

**LEGISLATIVE ASSEMBLY OF SASKATCHEWAN**  
**Third Session — Seventeenth Legislature**  
**5th Day**

**Wednesday, January 31, 1973**

The Assembly met at 2:30 o'clock p.m.

On the Orders of the Day.

**WELCOME TO STUDENTS**

**Hon. A. Taylor: (Kerrobert-Kindersley)** — Mr. Speaker, I should like to at this time introduce to you and through you to the Members of this House a group of Grade Eight students from the Kindersley School, sitting in the west gallery. There are about 30 students accompanied by two of their teachers. They are an energetic group of students who have just travelled some five hours on a bus to get here leaving at 5:00 o'clock this morning, which is, I think, before most of us were up and at our work. The only thing they suffered they told me by the time they reached here were hunger pains. We do hope, however, that the students have an enjoyable and interesting trip to our provincial capital and that their visit to the Legislature will be informative and pleasant. I am sure, Mr. Speaker, that all Members of the Assembly will join me to wish them a very safe and a happy trip home.

**Hon. Members:** — Hear, hear!

**Mr. K.R. MacLeod: (Regina Albert Park)** — Mr. Speaker, I should like to introduce to you and to the Members of the Assembly 100 Grade Eight students from W.C. Howe School in Regina. They are accompanied by their teachers Messrs. William Dumanski, Murray Schmidt and Ron Kelln. They are going to listen to the lofty deliberations of this august body and then take a tour of the building, after which I shall have the pleasure of meeting with them. I hope they enjoy their stay and ask that we bid them welcome.

**Hon. Members:** — Hear, hear!

**QUESTIONS**

**Dental Auxiliaries**

**Mr. G.B. Grant: (Regina Whitmore Park)** — I understand that currently there are students being trained as, I believe the title is, dental auxiliaries, if that is the correct title. I should like to ask the Minister if the program for the utilization of these students when they graduate has been formulated and if so if it can be made available to the Members of this House?

**Hon. W.E. Smishek: (Regina North East)** — Mr. Speaker, the program as such has not been formulated. We have established an advisory committee on dental care. The committee is at the present time holding public hearings and after the committee has completed its study it will be submitting a report to me. I expect by March 31st. Following that a policy will be formed.

### **Special Committee on Business Firms**

**Mr. J.G. Lane: (Lumsden)** — Before the Orders of the Day I should like to direct a question to the Hon. Premier. I am going to indicate to him, I am assuming he doesn't have it on his desk, a notice that was put on the desk of some of the Members, "Notice of Meeting, date Tuesday, January 30th, 1973 at 9:00 o'clock a.m. — Special Committee on Business Firm" In light of the Government proposing and backing the idea of intersessional committees of the Legislature and the fact that when the Members of the Opposition attended that meeting at 9:00 o'clock a.m., what does the Premier intend to do about the utter arrogance of the Business Committee members on the Government side who don't bother showing up and we can't even get a quorum to carry on this business. We note too, Mr. Speaker, and we ask the Premier what he intends to do about the practice of the Members opposite when the Session is sitting that members of the committee do not get paid and what he intends to do about this no-pay — no-show approach of the Business Committee members?

**Hon. A.E. Blakeney: (Premier)** — Mr. Speaker, I think Members who have been here yesterday and today will appreciate the dilemma which this Premier finds himself in. Yesterday I was upbraided because I was talking to members of the Agriculture Committee and today I am upbraided because I do not command attendance at a meeting of the Business Committee. This Committee is a committee of the Legislature. It is not a committee of the Government. Now I am well aware, Mr. Speaker, that on several occasions members of the committee have not been as diligent as they might be. I am told for example that at a radio committee meeting yesterday there was not a quorum because of the absence of some Opposition Members. Yesterday, I take it there was not a quorum because of the absence of members of the Agricultural Committee. I certainly will look into this matter so far as our Members are concerned and I ask the Leader of the Opposition to look into it as far as his Members are concerned. I am very sure that the committees who have been so diligent in the past will continue to be so in the future.

### **ADJOURNED DEBATES**

#### **ADDRESS-IN-REPLY**

The Assembly resumed the adjourned debate on the proposed motion of Mr. H.H. Rolfes (Saskatoon Nutana South) and the amendment thereto by Mr. McIsaac (Wilkie).

**Hon. A.E. Blakeney: (Premier)** — Mr. Speaker, before I adjourned debate yesterday I had occasion to remark upon a number of the comments of the Leader of the Opposition (Mr. Steuart) and of the Member for Wilkie (Mr. McIsaac) in the course of their contributions to this debate. I do not wish to go over that ground again. I do however, wish to make one comment. I had occasion following yesterday's sitting to look at some of the clippings with respect to the Roumanian Tractor Plant referred to by the Leader of the Opposition. I also had occasion, Mr. Speaker, to listen to a part of the legislative broadcast yesterday when the Leader of the Opposition was speaking. I heard him say on the broadcast and I do not think I misunderstood him that, in his words, the Blakeney announcement had announced the plant. The phrase used

by the Leader of the Opposition was that there had been an announcement that the plant would come and that it had been done by Blakeney.

May I point out for the benefit of this House, and the benefit of everyone in Saskatchewan, that I have not announced that there will be a Roumanian Tractor Plant, that Mr. Thorson has not announced that there will be a Roumanian Tractor Plant, that no other government official has announced that there will be a Roumanian Tractor Plant. Every announcement made by anyone on behalf of the Government made perfectly clear that no final deal had been made. We made it abundantly clear that negotiations were under way with respect to a Roumanian Tractor Plant and that no deal had been completed. It was clear throughout from every announcement made by the Government that the construction of a plant depended on matters not yet decided, notably a Department of Regional Economic Expansion grant. Now, Mr. Speaker, I do not intend to announce that there will be a plant until I am reasonably sure that such will be the case. I don't want to follow the custom of the previous government in announcing industries that never materialized.

Mr. Speaker, I stood in this House when announcement after announcement was made of asbestos pipe plants in Regina, of a Volkswagen plant in Regina, of a heavy water plant in Estevan and on and on and on. As a matter of fact when I sat on the other side of the House I used to have a section of my speech which I used each year called the phantom industries and I used to gather up the announcements that had been made that had not matured. I think premature announcements serve no useful purpose. None came from our Government or its officials, none came from the Roumanian Government or its officials. I regret that announcements which have apparently misled the Leader of the Opposition have come from a multitude of other sources.

I propose to follow a policy of announcing a new industry when there is some probability of its coming. This is not to suggest that we will not make announcements concerning negotiations but I want to make clear now as I have done in the past that announcements don't equal industries. If they did, Mr. Speaker, in the years between 1964 and 1971, Saskatchewan would have been the industrial heartland of North America.

**Some Hon. Members:** — Hear, hear!

**Mr. Blakeney:** — I particularly do not appreciate any attempt by the Leader of the Opposition or any other person to suggest that we were following what I think is a discredited practice of the Government that he was a Member of.

Mr. Speaker, the Leader of the Opposition spoke of development of jobs and of industry and outside the House he called the Throne Speech a socialist document. May I commend him on his powers of perception, because I regard that description as a compliment.

**Some Hon. Members:** — Hear, hear!

**Mr. Blakeney:** — Mr. Speaker, I don't know whether there is really much point in attaching labels to the politics of the 1970s, but if the Leader of the Opposition wants to deal in labels I'll accept

that one. What is significant is that the Throne Speech and the policies it outlines can be traced directly to our party's election program put before the people before the last election, our New Deal for People.

**Some Hon. Members:** — Hear, hear!

**Mr. Blakeney** — Our New Deal for People clearly calls for developing our resources for the benefit of the people of Saskatchewan and for using public enterprise as one of the methods of such development, and in the Throne Speech we announce our intentions to proceed along those lines. The New Deal calls for development of new ways of making it possible for more farmers to operate more family farms more successfully. In the Speech from the Throne we outline an extension of the kind of development we propose in agriculture, compare the promise and the action. Small business assistance, tourist development, northern development. Yes, Mr. Speaker, if the New Deal for People was a socialist document, then so is the Speech from the Throne. This Government is prepared to step in with public action and public enterprise wherever that stands to improve the lives and the living standards of the people of Saskatchewan.

**Some Hon. Members:** — Hear, hear!

**Mr. Blakeney:** — I say to the Leader of the Opposition and to all the people of Saskatchewan that sharing the ownership and the fruits of development are things that people of this province believe in. I have stood in this House on other occasions and outlined our strategy of development; most people have understood it and I think clearly, but for the benefit of the Leader of the Opposition, let me say it again.

First, we believe that economic development is of first importance in Saskatchewan, but we don't believe in pursuing it at all costs. Development projects must meet three basic criteria. First, the fruits of development must be fairly distributed; secondly the public should not be called upon to unduly to subsidize development over the long haul; thirdly the environment must be adequately protected.

Given these guidelines, let me outline our approach to the problems of economic development. First, the pursuit of development must be more than going after the big glamour projects, like pulp mills and potash mines. Why? For one thing there aren't many to be had. Second, they are usually capital intensive, they consume vast amounts of capital investment but employ relatively few people. Sometimes, as in the case of the Prince Albert Pulp Mill they involve putting large amounts of public money at risk. Clearly, a more diversified strategy is required and that strategy must be soundly based on the reality of Saskatchewan. That reality is that agriculture is our basic and most important industry. However you measure it, in employment, in number of enterprises, or in value of production, agriculture is our basic industry.

**Some Hon. Members:** — Hear, hear!

**Mr. Blakeney:** — So the first element in our strategy is to do what we can as a Provincial Government to make farming as rewarding as

possible for as many families as possible. There are new measures in the Speech from the Throne that I will refer to later.

The second element of our strategy is to build on the first. Not only is agriculture the biggest producer of primary wealth in the province it is also the biggest consumer of manufactured products. We have to build on those hard facts. We can build by seeing if we can process right here in Saskatchewan as many of our agricultural products as possible and second by producing here in Saskatchewan as many as possible of the things that agriculture uses in production. Certainly we can produce for a continental and world market, we have shown that. Let us be sure that as we send our products to the world market, let's be sure that when we are going after the markets on the grand scale we don't overlook the local markets on the small scale.

Mr. Speaker, that's been our approach and I think we have been having some success.

On the agricultural processing side let me mention a few. The Saskatchewan Wheat Pool has expanded their rapeseed processing plant at Saskatoon, that came into production in May of 1972. Agra Industries undertook in June of 1972 to build two new facilities, a complete packaging plant and doubling of their refining capacity. After all this equipment is installed Saskatchewan in the new year will have its first packaging plant for margarine and shortening in the history of Saskatchewan.

**Some Hon. Members:** — Hear, hear!

**Mr. Blakeney:** — Expansion of Intercontinental Packers which has been going on over the past three years has tripled the size of the packing facility and has created employment for 135 new people. The cost was \$4.5 million.

The Dairy Producers Co-op has set up manufactured milk plants at Saskatoon and Yorkton. The Yorkton plant alone which will be in production this year will have capital costs of close to \$3 million. Lake Athabasca Native Fisheries Co-op, is a fish processing plant completed last July. This plant employs 40 people, all Indian and Métis.

**Mr. Steuart:** — All Federal money!

**Mr. Blakeney:** — Mr. Speaker, the Leader of the Opposition suggests that some of the money came from the Federal Government. That, of course, is accurate. In some cases, a great deal of the money came from the Federal Government. We are not in any sense ashamed to accept Federal Government money or any other money in developing Saskatchewan.

**Some Hon. Members:** — Hear, hear!

**Mr. Blakeney:** — Mr. Speaker, there have been many other developments, two new feed mills at Bruno and Lanigan, an expansion of an alfalfa dehydrating plant at Arborfield, meat processing plants at Watson and Regina, a distillery expansion at Weyburn, just to name a few, and a few which process Saskatchewan agricultural products.

On the side of making products for the provincial prairie markets we have had similar success. We know that every industry we can generate which can produce products here to replace products formerly imported means jobs, more production and more returns. So there are a number of industries which have been established or expanded. At Shellbrook, a little trailer factory to make trailers for horses and cattle. In Regina, Verlage Systems — five new employees — manufacturing amplifier systems. In Regina and Saskatoon, Westank — an expansion involving close to 100 employees. At Yorkton, Beaver Lumber Company established about eight months ago a plant for production of prefabricated houses, and that employs 38 people. There are many others; at Kindersley, Boychuk Manufacturing — oil field products; Arcola, A. & G. Welding Limited — oil field products; Oxbow Industries — steel enclosures; North Battleford, M & M Fabricators — prefab home plant addition; Moose Jaw, Canaday's — another expansion and 20 new jobs. Of course IPSCO at Regina has a major expansion underway which will mean 250 new jobs.

Let me say again for the benefit of the Leader of the Opposition, we are building a more stable and intensive agricultural economy. We are promoting with some success the development and expansion of more processing of farm products and more manufacture of goods used in farm production. We are promoting the development and expansion of production in Saskatchewan for the prairie market of those products which we otherwise would import. We have taken steps to expand tourism and as we announced in the Speech from the Throne, we have taken steps to create more jobs and greater returns for Saskatchewan in the use of our forest products.

Certainly we look to Saskatchewan businessmen to provide leadership in much of this development and we are willing to work with them, we are anxious to work with them. We look to the co-operative movement to become more and more involved in new ventures. But where home-grown private or co-op initiative is lacking, or where the choice lies between sending private profits out of Saskatchewan or retaining public returns here at home, we don't hesitate to consider the path of public enterprise.

