happen when we were in power and has continued under the NDP so it has little to do with politics. The truth is the oil companies have honeycombed the most likely areas in their search for oil with disappointing results at the shallow and medium levels. Most of what is now left to explore is at the deep levels and so far this area has failed to yield any significant finds. Deep exploration is very costly, about \$150,000 a well. On top of that the prospects in Alberta, the Territories and the Arctic look much more attractive. So most of the oil industry's exploration money is being spent where the chances look best.

Does this mean we in Saskatchewan should just throw up our hands and quit? By no means, Mr. Speaker. It is significant that in 1972, under the NDP, the oil companies paid us over \$4 million in bonus bids, the highest since 1968. This meant that they were still interested in Saskatchewan. However, at about the same time, Mr. Thorson, the Minister of Industry, spoke to the oil men taking a very hard and threatening stand. Then this year the Premier got into the act browbeating the industry and warning them that if they didn't step up exploration his Government would move in. In fact, he had already developed his plans to go ahead with this Crown corporation even while he was speaking to the industry.

I say the Premier is gambling our tax dollars on a very, very long shot. If the Government is going into the deep horizons looking for oil, they could spend millions of tax dollars with nothing to show for it. It is a gamble that makes the Choiceland iron mine look small by comparison and I think it is unnecessary.

**Some Hon. Members:** Hear, hear!

**Mr. Steuart:** — We say, Mr. Speaker, encourage the oil industry with incentives as they have done in Alberta and take our share when and if they strike the oil or gas.

The oil industry has made suggestions to this Government but has received absolutely no encouragement.

Mr. Speaker, this last 10 years Saskatchewan taxpayers received over \$300 million in oil revenue with no gamble, no investment plus our share of the corporate and income taxes paid by the industry. The new policy of the NDP will be one more step in harassing and driving the industry out with no guarantee of any return in jobs or revenue for our people.

**Some Hon. Members:** Hear, hear!

**Mr. Steuart:** — The situation in regard to hard rock minerals is as bad or worse. The NDP intend to put Government crews in the North prospecting for hard rock minerals. Again, gambling the people's money against unbelievable odds. A better way would be to sit down with the mining industry and find out what incentives are necessary to get them back into the North. I say back because we had them there. In 1964 and 1965 under the old CCF policy similar to the so-called NDP plan there were only 2,006 acres staked in the North and only two permits were issued or recorded. We put in an incentive program and in 1968-69 1.35 million acres were staked and 169 permits were issued.

**Some Hon. Members:** Hear, hear!

**Mr. Steuart:** — In 1970-71 for example, over \$8 million was spent by private mining concerns in northern Saskatchewan. Our program results in the Anglo-Rouyn mine, the Motka Development and the Gulf Uranium Mine at Wollaston Lake. Now this boom has ground to a halt. And the answer is another incentive program, not Government crews running all over the North. We will risk millions, we will drive out private investors and very likely come up with nothing.

Mr. Speaker, I shall only mention the stupid decision of the Government to go into the timber industry in a large way. They have the same old gang back who drove out and kept out people who know how to develop a successful timber industry in the 1950's. And I predict they will do great harm to an industry that is just becoming viable. We have a good timber industry in this province. Sawmills, a stud mill, a chipboard plant, creosoting plants and a successful pulp mill. This industry is giving good employment and paying good wages to thousands of our people and pouring taxes and royalties into our treasury. I tell the Government to leave them alone or we will be back the way it was in the CCF days where most of our timber burned and rotted while the Government owned Timber Board rules the forest with an iron hand.

**Some Hon. Members:** Hear, hear!

**Mr. Steuart:** — Mr. Speaker, it is more than a year and a half ago that the NDP came to power in the Province of Saskatchewan. They were elected on a platform of promises unprecedented in the history of this province. The NDP platform called “A New Deal for People” contained 182 promises. And hundreds more were made on the constituency level.

The Premier would like the people of Saskatchewan to believe that all the promises he made in the last election are the 12 contained in this card that he waves around in this Assembly whenever we take him to task for breaking or ignoring some pledge made before the last election.

Now even his own Members know that this is not the truth. The large 22 page booklet containing almost 200 promises was in fact brought into this House in early 1971 and presented as the NDP blueprint for their first term if they should be elected to office.

Now last Thursday we heard the Government's plans for the coming year outlined in the Throne Speech. And even adding what they say will be accomplished during the next year to what has already been done, this NDP Government has broken or ignored ten promises for every one that they have kept.

**Some Hon. Members:** Hear, hear!

**Mr. Steuart:** Now, Mr. Speaker, I contemplate their record with mixed emotions. My first reaction is one of disgust at a government that would so arrogantly refuse to honor the pledges and promises that they made less than two years ago in their grab for power. But coupled with this sense of relief, that the people of Saskatchewan might be spared some of the planks in the so-called New Deal for People. It will take us years to recover from some of the promises that they have already fulfilled.

Now as the months go by it is becoming more and more evident that this New Deal may be a good deal for NDP members but is a very bad deal for the rest of the people.

**Some Hon. Members:** Hear, hear!

**Mr. Steuart:** — Mr. Speaker, let's examine

the record and see who had the good deal from the NDP and who has suffered under the weight of their ever growing power.

How about the ordinary people looking for work in Saskatchewan? Have they fared under the NDP? Well, if you are a defeated NDP candidate, provincial or federal, and NDP president, campaign manager, a secretary or an outstanding party supporter, the New Deal has indeed been a good deal. The number of high salary jobs, appointments to boards and commissions handed out to defeated NDP candidates, well known party hacks and hangers-on is without a doubt a record in Saskatchewan.

**Some Hon. Members:** Hear, hear!

**Mr. Steuart:** — Mr. Speaker, it is a sorry record and when we get the truth from this Government, if we ever do, about the number of NDP supporters feeding at the public trough, I am sure it will number close to 1,000 or more.

Mr. Speaker, I give the Government fair warning that our Members will continue to ask questions until they get the whole truth about this sorry mess. Unfortunately for thousands of other Saskatchewan people looking for work the NDP have no answer. The exodus from our province has not only continued but increased and the number of jobless has risen sharply. In December 1972 there were 3,000 more people unemployed than in December 1970. The situation is seen in an even more critical light when we realize there are fewer people here today than two years ago.

During the seven years of Liberal government the population of the province fell from 943,000 to about 926,000, a drop of approximately 17,000 people. In the last provincial election the NDP jumped on these figures and waved them around Saskatchewan promising to do better. They had program after program that would stop people from leaving the province. Mr. Speaker, I suggest we examine the figures since June 1971 and see where we stand today. Statistics Canada estimated Saskatchewan's population at 915,000 as of December 31, 1972. This is a drop of 11,000 in 18 months. 11,000 less people, 3,000 more unemployed under the NDP. This, after one and a half years by the Government who promised to end unemployment and reverse the flow of people from Saskatchewan.

Now one of the NDP plans, the New Deal for People, is worth recalling in regard to unemployment. On page six of their platform booklet, the NDP accused our Liberal government of selling out to American potash companies. Here is what they said and I quote:

Regina Liberals make deals with United States potash interests whereby American mines run at full capacity while Saskatchewan American owned mines lay off one-third of their workers.

This NDP document then made the following brave promise and again I quote:

An NDP government will end this potash cartel and restore employment.

In fact, a change in the potash pro-rationing brought in



by the NDP Government recently forced one of the two Canadian controlled potash mines to lay off 120 Saskatchewan workers.

I'm sure that the men and women in Saskatchewan looking for work received, Mr. Speaker, with bitterness the news that the NDP Government had a surplus last year of \$10 million of which \$7 million was money voted for public works and unspent.

The Government's excuse for failing to put this money to work to provide jobs for our people was that they found no plans when they assumed office. They claimed it was part of a phony Liberal budget. Well, Mr. Speaker, the only thing phony about the whole mess was the NDP excuse for their failure to use the money and produce the jobs.

They had nine months to plan and get projects under way. We have dozens of architects and engineers looking for jobs and thousands of idle tradesmen ready and anxious to go to work.

The Wafflers claimed that Mr. Blakeney is a bureaucrat's dream of a premier and nothing proves it more clearly than his failures to take quick and practical action to find jobs for the unemployed.

The Premier's answer to almost every problem is to set up a committee, commission, a study, or hire some new advisor, anything to stall for time to avoid facing issues. This may be smart politics but in this case it was a cruel hoax on our people who are looking for a pay cheque.

Mr. Speaker, in the field of health the New Deal looked good at first. An end to utilization fees and no premiums for Medicare and Hospitalization for senior citizens. But lately we are seeing the other side of the coin. Our hospitals have been subjected to budget slashing and a cut back in allowable beds by the Government, so severe that it is affecting not only the right of sick people to hospital care but the quality of care itself. We will be bringing this extremely serious situation to the public's attention as soon as possible in this Session.

What about welfare? Always a serious problem. But under the NDP it has become a disgrace. It will be revealed in this Session that the cost of welfare in Saskatchewan is rising at a rate that is almost out of control. Welfare is being handed out in too many cases with little or no investigation. The NDP have begun a costly publicity program actually encouraging people to seek welfare. By comparison the handling of the unemployment insurance mess in Ottawa was a model of responsibility.

**Some Hon. Members:** Hear, hear!

**Mr. Steuart:** — I wonder, Mr. Speaker, how many people in Saskatchewan realize that under the NDP Government individuals as young as 16, 17 and 18 are given money so they can walk out on their parents and live by themselves. These young people are living by themselves in apartments and rooming houses all over the province with little or no parental supervision or control. If parents abuse children, the Government should step in and if necessary place them in foster homes. This we agree with. But to encourage children who don't like normal discipline at home

to walk out and live practically unsupervised at Government expense is a disgrace and it should be stopped.

If this is the New Deal for people then I say it is a bad deal and the sooner we are done with it the better.

Then we have a New Deal for our farmers instead of the standard NDP program for agriculture which is usually to whine to Ottawa and do nothing themselves. We have the Land Bank or “how to con the farmer out of his own land with his own tax money”. Along with this is a compulsory hog marketing board without a democratic vote to the hog producers.

Jack Messer, the largest small farmer in the province is going to save our farmers, Mr. Speaker, whether they like it or not.

In the coming weeks our agriculture critics will outline in more detail the very serious failures of the NDP agriculture plan.

