

LEGISLATIVE ASSEMBLY OF SASKATCHEWAN
Third Session — Seventeenth Legislature
7th Day

Friday, February 2, 1973.

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

STATEMENT

WORDING OF RESOLUTIONS

Mr. Speaker: — Throughout the last few years there has been discussion as to the proper form of a Resolution in regard to preambles. I refer Hon. Members to Beauchesne's Parliamentary Rules and Forms, Fourth edition, 1958, page 165.

A substantive motion is a self-contained proposal submitted for the approval of the House and drafted in such a way as to be capable of expressing a decision of the House.

And further on page 166:

A motion should not be argumentative and in the style of a speech nor should it contain unnecessary provisions or objectionable words. Motions are usually expressed in the affirmative, even where their purpose and effect are negative.

Further in Bourinot's Rules of Order, Revised by J.G. Dubroy, page 28:

A preamble is objectionable in any motion or proposed resolution. When a motion is agreed to, it becomes a resolution. It is a common practice to prefix preambles to a set of resolutions, but it is at variance with correct parliamentary usage, and can be easily avoided by a careful framing of a motion.

I want to emphasize to all Hon. Members that a preamble is argumentative and is not to be part of a motion. Certainly arguments can be offered during the debate on the motion but should not be part of the motion.

After very careful consideration of Resolutions Nos. 4, 5, 6, 7, 9 and 10, as they appear in the Routine Proceedings and Orders of the Day, I rule that the said Resolutions do contain preambles. Any irregularity in a Resolution renders the whole Resolution irregular. (Beauchesne's Parliamentary Rules and Forms, Fourth Edition, 1958, page 167.) On the other hand, by means of small amendments, the irregularities in the above mentioned Resolutions can be corrected. (See previous rulings in Journals of the Legislative Assembly of Saskatchewan, March 5, 1952, page 125; March 17, 1970, page 97 and August 10, 1971, page 33.)

For the above reasons, I will amend the Resolutions as follows:

Resolution (No.4) — delete the word "supports" and

substitute the words “press for.”

Resolution (No.5) — delete the words “in recognition of its concern about the disruptions to grain and livestock producers resulting from unstable feed grain prices and serious shortages of feed grains.”

Resolution (No.6) — delete the words “deploring inequitable freight rates which burden Saskatchewan industry.”

Resolution (No.7) — delete the words “recognizing its serious concern at the plight of our senior citizens.”

Resolution (No.9) — delete the words “recognizing the inherent instability in world grain prices and markets, and the disrupting effect this instability has on the remainder of agriculture and the provincial economy.”

Resolution (No. 10) — delete the words “regrets to learn of” and substitute the word “opposes”.

I shall ask the Clerk to make these corrections and print them accordingly so that the Members can be prepared when the Resolutions do come up.

WELCOME TO STUDENTS

Mr. D.W. Michaluk (Redberry): — Mr. Speaker, I should like to introduce to you and through you to the Hon. Members of this Assembly three groups of high school students, some 150 in number, from the three high schools in the Blaine Lake School Unit, seated in the west gallery and the Speaker’s Gallery. Leask and Marcelin High Schools are on the periphery of my constituency and the Shellbrook constituency, while the Blaine Lake Composite High School is within my constituency.

In the Marcelin group, Mr. Speaker, I recognize many familiar faces as it was in this school that I spent the last four years of my teaching profession and I have had the privilege of instructing some of them. I did have the privilege of substitute teaching in the Leask High School after my retirement so there are some familiar faces there also. Mr. Wayne Wilte who is accompanying the Marcelin group was on the teaching staff at Marcelin at that same time. I want, Mr. Speaker, to extend a particular welcome to Mr. Ken Kulrick, principal of Blaine Lake Composite High School and his group from Blaine Lake and the surrounding area. In this group are some students from the village where I reside, the village of Krydor.

Mr. Speaker, I welcome the entire group here today. It is my sincere hope that they will profit in an informative and educational sense from their trip to the capital city and this Legislature. Undoubtedly, Mr. Speaker, their presence here this afternoon will give each one of them an insight into our democratic process. It is my wish and hope that their return home will be safe.

Hon. Members: — Hear, hear!

Hon. G.R. Bowerman (Shellbrook): — Mr. Speaker, it is indeed my privilege this afternoon

to welcome that same group of students to the Assembly. The students are from the Shellbrook constituency as the Hon. Member from Redberry has indicated. At least two of the schools are in the constituency of Shellbrook. I am sorry to say that I was unable to meet them prior to their coming to the Assembly this afternoon. Perhaps that privilege will be extended to me when they leave the Chamber and I shall have an opportunity to speak with them.

It is not often that the Shellbrook constituency is represented here in the galleries during the sessions. Our constituency is somewhat removed from the capital city and the efforts that are required to be here are considerably greater than for those who are in closer proximity. I am pleased that the students and those who accompanied them this afternoon made this special effort to be here. I am pleased and delighted to be associated with them and to welcome them to the Chamber.

I want to wish, Mr. Speaker, and I am sure all Members of the House want to wish the students a safe journey home and that their trip will have been considered by them both to have been a challenging and informative afternoon in the Legislature of the Province of Saskatchewan. We bid them a safe journey home and an early return.

Hon. Members: — Hear, hear!

Mr. J.R. Kowalchuk (Melville): — Mr. Speaker, once again I have the honor of welcoming through you, Sir, another group of 75 high school students from Melville. These 75 students are seated in the Speaker's Gallery to the north.

Yesterday we had Grade Eight students from St. Henry's High School from Melville and today, once again, we have another group under the supervision of the very same Bob Reid and also two other teachers, the Art teacher, Miss Koltan and the French teacher, Mr. Peter Johnston to supervise them. They have brought another group of 75 students here today from St. Henry's. I want to welcome these 75 Grade Nine students from St. Henry's Separate High School from Melville.

Many of these students attending here today and yesterday were from the Melville School Unit. I had the honor of being a member of that Board for a total of 13 years. Also, all of these students next year will be attending the Melville Comprehensive School, the school that serves all the students in the Fourth Division in the Melville area including the Melville Unit, the Melville Public School and the Melville St. Henry's.

I am certain these Grade Nine students are looking forward with great zeal and great interest to get to Grade Ten at the Melville Comprehensive School.

I am sure, Mr. Speaker, that all Members of this Legislature welcome these 75 students and the staff with the sincere hope that this afternoon will be concrete evidence of how democracy works and how the elected Members contribute to its functioning for the betterment of the people of Saskatchewan. We want to wish them a good educational afternoon, Mr. Speaker, and a good, safe trip back home.

Hon. Members: — Hear, hear!

QUESTIONS

EXPENSES OF SPECIAL INTERSESSIONAL COMMITTEES

Mr. D.G. Stuart (Leader of the Opposition): — Before the Orders of the Day, I wonder if I can ask the Premier if he would give us a commitment in regard to Orders for Return 20, 21, 22, 23 and 24. I will tell him what those are. These are the Orders for Return giving us the information in regard to the Intersessional Legislative Committees as to cost, their makeup and especially the total cost. The reason we need this as quickly as possible — we just got this Interim Report on the Special Committee on Welfare and it is a disgrace. I am sure they held 37 meetings, heard 200 briefs, spent unknown thousands of dollars and there is nothing in it. If this is the best we can get out of a whole year of these committees, it is absolutely a waste of taxpayers' money.

We have two Members on this committee and it didn't follow the terms of reference. This report is an absolute disgrace.

Mr. Speaker: — Order, order! We can't have a debate on asking a question.

Hon. A.E. Blakeney (Premier): — Mr. Speaker, the Member asks for a commitment. I have reviewed those Orders. They haven't been ordered by the Legislature yet. The Legislature can't order them in that particular form since they ask all the people who attended the meetings and I am advised that nobody kept a count of all the members of the public who may have attended a particular meeting so we can't pass them in this form. If we make that amendment and I have amendments prepared ready to move at the appropriate time, then my information from the Clerk is that this information is available and we will be happy to supply it.

I think, Mr. Speaker, that the Interim Report of the Committee on Welfare is on the Order Paper and I would suggest the Hon. Member debate the shortcomings or otherwise of that particular committee's report at that time at the appropriate occasion.

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).

Mr. F. Meakes (Touchwood): — Mr. Speaker, when I adjourned the debate yesterday, I had passed my compliments and congratulations to the three new Cabinet Ministers, to the Member from Athabasca (Mr. Guy) and I had dealt for a few minutes on what I considered the shortcomings of the Opposition.

I should now like to turn to the Speech from the Throne and look at it in some detail; examine it in light of the needs and the aspirations of the people of Touchwood and how it will affect them. After reading the Speech over I am convinced it will go

down in history as one of the great ones on the record of our province.

Touchwood constituency which I represent is widely diversified in its people, in its geography and in what it produces. We have extremely good wheat lands in the Cupar plains, through to the beautiful rolling Touchwood Hills with all its early history, through to the Beaver Hills north of Ituna and on out to Theodore. Here are the mixed farms with many herds of cattle and hogs. The whole area through the years has been a reasonably sure moisture area. And here we have citizens that originated from every country of Europe. A real Canadian mosaic and one that I am proud of.

Over the years this has been a small farm area, but in recent years because of short-sighted policy and successive Liberal and Conservative governments, more and more of these small farms have found their backs to the wall and have been forced to leave the land to go to the cities and start a new life.

For many years governments and their programs, both federal and provincial, have assisted and encouraged this trend. They have worshipped at the shrine of bigness and of economic units. If we are to be a happy, vibrant, prosperous nation we must have farm policies that make this possible. If the traditional family farm is to survive, governments must immediately bring in programs to stop this exodus of the young people and encourage and assist the smaller farmers to diversify. In the end this will not cost society a cent, but rather it will be an investment. People working and producing food for a hungry world will enrich our society much, much more than people on welfare and it will also enrich the lives and the minds of the people.