**Some Hon. Members:** — Hear, hear!

**Mr. Blakeney:** — And that, Mr. Speaker, sums up our development strategy.

There are growing indications that our new development strategy is beginning to bear fruit. More. and more people are seeking jobs and more and more people are finding jobs. It looks as if the huge population losses which we suffered in 1969 and 1970 and 1971 have been slowed down — they have already been clearly slowed down very sharply. In our first year of office, the population loss was about half what it was in their last year of office.

**Some Hon. Members:** — Hear, hear!

**Mr. Blakeney:** — There is every evidence that the population loss has slowed still more. I will refer a little later to what has happened in our major cities. Apartment blocks are full once again. Ask the people in Saskatoon and ask them in Regina.

**Some Hon. Members:** — Hear, hear!

**Mr. Blakeney:** — Housing starts are booming, apartment block construction is started up once again. Our work force according to both Statistics Canada and the Department of Labour is on the rise. I know that any figures for a short term can be misleading but I looked at the figures for the last quarter of 1972 and the number of people holding jobs in Saskatchewan at the end of each of those months was on the average 7,000 higher than a year ago.

**Some Hon. Members:** — Hear, hear!

**Mr. Blakeney:** — If, Mr. Speaker, we are losing population it is a little surprising that we have 7,000 more people at work. Now 7,000 jobs is not enough, but it is progress. Those sitting across the way, Mr. Speaker, would like to forget but many will remember the wild and irresponsible promises that their party made years ago, not about 7,000 jobs, but about 80,000 new jobs — 80,000 jobs which proved to be imaginary jobs — jobs which were bad dreams for the people of this province as they had to leave this province in numbers never before equalled in the peacetime history of this or any other province.

**Some Hon. Members:** — Hear, hear!

**Mr. Blakeney:** — What would the people of Saskatchewan rather have, Mr. Speaker, 7,000 real jobs or 80,000 pipe dreams? You know the answer as well as I. The people of Saskatchewan want to forget those empty promises, those seven lean years, those seven gone years, the seven Liberal years. They want solid progress, they want solid progress like they have seen during the last 12 months and Mr. Speaker, under our Government they will get that progress.

**Some Hon. Members:** — Hear, hear!

**Mr. Blakeney:** — I said earlier that the core of our development strategy is a prosperous and healthy agricultural economy. Our Government has already taken a number of steps to preserve and develop the family farm in Saskatchewan. The Land Bank Commission created last year, under a hail of abuse by Members opposite is a pioneer effort which is already having an impact on family farm transfer. Much has also been done to help farmers expand their livestock enterprises and to intensify farm production. But, by and large, we are not yet solving the problem of one very important group of agricultural producers. These are the farmers who don't quite have enough resources of land or machinery or livestock or other capital to make the leap into a viable farming operation. This is particularly the case with many young farmers trying to get started. We have decided that we are going to do something to meet this problem and we are introducing a new agricultural incentives act which will launch a brand new program called FarmStart.

**Some Hon. Members:** — Hear, hear!

**Mr. Blakeney:** — My colleague, the Minister of Agriculture (Mr. Messer),

will be saying more about FarmStart, I just want to sketch some of the basic thinking behind it. Our objective is to create the kind of conditions which will ensure the future of rural Saskatchewan and the farm communities which serve it. We are moving in two broad directions. First, to make possible for the agricultural resources of this province to support as many farm families as possible and second, to improve the economic strength and the comforts and amenities of our villages and towns. Item one, keeping as many farmers as possible, is what FarmStart is all about. This program is designed to encourage more intensive agriculture through expansion of livestock enterprises, through other intensive farming operations. It is directing this help to those who need it most in a very practical way by subsidizing interest rates and by providing earned grants to farm operators who can't otherwise become economic. More livestock, more farmers, more family farms, more business for small towns and villages. We don't say that every farm in Saskatchewan will survive, but we do say that we must bend every effort to keep the largest possible number of viable family farms alive and economically healthy. Mr. Speaker, we believe that this is fundamental.

We have taken some direct steps to improve life in the small communities and to improve economic opportunities because we believe that the small communities depend on the farms and the farms depend on the small communities. We have done a number of things, some may seem relatively modest, all add up to an interesting package.

To help the businessmen in small towns we have instituted a rebate system on beer sales to improve the returns to smaller hotels. We have launched a small business branch to provide technical help and management assistance to small businessmen. We have extended SEDCO loans to commercial establishments, small commercial establishments, for the first time. This action has been welcomed. We have received applications from and agreed to loans to some very small businesses, to a stamp and gem store in a village of just over 100 people; to a ready-mix concrete business in a village of 500; a loan to a TV repair shop in one of the smaller towns. Loans have gone to other businesses like service stations, confectionery stores, trucking operations, motels, to name a few. Some of these are undoubtedly risky loans, some of them may well produce losses, but we think we should take those risks in order to keep small businesses in small towns.

**Some Hon. Members:** — Hear, hear!

**Mr. Blakeney:** — Of course, one very concrete and practical step to help the small businessman was to make him eligible for property tax relief through the property improvement grant, up to \$130 last year and Mr. Speaker, more this year. The opportunity to assist small businessmen was almost totally ignored by the government of the party opposite when it was in power. Mr. Speaker, that has been changed.

What are some of the other steps taken by the Government to strengthen small communities. Two very concrete steps, Operation Main Street and Operation Open Road. It is all very well for the Member for Wilkie (Mr. McIsaac) to heap scorn on these programs but I think he will find that they are pretty acceptable to people in smaller centres of Saskatchewan.



**Some Hon. Members:** — Hear, hear!

**Mr. Blakeney:** — In a different way our developing community college program will benefit small communities by decentralizing adult education.

The Member for Nutana South (Mr. Rolfes) has pointed out that the criteria for nursing homes have been changed to allow some nursing homes to go up in smaller centres which could not earlier qualify.

And finally, one can't ignore the impact which our winter works program over the past two winters has had on improving recreational facilities and other community owned resources in dozens and dozens of villages and smaller towns.

**Some Hon. Members:** — Hear, hear!

**Mr. Blakeney:** — I've been around this province, Mr. Speaker, and I've visited rinks and swimming pools in villages and towns and I can tell you that the people in those centres very much appreciate the assistance they receive.

**Some Hon. Members:** — Hear, hear!

**Mr. Blakeney:** — Mr. Speaker, small town merchants are getting a better deal, farmers are getting better service, the people in rural Saskatchewan are getting a better life because of the concerted actions of this Government to build the agricultural industry and improve our small communities and the services they are able to offer.

**Some Hon. Members:** — Hear, hear!

**Mr. Blakeney:** — As the Speech from the Throne indicates, we will take major new efforts in this direction because, Mr. Speaker, we believe that the future of Saskatchewan depends upon the farm economy. Ours is not a policy of getting people off the land. Ours is not the policy of the Liberal Party and the Task Force Report and the new Small Farm Development Plan of the Federal Government. Ours is a policy of keeping people on the land, of having the largest possible number of viable family farms. Mr. Speaker, that's our policy and that's the one we propose to follow.

**Some Hon. Members:** — Hear, hear!

**Mr. Blakeney:** — Mr. Speaker, may I now turn to another area of development. I find as I go about the province that a subject of great interest to many people is our northern timber areas, and how we are using and protecting this resource. I am sure you will recall this subject played a pretty important part in the election of 1971. We in the NDP fought and fought hard against the deal which the previous government has made for another giant pulp mill in the Meadow Lake area.

**Some Hon. Members:** — Hear, hear!

**Mr. Blakeney:** — I'm not going to replay that campaign except to remind you what the issues were as we saw them. We said that the Athabasca Pulp Mill deal was a bad deal and we said it was a bad deal on three counts. It was a bad deal financially because the Government took too great a risk for too little equity. It was a bad deal ecologically because of potential pollution and forest management practices had not been checked out. And it was a bad deal economically because it would produce too few jobs on a net basis and at too high a price in investment per job. Clearly the Liberal policy on forest development was to invite people from outside Saskatchewan and indeed from outside Canada to come and help themselves to our resources.

**Some Hon. Members:** — Hear, hear!

**Mr. Blakeney:** — That was and is the policy of the Liberal Party. That is not the policy of the New Democratic Party.

**Some Hon. Members:** — Hear, hear!

**Mr. Blakeney:** — And we set out to change that policy. So one of our first acts as a government was to cancel the Athabasca deal. And knowing what I know now, there is not the slightest doubt in my mind that this was the correct and only step to take.

**Some Hon. Members:** — Hear, hear!

**Mr. Blakeney:** — We set about to see whether or not Saskatchewan's resources of timber couldn't produce more for the people of Saskatchewan. The situation which we found ourselves in was this. The great bulk of the cutting rights in our accessible commercial forests had been assigned to three operators, Simpson Timber in the east, Prince Albert Pulp in the centre and Meadow Lake Sawmill in the west. These operators were producing essentially two products, wood pulp and studs. Neither of these products requires larger diameter trees. Yet the allowable annual cuts in the assigned areas included large quantities of wood in the larger diameters, nine inches and up.

So we began to ask some questions and here are some of them. Are there any alternative uses to which all or part of our forest resources can be put? And if there are and if we can compete in the production of these alternative products, how do these other uses compare with studs and pulp? How do they compare in value and in manufacture, in number of jobs per cord of timber used, in returns to the province?

We engaged some consultants and we asked them to examine our forest resources, to take a look at our present timber use, and to make recommendations. They have given us a preliminary report and from this report we think it is already clear that we have been pretty unsophisticated here in Saskatchewan. Should we cut up a 10-inch saw log up into studs? I'm told it's against the law in the State of Washington. I'm told it's not even done in the interior of British Columbia where their timber is much larger than ours. But it is being done in Saskatchewan every day and in large quantities.

We are not getting as many jobs as we should from our

forest resource. We are not adding as much value in processing as we could. And we are not getting as big a return for the people of this province as I think we are entitled to.

**Some Hon. Members:** — Hear, hear!

**Mr. Blakeney:** — Let me discuss one way of making better use of our larger timber. There is a strong indication that our forests can support a spruce plywood industry on a sustained yield basis. We can produce a competitive product at a competitive price and we can add many new jobs in the forest industry.

Let me compare as an example the number of jobs in a plywood mill compared with a stud mill. The measuring rod is employment per cord of log input. In a stud mill about two hours of employment per cord. In a plywood mill about four and one-half of employment per cord. This means on the basis of wood used, a plywood mill employs more than twice as many people as a stud mill. I'm not talking about substituting a plywood mill for a stud mill. The ideal situation would be an integrated situation, the stud mill would use smaller logs plus the cores from the plywood operation. The plywood mill would use logs nine inches in size and up and both would contribute chips to the manufacture of pulp. That's what we want to see. The smallest possible waste of timber, the largest possible number of jobs, the reserving of areas for development by native people, and the highest value of product for each cord of wood.

**Some Hon. Members:** — Hear, hear!

**Mr. Blakeney:** — Precisely what form a new development will take, where it would be located, how it would be organized, these are questions currently under close and active study. But I can tell you this. Preliminary discussions have already been held with senior officers of Simpson Timber Company, Prince Albert Pulp Company to discuss the Government's urgent concern that we improve the use of our timber resources. I am pleased to say that the officers of both companies recognize the importance of getting the maximum from the resource and our talks are continuing. And I will tell you this too, as I told them, that we are seeking a major role in the future development of forest products manufacturing in Saskatchewan for the public sector. We would see a greatly enlarged role for the Saskatchewan forest products of which the Saskatchewan Timber Board is a division

You may know that the Saskatchewan Timber Board has underway an experimental lumber operation at Sturgis using strictly poplar lumber to manufacture furniture core stock. The results look very encouraging. Plywood and specialized poplar are not the only possibilities. We think that more prime spruce may be able to be made into dimension lumber. And that's a higher value product in terms of jobs per cord than either studs or plywood. You know, to make pulp or studs out of prime white spruce is to make hamburger out of T-bone steaks.

**Some Hon. Members:** — Hear, hear!

**Mr. Blakeney:** — Mr. Speaker, we think we

can produce or market these top price products, produce chips as a by-product, provide the chips to the mill and not in any way hurt the pulp mill at Prince Albert. Some rearrangement of existing cutting rights may be necessary. These are now under consideration by the parties concerned. We believe that we can see our forest products much more a factor in the economic life of Saskatchewan than they have been in the past.

**Some Hon. Members:** — Hear, hear!

**Mr. Blakeney:** — Now, Mr. Speaker, in addition to looking at better use of trees harvested, we have taken steps to improve forest harvesting practices. Mr. Speaker, the Liberals permitted and defended clear cutting over large areas and that has been stopped.

**Some Hon. Members:** — Hear, hear!

**Mr. Blakeney:** — Cutting can now proceed in relatively small blocks or strips. We have taken steps too to protect the North Saskatchewan River. The Liberals permitted and defended the dumping of virtually untreated mill effluent into the river with potentially very dangerous results. Mr. Speaker, that too has been stepped.

**Some Hon. Members:** — Hear, hear!

**Mr. Blakeney:** — We are proud to say that we have taken steps to protect our natural heritage.

Let me turn to the Churchill River system. I want to say something that I have said over and over again. That river system is a great natural resource. Before many years it will be the basis not only for growing forest industry but if we are wise, it will be a haven of unspoiled nature in an increasingly polluted world.

The Liberal policy was to sacrifice the Churchill.

**Mr. Steuart:** — Nonsense!

**Mr. Blakeney:** — Let me recall again their proposal for that river as part of the proposed Athabasca Mill project. Let me report again what we reported in this House before, and make your own judgment as to whether my statement was nonsense.