Mr. Speaker, we must not forget the New Deal for resource development. The NDP call it conservation, everyone else calls it stagnation. They have succeeded in grinding to a halt new resource development in Saskatchewan by freezing out private investment. The result has been more unemployment, more people leaving Saskatchewan and the great booming optimism we saw in northern Saskatchewan two years ago has been replaced by gloom and depression.

**Some Hon. Members:** Hear, hear!

**Mr. Steuart:** — Another group who are on the receiving end of the NDP New Deal have been our motorists. The Liberals launched the greatest highway building program in the history of Saskatchewan. We spend hundreds of millions on our highways to help farmers, industry, tourists and above all the motorists. Another major reason for our great highway program was safety. Good highways are certainly safe highways. The NDP hated our program, first because it was popular. They attacked it day in and day out. They claimed we were wasting money, helping our friends the contractors and starving other more worthy projects. These claims were and are as false as most other propaganda put out by the NDP. Mr. Speaker, they poured out this unmitigated tripe for so long that when they came to power the Premier had no choice but to make a drastic change in the highway program. The appointment of Eiling Kramer as the first Minister of this bad roads policy was certainly fitting.

Fresh from a disastrous sojourn as Minister of Natural Resources I am sure he will live up to the Premier's expectations. He has already begun by firing the deputy minister, Lloyd Holmes, a man known all across the nation for both his integrity and ability. It will be a sad day for Saskatchewan if this Government allows one of the finest highway systems in the world to deteriorate for quick political gain, as it seems to be doing.

**Some Hon. Members:** Hear, hear!

**Mr. Steuart:** — Mr. Speaker, the Department

of Northern Saskatchewan was introduced with great fanfare one year ago. This was going to bring the New Deal for people in the North and the native people would move into an age of prosperity and self-determination. It only took the NDP about two months to shatter this dream. Their first action proved there was no New Deal for our northern people, it was in fact a return to the old nightmare that began in the 1950s and ended in 1964.

Under the former CCF government northern Saskatchewan was a virtual dictatorship run by the Department of Natural Resources. The DNR told the Indians where, and when and how they could fish, trap or prospect. If the Indians dared to fish in the wrong lake or sell them to the wrong buyer the DNR seized their nets and dragged them into court.

Mr. Speaker, this is why the Liberal party won those northern constituencies election after election even during the long years of CCF rule. The native people had no use for the heavy handed bosses of the old DNR. And who were some of those bosses? Well, there was a fellow called Bowerman, another called Churchman, another called Towill and of course the big boss himself, Eiling Kramer.

So Mr. Blakeney became the Premier and he unfolded his New Deal for northern Saskatchewan. Whom did he send up North? None other than Kramer, Bowerman, Churchman and Towill. Same old gang only this time the Premier armed them with even more power than they ever had before.

**Some Hon. Members:** Hear, hear!

**Mr. Steuart:** — So this gang became virtually dictators in the North again. Oh! They had a hand-picked group of people whom they are supposed to consult with, most of them from the South and almost all of them are NDP supporters. No wonder the native people voted against the NDP Government in the Athabasca by-election. No wonder the Indian people of Black Lake walked out en masse when the Premier was addressing them. In that community the NDP received only two votes, neither one of them native people, but 104 were cast against them.

**Some Hon. Members:** Hear, hear!

**Mr. Steuart:** — I was there, I watched them, I talked to them. That's the group of people who said, "Oh, the Premier might fool the rabbits and the white people but he will never fool us Indians again."

You know, Mr. Speaker, probably the ugliest incident of the whole by-election was the way the NDP treated Ray Jones, the Indian who dared to try for the NDP nomination and who ran as an independent after being booted out of the party. Ray Jones committed two sins as far as the NDP were concerned. First, he was an Indian and second, he almost took the party nomination away from the four or five white men running against him. The NDP called off that nomination, held a kangaroo court and expelled Ray Jones from the party.

Using every yardstick by which real progress can be measured, the North has regressed since the NDP came to power.

Fishing is in a mess, prospecting and mining have almost stopped, even tourist development there has been frozen by this Government. Welfare is up, the number of government employees increases almost daily. There is now about one civil servant for every nine residents in that part of the province. Unemployment is higher than two years ago and the population is down. The only hope for a return to real development in northern Saskatchewan is a complete reversal of government policy.

I call on Premier Blakeney to re-examine the whole concept of the Department of Northern Saskatchewan and change it as quickly as possible.

So far, Mr. Speaker, my remarks have centered upon the failures of the Government in the last year. Before moving on to what the Members on this side of the House propose to do about these serious failures, I should like to speak on two other topics of vital concern to Saskatchewan citizens.

The first is the industrial policy of the NDP and the second centres around individual rights.

Mr. Speaker, one of the strongest indictments that can be brought against this Government's performance in the last year and one-half is to be found in its own publication, the Year End Review 1972, by the Saskatchewan Department of Industry. In this pathetically small document, it contains only three pages of print, listed are all of the so-called great industrial business developments which took place in this province in 1972. It lists 48 expansions and new developments that have come into the province in this past year. The largest for \$10 million and the smallest for \$30,000. At first glance one might assume that the Department of Industry had suddenly taken on new life but I propose that we take a look at these industries and determine who is really responsible for the development. I suggest, Mr. Speaker, that we review these industrial concerns and find out just how many of them are on this list because of actions by the NDP.

Well, the first entry into the Government's list of industrial expansion is the Saskatchewan Wheat Pool. It announced that an expansion of their rapeseed processing plant has been completed in Saskatoon at a cost of \$3 million. Now for the information of those Members present here today, I should like to point out that expansion was announced in 1970 by the Saskatchewan Wheat Pool and neither Premier Blakeney nor his Minister of Industry (Mr. Thorson) can claim the slightest bit of credit for this expansion.

Next we have the Prairie Rose Custom Feeds of Lanigan. We are told in this government publication that the firm reconstructed their feed mill and due to reconstruction they now have storage capacity for 50,000 bushels of grain and their market now covers a 25-mile radius and that their mill employs three people. However it is interesting to note that the reconstruction was necessitated by a fire at the feed mill and had nothing whatsoever to do with growing confidence in this Government or in this province. It is also noteworthy that the increase in storage capacity is not more than five per cent. Their marketing area has not been increased, there has been no increase in the number of people employed, it's still three.

A third example, Intercontinental Packers in Saskatoon,

which has tripled the size of its packing facilities at a cost of \$4.5 million. This expansion began over three years ago under the Liberal administration and the NDP sitting opposite had absolutely nothing to do with it.

Then there is the Lake Athabasca Native Fisheries Co-operative. This is a fish processing plant that employs 40 Indian and Metis people. The project is funded by the federal government. They have received \$300,000 and will soon be receiving another \$200,000 from the federal government. Mr. Speaker, you can study this piece of NDP propaganda from cover to cover and you will find not one word of credit given to the federal government.

We are also told that Central Canadian Distilleries of Weyburn have built a maturing warehouse at a cost of \$680,000. For the information of this House, Central Canadian Distillers started operation in March 1971 with a substantial grant from the Saskatchewan Economic Development Corporation under the Liberal government and at that time plans were already being made for this warehouse.

Now, Mr. Speaker, there are just a few examples. Our critic for the Department of Industry will go through this list of industries to give an indication of how false the NDP claims are, that they have nothing to do with 90 per cent of them. I should like to point out that out of 48 industries listed in the Industry Department's Review less than 10 of them are actually new developments for Saskatchewan. Even out of this small number the Government sitting opposite can take no credit for their appearance on the industrial scene of this province. On the contrary, the NDP Government under Premier Blakeney has declared a war on business, the result being a virtual standstill in industrial growth while unemployment creeps higher and higher and our population drops lower and lower.

This war on business had taken place on two fronts. Firstly, legislation. The NDP passed the Succession Duty and Gift Tax Acts. These Acts will provide only a negligible amount of revenue to the province and will in no way redistribute a significant amount of wealth. It serves only to discourage family firms from moving into or staying in our province. The Province of Prince Edward Island has just announced its intention to abolish succession duties.

Secondly, we have the Government Consumer Affairs Bill, also in part an attack on business. This Bill gives the Cabinet the power to close down any business in Saskatchewan for five days without consultation or without any safeguard for the business concerned. And even more important, it does not provide for any compensation for loss of sales or damage of a firm's reputation if the closure is unwarranted.

The Provincial Treasurer (Mr. Cowley) has also been responsible for a 17.6 per cent increase in personal income tax and a one point increase in the corporation tax, neither of which will induce business to come to our province. In fact, the business community in our province has without a doubt been the recipient of the worst part of the New Deal during the last 18 months.

The Premier has also continued the war on business by his own attitude and the attitude of his Cabinet towards business

and industry. We are beginning to get a clear indication of what the policy of this Government towards investment really is. They have done nothing to encourage growth in the private sector of the economy and they now seem headed on a course of socialism that could cost the taxpayers millions of dollars with no guarantee that there will be any returns in jobs or in revenue. There is little wonder that Saskatchewan is once again being written off by most investors throughout the country.

Mr. Speaker, this past summer we had the opportunity to witness events in Saskatchewan that have been the cause of concern of all responsible people. Recently the Kraft Corporation of Canada announced its intention to build a \$15 million vegetable processing plant somewhere in Canada. This processing plant will use rapeseed, rapeseed is grown primarily in the Province of Saskatchewan. One might wonder why the plant was not planned for this province where the rapeseed is grown. However, Mr. Speaker, if we remember that Premier Blakeney has been driving around in a car that carried a "Boycott Kraft" sticker and if we remember that the NDP caucus of this Legislature passed a resolution supporting the National Farmers' Union boycott of Kraft, it is not hard to understand why the Kraft Company has pointedly ignored Saskatchewan as a possible location for this important plant. Why indeed should they come into a province where the Government is openly and actively hostile to them?

Now all of this would have been tolerable had the cause to boycott Kraft been justifiable. Since the boycott began we have seen and heard practically every responsible organization that is in any way connected with the dairy industry of Canada come out against the Kraft boycott and denounce it as irresponsible and term it a cheap trick to gain national attention.

Mr. Speaker, I quote from a news release by the National Dairy Council of Canada issued in June of 1972:

The President of the National Dairy Council of Canada, Mr. John R. Jackson, stated today that recent statements of the National Farmers' Union in soliciting the support of consumers in a boycott of Kraft foods have not only been misleading but have been outright lies.

Here is a quote from a letter in the Toronto Globe and Mail of August 30, 1971, by David G. MacFarlane of the Department of Economics at McGill University in Montreal:

The irresponsibility of some farm organization leaders is revealed in the NFU boycott. I have no brief to make for Kraft Foods but I can think of few things more detrimental for farmers' interests than to attack this company which has nothing to do in establishing milk prices. The point in this letter is to pay tribute to the NFU for its expertise in confusing farm policy issues.