Mr. Speaker, when I look at the Speech from the Throne and its contents in the light of what I have said and how it affects my constituency, I also look at it in the light of the election program of the New Deal for People that I and all New Democratic candidates went to the voters of Saskatchewan on. When I do this I am pleased with the document. As a democratic socialist of which I am proud I see the beginnings of our program. I also see programs that I believe will help solve some of Touchwood's problems. Let me point out to this House just a few of them.

The first I see is the FarmStart program. This program operated in conjunction with the Land Bank will begin to reverse the trend of few young people entering the business of farming. I do not say it will be a cure-all, but I believe it will be an assist. I see that it is a way for many present small farmers to stabilize their operations and in general make a more healthy farm community. When I talk of the farm community, I not only mean the farmers but I include the villages, the towns and the business people that serve our farmers. They are completely dependent on the economic welfare of the agricultural sector and when farmers prosper they prosper. When times are hard they suffer as well as the farmer and in some ways even worse.

I see that plans are afoot to strengthen the hog marketing commission. Here is another step in the right direction. For years we have had the situation of fluctuation in the price of pork as the demand or the lack of demand of the product went.

February 2, 1973

As long as I can remember the price of pork has gone from one extreme to the other. If we were to get into the world market and in particular the Asian market, then the source of production must be uniform. I believe that a hog marketing commission is a step in the right direction.

Farmers will appreciate anything that can be done in assuring the availability of machinery repair parts and warranty performance. In recent years one of the chief complaints I hear is often the long wait on repairs, also on the problem of getting proper warranty service. I am glad that this is mentioned in the Speech from the Throne. It is a national disgrace in my opinion. Surely when a farmer buys a \$10,000 or a \$20,000 machine, he should be able to get some good service for it. I only wish a provincial government had the power to do something about the prices of machinery and repairs.

I see in the Speech from the Throne a new program to assist senior citizens to repair and improve the home. This has been long needed and will be a popular program.

I am proud to see that plans are afoot to conserve every foot of forest products in the North. After the tour in 1970 that the Leader of the Opposition (Mr. Steuart) who was then the Provincial Treasurer, arranged for some MLAs to go through the pulp wood area, I was convinced that something drastic had to be done. The absolute waste that I saw was sickening. The people of this province have too big an investment in their natural resources to see them squandered. If there was one thing that defeated the Liberal Government in 1971 it was the resource giveaway and the resource waste. It is only a government like that government which worshipped at the shrine of international corporate enterprise that would succumb to such a disgraceful policy.

With all the talk of fuel shortage in the world and with some 99 per cent of oil reserves in this country in the hands of a few oil companies, I welcome the announcement of the establishment of a Crown corporation to take part in the exploration for gas and oil. I hope this is one way of assuring that the people of this province will be protected in fuel supplies. I, for one, hope that in the future it can be extended into the production field as well.

The announcement of further steps to reduce property taxes for school purposes will be welcome. Tax rates under the previous government grew and grew. Some of the local governments of Touchwood saw an increase from 1964 to 1971 of up to 20 mills. This news of large sums of money for local government plus increased Property Improvement Grants is another step in implementing a New Deal for People.

For many years New Democrats have talked of the necessity of bringing in legislation to control the expenses of candidates of political parties. I am pleased that this will be done and this is another step to fulfil the New Deal for People.

For 100 years the two old parties have been able to use the slush funds of corporations and special privileged groups. Ordinary citizens' rights have often been forgotten in the face of listening to these groups. The old adage of, 'He who pays the piper calls the tune' is still true. Mr. Speaker, this Speech from the Throne is an example of what a people's

government that owes no allegiance to special groups can do. I am proud to be a part of this Government and to be taking part in seeing that both legislation and programs are what the people of Touchwood and in Saskatchewan want.

Now, Mr. Speaker, I should like to turn to what I have always done ever since I have been a Member representing Touchwood and review conditions in Touchwood in the last year. It is a rural constituency depending on agriculture and I must say that the finances of farmers have been a bit better the last year. Good cattle prices, free sale of grain and they have been able to payoff a few debts. But let me tell you the economic squeeze is still on. There are still farmers forced to leave the land. You will see auction sales this fall again. We need new programs to assist and I think that one of those programs is the Land Bank. I am not alone in this, I want to quote from an editorial from the Western Producer on January 25th in part:

The Saskatchewan Government is to be commended for making this positive move which is designed to facilitate the transfer of farm land from one generation to the next. The Land Bank system is an important measure which in effect introduces a major readjustment of the land tenure system we have known in this country since the first days of settlement. In the past two decades or so there have been growing doubts about the old system and its effectiveness in maintaining the family farm structure.

They said the program for financing young farmers is going to be a good one. It is certainly going to need better and more technical advice.

I want to express the appreciation of those people from villages and towns from Ituna to Semans who this year got natural gas. It was a long seven years of Liberal Government that they waited and they had promised them and again promised. I want to say how much we appreciate it.

I am happy to see that the Cupar Nursing Home which is nearing completion will be, I believe, taking in guests by early April. Now, with the new criteria, I am hopeful that we can have some more of these in Touchwood and I know that the area of Ituna is already working on it.

I want to speak on behalf of the hospital in Lestock, the need for updating this hospital. I hope that when the Budget comes in that there will be something for this.

I want to turn for a moment or two, Mr. Speaker, to our native people. There is still a great need to assist these people. I am hoping that in the coming year that we may see an industrial school at Punnichy with the co-operation of the Federal Government, the Provincial Government and the Govan School unit. There is a great need to find employment, to start local industry, to involve the native people themselves. I want to also congratulate the Métis society in the building of the Lestock home. It was practically an all local effort done mostly by people who were untrained. It was a real "good training project. It might have cost a few more dollars than if you had employed an outside contractor and skilled labor but I do believe that it was a worthwhile training project. There is great need of upgrading and giving technical training and then finding

employment for these people. If not what will happen? What is going to happen to democracy? I should like to ask a few questions.

Have we got democracy? If so, will it survive? If it isn't surviving what can we do to revive it? What happens if we don't act on it now? I want to suggest to this House, Mr. Speaker, there is one word that is mouthed, used and abused and it is the word 'democracy'. We use the word as though it was something accomplished. I am not saying that we haven't a degree of democracy and I am not certain that we will ever achieve the ideal, but I am saying that we have not got it anywhere in the world to my knowledge. Immediately someone will say that we do have the right to vote, to choose our representatives, to govern ourselves. I will not argue that too much, except to say that the candidates or the political party which has the most money is more liable to win. Also as long as we allow lobbyists with their money and their privileges to operate, there will be no real voting democracy either.

But there is more to democracy than voting. As long as there is no economic or racial freedom in our society there will be no real democracy. In fact I am not sure that the little democracy that we have will survive unless drastic action is implemented and implemented soon. Throughout the world the rich are getting richer, the poor are getting poorer. Our mass media is getting faster and faster. We now can see to a greater degree than ever before how the other half of the world lives. If something is not done to narrow the gap between the haves and the have-nots then I am afraid there will be uprisings and strife and rebellion by the underdogs and we shall be to blame. Unless we of the more advanced nations can find a way to get our surplus food, medicine, etc., to those countries that are hungry and sick the time may come when they will come and take it from us. Let no one say we can't afford it. We, in the western world, can find money to build aeroplanes and bombs, produce our sons and daughters for cannon fodder, let us not say we cannot be our brother's keeper. We call ourselves a Christian society. I say we are a disgrace to the Christian philosophy. How many of us would sacrifice our nice homes, our new car, our weekends at the lake, our three weeks holidays or any other of our modern conveniences that we take for granted.

I ask how many of us really never see the color of the skin of those we meet? Or never stop to think of what the person's religious or ideological belief is. Or how financially successful that person is. I don't claim to be blameless, but unless society is prepared to bury its prejudices, we never can expect to come close to achieving true democracy.

Let us not forget that the white man came to America, took over the land from the natives by force, stole their women and herded the natives onto reserves and has exploited them ever since. Mr. Speaker, I am worried at the reaction of our society to the underprivileged. More and more their attitudes are hardening, more and more they are suggesting tougher and tougher remedies. I want to suggest there must be patience, understanding and assistance.

Today in some of the larger areas of our country there are now third and fourth generation welfare recipients. Children who grew up in the morass of poverty and unemployment have little chance to improve themselves. In my opinion governments must

act now. They must bring employment, must improve housing, education and find a way to lift the unfortunate. Otherwise, we in Canada, will face the problems of Little Rock, Birmingham, Watts, Chicago or Washington.

Mr. Speaker, I realize that I have been sermonizing. I make no apologies. I have spent a lifetime fighting for the democratic process. I still have faith and optimism in that we can achieve this goal as a reality. We must be prepared to change in this new technological age, change to meet the new needs and the new techniques.

Mr. Speaker, because this Speech from the Throne is aimed at some of the things I have been talking about, and I see the possibilities of improving our lot in our society, I will be opposing the amendment and I will be Supporting the motion.

Some Hon. Members: — Hear, hear!

Mr. E.F. Gardner (Moosomin): — Mr. Speaker, my first words must be to congratulate the NDP Members from Nutana South (Mr. Rolfes) and Gravelbourg (Mr. Gross) for a good presentation in moving and seconding this Motion. I should also like to congratulate my colleague, Mr. Allan Guy, for a well deserved win in Athabasca and we welcome him back to this House.