**Mr. Steuart:** — It is nonsense!

**Mr. Blakeney:** — It was planned that the Athabasca Pulp Mill designed as one of the largest single line pulp mills in the world, far larger than the Prince Albert Pulp Mill. It was planned that that mill was to discharge its effluent into the tiny Beaver River which drains into the Churchill River system. During the winter months the volume of effluent from the mill would have been just about equal to the flow of water in the river.

**Some Hon. Members:** — Ohhhh!

**Mr. Blakeney:** — Just let me say that again. The volume of effluent which would have been poured into the Beaver would have been just about equal to the water flow in the Beaver. Just get a picture of that! Downstream from the river, half water and half malodorous black chemical pulp mill waste.

**Some Hon. Members:** — Shame!

**Mr. Blakeney:** — Federal and provincial pollution experts said that at least four major studies would have to be completed before there could have been any reasonably clear idea of the pollution and environment problems of that mill. And the reports said that. Yet, the former Government, the remnants of which sit opposite, Mr. Speaker, was in such haste to announce the project, in such haste to announce it for election purposes, that they shoved aside their own consultants and they shoved aside their officials, they ignored their serious warnings and they signed on the dotted line. The studies had not been done and long before the necessary studies could possibly have been completed, the commitment to the mill would have been irrevocable. Just how serious that would have been is revealed by a newspaper clipping by a senior federal government official speaking in Saskatoon last February. I quote from the Star-Phoenix:

‘The Beaver River is not large enough to assimilate the effluent from a major pulp mill,’ a federal environmental official Friday told delegates attending the Canadian Society of Wildlife and Fishery biologists meeting here. K.P. Lucas, Assistant Deputy Minister for the Federal Environmental Department said ‘the river which eventually discharges into the Churchill River system would not have been large enough to absorb the pollution from a proposed 1,400 ton a day craft pulp mill. There is not a chance the federal guidelines would have given proper protection to the Beaver,’ he said.

It is entirely possible that this deal if it had gone through would have put us in this impossible dilemma. We could have been faced with the impossible dilemma of having to choose between having either \$180 million pulp mill, railway line and town site standing idle, or a continuing heavy public subsidy of an elaborate and expensive effluent treatment operation, as a price of having one of the largest pulp mills in North America.

**Some Hon. Members:** — Hear, hear!

**Mr. Blakeney:** — Mr. Speaker, the consultants hired by the Government itself and the consultant reports filed in this House made clear that there was a substantial possibility that the Beaver River could have been polluted and indeed the Churchill River could have been polluted right down to Hudson Bay. That’s what the consultants said.

**Mr. Steuart:** — If we hadn’t taken any precautions!

**Mr. Blakeney:** — Mr. Speaker, this is how the Liberals proposed to deal with the Churchill River. Without hearings, without consultation,

without even studies, they proposed to make the Beaver River and its parent the Churchill an industrial sewer.

**Some Hon. Members:** — Hear, hear!

**Mr. Blakeney:** — Our approach to the Churchill is very different. Clearly the river has recreational potential. Just as clearly the river has importance to those who live along it. Clearly too, it has power potential. Are all of these uses actual and potential compatible? Are some of them? We don't know. And that is why we are asking the Department of the Environment to do a comprehensive environmental impact study on proposals for recreational development and power development on the Churchill. We are asking them to study and report on the likely effect on the Churchill, we are asking them to permit the fullest possible public consultation.

We in Saskatchewan must decide and decide soon how we wish to use the Churchill River. To fail to decide is to leave the river to haphazard development which has proved so disastrous in so many places. This Government believes that all uses must be considered and a rational and conscious judgment made. To do less will be to fail to keep pace with our children and our children's children. So we are going ahead with a major environmental impact study. And we want all interested parties to put their point of view. Native groups, forest operators, fish and game groups, environmental protection groups . . .

**Mr. C.P. MacDonald:** — Hog producers?

**Mr. Blakeney:** — . . . industrial groups. All should have full opportunity to be heard.

**Mr. Steuart:** — And ignored!

**Mr. Blakeney:** — We think this is a responsible way to be heard. We think this is a responsible way to act. Members opposite may cast scorn at hearings. They certainly didn't suggest any when they were going to pollute the Beaver or the Churchill. But we think there should be hearings. \

**Mr. C.P. MacDonald:** — Why don't you do something about it?

**Mr. Blakeney:** — We think that people should be given a chance to be heard. We think this is a responsible way to proceed. And we believe that it will be welcomed by the people of Saskatchewan both by those of us who are here now and by the generations yet to come.

**Some Hon. Members:** — Hear, hear!

**Mr. Blakeney:** — Mr. Speaker, a few weeks ago I listened with great attention and interest as the Governor-General read the Speech from the Throne at Ottawa. I was most intrigued by what I heard and by some of the things that the Prime Minister said later, particularly about the West. And the other night at the evening event following our own opening here in Saskatchewan as we looked back at the early days of the territorial government,

at the hundred years since the founding of the North West Mounted Police, I was struck by the fact that history really does repeat itself. It might almost be put in the language of a fable. Back in 1872 things were happening in the West and the message went back to Ottawa that something had better be done — something had better be done about establishing law and order in the western territories. And Ottawa with its ear to the political ground and its eye on future expansion listened to the message from the West. And the North West Mounted Police was established in 1873. The Federal Government moved with unusual speed and concern. But over the next one hundred years those in the valley of the Ottawa became even more engrossed in the financial heartland of Canada and they listened less and less to the West. Our pleas went unlistened to. Indeed, at one point when western farmers had storage bins bulging with wheat and they sought help from Ottawa, the eastern leader of the day was quoted as saying, “Why should I sell your wheat.” And discontent grew among westerners as none of their messages to Ottawa were heard. Until, as it came to pass, in 1972, one hundred years after the first territorial council called out and was heard, a second message was sped on its way, in late October and it penetrated, yes even to those on high, it penetrated.

**Some Hon. Members:** — Hear, hear!

**Mr. Blakeney:** — There was discontent in the West. And so it is that in 1973, one hundred years after the founding of the North West Mounted Police, the leaders of the East have embarked on a second voyage of discovery of Western Canada. They’ve already discovered that Westerners don’t like the freight rate structure, they discovered that we have problems with regional economic expansion, and they discovered that all is not well with transportation in the West. Next July, so it is written, the leaders of the Federal Government and the governments of the four western provinces are to meet in the West to discuss western economic opportunities. One thing, Mr. Speaker, is crystal clear. All of the sophisticated improvements in communication we have seen in the last one hundred years, microwave, Anik satellites and broadband don’t mean a thing when it comes to getting a message to Ottawa. What it takes is a little old-fashioned election.

On this second voyage of discovery, Mr. Speaker, Federal Liberal Cabinet Ministers have even discovered that Saskatchewan has a provincial Liberal leader . . .

**Some Hon. Members:** — Hear, hear!

**Mr. Blakeney:** — A provincial Liberal leader, not many followers, but a leader . . .

**Some Hon. Members:** — Hear, hear!

**Mr. Blakeney:** — And the Leader of the Opposition was given the VIP treatment in Ottawa just a few weeks ago and when he came back the Hon. Leader of the Opposition told us of all the changes in the wind, and what he and the Liberals were going to do for the West. Mr. Speaker, we know what the Liberals are going to do for the West, we know what the Liberals did for the

West. If they intended to do anything for the West we know and everybody in Saskatchewan knows they would have done it before the election and not after. The Leader of the Opposition hasn't changed; the Prime Minister hasn't changed; the Liberal Party hasn't changed. What has changed is that there is a minority government in Ottawa.

**Some Hon. Members:** — Hear, hear!

**Mr. Blakeney:** — And if the Liberals want to stay in power they have the New Democratic Members of Parliament, who have the real interest of the West at heart.

**Some Hon. Members:** — Hear, hear!

**Mr. Blakeney:** — Mr. Speaker, up until October 30th when that message went to Ottawa, the Leader of the Opposition was entirely unsuccessful in convincing his Ottawa colleagues to pay any attention to the West. Now what has made him suddenly so persuasive? I'll tell you what, Mr. Speaker, what suddenly made him so persuasive — 31 New Democrats in Parliament.

**Some Hon. Members:** — Hear, hear!

**Mr. Blakeney:** — If the West gets a 'new deal' from Ottawa it's not because the Liberals have changed. It's because the balance of power has changed, Mr. Speaker. Nevertheless, Mr. Speaker, whatever be the reason I welcome the fact that the West has been rediscovered and I assure the Hon. Leader of the Opposition and you, Mr. Speaker, and the people of Saskatchewan that our government will do its utmost to get the best deal possible for Saskatchewan and the West when we meet in conference, probably in July.

**Some Hon. Members:** — Hear, hear!

**Mr. Blakeney:** — Mr. Speaker, one of the subjects which will be discussed and which will require some painful discovery at Ottawa, is the attitude of Westerners and the people of Saskatchewan in particular to the Department of Regional Economic Expansion, popularly called DREE.

During the Federal election campaign I made some pretty sharp criticisms of the administration of the DREE Grant program. I pointed out that in the first two years of operation, from 1969 to the end of 1971 (two and a half years), 30 per cent of the DREE grants went to the Atlantic provinces, 20 per cent to the Western provinces, 37 per cent to Quebec. And then I pointed out a curious thing, I pointed out that something had happened to the DREE program on the way to the election. Because in the first three months of 1972 the DREE money was awarded on a very different basis. Instead of 30 per cent, Atlantic Canada got 13 per cent and instead of 20 per cent the four Western provinces got 7 per cent and instead of 37 per cent, Quebec got 75 per cent.

Now the Prime Minister reacted to these comments of mine, and he made two general responses to my criticisms. One response was, in effect, that these comments should not be made



because they are to use his word, 'divisive' and harmful to Canadian unity. He is quoted in the Regina Leader-Post of December 2nd, 1972, as saying:

The DREE program was attacked from many quarters and for reasons which should make Canadians ashamed and by people who wanted to make it look like it was designed only for Quebec.

The second response was that my figures gave an inaccurate picture. Now, Mr. Speaker, this is a very serious question for Western Canadians and I wish to deal with the points raised as fully and dispassionately as I can.

I am going to ask the indulgence of the House to take a little time on this because I regard it as a serious matter.

I want first to make one definition clear. When I talked about DREE grants I was talking about DREE grants under the Regional Development Incentives Act and the Special Area program. The context made this perfectly clear. I was not, for example, talking about the spending of the National Capital Commission at Ottawa which happens to be administered by the Department of Regional Economic Expansion, nor was I talking about the spending by PFRA on dams or community pastures; that's also administered by the Department of Regional Economic Expansion. I was talking about the grants to industry and the context of my remarks, including references to grants to IBM and Union Carbide and Procter and Gamble, make this clear beyond question. I was using the term DREE grant the way everyone else in this province uses it. I know of nobody in Saskatchewan, who when he talks about DREE grants, means spending by PFRA on community pastures or dugouts, or the like.

I want to turn first to the general charge that the remarks about the uneven distribution of the DREE grants are divisive. Now I believe that the Regional Development Incentives Act program started out as a program for all Canada and that after a time a strong change of direction in favor of the Quebec region was evident. I believe that this was unfair, unfair to other regions and I said so and I say so and I'm not ashamed to say so.

**Some Hon. Members:** — Hear, hear!

**Mr. Blakeney:** — The Prime Minister replied that no responsible politician in Quebec is complaining about the West getting two-price wheat, or 2,000 hopper cars. True. Because these are regional programs, declared to be such. Nor is any responsible western politician complaining about Quebec getting large ship building subsidies, or the Maritimes getting large Cape Breton Development Corporation spending. These too are regional programs, declared to be such. The Regional Development Incentives Act on the other hand, was announced as a program for all disadvantaged regions, but as time went on it seemed to become increasingly a program for the Quebec region and perhaps Nova Scotia.

Now let me now state the obvious. Our quarrel is not with the Province of Quebec, our dissatisfaction is not aimed at any racial or linguistic group. Indeed, I suspect that many recipients of DREE grants in the Quebec region were companies

owned by English-Canadians or Americans. Our case is simply this. We are, in many ways, as disadvantaged as Quebec. Indeed, in every year since DREE grants came into being per capita income in Saskatchewan has been lower than in Quebec. During the years 1968 to 1971 inclusive per capita income in Saskatchewan averaged 80 per cent of the Canadian average; in Quebec 89 per cent of the Canadian average. Measured by per capita income we are as disadvantaged as the Quebec region.

Only the fact that very large numbers of people left Saskatchewan in the years 1968 to 1971 and 1972, has kept our employment rate down. When many people leave a province serious problems result which don't show up in the unemployment charts. Problems that mean that more help is needed to attract industry, not less. So in terms of job opportunities we were in the years since 1968 every bit as disadvantaged as the Quebec region. If Quebec needed industry, and I don't deny it, then so did we. So we say this; that the DREE-RDIA program was meant for all provinces suffering from regional disparity; that we are such a province; that our need is as great as the Quebec region; that nonetheless the program was changed to benefit the Quebec region preponderantly. We say that this was done as a matter of government policy and that this was unfair to Saskatchewan. We say further, that in our view this federal policy is divisive and that to reveal the facts is not divisive.