Mr. Speaker, here is another quote. It comes from a statement made by the Chairman of the Ontario Milk Marketing Board, Mr. George McLaughlin. The Ontario Milk Marketing Board represents 20,000 milk producers in that province, and I quote:

This NFU group has been consistently trying to mislead not only certain small segments of dairy farmers but also the general public and their elected Members of Parliament.

Now these are just three of the outright condemnations that have been made by responsible farm groups and responsible individuals including the Minister of Agriculture for the Province of Ontario. Yet Premier Blakeney and his Government have hopped onto this empty bandwagon and the result has been the possible loss of a potential and valuable industry to this province. Is there any wonder, Mr. Speaker, that when the Premier takes this type of irresponsible action, that investment community across Canada looks on him, his Government and, unfortunately, this province as a bad joke?

Now, Mr. Speaker, I don't want to appear to be unjust to Premier Blakeney and his Government. I think that it is only fair that we recall to the members sitting here today how very active the Government was in attempting to establish at least one industry in this province. I refer, of course, to the Roumanian tractor assembly plant. On December 8, 1971, a headline in the Regina Leader-Post proclaimed for all Saskatchewan to see – "They're Coming, They're Coming". I thought it was the Russians or the British but it was the Roumanians. "They're Coming, They're Coming" – December 1971, this was the first of a seemingly endless series of announcements regarding the NDP Government's latest attempt at attracting this industry to the province.

Despite this auspicious beginning, nothing much seemed to happen other than weekly and at times daily speculations in this Press and over the air as to where and when the Roumanians would build their tractor assembly plant. As early as December 15, 1971, the Roumanians themselves stated and this is worth remembering:

The final decision will be based on hard economic factors and the labor and facilities available.

They declared a definite preference for a Saskatoon location. In the Star-Phoenix of December 23, 1971, we read "Tractor Plant May Open In City In Year's Time". S.G. Fawcett who at that time was the Industrial Relations Officer for the City of Saskatoon said:

The Roumanians are being very realistic in a target date. They are allowing an extra month for construction of the plant, an extra month for training personnel and an extra period of time for the installation of equipment.

They even allowed a two month period for a provincial government market survey.

Now January 1973 has come and almost gone and not only has the Roumanian tractor assembly plant not opened its doors for business, not hired or trained any of the 100 to 1,500 Saskatchewan people it was reputedly going to employ, but there has not been one single brick laid nor one single nail driven towards the construction of this plant. In fact, no final agreement has been signed.

Much of the blame for this delay is directly due to the political manoeuvring of Mr. Blakeney and his Government. The Roumanian Government first conducted their own feasibility study of major centres in the province for a plant site. They surveyed Saskatoon, Moose Jaw, Yorkton and Kindersley and they decided that Saskatoon was the best location. Hoping for cheap political

gain, Mr. Blakeney then began touting Moose Jaw as the preferred site for the tractor assembly plant. He knew in December of 1971 that the Roumanians had made the decision in favor of Saskatoon. He knew or he should have known that they were unlikely to change their minds and build in Moose Jaw but he wanted to show the citizens of Moose Jaw how truly concerned he was with their economic difficulties. He needlessly held up work on the factory and raised false hopes for the citizens of Moose Jaw. Because of Mr. Blakeney's phony protestations the City Council of Moose Jaw was encouraged to send a five-man delegation on a fruitless mission to Roumania. This was in February and negotiations between the Government of Saskatchewan and the Government of Roumania regarding the location of the tractor plant dragged on through March when we read the following headlines in the Leader-Post, March 18, 1972 – "Moose Jaw Extends Roumanian Tour, Plant Statement Monday". In April there were more talks but still no action. Here's another headline in the Leader-Post, April 6, 1972 – "Saskatoon Complains To Government". Another headline – "Moose Jaw Favored". This was a statement by the Minister of Industry (Mr. Thorson) that the Government of Saskatchewan would prefer Moose Jaw but again that 'the final decision should be based primarily on hard economic facts'. Exactly what Saskatoon's Industrial Officer and the Roumanians had said four or six months earlier.

Another headline – "Government Said At Fault If Tractor Plant Lost". Alberta and Manitoba are now being rumored as alternate sites. In the Leader-Post and Star-Phoenix of April 13, 14 and 15 there were headlines reading as follows: "Factory Location Unknown"; another headline – "Where Oh Where?"; and another – "Nobody Really Knows". Then on April 17 the Premier got into the act again and we read this unbelievable statement – "Blakeney Raps Tractor Dispute". Here, this self-righteous Premier asking one and all to behave responsibly when in the past three months he has been heaping fuel on the controversy. The situation, understandably, did not resolve itself even in May.

Here is another headline – "Tractor Plant Problems" reads the headline in the Leader-Post on May 10 and I quote:

A feasibility study currently being conducted regarding the proposed Roumanian tractor plant in Saskatchewan has shown up some little problems in regard to marketing but negotiations are continuing, Premier Blakeney said Wednesday.

Communications between the Governments of Saskatchewan and Roumania seemed to have worsened in June. "Roumanians Expected By June 15" – the Leader-Post cried June 6, 1972. Ten days later by June 26 the Leader-Post had another headline – "Roumanians Expected To Arrive Next Month". In July there was a flurry of speculation regarding the elusive Roumanian delegation. "Roumanians Are Still Coming . . . But When Still Question" – said the Moose Jaw Times Herald of July 4, 1972. The Leader-Post of July 11 said – "Two Roumanians, Other Expected Later". But then we get to the July 14 Leader-Post three days later – "No Sign of Roumanians Yet". By July 19 the Roumanians finally arrived but the headlines read in the Leader-Post – "Tractor Plan Still Up In Air".

As last on July 25, 1972, after eight long months of negotiations it was announced that the tractor assembly plant was to be built.



**Mr. Blakeney:** — By whom?

**Mr. Steuart:** — Oh well, we'll get to that. You've just stirred up enough troubles so just keep quiet for a little while, you'll get your chance.

The Roumanians had made their decision in December of 1971 and they spent the next eight months pleading with the Government of Saskatchewan to allow them to start work. The day after the official announcement the Saskatoon Star-Phoenix ran the following headline — "1,500 Jobs? Roumanian Blasts Provincial Government". That was one Roumanian that shouldn't have showed up as far as Blakeney is concerned, I think. The Roumanian who made that statement was Ted Puskas, President of Western Importers Ltd. of Alberta, the Canadian firm which is representing the Roumanian interests. He was highly critical of the Saskatchewan Government and the way in which the site for the tractor plant was chosen. I am quoting what he said:

We had some tough talks with the Provincial Government but I could not understand the attitude of the Premier.

He is not alone in that, Mr. Speaker. Mr. Puskas said that Saskatoon was always the choice location as far as the Roumanians were concerned. Six months have passed since that time that Mr. Blakeney made his announcement and still no work has been started on the tractor plant. The tractor company has to date been unable to obtain a Department of Regional Economic Expansion grant because it and the Provincial Government refused to provide the Federal Department of Regional Economic Expansion with the necessary information as to how the plant is to operate and how it intends to market its tractors. You haven't given the information. Of course, it's rubbish, it is rubbish and the nonsense you have talked about is the prime example of the rubbish. If you would give them that information, I know you haven't given them that information, you might get the DREE grant. This is the same NDP Government which only four months ago was parading up and down the province condemning the Liberal Federal Government for giving grants and I quote them, "to corporate welfare bums". Especially to old corporate welfare bums. Now what is he trying to do? Well, according to them it is trying to rip off the Canadian taxpayer to the tune of \$1 million to subsidize a company controlled by the Government of Roumania.

Mr. Speaker, if this tractor plant ever does begin operation and if tractors ever do roll off its production line, it will undoubtedly be true that the NDP Government has made more mileage in the media out of the Roumanian tractor plant than any farmer is ever likely to get out of one of their tractors. The whole episode would be a dad joke if we didn't need the industry and the jobs so badly.

Mr. Speaker, I have touched on some of the more glaring examples of the Government's failure to live up to the platform on which they were elected. I have tried to show how unfairly their so-called New Deal is working. It is a good deal for NDP insiders but it is a bad deal for most of the people in Saskatchewan. But the most serious failure has been the clear cut policy for job producing development of our resources, both human and material. Most of these could be called sins of

of omission, things they have failed to do, issues they have refused to face, problems they have swept under the rug, of study groups or on-going committees.

I should like to deal for a few minutes with what we in the Liberal Party are convinced is by far the most serious situation created by the Blakeney Government in this province. Mr. Speaker, I am referring to the steady erosion of individual rights in Saskatchewan that has taken place these last 18 months under the NDP.

**Some Hon. Members:** Hear, hear!

**Mr. Steuart:** — The takeover of individual rights and freedoms by the Government is the hallmark of all socialist administration. The basic philosophy of socialism calls for the government to plan and regulate the means of production and distribution of the goods and services we use in our everyday life. They call it the planned economy and it sounds reasonable and worthwhile. Mr. Speaker, let no one be in doubt there is a vast difference between setting certain economic goals and then laying reasonable plans to achieve them and the socialist idea of a master plan covering all or almost all of our activities.

These super plans must be their very nature demand a great degree of control over the individual. The government under socialism becomes the be-all and the end-all and it gradually ceases to be our servant and eventually becomes our master. The people say it can't happen here. No one can convince me that Premier Blakeney or Roy Romanow or Jack Messer or all those nice young NDP school teachers or preachers are planning some evil design to take away our freedom and independence. I am convinced that the NDP like most other political parties is sincere and well intentioned. The NDP want to improve the lot of our people and in many areas they have succeeded. It is not their intentions we quarrel with, it is not their goals that concern us, it is the method they use and the road they are taking us down to achieve those goals we don't believe in.

**Some Hon. Members:** Hear, hear!

**Mr. Steuart:** — We will fight against this as long as we exist as a political party. We in the Liberal Party believe in the individual, this means we will protect his rights, fight for his rights to determine his own destiny with government help if necessary but with as little government interference as is possible. We are convinced these rights are being lost to individuals under the NDP's headlong rush to plan our lives and to save us from all kinds of evils, both real and imaginary.