Mr. Speaker, since the last session of the Legislature no Government program has received as much attention as the Land Bank. The rural people of this province have been subjected to a constant barrage of NDP propaganda which has been expensive, contradictory, misleading and deceitful. The purpose of this campaign was to promote and to salvage from disaster a plan that is basically unsound, and as a result of this campaign, the people of this province are confused as to the motives, objectives and operation of the Land Bank scheme. Most people suspect that the plan is costly, inefficient and harmful to our rural way of life but the details are often lacking.

I should like to review the history of the Land Bank from the time it was first conceived until the present, in the hope that the details will be more clearly understood.

Now we are not sure when the NDP first decided to take over the farm land of Saskatchewan. We know, for example, that at NDP conventions in recent years this has been one of the major issues. From the 1969 convention we note: "A resolution aimed at eventual public ownership of farm land was passed Thursday by an agricultural panel at the Saskatchewan NDP convention." At this and later NDP conventions, the pattern became clear. A great majority of the NDP were in favor of a takeover of farm land, but a battle developed between the Union people and the Wafflers on one side, who wanted publicly to make their intentions known, and another more politically minded group who also wanted to take over the land, but wanted to do it in a more discreet and subversive manner. At the 1969 convention the fight was chiefly between the Trade Unionists, such as Len Wallace, an NDP delegate from Regina East, against the political people, such as John Burton, Jack Messer and Alf Gleave.

After the NDP became the Government, the battle continued. The Unionists, now joined by the Wafflers said, "Let's be

honest and say publicly that our intention is to own and control the farm land and the farmers.” The politicians wanted the NDP Government to own and control the land but were afraid to say so publicly.

Reports of their 1971 convention were a little more explicit and revealed such information as follows: “A motion to delete the option to buy clause was made by William Gilbey, former President of the Saskatchewan Federation of Labour.” John Gordon of Moosomin, a Waffler, quoted Agricultural Minister Messer as saying that during a closed panel discussion, that he would (that is Mr. Messer) would see to it that the Government made leasing of the land more attractive than the option to purchase.

Speaking of the option to buy, Don Faris, MLA for Arm River, and I am glad to see that he is in his seat, was reported in the Leader-Post as saying that our Government could fail on that. The Liberals could come out with an option and destroy us at the next election. The tone of their dispute can be noted by the report that tempers began to show with Don Mitchell a Waffle spokesman, telling Mr. Kramer to sit down and shut up.

Some Hon. Members: — Hear, hear!

Mr. Gardner: — They compromised, Mr. Speaker, by referring in the Bill to selling after five years, but in no way is it an option to buy. My purpose in supplying this background is to make one point perfectly clear to start with. Some NDP have stated publicly, some privately, but they agree in principle. The NDP in Saskatchewan wants to take over the farm lands of the province and wants to have the land owned by the state. Let everyone, Mr. Speaker, be clear on that point, because it is the NDP philosophy in the Land Bank system. In order to make it sound better the present Minister of Agriculture (Mr. Messer) keeps saying that he is changing the land tenure system of Saskatchewan which is simply a more acceptable way of saying that he is grabbing all the farm land he can get for the socialist state.

Some Hon. Members: — Hear, hear!

Mr. Gardner: — With the NDP objective now clear in our minds we can examine the methods they have used and plan on using to accomplish their goal of state ownership of the farms. They had several schemes in mind. First the Estate Tax legislation passed by the NDP last year will make it difficult for farm land to be passed on to sons and daughters. This break-up of family farms will make it easier for the NDP to get control of the land. Second, the Foreign Ownership Bill would prevent an elderly farmer from leaving his land to someone in a neighboring province and would prevent any farmer from selling land outside the province thus restricting his market and putting him at the mercy of NDP land buyers.

Some Hon. Members: — Hear, hear!

Mr. Gardner: — Third, the former Liberal Government had a policy of selling presently held Crown land to needy farmers. Hundreds

of thousands of acres were sold but the NDP put an immediate stop to this policy in order to keep the land in the hands of the NDP Government. Fourth, Mr. Speaker, one of the most vicious schemes by the NDP to promote the Land Bank has become obvious in the past few months. The Federal Small Farm Development program is a plan to help transfer land directly from an older retiring farmer to a younger needy farmer. At this time I should like to tell you basically what the Federal plan proposes to do. First, retiring farmers would be granted a cash subsidy in addition to the regular selling price if they sold to a needy young farmer.

Some Hon. Members: — Hear, hear!

Mr. Gardner: — The buyer of the land, Mr. Speaker, must not have assets of over \$60,000 which means he is a relatively small farmer in this day and age.

Some Hon. Members: — Hear, hear!

Mr. Gardner: — Third, Mr. Speaker, the buyer will not be required to mortgage the farm he already owns in order to buy additional land. This is very, very important.

Some Hon. Members: — Hear, hear!

Mr. Gardner: — Arrangements may be made for the retiring seller to continue to use the farm home

Some Hon. Members: — Hear, hear!

Mr. Gardner: — again, Mr. Speaker, there is no rental involved, there is a direct transfer of ownership from the retiring farmer to the younger needy farmer. This is basically, Mr. Speaker, the essence of the Federal farm plan.

Now, Mr. Speaker, Alberta signed this agreement last July, Ontario in August, other provinces followed suit. Benefits of the Federal plan are now available in six provinces in Canada. Another thing we should note that the plans are almost identical in all provinces. I have details of agreements with all these provinces. Everyone of these agreements states that land will be sold only to purchasers with assets of less than \$60,000 or in effect small farmers.

Some Hon. Members: — Hear, hear!

Mr. Gardner: — Now, Mr. Speaker, the Premier of Saskatchewan and the Minister of Agriculture have known this for at least seven months and probably longer because the Alberta agreement was signed and made public last July. However, they have deliberately misled the farmers of Saskatchewan by continually referring to the Federal plan as selling to the highest bidder or helping only the larger farmers. Mr. Speaker, in all the conflicting and misleading statements made by Mr. Messer in the past year regarding the two farm plans only once did he state his true intentions. I am going to quote from the Leader-Post September 15, 1972 — we are speaking of Mr. Messer:

The Agriculture Minister said that during the negotiations with the Federal Government one of the factors Saskatchewan has insisted on, is first right to purchase from Ottawa, land that the Federal plan purchases from Saskatchewan farmers.

I ask you to note Mr. Messer's statement very carefully because it clearly establishes the NDP position regarding our farm land. He is saying in effect, Mr. Speaker, the NDP do not like the Federal plan because it transfers ownership of land directly from a retiring farmer to a younger needy farmer.

Some Hon. Members: — Hear, hear!

Mr. Gardner: — Mr. Messer is saying that the NDP will have nothing unless they agree to buy the land socialist state instead of selling to do with the Federal plan and turn it over to the NDP it to a needy young farmer.

Some Hon. Members: — Hear, hear!

Mr. Gardner: — The NDP, Mr. Speaker, have thus made their position very clear. The Minister of Agriculture and the Premier have deliberately, knowingly and callously stalled the Federal plan in Saskatchewan and thus have prevented our young farmers from enjoying its benefits the same as young farmers in other parts of Canada. They have sacrificed the needs of our young farmers in order to promote their own socialist land grab scheme in Saskatchewan. Of all of the crimes committed by the socialists, none is more despicable than this, they will stand condemned by the rural people of Saskatchewan.

A case came to my attention last week, Mr. Speaker, of a needy young couple who had been saving to buy the farm of a retiring neighbor. They milked cows, kept poultry and hogs, deprived themselves of basic necessities trying to save money to make a down payment on this neighboring farm which they were renting at the time.

Mr. Messer: — Trying to make a down payment!

Mr. Gardner: — A few weeks ago the Land Bank Commission came along — Mr. Messer's Land Bank — bought this farm for a big price and cancelled their lease. Their hopes are dashed. There is no other land available nearby to purchase, they could not compete with the NDP Land Bank which has an unlimited amount of taxpayers' money available. If the Federal plan had been available, Mr. Speaker, young farm families like the one above could acquire land they need to make a decent living. Opportunities to purchase by these needy people are being missed every day. The blame for this situation can be placed squarely on the shoulders of Mr. Messer and his NDP colleagues.

Some Hon. Members: — Hear, hear!

Mr. Gardner: — There is no doubt, no doubt in the world, Mr. Speaker, NDP are deliberately stalling the Federal plan so that they can grab the land for themselves.

Some Hon. Members: — Hear, hear!

Mr. Gardner: I would hope, Mr. Speaker, that the Federal Government would soon put in the plan on its own and at least give these young farmers some small chance of competing with this free-spending, land hungry bunch of socialists.

Mr. Speaker, I have been listing the ways in which the NDP have planned to get control of the farm land of Saskatchewan. I have listed the Estate Tax legislation, the Foreign Ownership Bill, the NDP freeze on the sale of present Crown land and the deliberate stalling of the federal plan. Finally, of course, we must look at the direct method of acquiring land, the Land Bank itself. Our Liberal Members have effectively made their case against the Land Bank here in the House last year. I am not going into details again of these arguments. I will, however, show some of the ways in which this legislation is designed to acquire and keep this land for the socialist state.

Some Hon. Members: — Hear, hear!

Mr. Gardner: — First of all, Mr. Speaker, all of the Land Bank officials from the commissioners, district board counsellors, appraisers, etc., are hired or appointed by the NDP. No representatives of farm organizations, no freely elected people are involved, all are directly under the thumb of the NDP.

Some Hon. Members: — Hear, hear!

Mr. Gardner: — The possibilities of political interference in land purchases and land rental are obvious. You may have noticed, Mr. Speaker, ads in the paper when they were looking for counsellors and commissioners. I have the one here, Saskatchewan Land Bank Commission, looking for a chairman — \$16,000 to \$20,000 a year. Vice-chairman up to \$18,000 a year. Part-time commissioners, \$75 a day and they will get in addition to this, expenses. Now I am sure the farmers listening, Mr. Speaker, will agree that \$75 a day for a part-time job is a better wage than most farmers get for running their combine or baling hay.