**Some Hon. Members:** — Hear, hear!

**Mr. Blakeney:** — I'm personally particularly distressed at any implied suggestion that to criticize the administration of DREE is somehow to be anti-French. Our government has given and continues to give full support to efforts by the Federal Government to meet the legitimate language and cultural aspirations of Canadians whose first language is French. We will continue to do so. But this does not mean that we should not protest against the economic discrimination from which the West, and Atlantic Canada have suffered at the hands of Ontario and Quebec for nearly a century. To consider our criticisms as anti-French is to totally misunderstand them. Such misunderstanding does indeed divide Canada and is likely to be far more divisive than any public discussion of the DREE programs.

Mr. Speaker, I said that Mr. Trudeau's responses to my criticisms fell under two general heads.

First, that they were divisive — I have tried to deal with that response.

Second, that the figures did not bear out my criticisms. I will now turn to that response.

Mr. Trudeau responded by quoting in his Regina speech figures of per capita spending by DREE saying that they amounted to \$55 per person in Saskatchewan and only \$36 per person in Quebec. To this response I make two points. My first point is this — I was speaking throughout about the grants to industry, the RDIA grants. Mr. Trudeau in quoting per capita figures did not do that. He included all spending by the Department of Regional Economic Expansion; spending by PFRA on community pastures, on dams, on drainage projects and perhaps — I can't figure this out for sure — the head office expenses of PFRA here in Regina. Now that is simply a bad argument. It is the

reddest of red herrings. It is, to say the least, a faulty argument in the course of a debate on whether incentive grants to industry are fairly distributed, to talk about the spending on PFRA pastures, a program which has been going on for decades and almost by accident is included under the Department of Regional Economic Expansion. I reject the Prime Minister's figures as not relevant to this argument.

My second point is this. As my criticism made perfectly clear, I was not objecting to the administration of the industry grants up to the end of 1971. Indeed, the whole thrust of my objection was that what was previously a national program had become to a very large extent a regional program. I said, "something happened to the DREE program on the way to the election." I went on to contrast the 1972 program with the programs of earlier years. Now it is true, that up until late 1971 the DREE program seemed a program for all disadvantaged regions. So the money actually paid out looked not too unfair, because most of the money committed since the 1st of January 1972 had not been paid out, when I was making my comments. And so Mr. Trudeau quoted the money which had actually been paid out. But I was, and am, much more concerned about future commitments, commitments made after the first of January 1972 but not paid out. Everybody knows there is a time lag between committing money and paying it out under the DREE program. Sometimes a couple of years. It is perfectly clear that, based on the commitments being made in 1972, Saskatchewan was being virtually shut out of the program.

Now let me illustrate. I will quote figures for grants offered by DREE and accepted by the industry, but not paid out, under the RDIA and special area programs. For the five months from January 1, 1972, to May 31, 1972, of the \$65 million of grant offers the percentage of grants for Quebec and Saskatchewan are as follows:

Quebec — 59 per cent or \$38 million;  
Saskatchewan — 1.5 per cent or less than \$1 million.

And this trend continued after May 31, 1972. My figures indicate that for the period from July 7, 1972, to October 16, 1972, DREE made a total of 263 offers to all industries in Canada. Of this number, the total in Quebec and in Saskatchewan are as follows:

Quebec — 177; Saskatchewan — 1

For the period from January 1972 to September 1972 the comparable figures are:

Quebec — 609; Saskatchewan — 10

The trend of these figures for the whole of 1972 compare most unfavorably with the figures for 1969, 1970 and 1971, as far as Saskatchewan is concerned. Certainly, contrary to what Members may think there was no lack of applications. We believe that these figures are substantially correct. We believe that they do show that the administration of the DREE grants did change and change in a dramatic way. It changed not only to the detriment of Saskatchewan but to the detriment of a number of other provinces as well. Perhaps it was an unfair inference to suggest that the change came about because an election was on the way. Perhaps that inference was unfair, but then again, perhaps it was not.

Mr. Speaker, I have dealt with this exchange with the Prime Minister, not with a view to scoring debating points, but with a view to making as forcefully as I can two points which I am sure will be agreed with on both sides of the House.

Our objections to the administration of the DREE programs are in no way, and I say, in no way, associated with being anti-French or anti-Quebec.

**Some Hon. Members:** — Hear, hear!

**Mr. Blakeney:** — To dismiss them as somehow part of a Western backlash is a grave mistake. Our objections are based on our belief that our province is being unfairly dealt with in the administration of a major federal program which was announced to be for all regions, all regions suffering economic disadvantage and which should be for all such regions.

We may be mistaken in our analysis, but if we are, we ask that our objections be met head on by the Federal Government and not be dismissed with statements which are capable of the interpretation that our objections are merely the divisive statements of Western Canadian bigots. We don't regard ourselves as such. We are not saying that the Prime Minister said we were. I am saying that that inference is possible to be drawn.

I hope the Prime Minister did not mean that inference to be drawn, for nothing could be more destructive of Canadian unity than to characterize the economic grievances of Western Canada as being motivated by any racial animosity. They are not so motivated. There is regional animosity. There is widespread feeling that Central Canada, Ontario and Quebec gain most of the advantages of national economic policies. That feeling is a fact and it is a fact to be grappled with and it is a fact which very largely explains the election results last October. It is a fact which must be a key basis of discussion between the Federal Government and the four Western provinces.

Our sense of grievance concerning national tariff policy is well known. So is our feeling concerning transportation policies and freight rates. And then when we saw a regional industrial development program going to benefit primarily industry in the central heartland of Canada, which already has the bulk of Canadian industry, it seemed to us in Saskatchewan to be a galling new example of Canada's discriminatory national economic policies.

As the second voyage of discovery proceeds we will make clear in the strongest possible terms that DREE must change, that Western Canada must be given its opportunity to develop industry, in our way using our methods and with our fair share of help from the Federal Government.

**Some Hon. Members:** — Hear, hear!

**Mr. Blakeney:** — Mr. Speaker, that is the message that I want this Legislature to send to the present Prime Minister and to any Prime Minister who may succeed him whatever his political stripe.

**Some Hon. Members:** — Hear, hear!

**Mr. Blakeney:** — Mr. Speaker, the party that sits to your left, the Liberal Party was in office in this province for seven years and they were elected on a platform to reduce local taxes. Year in and year out they talked about oppressive taxation and some of the Members who are now in the seats over there went up and down this province talking about oppressive taxation, about 600 new taxes — slogans which they may well dust off lacking as they do any new or fresher ideas.

They were elected in 1964 and they began to give to the people of Saskatchewan their program. And for the people of Saskatchewan there began the seven lean years, the seven gaunt years. And for nobody was it leaner or gaunter than the property taxpayer. Mill rates went up and up and up. In rural municipalities they spiralled. In the rural municipality of Fertile Belt, for example, the mill rate for school purposes in 1964 was 35 mills; by 1971 it was 49 mills. In the towns mill rates soared. The town of Bengough the mill rate for school purposes in 1964 was 28 mills, in 1971 — 43 mills. In the cities mill rates went into orbit. In the Moose Jaw Public School District, for example, the mill rate for school purposes in 1964 was 26 mills; in 1971 — 47 mills. And the only relief given was the Homeowner Grant, which in 1971 reached the grand total of \$70 per year for homeowners, \$70 per year for farmers and nothing at all for small business premises.

In seven years total per capita taxation in this province doubled. New Democrats said that we would meet the problem head on. In our program for progress our “New Deal for People” we said we would launch it during our first term of office and we said this:

New Democrats recognize that taxation is necessary, but in a democratic society taxes should be levied on the principle of ability to pay.

**Some Hon. Members:** — Hear, hear!

**Mr. Blakeney:** — Citizens are entitled to maximum value for dollars spent in terms of service rendered. If new revenues are required they should be raised from resource royalties, income and corporation taxes and other taxes related to ability to pay.

**Some Hon. Members:** — Hear, hear!

**Mr. Blakeney:** — In the field of taxation we said a New Democratic Government will sharply reduce property tax mill rates for basic school operating costs on homes, farms and small business.

**Some Hon. Members:** — Hear, hear!

**Mr. Blakeney:** — Mr. Speaker, the program of the Party opposite when they were out of office was, “We will cut oppressive taxes.” Their program when they got into office was, ‘raise and double the taxes’.

Mr. Speaker, our program when we were out of office was as I have quoted. We will increase corporation taxes, income taxes and royalties and we will cut mill rates. That was our

program when we were out office and that is our program when we are in office.

**Some Hon. Members:** — Hear, hear!

**Mr. Blakeney:** — We believe that property tax for school purposes should be sharply reduced and we have done just that. Last year we increased school grants over \$11 million. Mill rates for basic school purposes were stabilized at an average of 43 mills across the province. Homeowners, farmers and small businessmen received the Property Improvement grants of not less than 13 mills. Rather than a top grant of \$70, homeowners received a top of \$78, farmers a top of \$195, small businessmen — who got nothing from the government opposite who now say we are running a war on business — small business who got nothing from that government got a top of \$130.

Last year we increased resource royalties and we paid that money to local ratepayers. Now that was a tax shift a shift away from taxes on homes and farms and a shift to taxes on resources. New Democrats say that that is a shift in the right direction.

The Throne Speech calls for a further shift. It calls for increases in income and corporation taxes so that school grants and property improvement grants can be increased again. This will be a further tax shift, a shift from property taxes to taxes better related to ability to pay. New Democrats believe that the property taxes for school purposes must be sharply reduced and we will act on that belief.

Mr. Speaker, we will find out whether Liberals support this policy, we will find out when they come to vote on the Bills with respect to income and corporation taxes. But whether or not Liberals support that policy, New Democrats support that policy and we support it proudly.

**Some Hon. Members:** — Hear, hear!

**Mr. Blakeney:** — Mr. Speaker, I want to turn to a different subject. I want to record my sense of profound relief that the war in Vietnam appears to have come to an end. There is good ground for hope that the United States' involvement has come to an end and some ground for hope that all major hostilities will cease. This, I am sure, gives deep satisfaction to all Members of this House. This has been a cruel war, a senseless war, a war dangerous for all mankind.

As you know, Mr. Speaker, some of us in this House have felt for many years that the involvement of the United States was a tragic error in pursuit of a policy which was wrong; wrong politically, wrong strategically and wrong morally. And as the years have passed, the results of this policy, results infinitely sad for so many people, have revealed themselves. More and more people particularly in the United States have called for a change. This call has been heeded, a truce has been signed, and now it rests with us to assist the rebuilding of this ravaged land.

It may be asked: What is our responsibility as Canadians? I believe we have a responsibility if for no other reason than

that we are relatively rich, and riches carry its own obligations. But there are other reasons. In some sense we were a tacit ally of the United States. We were part of their error not in the sense that we participated in the decisions, but rather that we participated in carrying out the decisions participated by supplying arms and strategic goods and supplying them in contravention of our long established policy of refusing to supply such arms to either side in a war in which we are a neutral country.

And leaving that aside we have a further responsibility. We have long been in the forefront in asserting that third parties — middle powers like Canada — can play a valuable role in preserving world peace. Our forces have served with distinction in the Near East, in Cyprus and elsewhere. We cannot reasonably refuse to take part in yet another peace attempt, although this one may be the most difficult and least promising of all.

I hope that we will shoulder our share of the task. I compliment and approve of the decision of the Government of Canada to participate in the peace keeping operations, even though some of the ordinary courtesies which Canada might expect have apparently been ignored; even though the job of peace keeping may be thankless and indeed may well-nigh be impossible. What we can do we should do. Again I compliment the Government of Canada on their decision.

**Some Hon. Members:** — Hear, hear!

**Mr. Blakeney:** — Every person everywhere has a stake in seeing that the whole of Indo-China is rebuilt to a state of peace and prosperity. Every Canadian has a stake in seeing the United States recover from the deep wounds which this war has inflicted on that nation. These tasks can now begin. We look forward to 1973, if not with confidence, nevertheless with more hope of peace in the world than for many years past.

Before I resume my seat, Mr. Speaker, let me say a few words about what I trust will be a subject which will not cause any division in this House. I refer to the celebration this year of the 100th Anniversary of the Royal Canadian Mounted Police.

The RCMP is, of course, a Canadian institution. The centennial of the force will be celebrated from coast to coast and not only in Saskatchewan. But the RCMP and Saskatchewan have had a long and historic relationship which gives this province a very special interest in the event.

The early members of the North West Mounted Police who arrived on the Prairies only two years after the Homestead Law was passed are credited with making the settlement of the Canadian West relatively peaceful, in contrast to the legendary lawlessness of the American West, a lawlessness which has given us the tradition of the cowboy stories but which must have been a pretty unpleasant lawlessness to live under.

But more than that, early records show that the local detachments of the force were not just the arm of authority. They became part of the frontier spirit of co-operation which made every man his brother's keeper. The early mountie helped the settlers fight forest fires, he carried the mail, he

brought aid to the sick and injured. This earned him a respect which has endured to the present day.

In 1882 Regina became the headquarters of the force, an association which continued for nearly 40 years. The RCMP as a federal force came into being in 1920; the headquarters were moved to Ottawa, but Regina continued to be the training centre and remains so today.

Let me note in passing that the Government of Saskatchewan and the RCMP have always had very close association. From 1906 to 1917 the North West Mounted Police were a force which, by contract, enforced provincial as well as federal law in Saskatchewan. This pioneering relationship was one which was to set a pattern which other provinces have followed, particularly since 1928.

We are going to have a whole series of events to mark the year. The Minister of Industry and Tourism will mention some of them, but here are some. There is an RCMP Caravan, a travelling display of the RCMP's history which will tour the northern United States from March to May. The RCMP band and musical ride will tour extensively in Saskatchewan. The RCMP will be featured at historic sites, provincial parks and campgrounds throughout the province. And, of course for Saskatchewan the celebration will reach its climax on July 3rd, 4th and 5th when the Royal Couple pay an official visit to this province. We look forward to that event, as I am sure all Saskatchewan does.