Let me list some concrete examples of what is happening to our independence under the NDP Government. The Land Bank, it is a good idea, but for all practical purposes the right of the individual to own the land he works is being denied. I have mentioned the Department of Consumer Affairs, The Hospital Standards Act which was amended last year taking away many of the basic rights from those who now own and operate our hospitals. The Trade Union Act was amended by the NDP and while some of the changes are valid, one clause was inserted that takes away their right to free speech from individual union members. The amendment to The Mineral Resources Act gives the NDP Government

almost unlimited power to take over and operate all or any part of the mineral industry. The Act setting up the Department of Northern Saskatchewan makes government officials absolute masters in northern Saskatchewan. The rights of our northern citizens are now severely limited. Mr. Speaker, The Family Farm Protection Act was another interference with basic rights in our province. The NDP Foreign Ownership of Land Act was the most blatant attempt of all to take away the democratic right to own and dispose of land with undue government interference. I urge the people of Saskatchewan to take a hard independent look at what is happening to our province and our rights as individuals.

The NDP is interfering with our family relations and our right to own land, with our right to do business and even with our freedom of speech. In some areas they have given themselves the power actually say whether an individual can make a living or not. This power grab must stop and we in the Liberal Opposition are going to propose a series of measures designed to give the Government an opportunity to back-off from this power trip they are on and restore basic rights and freedom to our people.

**Some Hon. Members:** Hear, hear!

**Mr. Steuart:** — My colleagues will present a number of amendments to various bills which will take out the unnecessary government power and restore the rights of the individuals. Among other steps we will be proposing, the Liberal MLAs will introduce amendments to the following Acts: The Land Bank Act, The Consumer Affairs Act, The Mineral Taxation Act, The Hospital Standards Act, The Trade Union Act, The Department of Northern Saskatchewan Act, The Saskatchewan Human Rights Commission Act, and The Motor Dealers' Act. The Motor Dealers' Act was put on the statute books during our term of office, I never agreed with the powers in that Act that were given to a civil servant and so we will present an amendment to restrict these powers. In addition, Mr. Speaker, our Members will bring before this Assembly other bills and resolutions designed to focus the Government's attention on problems that are facing the people of our province.

We will also propose measures designed to improve the economy of the province and to assist the Government in overcoming their failure to attract job producing business and industry. These proposals are in line with our pledge, not only to criticize the Government when we think they are wrong, but also to put forward positive alternatives for their consideration.

Mr. Speaker, there is another area in which I believe our Provincial Government could, if they have the best interests of our people at heart, show more co-operation and that is in the field of federal-provincial relations. The Federal Government is prepared to take action to help us solve some of our more serious problems. The Prime Minister indicated this on his visit to Regina, it was emphasized in the federal Throne Speech and I have concrete evidence of it on my recent visit to Ottawa. I recognize that there are many things that divide the New Democratic Party and the Saskatchewan Liberal Party, we disagree on most basic issues and our philosophic differences go very deep and they are very real. However, we do have some things in common and we do agree on the serious problems that face our people even if we can't see eye to eye on the solutions.

For example, we all know Saskatchewan suffers from discriminatory freight rates. Few Saskatchewan people would quarrel with the statement that tariffs which generally help Eastern Canada have hurt our farms and increased our cost of living. Mr. Speaker, we all know that one of the major reasons for western discontent as we move through the 1970s is the fact that too many of our decisions, the decisions that guide our lives, that guide prairie destiny are made in Toronto, in Montreal and in Ottawa. We all know that we have little or no control over our financial problems because the major financial institutions are headquartered in the East and they are too often unaware or uninterested in our plight. I believe there is some common ground on which we can agree on our fight for a fair deal for Saskatchewan.

Mr. Speaker, our Members will introduce resolutions which I hope Members opposite will support, calling on the Federal Government to put an end to the most glaring inequities facing the West. For example, I would point to a resolution that the Hon. Member for Moosomin (Mr. Gardner) has placed before the House urging the Federal Government to immediately construct a rail line to connect the CNR and the CPR main line to the British Columbia at Clinton.

**Some Hon. Members:** Hear, hear!

**Mr. Steuart:** — We might even call it the “Romanow Short Railroad”.

This will guarantee, as you know, the movement of tremendous quantities of western grain when the main lines are plugged with snow and be a great help to our farmers.

This resolution is typical of others we will be introducing and I am sure will receive the support of all Members of this Assembly. This lack of control over our own destiny has hurt our farmers, our workers and our businessmen and impeded much needed development in this province. We are suggesting, Mr. Speaker, rather than grandstand plays indulged in by the Attorney General (Mr. Romanow) that we in fact join our forces and we are prepared to do that.

As a result of our recent convention in Regina, the Liberal Party will hold a policy convention in Vancouver early this spring. I will be at that meeting with a large delegation from Saskatchewan and I assure you, Mr. Speaker, that the people of Saskatchewan will be fighting for the real needs of our province regardless of political consideration. I urge the Premier and his happy little band of NDP to do the same thing when you go to the meeting of the federal and western provincial governments. It will be a great opportunity to achieve some positive gains for the West in general and for Saskatchewan in particular. I hope partisan politics will not be allowed to destroy the chance being offered to us by the Prime Minister and the Federal Government to right some of the injustices we have faced since Confederation.

Mr. Speaker, I said at the beginning of my speech that the NDP has broken 10 promises for every one they have kept. I have touched on just a few of their more outstanding failures. I have pointed out the serious drift into more and more government control that is taking place under the NDP. I only scratched the surface of the Government's arrogant use of public funds to

reward their party hacks. Our Liberal Members will bring more evidence to light in the weeks ahead to prove the bad record of the Blakeney administration. In view of what I have put on the record and what will be brought up in this and other debates, I cannot support the motion, in fact, my colleague from Wilkie (Mr. McIsaac) will introduce a motion of non-confidence in this Government which I will support along with all fair-minded Members of this Assembly.

**Some Hon. Members:** Hear, hear!

**Mr. J.C. McIsaac: (Wilkie)** — Mr. Speaker, at the outset of this year's Throne Speech Debate I want to congratulate the three new additions to the Cabinet opposite. I want also to congratulate the Mover and the Seconder for the excellent job they did yesterday in trying to make a poor effort sound good. I shall have more to say on remarks of both of them later.

I want to congratulate as well the Member for Athabasca (Mr. Guy) . . .

**Some Hon. Members:** Hear, hear!

**Mr. McIsaac:** — . . . for his successful re-election last September and we are happy to have him back in this House. I am sure the people of the province are happy to see him back in this Legislature.

**Some Hon. Members:** Hear, hear!

**Mr. McIsaac:** — Mr. Speaker, the content generally of last Thursday's Speech from the Throne is a clear indication once again — not that we need another — of where the NDP Government intends to leave the province. Last year we saw them launch an experiment in public ownership of farm land, this year it is oil and gas exploration plus timber development, plus mining exploration and other activity in northern Saskatchewan. At the same time, Mr. Speaker, it is also clear that they are still unsure how they are going to get there in this venture to socialize every aspect of our resources. They are not obviously too concerned about what is going to happen to the province, its people and its other natural resources as they launch these warmed up socialistic experiments. So far we have no evidence that they are going to have any new or innovative ideas to carry out these objectives.

I rode down to Regina on the opening day of this Legislature with the former Member for Prince Albert East, Mr. Berezowsky, and he was telling me of an opportunity they turned down last fall. It did seem to me like a reasonable venture if indeed they want to get into public ownership of mining and training of mining personnel. As I understand it they have turned down that opportunity so I am anxiously awaiting as this debate wears on and this Legislature continues to deal with all these items to see the details of some of the various plans they are going to put forward.

I mentioned that the Mover and the Seconder did what I thought was a commendable job yesterday. They didn't really eulogize the government blueprint for socializing timber or oil

and gas, they left that alone and that was probably the smart thing to do. The Member for Nutana South (Mr. Rolfes) spoke very glowingly of his Government's great sensitivity to the wishes of the people. He said, and I believe this is roughly what he said, we are prepared to listen, prepared to change our mind, prepared to go out and seek the views of any and all people from all walks of life.

Oddly enough, Mr. Speaker, I personally and other Members on this side have heard dozens of complaints about how difficult it is to get to see the NDP Cabinet Ministers because of the phalanx of executive assistants one must wade through first. Interestingly enough, just before the House opened today, we had a copy of the Carillon, the local university Regina Campus Press, placed on our desks and I will quote from an editorial in that. They are referring to discussions with Regina Members over possible changes in the university structure in Regina. They point out Mr. Blakeney was unavailable for comment.

He is so well insulated by secretaries and assistants that it is virtually impossible to contact him.

They go on to point out later on that they were always able to contact the former Premier, Ross Thatcher, any time they wanted to.

**Some Hon. Members:** Hear, hear!

**Mr. McIsaac:** — I wonder about their listening ability with respect to denying the rank and file hog producer in the province a vote on the proposed Hog Marketing Commission. Is this what the Member for Nutana South (Mr. Rolfes) thinks is listening to the voice of the people. Mr. Speaker, such a commission may well be a good move but nobody knows yet what the plan specifically proposes and if the Minister of Agriculture (Mr. Messer) does he most certainly hasn't told very many people what are the details of this plan up in our area. I am sure the Minister of Highways (Mr. Kramer) can vouch for this, that the number of people is fairly large in hog production. There are others who are buying and handling hogs and none of them seem to know where they are going to fit into the new structure. I suggest, Mr. Speaker, that the Minister is creating undue concern and apprehension in the minds of a lot of people by his high-handed approach to setting up this compulsory marketing system. I am disappointed particularly in the Minister of Agriculture (Mr. Messer) because I thought he would have learned his lesson last year by his mishandling of the foreign ownership legislation.

**Some Hon. Members:** Hear, hear!

**Mr. McIsaac:** — Oddly enough that is a committee that we don't hear too much about of late. You may recall, Mr. Speaker, that this was one committee that sort of changed course in the middle of stream last summer. Now we are not sure whether there is a report available, whether there is an interim report being prepared. I am sure we'll learn sooner or later but really that committee has apparently been trying to die as far as the Government is concerned.

The Member for Nutana South yesterday also tried to defend the politicking of his new Minister of Welfare (Mr. Taylor), the

new Minister who is holding a series of public informational meetings across Saskatchewan to promote, I suggest, Sir, not the greater welfare of the people but the greater welfare of the NDP.