Some Hon. Members: — Hear, hear!

Mr. Gardner: — The Bill, Mr. Speaker, gives the Minister fantastic powers to make regulations regarding the land purchase. For example, Section 67, subsection (f) says that the Minister can make regulations respecting the management and control of commission land, which means in effect that they can tell the renter how he must farm, what he can grow, when he has to summer fallow and so on.

Mr. Speaker, the NDP have no intention of ever selling any of this land to a renter. They have carefully provided for this in the Bill. I would ask the people of this province very carefully to look at the Land Bank Bill. First, they say that no land can be sold for five years. Now this, of course, Mr. Speaker, conveniently puts them past the time of the next provincial election and if they were re-elected they could immediately bring in an amendment to extend the period for five or ten years again.

Some Hon. Members: — Hear, hear!

Mr. Gardner: — The only chance the farmer has of buying the land is to hope that the Liberals will be elected in 1975, as we will sell the land back to him if he wants it.

Some Hon. Members: — Hear, hear!

Mr. Gardner: — Now the NDP also protect themselves from ever selling, they also protect themselves by stating that they can set the price at the time of sale. There is no independent board, there is no option to buy at a specific price, no appeal from the price that is set by the Land Bank, which means, of course, that they can set a price so ridiculously high no one can ever buy. They have also stated that they will sell for cash only. Obviously if a person meets their qualification to rent the land in the first place it is unlikely that he is going to be in a position to buy for cash a few years later.

Rents may be raised by the Land Bank, the renter will be forced to pay this increased rent or get off the land. Rents are cash, bear no relationship to crop yields, markets, prices or anything else. Thus we see that the whole plan is loaded in favor of the NDP Government. We should also note that a vast amount of public funds will be needed to supply and satisfy this socialist craving for our farm land.

Some Hon. Members: — Hear, hear!

Mr. Gardner: — They have already spent over \$10 million and they predict themselves that in a few years it could surpass \$100 million. This money must come from the pockets of the taxpayers of Saskatchewan. Mr. Speaker, how do they intend to get this? They have already raised the income tax rate twice in the last year and a half, where we didn't raise it in the previous seven years. I hope that every wage earner, every farmer and every merchant in this province when he is filling out his income tax form in the next few months will remember that his tax is much greater because of the actions of the Blakeney Government.

Some Hon. Members: — Hear, hear!

Mr. Gardner: — At this time, Mr. Speaker, we should perhaps reaffirm our position regarding the basic philosophy of the Land Bank plan. We recognize that there are times when a farmer might find it advantageous to rent some farm land and I want to make this clear, perhaps when he is getting established or he may at some period have extra help or extra machinery which he may utilize efficiently on some rented land. We believe that a farmer's ultimate goal should be to own at least part of the land he operates. We are opposed to a system whereby the state owns and controls the land.

Some Hon. Members: — Hear, hear!

Mr. Gardner: — We are opposed to a system where the farmer is merely a tenant or a serf tied to the land by a government lease, where he toils for the socialist state all of his productive years

and leaves at 65 with nothing; where a farmer is deprived, Mr. Speaker, of the pride of ownership in his own land, where he has no incentive to improve his surroundings because they simply don't belong to him. We are opposed to a plan where a farmer cannot retire with dignity because he has no land to sell.

Some Hon. Members: — Hear, hear!

Mr. Gardner: — Every small town in Saskatchewan has many retired people, retired farmers or widows of farmers who are living now on the proceeds of a farm that was sold at a price much higher than they paid for the farm years ago. Everyone living in rural Saskatchewan knows this to be a fact, but under the NDP land tenure system of Mr. Messer this will simply be no longer possible. The Government will own the land, there will be no land to sell.

Some Hon. Members: — Hear, hear!

Mr. Gardner: — Any increase in the value of land, and this could well happen over the years, will go to the Government, not to the retiring farmer or to the farm widow. Under Mr. Messer's plan if a farmer dies at age 60 or 65 his widow will have no land to sell because he has been merely a renter and she may well be left with nothing. The Minister of Agriculture, Mr. Speaker, refers to his new system of land tenure. This system, of course, is not new. Many of the people living in Saskatchewan today or their fathers or grandfathers came to our province to escape just such a land tenure system as Mr. Messer is now proposing.

Some Hon. Members: — Hear, hear!

Mr. Gardner: — They came from Europe, from Poland, Ukraine, Scotland, Germany, dozens of other countries because in Saskatchewan they could have a chance to own their own piece of land. Mr. Speaker, Mr. Messer is trying to turn the clock back 200 years with his new land tenure plan and the rural people of Saskatchewan will not accept it.

Some Hon. Members: — Hear, hear!

Mr. Gardner: — We have looked at the motives behind the Land Bank, the methods used to promote it, we have indicated our reasons for opposing it. We have traced the history of its development until about the time of the last session. Now let us conclude by examining what has happened in the past few months.

The Land Bank offered to buy land and received a large number of applications from sellers, who sensed that the NDP may be paying a big price with government funds. This continued throughout the summer. The socialists were feeling pretty good, they had land available to buy, they had an unlimited amount of taxpayers' money to buy it with. But there was one catch, no one wanted to rent. Mr. Messer had gone on record clearly and stated last spring that the plan would be self-supporting. The rent charged would cover the interest paid to buy the land. He was sure of this, he set the rental rate at 6 1/2 per cent, he published it in the Gazette to make it official. Everyone in the province knew what they had in mind. Now our Liberal Members

told him that he wouldn't get any renters at 6 1/2 per cent

Some Hon. Members: — Hear, hear!

Mr. Gardner: — no one would rent and we were proved correct.

The months went by in the summer and in the fall of 1972, Mr. Messer and Mr. Blakeney were becoming desperate. They couldn't keep buying millions of dollars worth of farm land unless they had someone to rent it to, and there were no renters. It appeared that the Land Bank scheme would be a complete failure before it really got going. By last December, the Minister of Agriculture was faced with an alarming choice, first he could let the Land Bank plan fail or he could bail it out by subsidizing the rental rate with huge sums of public money. The decision was made more urgent as the Legislative Session was fast approaching. The Minister stalled, and finally he completely reversed his previous stand — and this may not have been that difficult for the Minister of Agriculture — and then he announced on January 15th, just before the Legislature met, that public funds would be used to subsidize the rental rates and it would be reduced to 5 per cent of the purchase price.

This, Mr. Speaker, saved the Land Bank from disaster by producing the renters he needed to get it started. Perhaps even a greater influence was the fact that the prices for grain were rising and there were possible renters available. This put a little sugar coating on the pill for the renter but it didn't change the philosophy of the Land Bank. In addition to the objections I mentioned before, it is an inefficient plan which will have to be constantly supported by huge amounts of taxpayers' money.

Mr. Speaker, Mr. Blakeney on several occasions in the past and earlier in this debate has indicated that this Land Bank system will not reduce the number of farmers in the province, which, of course, is ridiculous. Every time the Land Bank buys land from a retiring farmer and leases it to an existing farmer he has, of course, reduced the number of farmers. This is another example of the Premier misleading the people.

Some Hon. Members: — Hear, hear!

Mr. Gardner: — Some strange reports are already coming in, Mr. Speaker, of the way the Land Bank transactions are operating. I am just going to give you one or two quick examples.

A farm worth about \$34,000 was purchased by the Land Bank for over \$50,000. A neighbor brought to my attention that a potential renter would be much better off paying 6 1/2 per cent of the true value, rather than 5 per cent of this inflated price.

A farmer who had been advertising his land for sale at \$27,000 couldn't find a buyer. He had it appraised by the Land Bank and they gave him \$30,000. Obviously a misuse of public funds.

An elderly gentleman told me last weekend that he sold his land to the NDP Land Bank for a big price. I asked him what he was going to do with the money and he replied that he was going to buy more land. He said, "You know, with a scheme like this

going I don't want to miss out," and he told me with a twinkle in his eye, "I may decide to retire again next summer."

In order to verify the accuracy of the information we receive, we have asked the Minister of Agriculture (Mr. Messer) if he will have his Land Bank officials supply Members of the Legislature with details of Land Bank transactions. Public money is being spent and we are the representatives of the public. Mr. Messer arrogantly refused to comply with our request when I asked him this question in the House. Apparently our only chance of getting this information is to put hundreds of written questions, which may sit unanswered on the Order Paper for weeks, months or years.

Even in its early stages, the Land Bank is obviously inefficient. Its future is unpredictable. We know that it will result in a large portion of our farm land being owned by the state. From comments made by the Minister and other socialists, we can suspect that they have in mind the establishment of co-op farms or state farms, which would compete with free-enterprise farmers who are left.

With the Land Bank they have created a monster which could well destroy our cherished rural way of life.

Some Hon. Members: — Hear, hear!

Mr. Gardner: — If enough opposition is shown by our rural people and others to this land grab scheme, perhaps we can keep the damage to a minimum until the next provincial election when the people will have a chance to elect a Liberal Government.

Some Hon. Members: — Hear, hear!

Mr. Gardner: — Mr. Speaker, a Liberal Government would return control, management, and ownership of farm land to the farm people where it belongs.

It is obvious, Mr. Speaker, that I will not be supporting the motion.

Some Hon. Members: — Hear, hear!

Mr. E.F. Flasch (Maple Creek): — Mr. Speaker, I am glad that there is so much applause from the Members opposite before I start because you don't know what you will get after you finish.