Mr. Speaker, I invite you and Members on both sides of the House to join me in saluting the RCMP and in inviting the citizens of Saskatchewan to make this a gala year in honor of the first 100 years of that historic and colorful force.

**Some Hon. Members:** — Hear, hear!

**Mr. Blakeney:** — Mr. Speaker, the Speech from the Throne set out the concern of our government about the control and use of our energy resources. I believe this concern is shared by all thoughtful Canadians. That concern is felt most strongly about our oil and gas. Our government intends to act on that concern.

During the 1950s the CCF Government took steps to secure supplies of natural gas for Saskatchewan citizens. The Saskatchewan Power Corporation bought gas, developed gas wells and is even today engaged in joint ventures for the exploration of natural gas.

The Liberals and their friends have a different philosophy. During their seven years they did little or nothing to add to the gas reserves owned by the SPC. In fact they sold resources of gas in a deal which was clearly exposed in the Crown Corporations Committee as a sell-out of our resources.

**Some Hon. Members:** — Hear, hear!

**Mr. Blakeney:** — Our choice as citizens of Saskatchewan is simple. We can act so that all of our gas reserves and all of our oil reserves are owned by outside and largely foreign companies and have our reserves used as these foreign companies think is best for them. Or, we can act to see that some of our oil, some of



our gas, is owned by us and is used in the best way for us and for our children. That is our choice.

The Liberal Party has chosen as between foreign oil giants and the Saskatchewan people. They chose the foreign oil companies. The Leader-Post has chosen. To the surely modest proposal that the people of Saskatchewan through a Crown corporation might be one of the groups exploring for oil and gas owned by the people of Saskatchewan they, the Leader-Post editors have reacted in a characteristic way.

In an editorial in the Leader-Post of Saturday, January 27, 1973, they said this:

Those who value the modern-day principles of a free economy in which it should be a government's role to supplement private business rather than dominate it, tend to see those initiatives as an attempt by government to get a toe in the door which will lead in time to complete state domination of all of the basic supports for the Saskatchewan economy, including agricultural production and processing, potash and metal mining, petroleum and the forest industry.

Only the Leader-Post in one of its more paranoiac moments could construe a proposal for an oil and gas corporation to explore for our own oil and gas to ensure reserves for our own people as the first toe in the door which will lead in time to the complete state domination of agricultural production.

But then the Leader-Post has over the years seen sinister plots in all sorts of proposals. In proposals for public automobile insurance, proposals for a public hospital plan, proposals for public medicare.

We can at least say this for the Sifton Press editorials on economic issues, they are consistent. They always oppose Saskatchewan control of Saskatchewan resources. They always favor control of Saskatchewan resources and Saskatchewan business by outsiders. That is not surprising. After all these papers are not owned in Saskatchewan, their bosses, too are outsiders.

**Some Hon. Members:** — Hear, hear!

**Mr. Blakeney:** — Mr. Speaker, we of the New Democratic Party do not make the choice of the Liberal Party, we do not make the choice of the Sifton editorial writers; we make a different choice. We choose a different road. It may be a road less travelled but it is a road which can lead to a better society. One where we here in Saskatchewan are not mere hewers of wood or drawers of water but where we in Saskatchewan own at least some of our resources — our resources of oil, gas and timber. Our efforts may fail. There is a risk. That is a risk we think we should take.

**Some Hon. Members:** — Hear, hear!

**Mr. Blakeney:** — And if we fail, it will be in the cause of developing Saskatchewan resources for Saskatchewan people.

**Some Hon. Members:** — Hear, hear!

**Mr. Blakeney:** — Mr. Speaker, I want to make clear as I have done on other occasions that in launching an oil corporation we lay no blame on the present oil companies. They have operated by the accepted rules of the game. Fault, if there be any — and I am not sure there is — lies with the people and their governments. Whether or not there has been fault in the past, we think it is time to take a fresh look at the future. We see real prospects for developing Saskatchewan oil and gas, by Saskatchewan people for Saskatchewan people.

**Some Hon. Members:** — Hear, hear!

**Mr. Blakeney:** — We acknowledge that our effort may be limited. We acknowledge that the effort may be risky but we believe that the effort and the risk are fully justified and we believe that the people of Saskatchewan will agree.

**Some Hon. Members:** — Hear, hear!

**Mr. Blakeney:** — Mr. Speaker, there were two other subjects which I intended to touch upon. I want to give other Members a chance to participate in this debate. I proposed to say something about freight rates and rail line abandonment and something about housing. I will seek another occasion in this House to direct remarks particularly on the matter of freight rates and rail line abandonment.

I have dealt with many aspects of the program outlined in the Speech from the Throne. I believe it to be a program for progress. It is a program which asks Saskatchewan people to fight for their fair and just share of economic rights. It asks them to fight for those rights. It asks them then to join together to build this province into a better place, to the place where we all want it to be; where the young are encouraged, where the weak are protected and where men of good will can build a way of life which is distinctly our own, which bears the clear stamp — Made in Saskatchewan. I believe this Throne Speech is a step along that road, and because I believe it is a step and a long step along that road. I will oppose the amendment and warmly support the motion.

**Some Hon. Members:** — Hear, hear!

**Mr. A.R. Guy: (Athabasca)** — Mr. Speaker, we have listened for an hour and a half to the Premier of this province. I am sure that those who took the time to tune in today were disappointed. The approach that he took was negative. It was contradictory and it was filled with half truths. One would have thought that the Premier of the province would have listed more of the supposedly progressive steps that his Government has taken. Instead he took the time to criticize Ottawa, to try and make his criticism of DREE palatable to the people of Saskatchewan. I know that after the federal election of October 30th he received volumes of mail that criticized him for his attitude during that campaign. It is surprising to hear the Premier today stand before us and try to justify his position in regard to DREE grants, when only a few months ago he was crawling on his knees, in fact, I think

he still is crawling on his knees to Ottawa to get a grant for his friends from Roumania. If he thinks that Ottawa after the unwarranted criticism which has divided this country from one end to the other that he has made in regard to the DREE grant will be given a grant, he will be sadly mistaken. Not only that, Mr. Speaker, the Roumanians had no intention of coming to this country in the first place.

**Hon. G. Snyder:** — Afraid of socialism?

**Mr. Guy:** — Yes, I wouldn't be surprised that they are afraid of this type of socialism.

**Some Hon. Members:** — Hear, hear!

**Mr. Guy:** — If you compare the socialism of Roumania with the socialism of Saskatchewan, Saskatchewan is too far left for them.

**Some Hon. Members:** — Hear, hear!

**Mr. Guy:** — No, Mr. Speaker, the Premier can stand here today and try to justify his position that he took in the federal election and that of his leader Mr. Lewis but the biggest joke of the afternoon had to be when he stood here and said, "These 31 New Democrats," with I think 17 per cent of the vote, "are going to make those Liberals in Ottawa stand up and take notice."

Well I think the Leader of the Opposition (Mr. Steuart) made it perfectly clear after his visit to Ottawa, Mr. Trudeau could sit there and insult the leader of the NDP hour after hour, day after day, month after month. And then when it was all over could say, "Mr. Lewis you get down and wipe my shoes for me," and Mr. Lewis would be on the floor wiping his shoes because he is afraid to face the country again because he knows he would be wiped out. To have the Premier of any province in Western Canada whether it is Manitoba, British Columbia or Saskatchewan where the NDP are in power even to suggest that the Federal Government is afraid of that small band of NDP that have been returned through accidents rather than through any wish of the people, I say is the joke of the afternoon.

Then of course the Premier went on to mislead the public as he usually does and I think it is unfortunate that he uses radio time to mislead the public. He said this afternoon — whether he did it deliberately or not I am not sure, I rather hesitate to claim that he would make such deliberate misrepresentation. But if you check the records and we all know you have to check the tapes because the other day the Premier made it very clear he doesn't take any responsibility for anything that he says that is reported in the newspapers. He doesn't believe in what is reported in the Leader-Post or the Star-Phoenix. I don't know whether he even believes what is reported in the Commonwealth. I hope not, because if there ever is a misleading paper in this province, it has to be the NDP organ known as the Commonwealth. But he stated and you can check the tapes and if I am wrong, I will apologize to the Premier. He left the impression, in fact he said, the Property Improvement Grant was increased so everyone got \$130.

**Mr. Blakeney:** At the top!

**Mr. Guy:** — Oh yes you did, Mr. Premier! You said that the Property Improvement Grant last year was \$130. Well if that is true I should like to know where the difference between \$78 and \$130 is for me. I got short-changed by the Premier of Saskatchewan. What he didn't say of course was that the majority of the people of this province got an \$8 increase because the grant from the Liberals was \$70, he added \$8 and then tried to take credit for the whole \$78 and has been unsuccessful in doing so. I hope the Premier did not intentionally mislead the public that were listening today because I don't think that he is that type of man.

But he is a very contradictory type of person. He said the Prince Albert Pulp Mill is too big a risk for public funds, that is why we couldn't support it. The Athabasca Pulp Mill we couldn't support because it was bad financially, it was too big a risk for the people of Saskatchewan. Then about ten seconds before he took his seat he said, "But we are going into the oil industry." We are going to drill holes at \$150,000 each with public money. But there is no risk involved there. Well, Mr. Speaker, if you think that the people of Saskatchewan are naive or gullible enough to suggest that there is a difference between investing money in a pulp company where the resources are already proven and in an oil exploration program where the resources are not proven, I think you are going to have some problem in trying to convince the public that you are on the right wicket. Maybe our brilliant young Member from Estevan (Mr. Thorson) who comes from the oil country will be able to shed some light on this but if his performance last year is any example I think he will have some problems convincing the people of Saskatchewan also.

Then of course the Premier went on to say that he was the friend of industry. The friend of business. Industry doesn't forget that it was only a few weeks ago that he spoke to the Canadian Petroleum Association. Was he their friend then? No, he threatened them on the same basis that the Minister of Industry threatened them last year. He admitted today that he had threatened Simpson Timber and Prince Albert Pulp on the same basis. If they don't do what the Government of Saskatchewan wants them to do, they can be prepared to see some of their leases taken over. They can see harassment like they have never seen before. Then of course he said the Athabasca Pulp Mill would have destroyed the Beaver and the Churchill Rivers. Then in the next breath he said, "But if the Liberal Government had proceeded with the plans to provide effluent control, it would have cost too much." In other words, one minute he is saying they were going to destroy the Churchill then in the other he said they had a plan they had a program of control but it was going to be too expensive. Now it can't be both, it has to be one or the other. I am sure glad he has got some concern for the Churchill and the Fond-du-Lac Rivers today, because he sure didn't have any last summer. There were survey crews in Stony Rapids from the Power Corporation that cut down trees, and strewed garbage from one end of the lake to the other. They spent hundreds of thousands of dollars of the taxpayers' money and now today all of a sudden, because of the Athabasca by-election, because of the hue and cry that has been raised by environmentalists and the local people, they say, oh yes, but we are going to do a study first. We are going to do an environmental study. Why, if you are going to do an environmental study didn't you do it first and save the taxpayers of this province the hundreds of thousands of dollars in drilling holes, and in

finding construction material. They spent it during the election campaign because they wanted to show that there was activity. But it backfired and the Attorney General can't stand the truth.

**An Hon. Member:** He can't stand you!

**Mr. Guy:** — We always knew he was a little allergic to the truth but we thought that he could sit and take it like a man. Well, since they have all gone I should like now first of all to congratulate the mover and the seconder, who did a good job attempting to support a document which the high priced planners of this province should be ashamed to place before the public. You know I don't want to take away from the mover and the seconder their efforts in this regard. But throughout that document particularly in reference to the federal scene, I could see that fine \$22,000 hand of John Burton writing paragraphs of those two speeches. All I am going to say is that if that is the best that he can do for \$22,000 that the taxpayers are not getting a New Deal for the people of Saskatchewan.

I should also like to congratulate the three new Cabinet Ministers. I must say that I was hoping that my MLA would have been included in that new rank of Cabinet Minister. But I want to say to him not to give up hope, because I understand from statements made at the New Democratic Convention in December or November that the Premier sort of left the impression that there would be new appointments either after the Session or very soon there on. So I would say to those who were overlooked like my good friend from Regina North West (Mr. Whelan) who has been in here since 1960 and I am going to have more to say about his role in Uranium City if he comes back. Don't give up hope you may have an opportunity to get into this Cabinet but I think the former mayor of Regina is too right wing to get into this type of a Cabinet. In fact, I wonder why he even wants to get into that Cabinet when their approach to the problems of Saskatchewan is as they are.

Well, Mr. Speaker, it is with a great deal of pleasure that I rise to participate in the Throne Speech Debate. I think you will remember last spring there were many disbelievers sitting to your right, who thought that I had made my last speech in the Legislature. You know, you will recall Premier Blakeney said, "If the Member comes back he will be the first to be unseated in a controverted election and re-elected at the subsequent by-election." I think that the fact that he delayed calling the by-election until the last possible moment meant that he also recognized the old saying that 'there is a first time for everything'.