**Mr. C.P. MacDonald:** — Misuse of public funds.

**Mr. McIsaac:** — I wonder, Mr. Speaker, if the Member for Nutana (Mr. Rolfes) who is back in his seat, really supports the kind of advertising carried out by the Minister of Highways (Mr. Kramer). I am sure he has seen this little picture of my good Member along with a telephone number to check on road conditions. Now I'm not sure what in the world the Minister's picture is there for or how using tax dollars to put his picture there helps provide information on roads. My only complaint is, I wish he would use a better picture of himself. He has a better hat than that old straw hat, I know he has, and I should be glad to lend him my stetson if he so wants to keep his picture in the public eye.

I shall be interested, Mr. Speaker, in the new legislation that is projected in the Throne Speech to control election expenses. It will be revealing indeed. But how will this new law control the abuses of political advertising being conducted by this Government under the guise of public information?

**Some Hon. Members:** Hear, hear!

**Mr. McIsaac:** — Last fall during September and October there was a very intensive advertising campaign telling taxpayers to file a claim for their Property Improvement Grant. Mr. Speaker, just a note of information here — that's the NDP name for the Liberal Home-Owner Grant program.

**Some Hon. Members:** Hear, hear!

**Mr. McIsaac:** — But there were advertisements placed in every weekly and daily newspaper and others in this province during September and October. More advertisements than we have seen in any other of the ten months combined. Now you might think, Sir, was it because the taxpayers had to file their applications by the end of October? No, it wasn't because the date for the closing of applications is February 15, about two weeks away and I haven't seen any ads recently in local papers of note. But there was another event on October 30 and that was a federal election.

**Some Hon. Members:** Shame, shame!

**Mr. McIsaac:** — Why this big program during September and October if for no other reason than to help their federal counterparts in that election? Any new legislation to control election and campaign expenses, Mr. Speaker, will most certainly have to control this type of blatant abuse of spending dollars to support purely partisan political advertising. I could cite more examples, Mr. Speaker, and as this Session progresses the Opposition Members will be further illustrating that the NDP aren't as virginal in this regard as they would try to make out.

The Member for Nutana South (Mr. Rolfes) yesterday got carried away a bit as he often times does in reciting a list of accomplishments of his Government. Mind you, most of them were still in the development stages. For the record of this House, Mr. Speaker, I want to correct him on one statement. School grant legislation that removed the previous inequities against separate school systems in this province was introduced and was law not by the present Government but by the former Liberal Government. I just want to correct the mis-statement to the House yesterday made by the Member for Nutana South in that regard.

**Some Hon. Members:** Hear, hear!

**Mr. McIsaac:** — Now the Member for Gravelbourg (Mr. Gross), a young Member, a new Member, did a very credible job. I hope and I know he doesn't believe all of those things that he said there yesterday.

**An Hon. Member:** — Did he write it?

**Mr. McIsaac:** — Well, I'm not sure. I'm sure he did write it. He spoke of one issue that has come up again during the course of the campaign. He mentioned the question of rail line abandonment in the province and what terrible plans the Commission has or the railroads have for pulling up railroads all across this province. And the fact that these plans are not proceeding, Mr. Speaker, is because of the Liberal Party when we were the government.

**Some Hon. Members:** Hear, hear!

**Mr. McIsaac:** — That's the reason those plans are not proceeding. The only railroad that was pulled up in Saskatchewan as my leader, the Member for Prince Albert West (Mr. Steuart) pointed out yesterday, was when the NDP were in power here in this province. The total track mileage, as a matter of fact, was increased under the Liberal Government here in Saskatchewan.

**Some Hon. Members:** Hear, hear!

**Mr. McIsaac:** — The reason for that was the development of a number of industries. I am sure that we are not, on the evidence so far going to see the same kind of extension of track mileage under the NDP.

I don't blame the Member for Gravelbourg for his sort of an ostrich-like approach to this question of rail rationalization because his senior party colleagues from the Premier on down have set the example in this regard. The Premier himself made some utterances on rail abandonment during the course of the federal election. I am not sure what prompted those remarks at that time. Perhaps there are things happening that he knows about that were not obvious publicly to the rest of us. But I think this, Mr. Speaker, and I want to suggest to all Members, both the Liberals and certainly to the Members on the Government opposite, that they sit down and read the new transportation legislation, the various procedures that are there, the various factors that must be taken into account before any railroad can even consider any line for abandonment. Obviously, they don't know that those procedures are.



I suggest also, Mr. Speaker, that the NDP approach to rail rationalization in rural Saskatchewan is a real example of how they have let rural communities fade away. They cry and wail about rural life and yet refuse to recognize, and there is nothing wrong with recognizing it, that there are and have been changing patterns of rural life, of farming and living in this province. So that the type and size of community that is needed to serve rural people today, the type and the size of community that people will indeed live in and support in rural Saskatchewan is different than what it was 50 years ago or 20 years ago. And if this Government would accept that fact then some progress could be made in taking a real look at rural problems in Saskatchewan to date.

**Some Hon. Members:** Hear, hear!

**Mr. McIsaac:** — Rail rationalization and this entire grain-handling system are two very basic issues that do require good, sincere and solid discussion. Until they do, I am sure they will continue, the NDP Government opposite, at their own efforts at solving modern day problems with an old hat political rhetoric.

Mr. Speaker, I am indeed pleased to follow the Member for Prince Albert West (Mr. Steuart) in this debate. His speech today both in content and delivery is solid evidence, I suggest, Sir, of why he won the leadership of the Liberal Party a year or more ago.

**Some Hon. Members:** Hear, hear!

**Mr. McIsaac:** — The Saskatchewan Liberal Party held a most successful convention in December last, Mr. Speaker. At that convention his performance certainly united Liberals and a lot of non-Liberals across this province behind his leadership.

**Some Hon. Members:** — Hear, hear!

**Mr. McIsaac:** — And his performance there and his performance today and his performance of recent months is further evidence of why he is going to be sitting over in the Premier's chair after the next provincial election in this province. While the Blakeney Government continues to work against federal authorities for their own political purposes, I am convinced that on many occasions, Mr. Speaker, the Leader of the Opposition in Saskatchewan has been actively and I think successfully trying to promote improved relations with the Federal Government. Sure, it took the October 30 election to make many of the federal liberal officials elected and non-elected to recognize that there was an alienation in Western Canada and Saskatchewan particularly.

I think the NDP, the fact that they refused to sign the Small Farms Development Policy with the Federal Government, is just one excellent illustration of how they are trying to frustrate any effort made by the Federal Government to promote the interests of Saskatchewan farmers and Saskatchewan people. That, Mr. Speaker, is a program that will help both retiring farmers and young farmers wishing to strengthen or enlarge their operation in farming. They refused to sign for the simple reason that they don't want the socialist Land Bank scheme to look any more sickly than it now is. The NDP don't want Saskatchewan

farmers to have an alternative policy for land transfer. The Minister of Agriculture (Mr. Messer) himself, on an open line radio show a week or two ago that I had the pleasure of listening to, told his listeners that the province would sign the agreement as long as the Provincial Government and his people retained the authority to put all or any land being offered for sale into the Land Bank first.

**Some Hon. Members:** Oh, oh!

**Mr. Lane:** — Terrible!

**Mr. McIsaac:** — He took a little time to get it said but that is certainly the essence of his remarks that day. The Liberal Small Farms Development Policy does have weaknesses as far as Saskatchewan is concerned. There's no question about it. We don't deny it. But the Government opposite, Mr. Speaker, are not trying to improve the scheme, they are trying to scuttle it instead.

**Some Hon. Members:** Hear, hear!

**Mr. McIsaac:** — In this regard the Leader of the Opposition (Mr. Steuart) and other Members of this caucus have urged Ottawa to make some improvements and some changes in that plan and make it available to Saskatchewan farmers and I urge the Government opposite to co-operate with Ottawa in this regard.

I want to suggest though, Mr. Speaker, that as a result of the efforts of the Leader of the Opposition, that plan will soon be available to retiring Saskatchewan farmers who want to sell their land, who want to sell their land to the Government through Farm Credit and in turn have their sons or daughters or neighbors, for that matter, the opportunity for buying that land, an opportunity that isn't available under the Land Bank scheme today.

**Some Hon. Members:** Hear, hear!

**Mr. McIsaac:** There are a lot of people interested today in transferring land, in enlarging small holdings, that want no part of the present provincial Land Bank scheme.

I think there is one other illustration of the efforts of late of the Leader of the Opposition to further Saskatchewan interests and that is the announcement from Ottawa that a DREE office will be set up here in this province. That came as a direct result of Mr. Steuart's efforts of recent weeks. The Premier on the other hand saw fit to trot off to the old stamping grounds down in the Maritimes and proceed to kick the program apart during the course of the federal election campaign. He complained about lack of co-operation, complained we weren't getting a fair deal, that Quebec was getting all the money and so on. At the same time, he hadn't done his homework or didn't at that time, as reported in the Globe and Mail, with respect to properly filling out the application form for a DREE grant for the Roumanian tractor plant.

Mr. Speaker, I want to take a few moments to comment on some of the things the Throne Speech did not say. There is nothing in the Throne Speech this year for the support or

the strengthening of local governments in this province. There is very little mention of any effort on the part of this Government to assist municipalities. Everyone will remember in their last term of office, they attempted to foist what at that time may have been a good structure but they were doing it prematurely and in a wrong manner, a premature county structure on rural Saskatchewan. Now, so far in their present term, the NDP seem determined to leave municipal governments floundering in their own growing problems. They are doing nothing to help them. No mention is made in the Speech of any new program, no new road programs for rural Saskatchewan. In short, there is no New Deal for municipalities.

We are told that a Housing Authority is to be created and this, of course, is a piece of window dressing, Mr. Speaker. It will depend entirely and largely, I suggest, on federal funds for its financing. All of the various moves that are mentioned in the Throne Speech were referred to last night in a CBC news item of new federal legislation that is going to make them possible. I suggest also that present legislation on our Saskatchewan statute books would allow the Government to proceed and to carry out any of the programs being put forward by Ottawa.

There is one statement in that section dealing with the Housing Authority that I think is noteworthy, Mr. Speaker, and that is this, "that hundreds of new jobs will be created directly and indirectly". We know what this means under the Blakeney Government. The new jobs will be in the Civil Service. They will be on the public payroll. And I have no doubt, if their past record in other new departments is any indication, that there will indeed be hundreds of new jobs created. As has been pointed out earlier, Mr. Speaker, the unemployed in Saskatchewan have two real options under this Government. They either leave the province or get a job with the Government itself. I am not sure which route at the present time is absorbing the most number of people.