I should like to start off, Mr. Speaker, by doing some of the traditional things, congratulating the mover and seconder of the Address-in-Reply for the excellent job that they did. I should like, too, to congratulate the new Members who have been added to the Cabinet and I know that they will do a creditable job. And I suppose once more I have to congratulate the Member for Athabasca (Mr. Guy). He is back again and he is back in his true form. Like one of those big bears that he has so many of in his constituency, he came lumbering out of the woods and he headed straight for the garbage.

Some Hon. Members: — Hear, hear!

Mr. Flasch: — He really wallowed in it the other day, Mr. Speaker. I should caution him though not to take too much consolation from that win, that narrow victory, because if his popularity and the popularity of his Party. Doesn't increase any faster in the next two and a half years than it has in the past year and a half, they will be wandering in the political wilderness of this province for a long time to come.

Some Hon. Members: — Hear, hear!

Mr. Flasch: — I should like to say, too, that the Federal Liberals didn't do very well in the election campaign and they certainly did nothing in British Columbia. In the Federal campaign, they elected one Member. We are not exactly happy either, we elected only five, but I'll tell you that's better than they did. I know that it is not much consolation to say that one did five times as well as a Liberal in any field of endeavor but at least we did do better.

Some Hon. Members: — Hear, hear!

Mr. Flasch: — Now it was rather amusing to see the part the Leader of the Opposition (Mr. Steuart) played in the Federal campaign, I remember how before the vote, he went around praising the Prime Minister. He said he was the greatest thing that has ever happened to Canada. Here was the man whom Canada needed — just what the doctor ordered. And then after their dismal showing in the election, he made an about-face and he castigated him at the Liberal convention and he said it was about time he listened to the people of Western Canada. I thought for a minute there would be repeated that old biblical tale of David and Goliath, Mr. Speaker,. But that's the Liberals; they say one thing and they do another. It is like the character in Richard III, I believe it was who jumped on his horse and rode off in all directions.

Some Hon. Members: — Hear, hear!

Mr. Flasch: — I should like, Mr. Speaker, to caution the Liberals to establish their credibility once more among the people of this province. We wouldn't want to see them vanish entirely from the political scene. I can just picture, if they keep on doing what they have been doing lately, what will happen in years to come. If you want to see a Saskatchewan Liberal you will have to go to a museum.

Some Hon. Members: — Hear, hear!

Mr. Flasch: — Can't you just picture it, Mr. Speaker,? You walk in and there on the shelf beside the great auk and the passenger pigeon stands the last stuffed remains of Saskatchewan Liberalism.

Some Hon. Members: — Hear, hear!

Mr. Flasch: — This is what is going to happen to them if they are not careful.

The latest move though by the Leader of the Opposition was the best one. The other day he named his shady Cabinet, or his shadow Cabinet and, of course, he “sicked” all of his boys on one of the Government Departments and he said, “Now you play watchdog.” He himself took the Premier’s office. I thought he would have left that for the Member from Athabasca (Mr. Guy), but he took it on himself. The Member from Athabasca knows all the figures and all of the salaries, but he didn’t get the job. But that wasn’t the best one; the Leader of the Opposition is going to be critic of the Boundaries Commission! That’s a good one!

Some Hon. Members: — Hear, hear!

Mr. Flasch: — He suffered quite a demotion there, Mr. Speaker. He went from architect to critic.

Some Hon. Members: — Hear, hear!

Mr. Flasch: — But I’ll tell you one thing, he should know something about it. He knows all the “hooks” and he should be pretty good at his job of straightening them out.

Well, Mr. Speaker, I should like to turn for a minute to the economy of this province. Generally speaking, the farming economy is much better off lately. Look at the Liberals smile over there and take credit for it. I don’t mind. Cattlemen, no doubt, are well off because the price of beef is good. Certainly the large grain farmers are not crying right now. But there are many small farmers in this province, Mr. Speaker, who are a little bit unhappy and whose position is somewhat precarious. These are the people, Mr. Speaker, that a crop failure could certainly hurt. These are the people that according to the Speech from the Throne and through the Agricultural Incentives Act are the ones that are going to be helped. I certainly hope that the new program FarmStart will help these farmers put together the necessary resources to establish a viable economic unit.

Some Hon. Members: — Hear, hear!

Mr. Flasch: — Now there are many things, of course, that I could comment on in the Speech from the Throne. I think it is significant that we are going to establish a Crown corporation for the exploration of oil and gas. I don’t see why when we own the resources we shouldn’t be doing something towards their development and toward looking for them. Obviously the Leader of the Opposition doesn’t think so, but then that really doesn’t matter. He would say that he’s perfectly free in his party to toss millions of dollars into Doré Lake but that we shouldn’t gamble with a few bucks in the interest of the people of Saskatchewan.

I was rather interested too in his remarks about industrial development. Here one day in his speech he says, “I’ve got an alternative,” Yes, Sir, here it comes everybody — I am sure a lot of people in Saskatchewan didn’t sleep that night; they were waiting to see what he had. I wasn’t too optimistic, I thought perhaps he had another Anglo-Rouyn mine or another pulp mill.

Some Hon. Members: — Hear, hear!

Mr. Flasch: — But, he had nothing as imaginative as that, Mr. Speaker. He came in here the next day all deflated and said the Liberals are going to amend about seven or eight bills. That's all the imagination they have left, Mr. Speaker. That has been the story of the Liberals for the seven years that they were in office and that's been their story ever since.

Some Hon. Members: — Hear, hear!

Mr. Flasch: — Mr. Speaker, I think that there is nothing that explains as well or defines as well those seven Liberal years in office as does Macbeth's commentary on life. He described it, Mr. Speaker, as "a tale told by an idiot, full of sound and fury, signifying nothing."

Some Hon. Members: — Hear, hear!

Mr. Flasch: — I am pleased, Mr. Speaker, that this Government has seen fit to mention in the Speech from the Throne the establishment of a hog marketing commission. I think that it is time that the farmers in this province can expect to see some stability in prices for the hogs they produce. I know, Mr. Speaker, that I buy hogs one time for "two-bits" a pound, the next time 40 cents a pound and just about each time that the farmers in our area are raising hogs, the price is down and when they are out, prices are up. They are looking, Mr. Speaker, for some stability. The Liberals opposite would deny that to the farmers of this province, just as they did, they fought against Wheat Pools and everything else.

Some Hon. Members: — Hear, hear!

Mr. Flasch: — Now, Mr. Speaker, this Agricultural Incentives Program that I spoke of a minute ago, will certainly complement the Land Bank. We just heard a few minutes ago from the Member from Moosomin (Mr. Gardner). He stood up in this House and condemned the Land Bank, called it no good, just as he has done and the Liberals have done ever since it was introduced into this House. But, I didn't expect a Liberal to support the Land Bank because that's not the kind of bank that the Liberals know anything about.

Some Hon. Members: — Hear, hear!

Mr. Flasch: — They likely know something about financial institutions like the other banks, but not the Land Bank. I remember last year the Liberals were very inconsistent on their attack on that Bill. The Member from Prince Albert West (Mr. Steuart) and the Member from Milestone (Mr. MacDonald) both said, "They are going to make sharecroppers out of the farmers." Then that large Liberal from Lakeview (Mr. McPherson) stood up and he intimated or implied, that it was going to be a good plan. He said, you'd have to have an NDP membership to get some of that land. There you see them again, Mr. Speaker, inconsistent; one says it's no good, nobody would want the land, and the other says it's going to be reserved for a privileged few.

Some Hon. Members: — Hear, hear!

Mr. Flasch: — What do you do? Well, Mr. Speaker, the Member from Moosomin (Mr. Gardner) stood up a while ago, and in his usual fashion he twisted the truth so that no one would recognize it. I remember last year when he was speaking. I just thought of it. Somebody over there made the remark that some politician had told him one time never to tell the truth where a lie will serve just as well.

Some Hon. Members: — Hear, hear!

Mr. Flasch: — I have been watching ever since, Mr. Speaker, and I am trying to figure out who is the most apt student of that teacher. I think the Member from Moosomin (he has gone out now) just made his nomination speech.

Some Hon. Members: — Hear, hear!

Mr. Flasch: — Mr. Speaker, he compared the small farms program — that Liberal program — with ours. I should like to know how, under that program, anybody is going to be established in farming. I have a bit of duplicated paper here that says who qualifies for special credit. This is that Liberal plan. It says, “To qualify for special credit the buyer must be a Canadian citizen or a landed immigrant when he applies; he must be the owner of a farm, or a purchaser under an agreement of sale; or have been a tenant for more than three years; or be earning most of his income from the operation of the farm.” It doesn’t say anything about helping anybody to establish a farm, Mr. Speaker. Who is going to get into agriculture under a plan like that?

Now, Mr. Speaker, I should like to turn for a few minutes — well there is one more thing perhaps I should mention before I turn to my constituency. One of the other Liberals in this House — I almost forgot about it — the Member from Wilkie (Mr. McIsaac) got up and attacked the program ‘Open Roads’ that we launched. He said that the Liberals should get credit for it. He was going to put the arm on that program, Mr. Speaker, and claim it as a Liberal invention. But we won’t give the Liberals credit for operation ‘Open Roads’. That was our program. Operation ‘Open Mouth’ maybe, Mr. Speaker, but

Some Hon. Members: — Hear, hear!

Mr. Flasch: — certainly not operation ‘Open Roads’. Now, Mr. Speaker, many of the people in my constituency over the years have been retiring to Medicine Hat. The exodus of retired people to Medicine Hat has gone on for years and it continues to do so. Many of those people, when they reach retirement age settle there and Medicine Hat, I suppose, is a nice city. It is made up largely of people who came from the area along the border and this is in no way any fault of the economic situation on the farms as maybe the Liberals would like people to believe. Indeed, if anything it speeds the process up because the faster they make their money to retire, the sooner they go to Medicine Hat.