Wes Robbins (Saskatoon Nutana Centre) and I am sorry he is not in his seat, was so sure of my demise that he wasted the time of the Legislature one day reading a poem that he had written as an ode to what he believed would be my last appearance. I hope the Member for Nutana Centre will be as anxious to write a poem of welcome back as he was to write one for my farewell. Then other Members, and I am not going to name them all, they all got into the act. They said 'now you see him now you don't', 'Bye, Mr. Guy' and so on. It was quite enlightening at the time. I think the most prophetic comment of all came from a Member who entered the Legislature the same year that I did, back in 1960, the Member from Regina North West

(Mr. Whelan). If you check the Debates and Proceedings you will see on page 189 the following words of wisdom. "If the Member from Athabasca will get on his feet and ask how the next election in his constituency will turn out, I will tell him. My answer is that he will get every vote that he deserves."

**Some Hon. Members:** — Hear, hear!

**Mr. Guy:** — I was pleased that the Hon. Member spent a considerable time helping me get the vote that I deserved, which was obviously more than the NDP candidate deserved. In fact, the Member from Regina North West was in Uranium City for two weeks. He was the big organizer up there.

**Mr. Steuart:** He slept in the Union Hall.

**Mr. Guy:** — Well, this is what I was going to say. I think he got confused, because after two weeks in Uranium City he really didn't know whether he was coming or going because the polls opened at 9:00 o'clock in the morning, and at 10:30, good old Ed came out of the Union Hall where he had slept, into the sunlight, rubbing his eyes and scratching his ear and he realized then that 19 carloads of Liberals had gone to the polls and he didn't even have his brigade organized.

Well, on election night and subsequently after another recount, I was pleased to see that — well I'll tell you, it was a lot more a result of having Ed there than it would have been if he wasn't — there are 18 more votes that I deserve than in the previous election, one year earlier. This time I want to thank the supporters of the Athabasca constituency for their hard work and confidence in sending me back for my fifth consecutive time. In fact, I would ask all Members opposite, old ones, new ones, how many of you ever doubled your majority in one year?

**Some Hon. Members:** — Hear, hear!

**Mr. Guy:** — You know, I should also be remiss if I did not thank Dave Steuart, Leader of the Liberal Party, my colleagues here in the Legislature, my supporters throughout the province, who gave their time and energy to turn back the socialist hordes that swarmed over the constituency like locusts from July 1st until election day. I'm glad to be able to say that the Minister of Health (Mr. Smishek) who is laughing there today so much, participated in the campaign. In fact, here is a return which showed that he spent, oh no, that's not him. But as I was saying, well you know, I ended up with thirty votes. If the Member from Touchwood (Mr. Meakes) had spent two weeks up there I am sure that I would have been good for 50.

**Mr. Meakes:** — That's why I didn't go!

**Mr. Guy:** — That's why he didn't go, he said. Well I appreciate that, Frank, and I'll do the dame for you when you have a by-election, I'll come up there and give you a hand.

You know, never in the history of this province was a by-election so poorly organized and carried out. You know, one

would have thought that the Premier of this province and the Attorney General would have taken particular pains to see that it was run properly in view of the fact the previous election was declared void due to irregularities. But this was not the case, I guess maybe Roy didn't have any influence because I know that he wanted it run properly. Instead, from the day that the by-election was called it was almost as if the NDP knew they didn't have any chance to win and the Premier and the Attorney General did everything in their power to lay the grounds for controverting the election before the people ever had a chance to cast their vote. We had a running battle from day to day trying to keep the election officials operating within the terms of The Election Act. Now everyone who knows anything at all about the Athabasca constituency — and it doesn't include the Attorney General or the Minister of Health — recognizes that the size and the transportation facilities, the mobility of the people, make it difficult to hold elections at any time of the year. They also know that these problems are increased the closer you get to freeze up, with its unsettled weather and shorter days. But the Premier and the Attorney General showed their ignorance or else they didn't have any concern for the residents of the constituency or for those whose responsibility it would be to carry out the by-election, because you know . . .

**Mr. Steuart:** — Were you up there Roy?

**Mr. Guy:** — No, he didn't or we should have had 60. Although Premier Blakeney had from the middle of May of last year to set up the election machinery and prepare for the by-election, do you know that he didn't even appoint a returning officer until the day that the writ was issued. Then he expected the man appointed, who was from Uranium City, who knew nothing about running an election . . .

**Mr. Steuart:** A man of the cloth!

**Mr. Guy:** — . . . and who had never been in any other polls of the constituency, to travel the vast expanse of the constituency to find DRO's, poll clerks, enumerators, rent polling places, enumerate, type and distribute voters' lists and make arrangements for the advance polls, all in 28 days. Now I'll tell you, for 28 days confusion reigned supreme and the Minister of Northern Saskatchewan (Mr. Bowerman) didn't help it any. And I want to make it clear that it was through no fault of the returning officer, no way, the full blame of this fiasco must rest squarely on the shoulders of the Premier who was responsible for allowing such an unnecessary chain of events to develop and for waiting until the last possible moment when the weather was at its worst to call a by-election.

You know, some local NDP supporters after the election were disenchanted and they came to me and they said, "You know I'm glad you won because the Premier held off for as long as he possibly could because he wanted to bring the Federal election into the Athabasca campaign." Because they said that the Premier believes that if you can get the Federal election and the Provincial by-election running together that the Indian people are going to be confused. Well I'll tell you that the people up there showed whether they were confused or not.

I'm glad the Premier has come in and I don't want to have to go back and say what I said about him before, but I want to say this, that he has to accept the full responsibility because he didn't call the by-election and he didn't appoint a returning officer until the day the writ was issued. You know, I find that rather strange and I'll tell you why I find it strange. I've lost my glasses and I might not be able to see, but I'll tell you why I find it strange. I picked up the Gazette of January 12th and I find in there that there have been some returning officers appointed — one for Regina North West; one for Saskatoon City Park; one for Saskatoon Mayfair. I'll tell you what's happened — all of a sudden in each of these constituencies he found people that needed some additional funds. They have been put on the payroll of the Provincial Government. There is not going to be a by-election in anyone of those seats in the foreseeable future, especially in Regina North West. There isn't going to be so far as we know and not only that but I will wager, Mr. Speaker, that the boundaries of those constituencies are not going to be what they are today. So why would the Premier of this province appoint returning officers in these constituencies years before an election is anticipated and yet in Athabasca he wouldn't appoint a returning officer, in a far more difficult seat, until the day he announced the by-election? Well, I know the answer — I hate asking my own questions and giving my own answers, but I am going to — he wanted to controvert that election from the day he called it because he knew he couldn't win.

**Some Hon. Members:** — Hear, hear!

**Mr. Guy:** — I'll tell you, if anybody walks in his sleep, it had to be the Minister of Northern Saskatchewan because he spent more time from June 1st until the election day sleeping in the constituency. In fact, if he had done some work they might have been able to elect their member. Well, you know, Mr. Speaker, to compound the confusion the Premier sent his special assistant, Don MacMillan, who also doubles as the Assistant Chief Electoral Officer — there is no Chief, to help the returning officer and it was like the blind leading the blind because Don knew even less about elections, he knew less about the Athabasca constituency than the returning officer, and he knew nothing. He knew nothing at all. And I say that in due deference to the Assistant Electoral Officer because he again was part of a plot by the Premier to controvert the election before there was ever an opportunity for the people to vote.

**Mr. McPherson:** — Is he a part of it?

**Mr. Guy:** — Well he had no choice. The Premier said, get up there and help add to the confusion, and he did.

**Some Hon. Members:** — Hear, hear!

**Mr. Guy:** — I'm sure from the conversations that the Assistant Electoral Officer and I had during the campaign that there was no confusion as to who were unbiased civil servants and who were unbiased Liberal candidates and so on. I think that was all clearly defined before the campaign was over. But I would say this, that this contempt by the Premier and his Cabinet and the NDP, for the people of the Athabasca constituency played no small part in the final result on election day.



You know, Mr. Speaker, there are about 55 minutes until I have to call adjournment for today, because it's Wednesday, but if I was to take the time of this House to recite all the problems we had in the irregularities that the Government tried and did get away with, it would take the full six days of the Throne Speech Debate. Therefore, I am only going to refer to a dozen or so of the most glaring discrepancies that occurred and I do this only to show the type of man the Premier is and the lack of conscience of the NDP political machine that we were dealing with.

You know, the setting up of the operation of the polls was disgraceful. Pelican Narrows had an advance poll in 1967 and 1971 to serve more than 400 voters. This year there were 300 additional voters to be served because of the road that was completed to Sandy Bay and do you know that this year when we asked, "Are you going to have an advanced poll in Pelican Narrows as has been the procedure in the past?" we were told, "No."

**Mr. Wiebe:** — Why?

**Mr. Guy:** — Well, I don't know but I have my suspicions. In spite of repeated arguments the answer remained "No" and when one looks at the results of 1971 you can only guess why the poll was refused — it was 75 per cent Liberal.

**Mr. Lane:** — What about Black Lake?

**Mr. Guy:** — Well, Black Lake was another Liberal poll that was promised an advanced poll by the returning officer but the day the advanced poll was to open it was cancelled. It was cancelled! It was cancelled without any consultation with the three other candidates. And in Uranium City even the advanced poll did not open on the first night that it was supposed to as it was proclaimed in the proclamation of the Government. In La Ronge they opened one hour late. Now the NDP tried to use the excuse of a plane accident, which delayed the ballots but . . . ah ha! the Premier laughs. I wish he had been on the plane. It would have shocked him a little perhaps. But I'll tell you, that that is no excuse because the only reason that those ballots were on that plane was because they tried to use an illegal ballot in the first place.

**Mr. Steuart:** — Did you know all this, Roy?

**Mr. Guy:** — Roy knew it but he turned a deaf ear to it. He needs one of those hearing aids that are going to be provided free by the government.

**Mr. Romanow:** — Who engineered . . .

**Mr. Guy:** — I don't know, I think it was the Member from Cutknife (Mr. Kwasnica) the way he is talking.

Cree Lake South, which has always had a poll as far back as any Member of the House can remember, had its poll proclaimed on the proclamation that came from the Government, but then the Assistant Chief Electoral Officer refused to set one up and when

I asked him why, he said, "It costs too much." So we figured out what it would cost and it would cost \$50 to set up a poll in Cree Lake, but \$50 was too much for the NDP Premier and his Government to give the franchise to the people there. But they wasted hundreds and thousands of dollars in unnecessary flying, enumerating and reprinting of ballots, all due to mismanagement and poor judgment. And when I asked the Assistant Chief Electoral Officer where are these people going to go to vote, I was told that that was their problem and who ever wanted them to vote could make the arrangements to have them vote at any other poll.

Then, in Pelican Narrows there were 15 to 20 people who lost their right to vote because they had to leave at 9:30 in the morning for a doctor's appointment which had been arranged for several weeks in Flin Flon. But the polls in Pelican didn't open until 11:30 — 2 1/2 hours after the time set by the Premier's proclamation. In La Ronge the nursing home was refused a poll, the patients then were also refused the opportunity to vote during election day at any of the regular polls and when I asked the Assistant Electoral Officer why, this was the action that was being followed, he told me that he had been in touch with the Attorney General and that was the advice that he had got from his office. And then a poll was set up at Anglo-Rouyn Mines the day before the election.

**Mr. Steuart:** — Wake up, Herman!

**Mr. Guy:** — You know, we were not advised and we would never have known that there was a poll at Anglo-Rouyn until one of the residents **phoned** in and asked if we wanted a scrutineer out there. A voters' list had been done two days before with a big typewritten line underneath saying, "No revision required."

**Mr. Lane:** — No scrutineer?

**Mr. Guy:** — And you know the enumeration was as bad, or worse than the poll organization. In La Ronge, Uranium City and across the constituency hundreds of voters were left off the list. The best deal was in La Ronge where they took four polls, and put them on one list, if a fellow had had a bicycle or a good fast car he could have voted four times before anybody found out. It all happened where the NDP polls are in La Ronge. I don't know why they didn't make it that way for the other polls.

**Mr. Rolfes:** — Is that how you won?

**Mr. Guy:** — No, because we were honest enough. We said to the Chief Electoral Officer, we will not stand for such shenanigans and we hurt ourselves because the polls had to be redone and we never even got the voters' list until the Saturday before election day, which was contrary to the Act.

Then you know, they also tried to set up a poll at a transient road camp where it was obvious that anybody there was not a resident of the constituency and this was done just four days before the election. The voters' list was compiled secretly and then again it claimed that there was no revision required.

**Mr. Steuart:** — No revision?

**Mr. Guy:** — No revision required! Well, thank heaven reason prevailed and we were able to have that poll thrown out where it belonged.

But you know, perhaps the most glaring attempt to controvert the election was in the printing of the ballots. Now you can check, Mr. Speaker, with the legislative record there of the legislation and it states clearly that the names appear on the ballot with the surname last. The Premier is looking as if he doesn't believe it. And I don't think that maybe he does because I tell you I am going to read in a few minutes a letter which came from the Premier to the people of Athabasca constituency and on the bottom it showed a sample ballot where the surname was first.

**Some Hon. Members:** — No . . .

**Mr. Guy:** — Oh, yes! That's our Premier, that's our good friendly friend of the people. New Deal, New Deal for People. But the Act does state clearly that the surname will be last unless otherwise agreed to in writing by all candidates within one hour after the close of nomination and none of the candidates agreed to change the legal form as outlined in the Act.

The first we were aware that all was not right with the world was when all the NDP literature came out with the surname first. I have several examples. Here is one here, "Dalby, Bob." Here is another one, "Dalby, Bob." Then, here is another one, "Dalby, Bob." Oh, here is the one that really takes the cake. Here is a picture of the Premier and "Dalby, Bob" and "Bowerman, Ted," sitting around and it says:

Dear Northern voter: I am writing to you on behalf of Bob Dalby.