New departments, new authorities and new commissions have been the order of the day since this Government took office. This year they are slipping somewhat, I believe. A quick check shows reference to only three new departments or new agencies this year.

Now the thrust of the Speech from the Throne (I borrow that word "thrust" from the Minister of Health (Mr. Smishek) and others) is a further erosion of individual rights and individual freedoms. The Liberal Opposition will oppose every piece of legislation put forward by the Government opposite that further erodes individual freedom, that restricts individual choice, or that restricts individual opportunities.

**Some Hon. Members:** Hear, hear!

**Mr. McIsaac:** — There is no question, Mr. Speaker, that all governments regardless of their political stripe are guilty of legislation that is on our statute books both here and in Ottawa supposedly for the collective good of all citizens and yet, at the expense, in too many cases, of various individual rights. We were certainly guilty of it and there is no way any government can avoid some of that. In this respect, however, Mr. Speaker, any other party and any other provincial administration runs a poor second to the Saskatchewan NDP. At the same

time, the Blakeney Government is building a political machine and a bureaucracy the like of which we haven't seen in this country for years and years.

**Mr. Lane:** — Ever seen.

**Mr. McIsaac:** — Ever seen, probably correct. The Liberals will continue to fight to protect and restore the place of the individual and the family as the basic unit of society which is so often forgotten as we go about framing legislation to protect people from themselves. We will develop and put forward policies and programs dedicated to that purpose both inside this House during the course of the various debates and outside of it.

One certainly looks in vain, Mr. Speaker, at the Throne Speech for any evidence of those many new and imaginative programs the NDP campaigned on in 1971.

The Minister of Highways (Mr. Kramer) gave it a trial last summer for two new policies, two new policies as far as he was concerned, that were carry-overs of policies established by the former Liberal Government. About five years ago under the Liberal Government a program was introduced to connect smaller urban centres to main highways. Existing roads were rebuilt and widened by the Grid Road Authority and the roads were then taken into the provincial highway system. Now I am sure the Member for Watrous (Mr. Cody), if he were in his seat, would be aware of this because the town of Bruno was one of this first of many communities to be so served. Unlike the liquor stores, it's one thing he can't move, he can't move the road.

**An Hon. Member:** — He can't take it out of there but he can wreck it though.

**Mr. McIsaac:** — There was also another Liberal program inaugurated that took in something over 1,000 miles of municipal grid road into the provincial highways system. And other policies that provided for hard-surfacing of hundreds of miles of grid road in the province, dust-proofing with oil, dust-proofing with salt, and dust-proofing lime stabilization and other techniques. I am glad to see the NDP continue those policies. They were good policies and they still are. There is one little difference, Mr. Speaker, and that is that these programs and policies are now under the Department of Highways and the political touch of the highways Minister. Formerly, they were under the Municipal Road Assistance Authority. Actually perhaps there are more differences than that. One knows roads linking one community out to the highway normally follow a straight line out to the highway. No so with "Operation Open Road", if any of you have seen the map. The program and map that the Minister had printed and distributed around and I am sure all Members have a copy. It will show you that the first such project which is now pretty well completed, partly in the Member for Redberry's (Mr. Michayluk) constituency, partly in The Battlefords riding. And it is approximately 40 miles, it is a good little road. It is a road that is enjoyed by everybody. But I ask you just to take a look at the map and see if you can determine the shortest way or the longest way from Rabbit Lake either to Highway 40 or Highway 4. The road comes out south, then it goes west, comes south, goes west again, south again, west again, one final scenic jog before it gets out to Highway 4.

Mind you, the only real explanation for this that is currently being given a good deal of publicity around that area is one other point that the Government has always stressed and stressed considerably. That has been their great concern for tourism and attracting and expanding tourism in the province. This is a move and a policy that we support. The only way they can explain the kinks in this road up there is that the Minister indeed was trying to promote tourism as they road took all the various scenic jogs out to Highway 4. It just happens to miss the Minister's ranch where it takes one real turn and nobody can really understand this. It goes on and it drops south and comes into North Battleford through a district that has long had a history of voting solid NDP. Now I am sure, of course, that voting pattern really had nothing to do with the location of that road but one can't blame people for thinking things like that up in that area. There are about four or five alternate ways to go straight out, a lot shorter, a lot more direct.

Another Liberal policy that I'm glad to see continued is a program of oiling or paving the main streets of urban communities and urban centres in this province. And once again the Government has dug up a new name for their plan. Literally dozens of towns and villages in Saskatchewan today have paved and oiled roads as a result of this good Liberal program. And again I congratulate the Government for carrying that program on.

The Minister of Highways (Mr. Kramer) is however launching one other policy that is a new policy, and it isn't a Liberal policy, that I want to say a few words about. It won't receive our support and it won't receive the support of the Saskatchewan people and that is his "cheap road scheme". He says we're through building quality roads. In a Press report he says there will be no more "champagne roads" I'm not sure where the champagne comes into the picture but it certainly wasn't on the road and it wasn't part of the former Minister's policy, the Member for Rosthern (Mr. Boldt). In our part of the province we have real reason to be alarmed at the Minister's plans in this regard. About 10 or 12 years ago a new section of highway at that time (It broke through new country) was built between Wilkie and North Battleford and was known as Highway 29. It was a narrow, dusty road and the overall engineering standards were certainly below grid road standards in the province at that time. That road became known as "The Kramer Trail". It has since been rebuilt by the Liberals, it has been widened, engineered better, it has been oiled and is today a very acceptable road for the traffic that it handles. But I say, Mr. Speaker, and I tell the Premier that the people up there haven't forgotten what that "Kramer Trail" looked like. They don't want to return to that kind of cheap highway as highway policy for the province.

Of all the weak arguments ever put forward, Mr. Speaker, the Minister justifies a cheap road with a short life span by saying it will be great for employment. It will be another way of hiring a lot of people to keep patching up holes and I believe I am quoting him fairly correctly as far as the sense of his words in this regard. It is just another of this Government's subtle scheme to hire more of their supporters on the public payroll. Again, I ask the Premier and his backbenchers opposite to maintain the quality highway program that was initiated by the Liberal Government and to keep building good quality roads in this province to continue to provide roads that we can be proud of. And roads that their supporters opposite are just as proud of as any one else in this province.

Mr. Speaker, I cannot support this Government's proposed venture in oil exploration. More about that at later debates. I certainly cannot support their sorry record in promoting industries.

In particular I want to say just a brief word at this time about their record and their many promises in the field of education. Just one or two comments at this point in time. Reference is made in about four lines in the Speech from the Throne for new bargaining legislation.

The present Minister of Education (Mr. MacMurchy) set out about four years ago to do his utmost to destroy area bargaining. I think it was December 1968 when he was Chairman of the Govan School Unit and he alone among something over 100 school board chairmen in the province saw fit to go out and sign a collective agreement with his teachers. This he knew and the trustees and the teachers knew, everybody knew was going to be null and void under new legislation that was then coming forth. He did it then to show his contempt for the government at the time and for the new legislation. He set out to destroy it without any thought of a constructive replacement. They campaigned on that.

Last year we expected to see new legislation, instead we see a committee report. This year we see new legislation promised in the Throne Speech. Yet a Press report of a few days ago tells us the Minister is still dealing with both trustee and teacher representatives trying to come to some conclusion about an acceptable piece of legislation, four years after he started to destroy it. Now he certainly demonstrated his ability, I regret to say, for the negative approach in this area. He has yet to come up with any new ideas. If he has we haven't seen them. I do hope they are coming forward. I shall be anxiously waiting for that piece of legislation, but I do question seriously, Mr. Speaker, whether we shall see any innovations in this regard during this particular Session.

Mr. Speaker, as I said earlier, I cannot support this Government's proposed venture into oil exploration. I cannot support their sorry record in attracting industries and the number of unemployed in the province. Accordingly, I move, seconded by my seat mate, the Member for Milestone (Mr. MacDonald):

That the following words be added to the motion: "but this Assembly regrets that the Government of Saskatchewan has failed miserably to attract job producing new industry to our province, that it is unable to cope with rising unemployment in Saskatchewan and through its various programs is contributing further to the erosion of individual rights of the people of Saskatchewan.

Debate will continue on the motion and on the amendment concurrently.

Hon. A.E. Blakeney: (Premier) — Mr. Speaker, may I first extend my congratulations to the Mover and the Second of the motion, the Member for Nutana South (Mr. Rolfes) and the Member for Gravelbourg (Mr. Gross). I think that Members on both sides of the House will agree that they did a creditable job and they brought distinction to their constituencies by their speeches in this House.

**Some Hon. Members:** Hear, hear!

**Mr. Blakeney:** — I'm very proud that I have the honor to lead a party which has new Members and young Members who have the obvious ability of the Members from Nutana South and Gravelbourg. May I say how pleased I am that since we last gathered in this House I have had the support of three new Members to the Cabinet. The Members for Kerrobert-Kindersley (Mr. Taylor), Biggar (Mr. Cowley) and Humboldt (Mr. Tchorzewski). Again, Mr. Speaker, I think it will be agreed, whatever may be the political view which the speaker holds, it will be agreed that each one of the Members is able and dedicated and is making a substantial contribution to the Government of this province.

**Some Hon. Members:** Hear, hear!

**Mr. Blakeney:** — May I extend also congratulations to the Member for Athabasca (Mr. Guy). Sporting as he does what must be one of his biggest majorities in years . . .

**Some Hon. Members:** Hear, hear!

**Mr. Blakeney:** — . . . 31 I believe. I am sure he feels much more confident than he did after previous elections. I can remember in a previous election that the Member for Prince Albert West (Mr. Steuart) who then, I think, was sporting a majority of about 85, described himself as "landslide Steuart". I don't know whether we can call the Member for Athabasca "landslide Guy" or "half landslide" or "quarter landslide Guy", but it was none the less a win for which we congratulate you. It certainly wasn't one that we knowingly made any contribution to, I will say that.

I think that when we heard the speeches of the Leader of the Opposition (Mr. Steuart) and the Member for Wilkie (Mr. McIsaac), one of the arguments that they stressed was the fact that this province has lost population and that jobs are fewer. When coming to grips with that sort of argument I think one is reminded of the old bromide that there are lies, damn lies and statistics and they were using the statistics. The Member for Prince Albert West talked about the population when his Government took office and the population when his Government left office. And by a fairly careful selection of figures he seemed to be creating the impression, I hope it wasn't knowingly, that the population of this province has not been declining rapidly during the years when he was in office. As a matter of fact, it is true that on the wave of prosperity which his Government inherited in 1964 . . .