Now, Mr. Speaker, we are having a problem with keeping our

senior citizens in Saskatchewan. Recently in Maple Creek, we did something about that because on December 15th the Minister of Social Services (Mr. Taylor) was out there and we attended the opening of the nursing home, the special care home, Cypress Lodge, in that centre which has been a long time in coming. I am happy to say that the Government of this province channelled \$116,000 in the direction of that institution.

Some Hon. Members: — Hear, hear!

Mr. Flasch: — The people of Maple Creek, Mr. Speaker, are doing something about their senior citizens. Right now they are in the process of attempting to find out whether or not there will be agreement or interest in that community for the development of a Senior Citizens Housing Program. I wish them well in that endeavor.

The Leader of the Opposition, the other day, commented on the highways the Liberals were building in this province and I would say they did build some good highways. They built lots of them in the Wilkie constituency, but none of them, the real dandies, came our way during those seven years of Liberal rule. We are not really kicking. We did get some dust-free roads but many of the highways in my constituency now need rebuilding. I hope that the Minister of Highways (Mr. Kramer) is listening. We do have a few fourteen or fifteen miles that are in urgent need of some dust-free treatment.

Mr. Speaker, I must mention the Cypress Hills Park. As you know the focal point of all recreational activities in the southwest part of this province is the Cypress Hills Park. It is not in my constituency, but I have spoken often with the Member for Shaunavon (Mr. Oliver) who represents that area, and his people and those who are in my constituency are very concerned about the state of the skiing facilities there at the present time.

Many of the people in Maple Creek have done a lot of work to develop what facilities there are. They do have the ski slope and, of course, Cypress Hills is a natural for skiing. It has the elevation and if there is snow anywhere in Southern Saskatchewan, certainly there will be snow in the Cypress Hills. But skiing enthusiasts have had a difficult time financially. The slope is there; they have a tow rope; they have some other machinery, but they are desperately looking for help and they need at least a T-Bar, Mr. Speaker.

I don't think that every time we want to improve something like this, we should go to a feasibility study and spend thousands and thousands of dollars getting some eggheads looking into books and coming up with some solution, which takes years to implement. I think that we should go ahead, and I hope that this Government will go ahead, and put a T-Bar in there, Mr. Speaker. And if, in later years, they find that there is a better location for the ski slope then move it and move the T-Bar. There is no great amount of money going to be lost in such a venture.

Mr. Speaker, I know that someone else wants to follow me on the air. I should have liked to have elaborated on my trip to the Yukon. I was fortunate enough to go on such a trip this summer, along with Mr. Speaker and the Member from Regina

North West (Mr. Whelan). Time does not, however, allow me.

The air flight was paid for by the Commonwealth Parliamentary Association. We looked after our own lodging, but I shall have to leave that for another time.

Mr. Speaker, I hope that you have gathered by this time that I will support the motion and oppose the amendment.

Some Hon. Members: — Hear, hear!

Hon. K. Thorson (Minister of Industry and Mineral Resources): — Mr. Speaker, I am pleased to be able to enter this debate and I first of all want to congratulate the mover and the seconder of the motion. Both of them have made their constituents proud and made all of us proud to be associated with them in this Legislature in the fine way they moved the motion.

Some Hon. Members: — Hear, hear!

Mr. Thorson: — May I also take this opportunity publicly and in this Legislature to congratulate three of my fellow Members of the Legislature who were appointed to the Cabinet this last May. I must say that they are a welcome addition to our ranks, have lightened the load and the work for the rest of us and, again, have been a great credit to their constituents and to this province.

Some Hon. Members: — Hear, hear!

Mr. Thorson: — I cannot let the opportunity pass without extending to the Hon. Member for Athabasca (Mr. Guy) congratulations on his re-election in the by-election last September. I am hoping, Mr. Speaker, that his contributions to future debates will, in some way, be more constructive than his contributions to this debate have been up to this point.

Some Hon. Members: — Hear, hear!

Mr. Thorson: — Mr. Speaker, here at the beginning of the year 1973 we are in a much happier time than we were when the Legislature met in 1972. Economic conditions in Canada and economic conditions in Saskatchewan are certainly much improved. The one significant political event of the past year has also made a very substantial contribution to our optimism and hope for the future. That is the fact that during the Federal election on October 30th last, the people of Canada made clear that they were not satisfied with conditions as they existed earlier in 1972.

We have a minority government in office in Ottawa and I ask the Hon. Members to cast their minds back to the last few years, going back to 1957 and from that time until this time we have had only two majority governments in office in Ottawa, the one of Mr. Diefenbaker's from 1958 to 1962 and the one of Mr. Trudeau's from 1968 to 1972.

I suggest, Mr. Speaker, every citizen of Canada looking back over those years will believe and appreciate that Canadian

citizens by and large got more action out of their Government in Ottawa in everyone of those years when there was a minority government in office. I am optimistic about the future for Canada as a result of the work of the present Parliament, because I believe a minority government will be much more responsive to needs and the desires of Canadian citizens than it ever would have been if there had been a majority Liberal Government elected last October.

On the international scene, too, the events of the past year, indeed, the past days, give us much more optimism and hope for the future than we would have entertained one year ago. The end of hostilities in Indo-China and Vietnam is now surely at hand. I remind the Hon. Members that for more than three decades, with the possible exception of the year 1954, there has not been a time when there was not active hostilities and war some place in the world.

I remember 1954 because that was the year in which the hostilities previously ended in Indo-China when the French forces were defeated at the Dien Bien Phu and unfortunately that peaceful period was short-lived and it has taken us all that time, nearly two more decades, to bring the fighting to a stop again in Vietnam. We can now look forward with some confidence and hope to a much more peaceful world than we have known in recent decades.

In Europe, Great Britain is entering the European Economic Community and that opens up the opportunities for trade, not only for the people of Great Britain and Europe, but for those of us who have a particular association and particular interest in Great Britain and in Europe. So I am confident that economically, politically, in this world and in this nation everything points to a much more hopeful future than we could have expected one year ago.

Here, at home, it happens to be a particularly unique year in that we are going to have a number of celebrations in Saskatchewan during 1973, beginning with the celebration of the centennial of the RCMP. In this year 1973, we are going to have the World Curling Championship, the Silver Broom Curling Contest here in Saskatchewan, in Regina, in March of this year. And in July, of course, we are happy to note that the Royal couple will be visiting Regina and visiting Saskatchewan to help us celebrate the centennial year of our Mounted Police.

Mr. Speaker, let me just say a word or two about economic conditions in Saskatchewan. I have said that this is a much happier time than it was one year ago. I have particularly in mind that some of the story has been, first of all, forecast in headlines of our newspapers and as the year rolled on in 1972 some of the newspaper stories have clearly indicated the improvements that we have been making in Saskatchewan in our economy during the past 12 months.

The Leader-Post on December 28, 1971 had a headline which said that steady economic growth is seen for Saskatchewan. I cannot help but refer to a headline which appeared in the Leader-Post a little more than one year later, on January 3, 1973, with the dateline from Estevan, which is naturally a place dear to my heart as it is my home and because I have the opportunity in this Legislature to represent the constituents in Estevan and in the whole constituency of Souris-Estevan. The headline on the

story from Estevan on January 3, 1973 said: "Best year for financial returns." And the lead paragraph is that year-end reports from city businessmen indicate 1972 was the best year in history for financial returns. And then the story goes on to give some of the details of various business places in the city of Estevan and the fact that they had the largest sales and the greatest volume of business in 1972 in their recent experience.

Some Hon. Members: — Hear, hear!

Mr. Thorson: — Now that is an indication of how the year began and how it ended. I just want to refer Hon. Members, because I know sometimes we tend to forget some of the good things that are happening in Saskatchewan, especially to our industries and our businesses. I want to refer to a headline or two from various publications taken, not for all of the 12 months, but a random sample so that we can remember some of the good things that have happened during 1972.

In March there was a headline in the Star-Phoenix dated March 22, 1972, that "AGRA expands its plant to make margarine" and Members will be familiar with that story. There was an interesting headline in the Leader-Post of April 11, 1972 which on the face of it might not have been thought to be of any great significance, but the Members will remember the discussions and debates that were carried on in this Legislature a year ago and so this headline which says, "Burns announces that plant will not close" had a final special significance in April 1972. On April 18th in the Globe and Mail there was a story from Regina which said, "Interprovincial Steel and Pipe to double output capacity" and it goes on to tell about a planned \$5 million expansion, which I am happy to say, Mr. Speaker, that that expansion has taken place during the year 1972 at Ipsco.

Here is a headline from July 28th in the Leader-Post which says, "Yorkton plant expanded", and the lead line is: "The second expansion program within a year is now under way at the Yorkton based Morris Rod Weeder Company." And another story from Yorkton in the August 21, 1972 Leader-Post which says: "Housing plant in full swing." It goes on to say that three or four homes are being turned out daily by the manufactured homes plant of the planned building division of the Beaver Lumber Company Limited recently established here at Yorkton.

On September 22, the Star-Phoenix had a headline which said: "Review shows Saskatchewan personal income on rebound," and goes on to show how the statistics are moving up during the year 1972. Another headline from the Star-Phoenix October 24, 1972 says: "Steel service plant opened in Saskatoon." The lead line: "Largest steel service plant in Saskatchewan was officially opened in Saskatoon by Russell Steel Limited recently."

And again from Saskatoon, November 30, 1972, the Star-Phoenix, the headline reads: "New Mendel plant opened." The story goes on to give an account of how the expansion, at a cost of \$4.5 million to the Intercontinental Packers in Saskatoon, makes it the single largest industrial employer in Saskatchewan and one of the foremost industries in this province.