But here at the bottom it says,

Yours sincerely, Allan Blakeney.

And then there is a sample ballot, "Dalby, Bob." Now who are you voting for Bob Dalby or Dalby, Bob? How do you know? All I suggest is, Mr. Speaker, that when this appeared on the Premier's letter that he knew the plot that was going on to controvert this election. He knew that he was not working within the confines of The Election Act, and I think that he should be ashamed of himself but by his laughter over there I guess he doesn't assume any responsibility for being an honest and forthright Premier that the people of the province will look up to, admire and enjoy.

**Mr. Lane:** — Herman doesn't believe you!

**Mr. Guy:** — Well Herman was only up there for a few days but he was too busy playing Bingo!

**Mr. Steuart:** — He's not even Catholic!

**Mr. Guy:** — Well you know we waited. Sure enough the official

ballots came out printed with the surname first. Well, we were naturally pretty upset. We took it up with the Assistant Chief Electoral Officer. He said, "Oh, yes but it's not my fault. The ballot error is the printer's fault." It appeared in the Leader-Post on September 19th. He said that the order in which the names of the candidates in the Athabasca by-election appear on the ballots is the result of a printer's error. If he had kept his mouth shut there he would have been ahead of the game. But he didn't, he went on and he said,

Mr. McMillan said the printing firm contracted to print the ballots had made a mistake in listing the candidates' surnames first

He said he had ordered the names to be printed Christian names first with one exception. With one exception! I wonder who it was. When you look at all these, what was the one exception that he had asked to have printed wrongly — Dalby, Bob? Well, Mr. McMillan said that he had ordered the ballot to be printed in the manner agreed to by the candidates. Well, this of course was absolutely false as I stated earlier. There was no suggestion that the Act would not be followed in regard to the printing of the ballots. But what really disturbed us is when we brought it to his attention and said, "If you use those ballots you will automatically controvert this election before it ever begins." When we asked whether the ballots would be reprinted he said he did not think there was time since the advance polls were to open on Wednesday. Well thank heavens, Mr. Speaker, reason prevailed and the ballots were reprinted. Can you imagine any government or political party knowingly printing the ballots in an illegal manner and then asking the candidate to support them in their wrongdoing?

Mr. Speaker, the irregularities that I mentioned are the frustrating aspects of the campaign but there are also some amusing ones and I want to take just a few moments to outline them to the House. I am sure that those Members who did not have the opportunity to come there and participate and there were very few of them who did not, I must admit. Well, one of the most amusing to those of us working in the campaign but probably not to the taxpayers of the province were the number of civil servants, Government Ministers, assistants, MLAs who were actively involved in the campaign through one guise or another. We got to know some of them pretty well before the campaign was over and I should like to take this opportunity to say 'thank you' to all of them on behalf of the Liberal Party and myself for a job well done.

**Some Hon. Members:** — Hear, hear!

**Mr. Guy:** — The first one that we have to recognize of course is Mr. Bill Allen, the Executive Assistant to the Minister of Northern Saskatchewan. For a salary of \$10,500 his Minister must have felt that winning the Athabasca by-election was one of the main aims of the Department of Northern Saskatchewan, for he was campaign manager for the NDP candidate and spent the full 28 days in the constituency at the taxpayers' expense. You know he did such a good job of losing the Athabasca by-election that they promoted him to be Provincial Secretary of the NDP. We say, thank God, because now his expenses will be paid by the NDP and not by the people of Saskatchewan.

**Mr. MacDonald: (Moose Jaw)** — Don't bet on it!

**Mr. Guy:** — Yes, that's a good comment.

Then we have Jason Shaw and Tony Wood who was a former defeated NDP candidate, both for the Department of Northern Saskatchewan again, regular workers in the NDP committee rooms, putting up posters, giving out literature . . .

**Mr. Steuart:** — Tearing ours down!

**Mr. Guy:** — Yes, and tearing ours down, again paid for by the taxpayers' money.

You know many of the NDP MLAs assisted in my victory — some more than others. I have already mentioned the help I received from the Member from Regina North West (Mr. Whelan). Others were equally helpful. The Rev. Don Faris, MLA for Arm River, Legislative Secretary to the Minister of Education and chairman of the committee studying the liquor legislation, was a regular visitor in my constituency from June until election day.

**Mr. Faris:** — I learned a lot about liquor.

**Mr. Guy:** — I missed that comment but I am sure it was a good one and he will have an opportunity . . .

**Mr. Faris:** — We'll get you a hearing aid.

**Mr. Guy:** — Oh, I have to get a hearing aid. I'm going to wait until I can get one free. I don't know how long I have to wait. But I think that toward the end of the campaign even he was getting confused, because on the Sunday before the election he attended our meeting in Pine House. Oh, yes, he arrived there on Saturday, his arms full of communion wine only to find that Pine House was 100 per cent Catholic and his services were not required. However, by the time of our meeting on Sunday afternoon . . .

**Mr. Faris:** — Mr. Speaker, on a point of personal privilege, I take it the Member intends that as a joke but if he is seriously accusing me of taking any wine or liquor into Pine House I want to challenge him and have him withdraw his remarks. It is absolutely untrue.

**Mr. Guy:** — Well, Mr. Speaker, I will take the Hon. Member's word for it. It is surprising that on his arrival that there was also a fair amount of "giggly" that appeared on the scene which can be documented by several sources. But if he says that he didn't bring it over for his Sunday School service I will certainly take his word for it. However, all I want to say is, by the time of our meeting on Sunday afternoon it was obvious that whatever had arrived had not gone to waste. But our meeting wasn't a complete loss, however, we did have a confession period where one of the Northern Advisory Council members told us he was working for the NDP, he had always been an NDP and he was proud to be working in the by-election at the taxpayers' expense.

He admitted that he was supposed to go from settlement to settlement explaining the role of the new Department of Northern Saskatchewan but that his Minister had told him to concentrate on the political angle during the election campaign. Freddy Thompson is the man in question. He was appointed to the Northern Advisory Council by the Hon. Minister, Mr. Bowerman, who is shaking his empty head and who assured us only a year ago in this same Legislature that these were not political appointments and that on being paid from the public purse he was working on behalf of everybody, not just the NDP. Thus his confession made the Rev. Mr. Faris a little uneasy as well as the people from Pine House who were attending the meeting and knew that it was not right to be using his public position for the benefit of the NDP. Well I have to put some of the blame on the MLA from Meadow Lake (Mr. Coupland) who also attended the meeting. It was the Member from Meadow Lake who happened to say publicly that Mr. Thompson had worked for the Tories, federally, in 1968 and it was at this moment that the Northern Advisory Council member took violent exception to this remark and confessed his active involvement in the by-election campaign on behalf of the NDP candidate. But it is interesting to note, Mr. Speaker, that the NDP vote went down from 117 to 64 in the Pine House Poll as a result of Mr. Thompson's confession and Rev. Mr. Faris' Sunday School meeting.

You know the Member from Prince Albert East (Mr. Feschuk), he's in his seat, was a steady visitor in my constituency and his poll was Sandy Bay. On election day he was caught on the horns of a dilemma. There were only three vehicles in Sandy Bay, two were privately owned and one was owned by the Department of Natural Resources. By 11:00 a.m. one of the privately owned vehicles was working for the Liberals, one of the privately owned vehicles was working for the independent candidate and it was obvious that the NDP was not doing that well. However, I want to congratulate the Member from Prince Albert East, he rose to the occasion with great aplomb. He didn't let the fact that there were the Liberals and the NDP beating him to the polls, he commandeered the government vehicle, covered the DNR insignia with NDP stickers, plastered the licence plate with mud and drove merrily on his way trying to make up for lost time. You know, Mr. Speaker, any other day it probably wouldn't have happened but on that particular day the RCMP happened to be in Sandy Bay. They saw a stranger driving the DNR truck and they stopped to see who it was. Well, fortunately for the Hon. Member no ticket was issued for an obscure licence plate or for tampering with government signs, or for that matter for uttering threats, as a local supporter told me that he had told them that their new houses would be discontinued if they didn't vote for the NDP candidate.

**Mr. Steuart:** — You did that, Mike?

**Mr. Guy:** — He did. Well, Mr. Speaker, these were the most obvious examples of the taxpayers' money and vehicles being used in the by-election but they were not the only ones. In many cases some more subtle examples were actually the most obvious when it came right down to it. You know the use of the taxpayers' money began long before the by-election was called. It actually began in the race for the NDP convention when Roy Myke, a member of the non-political Northern Advisory Council appointed by Mr. Bowerman became a candidate.

**Mr. Steuart:** — No one caught him working for the Government.

**Mr. Guy:** — That would be a shame. He began visiting each community in the constituency on government salary and expenses on the pretext of discussing the Department of Northern Saskatchewan. In fact it stated here and this was issued last year by the Hon. Minister, "Advisory Council to seek information in the North." Well, I must say that Mr. Myke certainly was seeking information but the information was how are the NDP going to do in the by-election. And I tell you if you think that it upset us, which it didn't, it certainly upset the other seven candidates when they saw him running around on government money and government expenses trying for the nomination that they were trying to get and having to use their own money to finance. However, he didn't turn out successful. But this gimmick of misuse of public funds came to my attention early in July. I toured many of the areas in the constituency and said, "Has Roy Myke from the DNS been in to hold a public meeting which was promised by the Minister?" And in community after community the answer was, "Oh, he has been here but we didn't see him," or "we never had a public meeting." He only went to those he thought were NDP and he had little pieces of paper that he was trying to sell them. They said, "We don't know what they were because they never asked us." But it appeared that these little pieces of paper were to give these people the right to vote for him in the nomination which was to follow. So it is obvious that he was far more concerned about the NDP nomination than he was in explaining the role of the new Northern Department. And you know he might have been successful if Ray Jones hadn't entered the picture.

This was the most sordid story of the whole campaign, as was pointed out by my colleague, the Leader of the Opposition the other day. It is hard to understand, Mr. Speaker, how a Premier and a political party that supposedly, and I say supposedly with reservations, stands for human rights and civil liberties, would calculatingly and deliberately deny an individual a nomination for the NDP because he was of Indian ancestry. This callous and brutal action by the NDP perhaps did more than anything else to destroy any credibility that the NDP and Premier Blakeney might have had against the two-thirds of my constituency that are of Indian ancestry.

You know other examples of the misuse of public funds were the continuing shuttle service between Regina and La Ronge and other northern points whereby ministers, executive assistants, deputy ministers, NDP MLAs and legislative committees, all visited the constituency on a regular basis. The three most regular Ministers, there is only one of them in his seat unfortunately, who were dubbed the 'troika' by the local residents, were Bowerman, Kramer and MacMurchy, and only when we received the return showing the use of the executive aircraft for June, July, August and September will the public really know how much they spent on campaigning for the NDP.

But you know I must not let this opportunity pass to thank the Minister of Highways (Mr. Kramer) for his statement a few days before the election that under no circumstances would the road from Waskesiu to La Ronge be dust freed in the foreseeable future. His statement helped significantly in the late stages of the campaign. I know the Premier is shaking his head

because he didn't like it either. He kind of sabotaged the efforts that they were spending the taxpayers' money on. And the Minister's derogatory statements about Anglo-Rouyn mine was also very helpful during the campaign, particularly in the La Ronge area. You know, Mr. Speaker, the Social Welfare Committee had a meeting proposed for Uranium City in, I think, July, and it was rescheduled to a date after the by-election had been called. Even then the meetings in Uranium City were a disaster. No appointments had been made by the chairman of the committee. The only members of the public who appeared were those whom the social worker was able to drag off the street. But I am sure that the taxpayers of this province will be pleased to note that at one public meeting in Uranium City, of which the Member from Nutana South (Mr. Rolfes) was one of the members at that meeting, that no one showed up and so here we had eight NDP and three Liberal Members with nothing to do. Well I tell you, again, I will give all 11 of them including my own supporters from this side of the House credit for being imaginative. They were in a hall where there was a bingo machine and they spent an hour and a half playing bingo.

**Mr. Lane:** — Who was the caller?

**Mr. Guy:** — So that they qualified to receive the per diem allowance for that day before the NDP Members got to the hustings to campaign.

**Mr. Lane:** — Who was the caller?

**Mr. Guy:** — I don't know who was the caller, maybe the chairman of the committee, but certainly it was a successful meeting for those who won the bingo games.

Perhaps the most bare-faced example of all time of the Government's use of public funds to win a by-election was the tour of the Premier and his full Cabinet just days before he announced the by-election. You know not only did they try to gain some political mileage by going up into my constituency, but they also tried some financial gain because here were the posters, "Cabinet Ministers Northern Tour." I'll tell you there were thousands of them printed. Guess who printed them? Well I will tell you. It says "Printed by Service Printing Company, 1630 Quebec Street." So not only did they hope to gain advantage by their tour but they also hoped to gain some financial support by giving the printing of the posters to Service Printing which is a privately owned little printing corporation, owned by the NDP.

**Mr. Lane:** — Was it tendered?

**Mr. Guy:** — Oh, I am sure it was tendered. You know the Premier tried to justify the tour on a non-political basis. You know what he told the public? "This is just another series of Cabinet meetings that we have been holding throughout the province." However, the people of Saskatchewan wondered why all of a sudden just days before a by-election, 11 meetings would be held in one constituency in one week, when only two or three had been held in the province in 14 months and there haven't been any held since.