**Some Hon. Members:** Hear, hear!

**Mr. Blakeney:** — . . . population increased from 1964 to 1965 by 8,000 people. Then the rot began to settle in slightly and the next year the increase was 5,000 people. The year after that it was 2,000, the year after that it was 3,000. Modest recovery. Then in 1969 the skids began. In 1969 down 2,000 people. In 1970 down 17,000 people.

**Some Hon. Members:** Hear, hear!

**Mr. Blakeney:** — In 1971 down 15,000 people. Now in the last year it has been down 10,000 people. I must say that is a happy upward trend.

**Some Hon. Members:** Hear, hear!

**Mr. Blakeney:** — 5,000 better than the last year when Members opposite were on the treasury benches. I think that the population loss has been stemmed. I say this because the employment figures continue to go up and up. The Members opposite say that unemployment too is going up. That is unfortunately the case. We are however, in a position where more and more people are now seeing the possibility of getting a job. And more and more people are offering themselves for work. And more and more people are being placed in work.

**Some Hon. Members:** Hear, hear!

**Mr. Blakeney:** — In the last quarter of 1972 the working force of this province went up an average of 8,000 people a month over the previous year.

**An Hon. Member:** — All defeated federal candidates.

**Mr. Blakeney:** — It is not our party that has serried ranks of defeated candidates in this province.

**Some Hon. Members:** Hear, hear!

**Mr. Blakeney:** — It is not our party that sends one single lone representative to Ottawa.

**Some Hon. Members:** Hear, hear!

**Mr. Blakeney:** — No indeed. I should like to deal with the matter of defeated Liberal candidates but it would take a great deal of time of the House. Even to deal with the ones who are on our payroll.

**Some Hon. Members:** Hear, hear!

**Mr. Blakeney:** — The Member from Regina South West (Mr. McPherson) waves his hand and well he might.

**Some Hon. Members:** Hear, hear!

**Mr. Blakeney:** — I will deal only and I will be merciful today, I will deal only with the defeated federal Liberal candidates who are on the payroll of the province. One was on the payroll of the province when we took office and he is no longer there, a Mr. Duddridge.

**Mr. McIsaac:** — Who?



**Mr. Blakeney:** — A Mr. Duddridge.

**Mr. Steuart:** — He was decentralized.

**Mr. Blakeney:** — Right. But may I recall to your mind the fact that there is a man by the name of Clark in the Provincial Youth Agency of the Department of Culture and Youth and there is one by the name of Larson who is the Agent General for Saskatchewan. He was the Member for Kindersley from 1949 to 1953, the Liberal Member for Kindersley. No one suggests that these people are not doing a good job. And I hope Members opposite are not going to suggest that, similarly, people who may have a different party label are not equally doing a good job.

**Some Hon. Members:** Hear, hear!

**Mr. Blakeney:** — Now, Mr. Speaker, I wanted to raise one other point. A suggestion was made in the House that income taxes have gone up. I think the figure of 17.6 per cent was used and I heard the Member for Lumsden (Mr. Lane) on television the other day using a figure of 18 per cent. This is arrived at by mathematics which only can be called Liberal mathematics. Because they take the taxes when they were in office of 34 per cent of basic tax and then they take the 1972 tax which became 37 per cent, but of a quite different figure, and they say that is an increase of three points. May I point out that after the increase of three points in 1972 the provincial taxes were lower for every single salary bracket than they were in 1971. Every single salary bracket. From amounts of annual income of \$2,800 to 100,000, you pick any figure in there for annual income and that man paid less provincial income tax in 1972 than he did in 1971.

**Some Hon. Members:** Hear, hear!

**Mr. Blakeney:** — And therefore it is entirely improper to suggest that there has been an increase in provincial taxes at all.

**Some Hon. Members:** Hear, hear!

**Mr. Blakeney:** — There is in the year 1973 going to be an increase in tax but it will be very modest for most people. Comparing the taxes in 1971 when Members opposite sat on the treasury benches and taxes in 1973 after the new tax changes are in effect, a married man with two children, with an income of \$4,500 will pay 20 per cent less tax. A person with \$8,000 income will admittedly pay around nine or 10 per cent, and this seems to be about the maximum increase. When Members opposite use a figure of 17.6 per cent as the Member for Prince Albert (Mr. Steuart) did today or 18 per cent as the Member for Lumsden (Mr. Land) did the other day, he is using incorrect figures, totally incorrect figures, figures which cannot be justified by any application of the tax tables which they have.

**Some Hon. Members:** Hear, hear!

**Mr. Blakeney:** — Now may I make a couple of other comments on the remarks of the Member for Prince Albert West. He talked about the Kraft boycott and he heaped a great deal of scorn on anyone

who supports the Kraft boycott. I want to say this, firstly, I know of no prospects of Kraft building a plant in this province either when we were the Government or when they were the Government. And I say this, if asked to choose between a plant owned by Kraft making margarine or shortening or a plant owned by our own Agra Industries Limited, I'll take Agra.

**Some Hon. Members:** Hear, hear!

**Mr. Blakeney:** — Not you boys. I asked to choose between a cheese plant owned by Kraft and one owned by Co-op Dairy Producers, I'll choose Co-op.

**Mr. Romanow:** — Not you boys. You Liberals will go for the Easterners every time.

**Mr. Blakeney:** — And that's why in the last I'm very proud to say that Agra has announced that they are expanding their operation to produce packed margarine for the first time in this province.

**Some Hon. Members:** Hear, hear!

**Mr. Blakeney:** — And I am pleased to say that the Co-op Dairy Producers are building manufacturing milk plants at Saskatoon and Yorkton to manufacture cheese on a large scale in this province for the first time in many, many years.

I will now turn to the other topic, the Roumanian tractor plant. The Member for Prince Albert West talked about the Roumanian tractor plant and he read announcements and more announcements and still more announcements by the Premier or the Minister indicating that a plant would be built.

**Mr. Steuart:** — I didn't say that.

**Mr. Blakeney:** — He quoted people from the City of Saskatoon, he quoted people such as Mr. Puscas who is with a subsidiary company, he quoted people from Moose Jaw. Why doesn't he quote someone from the Government?

**Mr. Steuart:** — You want to give me a minute.

**Mr. Blakeney:** — I will give the Member a minute if he will quote some thing which says that we said the plant was coming.

**Mr. Steuart:** — Mr. Thorson, that's who.

**Mr. Romanow:** — Well, there he is, the Minister of Industry.

**Mr. Steuart:** — Mr. Thorson said Roumanians could not have expressed . . . Saskatoon Wins Plant — Leader-Post, July 26, 1972.

Mr. Thorson said the Roumanians could not have expressed their preference in stronger terms . . . the plant will be built in Saskatoon. He said three factors weigh

heavily . . . and we have come to agree . . . plant to be built in Saskatoon.

There it is — Leader-Post of July.

**Mr. Speaker:** — Order, order! I don't think that we can have Members getting up and re quoting papers that way because it doesn't contribute to an orderly debate.

**Mr. Blakeney:** — As we suspected, what the quote said and he had all sorts of opportunities to quote me, what the quote said is that we agreed that if the plant would be built it would be in Saskatoon. At no time, I repeat, at no time has the Government of Saskatchewan ever said that plant would come to Saskatchewan.

**Some Hon. Members:** Hear, hear!

**Mr. Blakeney:** — Now, we would be delighted to have it here and we will do everything we can to get it here, but we have not at any time said it would come here. We have heard people from Saskatoon and Moose Jaw, we have heard the Member for Prince Albert West who wished it would come to Prince Albert.

**Mr. Steuart:** — Oh no! I didn't say that.

**Mr. Blakeney:** — I am sure that if he had any quote which would support his proposition, he would have done it and he has failed to do so.

Now may I refer to one other thing that he talked about, this erosion of personal freedoms. He talked about amendments to The Trade Union Act to guarantee free speech. Now I want to point out to the Leader of the Opposition and to every Member of this House as clearly as I can that the amendments which were made with reference to free speech were amendment which returned The Trade Union Act to the position it was before 1964. It removed the amendments put in by his government. And I want him to ask any trade unionist in this province, did he feel more free before 1964 or did he feel free under the government of the Members opposite?

**Some Hon. Members:** Hear, hear!

**Mr. Blakeney:** — Did trade unionists feel free when they were being hammered and harried by the former government?

**An Hon. Member:** — They still do.

**Mr. Steuart:** — Oh no! I didn't say that.

**Mr. Blakeney:** — Well, perhaps I'd better not assume what he has in mind. It's a pretty large assumption to know what he has in mind.

**Some Hon. Members:** Hear, hear!

**Mr. Blakeney:** — The Member for Prince Albert West talks about The Family Farm Protection Act. Now I want to say that we stepped in to protect farmers at a time when they needed protection, and we make no apology.

**Mr. Steuart:** — More like the Farm Baloney Act.

**Mr. Blakeney:** — Mr. Speaker, I want to refer to one other topic and this surely must be in the realm of humor. He was talking about ways to get something from the Federal Government and how the Province of Saskatchewan should not be abrasive with the federal government. We shouldn't be critical of the Federal Government. We shouldn't launch criticism of the DREE program. We shouldn't do anything that might prejudice the bargaining. Well, now, I think Members can cast their minds back to when the Members opposite sat on these treasury benches. We can remember the stance they took towards Ottawa. There was nothing sufficiently abusive for them to say about Ottawa.

**Mr. Steuart:** — They were wrong.

**Mr. Blakeney:** — I have a number of clippings here. I really don't want to deal with them at length because they deal with the late Premier (Mr. Thatcher) but I think it is very, very clear that the late Premier took a firm and strong stand against the Trudeau Government.

**Mr. Steuart:** — And he was right.

**Mr. Blakeney:** — Members opposite ask us to have confidence in that same federal Liberal Government with respect to rail line abandonment. They ask us to have confidence that same Liberal Government will have the interest of Saskatchewan at heart. That same Liberal Government that appointed as Chairman of the Canadian Transportation Commission, one Jack Pickersgill.