Coming up to the present time, here is a headline from the Star-Phoenix of January 5, 1973 and it says: "Tourist business

increased last year.” May I just take a moment to give credit to the former Government for having had the imagination to think of and to put into operation, Homecoming ‘71. It was an excellent program which all of the people of Saskatchewan who live here enjoyed very much. It made us good hosts to many of the visitors who came back to Saskatchewan during 1971. I say, without any hesitation, that it has paid good dividends as a promotion to the tourist industry because all of the indicators for 1972 show that we had more tourists and more tourist business in Saskatchewan in 1972 than we had in 1971.

Here is a headline from the Leader-Post of January 10, 1973 which says: “The White Cockshutt plans implement parts centre.” It goes on to tell about the establishment of this new parts distribution centre in Regina and Members will know that that follows a decision by the John Deere Company to set up a similar distribution centre in Regina also.

Here is a headline from the Star-Phoenix of January 17, 1973 which says: “Best year ever for retail sales.” It goes on to give some of the statistics from Saskatchewan for 1972. A small announcement in the January 27th Leader-Post which says: “AGRA announces a sale to Chile.” It goes on to talk about a \$3 million sale of crude rapeseed oil to Chile by that company out of its plant at Nipawin.

Here is a headline from the Leader-Post, January 3, 1973 that says: “Industries show expansion in 1972,” and goes on to detail some of them.

Mr. Speaker, what is going on in Saskatchewan and has been going on since this Government took office in June of 1971, has attracted the attention of not only our local press but also of publications that originate outside of the province. In the magazine “Trade and Commerce” for August of 1972 the details of what is going on in the economy in Saskatchewan was set out in several stories, some of them dealing with various communities and cities throughout the province, others dealing with sectors of the economy. The headline in the lead article, which by the way is written by Robert Tyre, and some Members may remember Mr. Tyre who is quite familiar with Saskatchewan and not always known, I may say, as being particularly sympathetic to my friends in the former CCF and the present New Democratic Party. But the headline or title to Mr. Tyre’s in “Trade and Commerce” for August 1972 says: “Provincial economy on upswing from disastrous 1970 slump.” And then it goes on, and under the heading of “Projects” it lists various companies throughout the province which have started new production or are expanding. Under that heading it lists some, and I have counted 21, different firms and then under a heading “Secondary industry” it goes on and lists some more and there I have counted a total of 19, making between the two, 40 firms in all which, since this Government took office, have either continued with expansion plans which they had or have started new expansion plans or started new commercial production.

Mr. Speaker, I don’t set this out with the purpose of trying to suggest that we are doing all in Saskatchewan that we should like to do in the way of industrial development or employment opportunities other than in primary industries. But I do mention all of these to remind the Members that it is not as gloomy a picture as the mover and the seconder of the amendment would have us believe when they suggest there is not sufficient economic activity in Saskatchewan to provide alternative

employment opportunities to our farm economy.

There are good things going on in Saskatchewan. They are going on in the private sector of our province and they are going on in the public sector of our province. I think the experience of the past year gives us good reason to be optimistic that we will make even further progress and greater increases in economic activity in the year ahead.

Some Hon. Members: — Hear, hear!

Mr. Thorson: — All of the economic indicators for Saskatchewan since this Government took office have been turning up with two exceptions or one exception really and that is the population figures. But when it comes to personal incomes or the net value of construction, when it comes to public and private investment, when it comes to retail trade, all of these figures are upward in Saskatchewan since this Government took office.

Some Hon. Members: — Hear, hear!

Mr. Thorson: — And as was pointed out by the Premier in this debate even the population decline in Saskatchewan, at least, has slowed down since this Government took office as compared to the days when the Liberal party was in office up until June 23, 1971.

Our labor force, the number of people employed, is also increasing. In 1970 it was at peak for Saskatchewan at 350,000. It declined in 1971, during the last year that the Liberals were in office by a couple of thousand. By 1972 it had recovered its earlier peak of 350,000. So, I think we have reason to believe that there are more employment opportunities in Saskatchewan than there were in those last years of Liberal administration, that that trend is also upward. Just as a footnote, I was interested to learn just this week that the Saskatchewan Power Corporation at December 31, 1972, had 3,131 more customers than it had at December 31, 1971; a small, but I think, significant indicator of the increase in economic activity, the increase in employment opportunities that is taking place in Saskatchewan.

Mr. Speaker, how does this come about? Well, let me refer Hon. Members to an article that appeared in the January issue of "Canadian Business," January of this year. I quote this one small passage from it.

Total capital investment (speaking of Saskatchewan) will probably increase by about the same percentage as 1972, an estimated 8.5 per cent. Mr. Blakeney's Government is pursuing a policy of encouraging development of relatively small manufacturing projects preferably based on local products. This contrasts with the spectaculars subsidized by the previous government at considerable cost to provincial taxpayers.

Mr. Speaker, I think the change in our economic situation in Saskatchewan since this Government took office is because of the definite change in the policy of the Government towards economic development. And that has been enunciated many times that it is our fundamental belief that our economic future in

Saskatchewan depends upon building up the people who are here and developing the resources with our people here in Saskatchewan and that we will not likely provide additional employment opportunities, we will not likely get the best development of our resources by chasing around North America or Europe trying to persuade some investor to come here to make a killing out of the exploitation of our mineral resources or our forest resources or any other of our natural resources. That is the policy which we have been pursuing. To try to build on what is here and to build up the people who are here. That naturally attracts us to our most important industry, agriculture, and hence the Speech from the Throne sets out some of the important new programs which we will be initiating and the other programs which we will be continuing to develop to build up our farm economy; to provide more opportunities for young people to farm and have family farms because they clearly are essential if we are going to have worthwhile smaller communities throughout the countryside in Saskatchewan.

Some Hon. Members: — Hear, hear!

Mr. Thorson: — So we want to try as much we can to process the products from Saskatchewan, our primary products from agriculture and from our resources. We want to develop industries and services which will find ready markets in our farm economy in the province and, of course, wherever we can to want to take advantage of any opportunity to manufacture goods which can be sold in markets in the Prairie Basin and beyond our borders.

Mr. Speaker, that is the kind of strategy which we intend to follow and I may say that in the course of this Session it will become clear how we intend in the Department of Industry and Commerce to build up the staff, to reorganize the branches, to launch new programs based on putting that strategy into practical application.

I regret, Mr. Speaker, to have learned in more detail as the months went by when I became the Minister of Industry and Commerce, how sadly that department had been run down and neglected and was not anything like the kind of department it once was when my late friend the Hon. Russ Brown, was first its Minister and the first to build it up.

Some Hon. Members: — Hear, hear!

Mr. Thorson: — Mr. Speaker, in 1972 it was a good year for business in Saskatchewan. And it was particularly a good year for small business men. There were during the year 19 operations which entered new commercial production, 29 operations which expanded and 15 new industries were announced. Together these would represent employment opportunities for some 1,400 new jobs in Saskatchewan. From the 1st of April, 1972 until the end of December of that year, there were six forgivable loans made under The Industry Incentives Act which totalled over \$131,000 and which gave employment to 54 people in those six new industries. As well there were five loans which had been finalized for payment at a total of over \$85,000 although the money had not yet been advanced. That would have provided employment for 83 people. There were 20 loan applications being processed at the end of 1972 under The Industry Incentives Act for a total of more than \$1 million and for 98 new job opportunities.

Mr. Speaker, I want to say something about what we have done during this past year with SEDCO. The Saskatchewan Economic Development Corporation, which was another agency that was created while my friend the Hon. Russ Brown was Minister, was set up for the express purpose of making credit available for industrial opportunities in the province. I regret to say that when the Liberals were in office, they did not make the best use of it that could have been made. It became clear to us that not only should we make more use of it in offering credit services to manufacturing and processing industries but that its terms of reference should be expanded so that credit could be granted to other types of industries as well. So, since August 1st of 1972, these terms of reference for SEDCO have been considerably broadened and now the corporation is able to consider applications for loans from not only industrial and manufacturing industries but also from service industries, people in the tourist business, recreational activities, retail and wholesale business, personal and professional services. Even in communication and transportation we are able to consider loan applications. Also, of course, for our people in the construction and contracting business.

In the year 1972, SEDCO gave assistance to more than 60 enterprises. Which is a record number for any year during the whole history of SEDCO since it was established.

As a matter of fact, Mr. Speaker, that is twice as many enterprises as were assisted in the year 1971. In 1972 the dollar assistance by SEDCO was nearly 13 million. It is interesting to note that more than two-thirds of the assistance given was given in the latter half of the year after the terms of reference of the SEDCO Corporation were expanded to include a greater diversity of enterprises. It is also I think worthy of note that more than half of the assistance was given in amounts of less than \$100,000. So when I say that it was a good year for business and a good year for small business in Saskatchewan, I think we can say with some pride that SEDCO had some involvement in it.

In 1972 we have concentrated on assisting industries related to agriculture, the basis of our economy. Almost two-thirds of the industries which were announced in 1972, either process farm products grown in Saskatchewan or serve agricultural producers. More than half of these are located in the smaller centres away from the large cities of Saskatchewan.

Mr. Speaker, since it was only in August that the terms of reference of SEDCO were broadened, Members will not be surprised to know that the volume of applications being considered by the SEDCO board each month has been increasing. I should just like to say something about the kinds of loan applications that were presented to the board of SEDCO at its last meeting which was in January of 1973. There were a record number of applications to consider, 21 in total. Of that 21, 15 were accepted. Two were declined and four were deferred for further information. The total value of the loans accepted of the 21 was just under \$2 million at \$1.927 million. The kinds of businesses which were represented by those loan applicants were of six different types. There were five loans from manufacturing industries for a total of over \$400,000. There was one service industry in an industrial sense and it was a loan of something over \$9,000. Four loan applications came from people in the tourist accommodation business. The value of the loans extended to those four was over \$1 million. There were three loans from retail businesses accepted for just under \$300,000. One in

transportation at \$25,000, one in the contracting business at \$35,000.