I am afraid the public of Saskatchewan are not that naive, Mr. Premier, that they couldn't see through your flying circus.

You know apparently the Premier was not satisfied with the reports that his Party faithful were bringing back. Time was quickly passing, freeze-up was approaching, so in an attempt to overpower and awe the people in the constituency the Premier took his whole Cabinet north. You know, Mr. Speaker, nothing could have helped me more. You know, up until that time the residents in my constituency had only seen one or two Ministers, many had never seen the Premier and Members of his Cabinet.

**Mr. Bowerman:** — . . . seven year . . .

**Mr. Guy:** — Oh, they had seen you, they saw you many years ago. In fact they sent you back to the farm long before you ever came into the government.

But you know many had never seen the Premier and some of the Members of his Cabinet and here all of a sudden for the first time they saw the Premier and all the Members of his Cabinet at one time. When they were told that these were the people who were running the affairs of the province, responsible for the Department of Northern Saskatchewan, responsible for abolishing the Indian and Métis Department, my success at the polls was assured.

During that tour money was spent with wild abandonment. A typical example was on August 16th when the Attorney General (Mr. Romanow) and the Minister of Health (Mr. Smishek) went to Pelican Narrows and Sandy Bay about 100 miles from La Ronge. You aren't going to deny that are you Mr. Attorney General?

**Mr. Romanow:** — No, I was there.

**Mr. Guy:** — That's right! And do you know what they did to get there? They rented an Otter on wheels which carries 11 people — two of them. They could have gotten a Cessna which carries three, but they wanted to go in big style so they rented an Otter, an 11 passenger Otter for the two of them. And it took them to an airstrip within about three miles of the village of Pelican Narrows. Well then to get to the settlement they needed a float plane.

**Mr. Steuart:** — Oh no!

**Mr. Guy:** — Oh, yes! The nearest float plane was three miles away. There was a company who has a base at Pelican Narrows. But where did they get their float plane from? They wired back to La Ronge and they got a float plane to come over and take them the three miles to Pelican Narrows.

**Mr. Steuart:** — Oh no!

**Mr. Guy:** — And then they took the plane from Pelican Narrows to Sandy Bay, then back to La Ronge and what did the Otter do? The 11 passenger Otter went back to La Ronge empty.

**Some Hon. Members:** — Hear, hear!

**Mr. Guy:** — Oh yes, that is the way they operated. Well I'll tell you not only was it a waste of public funds — and the Minister of Public Health (Mr. Smishek) is getting rather red, he was before but he is getting redder. Not only was it a waste of public funds but maybe the Attorney General doesn't know but he broke DOT regulations, because the company from La Ronge had no right to pick up at that area and take people to Sandy Bay because it is a protected base. But that didn't worry the Attorney General after all he is only the Attorney General to protect the laws and look after the regulations.

But you know, Mr. Speaker, I can't complain that much because both of them bombed in both places and if you don't believe it look at the results at the polls.

**Mr. Blakeney:** — . . . airlines did . . .

**Mr. Guy:** — Well, I don't know who flew them, but you are admitting, Oh, I am glad the Premier admitted it. You know for a minute there was a cynical smile came over the Premier's face that the Attorney General would never send back to get a plane to come from La Ronge over 100 miles away to take two of his Ministers three miles. But now he says, "Oh yes one of the La Ronge companies do that and they are interested to know that they were breaking regulations." Well I am glad he has put on the records of the House exactly what I am saying. I hope that the microphone was turned on, it is wasn't, turn it on and make him say it again.

**Some Hon. Members:** — Hear, hear!

**Mr. Guy:** — Well anyway following the flying circus by the Premier and his stooges, reports didn't improve, so the next stage of the campaign in the election was called and became the promising stage.

Day after day until after the election a new promise was made and a new goody was given. You know our workers reached the point when they got up in the morning — and I'll say they got up before Ed got up — oh, he can't take any more. Juts wait a minute Mr. Premier, I have just one more comment you will appreciate. Anyway the promising stage came and our workers who got up at 6:00 in the morning prepared to see Ed stumbling out of the Union Hall at 10:30 a.m. saying, "I wonder what the goody for today will be?" You know, unfortunately, the promises made a year earlier had not been kept so these promises were not taken seriously. They made a good effort. Here is a flash from the Minister of Education (Mr. MacMurchy): "La Ronge to get community college".

Well I'll tell you that the way their school was being run it needed a community college like they needed several other things. They needed a school system that had a principal to control and bring some sense into the system that is what they needed. Maybe they are going to get it now because they got a new principal and do you know why?

**An Hon. Member:** — Why?

**Mr. Guy:** — Well the old principal

became Director of Education because he was the agent for the NDP candidate.

**Mr. Lane:** — Oh, no!

**Mr. Guy:** — When this great paper came out and I want the Attorney General (Mr. Romanow) to see this, “Athabasca Advance.” “Bob Dalby is winning.” I wonder if he had been losing what they would have said, because I’ll tell you this was a great one. “The new department headquarters now moving to the North,” was one promise. Then they took away all the benefit of that headline by saying,

39 people will be working at the department headquarters in La Ronge. This will grow to about 90 in the next year.

And if there is anything that the local people of La Ronge don’t want, is a civil servant looking over their shoulders every hour of every day of every month of the year.

But they didn’t stop there, they went on to say — and this is where the Minister of Health (Mr. Smishek) gets into the act. He didn’t want to be outdone because he couldn’t spend as much time up there as the other Ministers but he said, “NDP Government provides grants for better hospital services.” Well, now you know, Mr. Minister, you misled the public or you tried to. Thank heaven my colleague the Member for Milestone (Mr. MacDonald) was up there to set the record straight. Those grants were exactly the same grants that had been provided by the Liberal Government. The fact that you were providing an additional grant was because the tender came in higher than it was expected and you had the responsibility. In fact, you had no alternative but to pay these additional grants. I am surprised at the Minister of Health for doing that.

And then there is one where Bob Dalby is shaking his fist and he says, “\$500 grant is a kind of action Bob Dalby supports.” This came from Ed. Tchorzewski, because he wanted to send some people to the Summer Games. Oh, it was only about three years ago that the Liberal Government had provided \$1,000 for exactly the same type of a grant to send students to sporting events.

**Mr. MacDonald:** (Milestone) — Where did they go . . .

**Mr. Guy:** — Here is a good one. “Fire fighters get 60 per cent more from the New Democratic Government.” Well all Members of this House know that I asked the Minister of Labour (Mr. Snyder) about the fire fighters’ wages and the first reply was, “No, they are exempted because they live in the North.” It was only because we continued to go after him day after day that he finally agreed when he thought it would be politically expedient.

Then there was, “Lower power rates help all communities served by SPC. Dalby says Uranium City next.” All I want to tell you is that we welcomed those lower rates and I am not making fun of that, but I am suggesting that Mr. Dalby had his nerve to say that Uranium City will be next when the SPC doesn’t even own the operation in Uranium City. He is going out on the limb when he takes that under his consideration.

Then we had, "Uranium City to have Direct Dialing soon." Have we got it yet? No! "Powerful local councils will be a reality," Mr. Bowerman said. I read in the paper the other day where there has been one elected a few days ago and this was back in September that it was going to be a reality. Green Lake got a local council just the other day. Where are the rest of them, Mr. Minister?

**Mr. Bowerman:** — Our record is still better than yours.

**Mr. Guy:** — Oh, don't be silly. It shows that when you are up there you are politicking instead of listening to the people. You don't know what is going on. But I'll tell you that the best one of all came from my friend the Minister of Health (Mr. Smishek) when he said, "Regular Dental Service announced for Uranium City." This is good! The Government was going to provide it. It wasn't very long after that that I picked up a copy of the Northland News and the Municipal Corporation had an ad in it that said, "The College of Dentistry, University of Saskatchewan, has advised that two dental residents of the University Hospital will provide care in Uranium City."

It wasn't completely the Government. Oh, I think that the Government had something to do with it. Yes, I think that the Government was going to pay a part of it. They weren't going to pay all of it. But I'll tell you what the Government was going to do. They were going to administer it, right? You were going to administer it.

**Mr. Smishek:** — . . . is going to administer . . .

**Mr. Guy:** — Oh, I see it is going to be administered by the university. Oh, in other words it is not your program!

**Mr. Smishek:** — Sure it is, the Government pays for it.

**Mr. Guy:** — But who is going to administer it?

**Mr. Smishek:** — We are going to pay for it and they are going to . . .

**Mr. Guy:** — Oh, you are going to pay for it and they are going to administer it. That makes a lot of sense. I am sure that the University would enter into a deal like that. They entered into a deal because you have said right here in this paper that it is a government service.

**An Hon. Member:** — Sure it is.

**Mr. Guy:** — Yes, sure it is and that is why I believe it is. Because in the last issue of Northland News, January 18th an announcement, "The dentists will not be arriving in Uranium City until February. Watch for further notice." And it was promised for the 15th of November and here in the middle of January you haven't even got the administration set up for this program.

The Minister of Public Health (Mr. Smishek) tried to take advantage of a political campaign to mislead the people of Uranium city. Shame on him!

Well I am sorry that the Premier is gone because the best promise of all . . .

**Mr. Romanow:** — I'm taking notes.

**Mr. Guy:** — Are you, good! Well, the best promise of all was when the Premier was in Uranium City and he announced lower beer prices. His tour was immediately nicknamed 'Beer Bust'.

In association with these promises there was the stepped up advertising publicity campaign. All of a sudden the only newspaper in the constituency received the greatest pronouncement of government information that we have seen over the years.

For three months they only had 347 column inches or about 115 per month, but in the month of September during the by-election it received 228 column inches, double what they had received months earlier. This was an obvious and blatant attempt to buy the support of the paper for the NDP candidate.

Well I'll tell you that the height of the ridiculous appeared in the August 15th edition, when they announced the time and the date of the Lloydminster hearing of the Legislative Committee to study foreign ownership. There is no agricultural land within 300 miles of Uranium City. If you think that the payoff has ended, you are wrong. January 18th, "Saskatchewan Land Bank Commission leasing land" appeared in the Northland News.

**Some Hon. Members:** — Hear, hear!

**Mr. Guy:** — How far can you go in this blatant attempt to pay off your political debts?

You know a similar situation appeared in the Northern News Radio program each day over CKBI. During the month that the campaign was in progress each news cast was filled with political propaganda. And if that wasn't obvious the programs started and ended with a voice clip from the NDP candidate.

Well, finally, Mr. Speaker, election day came and election day went and in spite — in spite I say, but perhaps I should say more likely because — of the deliberate poor organization of the election machinery, the involvement of civil servants, Ministers, MLAs, the Premier's flying circus, the promises, the advertising, the publicity programs, most of it at public expense, the NDP lost the election by a greater margin than they had a year earlier.

Tomorrow I am going to bring to the attention of the public what it cost first of all to get into the by-election. It cost the Government of Saskatchewan more than \$6,000 to create this by-election and they spent God knows how much more — I don't suppose we'll get the answer until after the session is over — to run the by-election plus all the advertising, publicity and trips that I have mentioned here this afternoon, and what did they get?

I'll tell you what they got. They got 482 less votes than they got the time before. There were 482 more people who voted against them after they had gone through all this ridiculous electioneering. People can be fooled, as Mr. Steuart said the other day. The Premier can fool the rabbits but you can't fool the people of northern Saskatchewan.

**An Hon. Member:** — Who said that?

**Mr. Steuart:** — I did and it was a very good quote.

**Mr. GUY:** — But you know in the overall analysis, Mr. Speaker, everyone appears to be happy with the election result. I'm certainly pleased to be able to represent the constituency again. Bob Dalby has been hired to do a study for the Department of Northern Saskatchewan, even though a similar study was done about three years ago by the Indian and Métis Department. The NDP official agent, Mr. Lindgren has been appointed Director of Education, he is certainly happy. Mr. Hammersmith, one of the candidates for the NDP nomination has been appointed as executive assistant to the assistant deputy minister of the DNS and his wife has been hired by the school board, they are certainly happy. Mr. Paroda, another candidate for the NDP nominating convention had his position reclassified at a higher salary. He is certainly happy. And Mr. Quant, the president of the La Ronge NDP has received a contract without tendering to provide propane for the new office building for the Department of Northern Saskatchewan in La Ronge. The only two who perhaps have been overlooked by the NDP Government in handing out of political patronage were the two candidates of Indian ancestry who originally contested the NDP nominations. This of course is not unexpected as the record to date shows the Department of Northern Saskatchewan is not interested in hiring local people or people of Indian ancestry if they can avoid it.

Well, Mr. Speaker, since there are a few comments that I should like to make regarding the Department of Northern Saskatchewan, the Throne Speech, the Premier's remarks today, I beg leave to adjourn debate.

Debate adjourned.

## **MOTION**

### **LEAVE OF ABSENCE**

**Mr. R. Romanow: (Attorney General)** — Mr. Speaker, I wonder if I might introduce a motion seconded by the Member from Weyburn (Mr. Pepper):

That Leave of Absence be granted to the Hon. Member Notukeu-Willow Bunch on and from January 30, 1973 until February 3, 1973 to attend on behalf of this Assembly, a National Prayer Breakfast in Washington, D.C.

**Mr. Guy:** — Mr. Speaker, could I just ask one question of the Attorney General. Is this at the expense of the Legislative Assembly or the Government?

**Mr. Romanow:** — My information is that it is at the expense of the individual Member and not at the expense of the Assembly.

Motion agreed to.

The Assembly adjourned at 5:30 o'clock p.m.