**Mr. Steuart:** — Oh! You know Jack?

**Mr. Blakeney:** — Yes. From Ontario, from Ottawa and then when Jack went to his reward in the Senate whom did they appoint? They appointed someone from where was it? They appointed Mr. Benson. Now Mr. Benson was born in Belleville and that's in Ontario and it's between Toronto and the Quebec border. He then went to school in Kingston which is between Toronto and the Quebec border and then he went into private practice in accountancy in Kingston between Toronto and the Quebec border and then he was elected to Ottawa and he went to Ottawa and that too is between Toronto and the Quebec border. He has detailed knowledge of that little cocoon of Canada where they don't care a hoot about freight rates. He is put in charge of the Canadian Transportation Commission. And I tell you, we in the West and, yes, those of us who came from the Maritimes, know something about freight rates and we know something about central Canadian oppression in freight rates and Edgar Benson knows nothing about it and he was put in charge of transportation by the Trudeau Government.

**Mr. Romanow:** — A Liberal payoff, that's all it was.

**Mr. Lane:** — At least he wasn't a defeated candidate.

**Mr. Blakeney:** — He got out in time.

Well, I just want to make one more comment before I take up a point raised by the Leader of the Opposition yesterday. The Member for Wilkie (Mr. McIsaac) referred to "Operation Open Roads" as an old Liberal program and he said that the road was a small road and that it missed the Minster's ranch. How different from the previous Liberal policy when there were large roads, four-lane roads and they went right to the ranch.

**Some Hon. Members:** Hear, hear!

**Mr. Blakeney:** — Well, Mr. Speaker, I want to deal with a couple of points raised by the Members opposite and I think one of the points raised by the Members opposite and I think one of the things which struck me as most remarkable about the speeches of the Members opposite was their assertion that we were an arrogant Government and they, when they were the government, were a perceptive government, listening to people, never in difficulty with the public. Well, I don't know how short they expect people's memories to be but all I can do is to characterize the government which they sat in in the words of the Globe and Mail, June 25, 1971. I have a very short quote.

People don't like being pushed around; perhaps that sentence would capsule as well as any the sentiment in Saskatchewan which concentrated this week to toss the Liberal Premier out of office and hand an overwhelming and surprising victory to the New Democrats.

**Some Hon. Members:** Hear, hear!

**Mr. Blakeney:** — People don't like being pushed around.

**Mr. Steuart:** — You'll find that out.

**Mr. Blakeney:** — And there are literally thousands of people who were being pushed around by the Liberals and right in there pushing the hardest was the current Leader of the Opposition.

**Some Hon. Members:** Hear, hear!

**Mr. Blakeney:** — But, Mr. Speaker, he is pretty careful of whom he wanted pushed around. When he was talking yesterday he suggested that our Government was pushing around Carling's Brewery. Now let me talk a little bit about the background of the Carling incident and I want to do this because it has been seriously misrepresented on many occasions.

On Wednesday, October 4 of last year, a meeting was held with all the brewery presidents in this province, including the president of Carling's Saskatchewan company. At that meeting the Government stated that Liquor Board regulations with respect to promotion and advertising would not be changed until

the report of the Legislative Liquor Committee has been received and considered. The breweries were invited to make any suggestions about changes in the regulations to that Committee. At the meeting it was agreed by all the brewery representatives, including the president of Carling's, that the regulations would stand and be adhered to. The regulations as they stood then specifically provided that "the giving or offering of gifts or gratuities to licensees and/or their staff or family is strictly prohibited". Everyone knew and understood that and they understood that it prohibited paying for outings for licensees or their families. It prohibited any payment of gifts or gratuities to hotelmen. That was the guts of the rule. On the following weekend Carling's undertook a major promotion directed to hotel operators, perhaps the most effective kind of promotional advertising possible, to promote the sale of beer. And certainly a form of promotion clearly prohibited under the regulations of the Liquor Board.

Now immediately following the events the facts were checked, the evidence was considered by the Attorney General's department. The breach of the regulations was clear. The Liquor Board then acted. In the light of the facts the Liquor Board was required to act in order to enforce the regulations, in order to deal fairly with the other breweries and in order to ensure that the recommendations of the Liquor Committee of the Legislature would not be made meaningless by prior action by a single brewer – Carling's. Accordingly, the Liquor Board advised Carling's that one of their products, Calgary Export Lager beer would be delisted for a period of two months. This, in effect, meant that this beer would not be sold to the Liquor Board or to any of their licensees for that period. Now on November 15 I met with the Canadian president of Carling's, which, by the way, is a subsidiary of Rothmans international organization. At that time the delisting of the Calgary Export Lager was discussed. The president of Carling's, the Canadian president, requested a reconsideration of the penalty and he volunteered to make the following commitments and he very shrewdly, I may say, volunteered to make these before he asked me what my position was. He volunteered that as president he would make a public statement that his company had committed a serious breach of the regulations, that whether or not the initial suspension was reduced no employees would be laid off by his company during the period of the delisting, and that his company agreed to adhere to all the regulations in the future, to act as good corporate citizens.

Based on these undertakings I reviewed the penalty and accordingly reduced the suspension from two months to one month. Carling's Brewery were permitted to sell its present inventory prior to the effective delisting period which was not at their choice but one set by the Liquor Board.

We believe the action of the Government was fully justified on at least three grounds. Firstly, the regulations were clearly, obviously and knowingly broken. It is not much use to have regulations if clear and intentional breaches do not bring measures of enforcement. Secondly, an agreement was made by and with all of the brewers. Fair play to the other brewers required action against Carling's. Thirdly, the Liquor Committee of this Legislature was at that very time, early October, meeting to write its report dealing, among other things, with advertising and promotion. If the report was to have any value we could not, as it seemed to me, permit one brewer to make a set of new rules, new rules which would inevitable have to be copied by the

other breweries with the result that we have a new set of rules not made by the committee but by the unilateral action of one brewer.

The Leader of the Opposition (Mr. Steuart) complains that delisting is the wrong penalty. Yet when he was the government his Government suspended licence after licence of the little hotelman, far more serious than the delisting of one product of a brewer and there weren't any court proceedings then. He didn't talk about arbitrary or arrogant action then. No, no! When he is dealing with the little hotelman he put his foot down, no talk about arrogance then. But when he is talking about a big international brewer like Rothmans he says to us, "Shame on you, why didn't you take them to court?" If the Leader of the Opposition feels that this Government is arbitrary in dealing with brewers and hotelmen, I invite him to ask the hotelmen.

**Some Hon. Members:** Hear, hear!

**Mr. Blakeney:** — They will tell him which Government is arbitrary. They will tell him which Government is arrogant. Our Government although we cannot always and perhaps often do what the hotelmen and the brewers want, we are willing to listen and consider their problems. We won't say that we will satisfy the brewers and we won't say that we will satisfy the hotelmen but we do say that we do listen to their problems and consider them fairly. That is in sharp contrast to the arbitrary treatment they received when the Leader of the Opposition sat on this side of the House.

**Some Hon. Members:** Hear, hear!

**Mr. Blakeney:** — Mr. Speaker, I want to refer to one other item in the Speech from the Throne. I want to talk a little bit about health and senior citizens. This Throne Speech outlines our proposals to take further steps to fulfil our election promises, the specific promises set out in our program card, the now familiar orange card, and I am glad to see the Leader of the Opposition has a copy because I supplied copies to all the Members of the Opposition last year for their reference.

**Mr. Guy:** — I lost mine.

**Mr. Blakeney:** — The Member for Athabasca (Mr. Guy) says he has lost the card. He has never really made any habit of keeping the promises that he made so he doesn't see why he should keep the promises that we made.

**Some Hon. Members:** Hear, hear!

**Mr. Blakeney:** — I refer also to the more general platform outlines in our booklet the New Deal for People, that splendid booklet, and I will deal this afternoon with two of the major planks, those with respect to health and with respect to senior citizens.

First, Mr. Speaker, let me call to your attention the fact that on February 1 chiropractic care will be an insured service under the Medical Care Plan . . .

**Some Hon. Members:** Hear, hear!

**Mr. Blakeney:** — . . . as we promised it would be, Mr. Speaker. When the Member for Regina North East (Mr. Smishek), the Minister of Health made his announcement, the Member for Prince Albert West (Mr. Steuart) referred to the fact that the announcement had been made on a particular day in the House and that we were continuing the old Liberal tradition. May I say that we are not continuing the old Liberal tradition. The old Liberal tradition was to make announcements that were totally hollow. I remember one day in this House, a grand day, February 23, 1965, when they scored high on two counts. One the front page there were two headline. One said Big Heavy Water Plant At Estevan and the other one said Steuart Says Small Hospitals Won't Close.

**Some Hon. Members:** Hear, hear!

**Mr. Blakeney:** — On the same front page, Mr. Speaker. We have, since taking office, fulfilled promise after promise in restoring and extending health care to the people of Saskatchewan. We have abolished deterrent fees. We eliminated the payment of medical and hospital premiums for those 65 years of age and over. We have insured chiropractic care.

Mr. Speaker, at this Session we will take the first step toward providing hearing aids at greatly reduced cost.

**Some Hon. Members:** Hear, hear!

**Mr. Blakeney:** — We will move a step closer to the start of our program of free dental care to all children up to the age of 12.

**Some Hon. Members:** Hear, hear!

**Mr. Blakeney:** — We have been already in training dental technologists. You will be asked at this Session to approve legislation establishing standards for these technologists. Before the end of 1974 we expect to begin providing basic dental care to children all across this province without charge.

**Some Hon. Members:** Hear, hear!

**Mr. Blakeney:** — It will take some time for the program to work in but we look for it to be another pioneering health program, pioneering for North America.

This will be a gigantic step forward in improving dental health in Saskatchewan. The institution of early dental care and effective training of children in the proper care of teeth will make a tremendous difference in general health of all our citizens in the years ahead.

And for the older citizens, Mr. Speaker, let me make a note of another promise fulfilled. We have long been aware of the plight of many senior citizens who are not acutely ill but who need nursing care. Were they in hospital they would have their care paid for but there has been no provision up till now for the payment of nursing care. We promised to pay for basic



nursing care for people in nursing homes and, Mr. Speaker, we propose to do that effective March 1.

**Some Hon. Members:** Hear, hear!

**Mr. Blakeney:** — Mr. Speaker, that is another promise made and another promise kept. Contrast that with the dreary record of the Liberal Party, a record studded with arbitrary hospital closures after promises that they would not take place, the cutting of grants to nursing homes, the heaping of deterrent fees on the sick. That record is known to the people of Saskatchewan and they will remember.

**Some Hon. Members:** Hear, hear!

**Mr. Blakeney:** — Mr. Speaker, I have a good deal more to say about the remarks of the Members opposite and about the program set out in the Speech from the Throne and accordingly I beg leave to adjourn the debate.

Debate adjourned.

The Assembly adjourned at 5:07 o'clock p.m.