Mr. Speaker, I confidently expect in this year ahead of us that there will be an increasing volume of loan applications received by SEDCO and accepted by SEDCO and that will play an continuing and increasingly significant part in the economic development of our province.

Mr. Speaker, I want to say a word or two about our co-operation with the commercial firm from Roumania that manufactures tractors.

I have a clipping here, Mr. Speaker, which quotes the Leader of the Opposition as having something to say about that but perhaps if he is going to take his seat in a minute or two I will wait until he is there and I will remind him of it.

Mr. Speaker, I am sure that the Members will appreciate (and I think everybody in the province appreciates by now) that there are certain additional difficulties over and above the ordinary involved in trying to put together an industrial package when all the people involved are sitting in a gold fish bowl and that is the way our Roumanian partners and ourselves have been

An. Hon. Member: — Gold fish just came in.

Mr. Thorson: — since this whole discussion began about Roumanian tractors in Saskatchewan.

Mr. Steuart: — You made the headlines.

Mr. Thorson: — The Leader of the Opposition says that we made the headlines. Well, Mr. Speaker, I think he was in on the act whenever he could get in. I don't think he ever hesitated on this subject or for that matter on any other subject to have something to say. I have a clipping from the Leader-Post of July 27, 1972 which says, "Economist says, prices will have to be lower." That's not exactly a revelation. I think everybody understood that if the Roumanian tractors were going to be of benefit to Saskatchewan farmers the price for them would have to at least meet the price of alternative offerings. At any rate the story goes on and deals with what the Leader of the Opposition had to say and at the very end it says: "He," meaning the Leader of the Opposition, "had no objection to the Saskatchewan Roumanian partnership itself."

Mr. Steuart: — I don't, never have had.

Mr. Thorson: — I am glad to know, Mr. Speaker, that he has no objection to that. I hope he will have an opportunity to discuss that with his colleagues in this Legislature who seem at times at least to express a different sentiment.

May I just, without wanting to create any controversy or any more controversy about the subject, try to set the record straight. I want to begin by saying something about what we have as partners, that is the Roumanian Company and our Government, agreed to so far as the terms of our partnership are concerned

and particularly about our financial commitments and obligations.

Mr. Speaker, we expect that to get the plant established it may require something in the order of less than \$2.5 million. We have agreed as partners that on our side we should have a 49 per cent interest and on their side the Roumanians should have a 51 per cent interest. And I may say that they were always firm that as developers of the tractor they should have a 51 per cent interest. We have said that our shares would amount to about \$171,867 and theirs will be \$178,882 and that makes a total injection of cash for shares of \$350,750. In addition, Mr. Speaker, we have agreed that SEDCO should advance, by way of a loan, slightly over \$1 million and the Auto Tractor people will also advance by way of a loan, slightly over \$1 million. Somewhat more than our share because they will have 51 per cent of the loan and we will also have, as we have the shares, 49 per cent.

Now that is the extent of our risk, Mr. Speaker, \$1 million by way of loan which will be secured by a first mortgage on the plant and the building and the land when it is established, if indeed it is established, and, of course, we will have the risk money of almost \$172,000 in for shares.

The Roumanians will also have to bear the financial burden of financing the inventory of components as they come into the plant to be assembled and of finished tractors in inventory ready for sales. It is anticipated that that will put a burden on them of at least \$1.5 million at any given time.

They will be bearing the greater risk and we will be bearing very little risk because, at the most, I would say it would be something like the shareholdings of \$350,000 we could lose even if a disaster fell and this company had to be wound up after a few years.

Mr. Steuart: — What about the \$1 million?

Mr. Thorson: — Well, as I said the \$1 million we feel is secured by a first mortgage on the land and the building. We don't expect to lose anything on that.

Now, Mr. Speaker, let me just say something about our agreement with our partners so far as the shareholders are concerned. We have agreed, although we have 49 per cent and they have 51 per cent of the shares, that it will take 75 per cent of the shares to make a decision about three different types of matters. One, would be any amendments to the articles of the association of the company. Two. Any amendments to the capital structure or the incurring of any new funded debt, any new capital debt, would require agreement by 75 per cent of the shareholders and not the simple majority. And, in the third category, it would take agreement by 75 per cent of the shareholders on anything dealing with the consolidation or the amalgamation or a merger or a winding up of the company.

We have also agreed with our partners that there should be seven directors on the company, which will be operating in Saskatchewan. And that, while we will only name three and they will name four, but on some matters it will take at least five directors in order to approve of the following types of things, that is, hiring of a general manager or determining the terms

of his contract, including his areas of responsibilities and his authority.

On any contracts with any shareholders there will have to be a majority of five of the seven directors in agreement. And if there are to be any dividends to be declared or share redemptions or capital expenditures, again, there will have to be agreement by five of the seven directors. We think that these provisions give us perfectly reliable control and security so far as our involvement in this venture is concerned.

Let me also say something about the status of our application for a grant from the Department of Regional Economic Expansion. In 1972 we applied jointly as partners for a grant of roughly \$1 million in our application. At that time, on the initial application, DREE turned it down arguing that we as applicants had not adequately established projected sales and profits for the new company.

The officials from the Department of Industry and Commerce, led by the Deputy, Mr. Dombowsky, subsequently submitted more data to DREE. At this point, early this winter, DREE indicated that if the partners would hire a manager to head the company the chances of getting a grant would be greatly improved. So, accordingly, Mr. Speaker, we are in the process of doing that now. It is now clearly necessary that we advance the stage of agreement between our partners and ourselves on terms of the contract for a general manager. I may say we have taken on a consultant, who has been assisting us in many phases of this whole project, to help us recruit a manager, and I am informed this week that we have received five interesting applications for that position. I think that it will be necessary before the winter is out for a team of some of our people from Saskatchewan to go to Roumania to finalize the last terms in the contract for a general manager. I expect then on return to Saskatchewan that the general manager will be hired and we will then meet the DREE officials again and if their decision is favorable, about this project in Saskatchewan, then I think we can go ahead.

Some Hon. Members: — Hear, hear!

Mr. Romanow: — I hope DREE comes through.

Mr. Lane: — Oh, yes!

Mr. Thorson: — Mr. Speaker, in the few minutes that I have left I should like to say a word or two about the state of the oil industry in Saskatchewan.

Members will be happy to know that in the opinion of the industry the outlook for exploration for oil in Saskatchewan is much better now than in any time in the past three or four years. I say that because, and I refer the House to the Leader-Post of December 20, 1972 in a headline which says: "Oil right sales net \$4.5 million." And the story begins by saying that receipts from the sales of Crown petroleum and natural gas rights in 1972 reached nearly \$4.5 million. The highest since 1969. The 1972 total was well above the \$2.5 million revenue from bonus bids on Crown rights in 1971 and the \$3.8 million for 1970.

Now, Mr. Speaker, I say that is a better indication than anything else you can get about the opinion of the people in the

industry as to the prospects in Saskatchewan. The fact that they are putting up money to get lands in Saskatchewan to explore for oil and gas.

Mr. Speaker, it is unfortunate that although we have enjoyed good revenues from our oil resources in Saskatchewan, our crude oil production is declining in recent years. We reached a maximum of production in 1966 with 93 million barrels and that has declined steadily each year since then. Our reserves are also declining, Mr. Speaker, and we have been, since 1959, actually producing more oil each year than we have been finding by way of exploration in Saskatchewan.

I just give some examples, Mr. Speaker of the situation. In 1954 there were 14 pools discovered with total ultimate reserves of 714 million barrels. In 1965 there were also 14 pools discovered but the total ultimate reserves were only 52 million barrels. That has been typical of the oil industry's experience in Saskatchewan right up to the present time.

Our drilling has also been falling off in Saskatchewan in recent years. In 1971 there was a substantial decrease in all important categories compared to recent years. You have to go as far back as 1962 to find a year when the number of wells drilled was as low.

The value of our sales of our oil, however, is in a different direction. There the trends are upward not down. That is the only major economic indicator for our oil industry which has been increasing in recent years. The annual sales in 1971 were \$229 million and exceeded the \$200 million in each of the last seven years. Of course this has been due, naturally not to increasing production because that has been going down, but has been due primarily to an increase in price. Members should keep in mind that there was a 25 per cent per barrel increase in the price of crude oil in December of 1970. There was a 10 cent increase in late 1972 and a further 20 cents per barrel increase announced at the beginning of this year.

It is interesting to note, Mr. Speaker, the totals for money spent, money taken out of our oil industry in Saskatchewan. The most obvious trend in expenditures by the industry is the sharp decline in money spent for exploration and development in the years since 1965. From \$95 million in 1965 exploration and development expenditures have dropped by one-half to \$47 million in 1971. Operating and royalty expenditures have naturally risen because the number of wells in production has increased. In both these categories operating expenditures and royalties paid, however, there has been a levelling off. The level is \$50 million in the first category and about \$25 million in the last.

Total expenditures by the oil industry have decreased from \$159 million in 1965 to \$124 million in 1971. Mr. Speaker, the direct government revenues from the oil industry in Saskatchewan reached its peak in 1965-66 at \$38 million. It has now declined to about \$28 million in the current fiscal year.

Let me just say a word — and I think the Members opposite will be interested in knowing something about the cost of doing business in the oil industry. It is not as the Member for Athabasca (Mr. Guy) tried to suggest the other day, \$150,000 per well. The experience in recent years in the various areas of

Saskatchewan suggests that the maximum for bringing in a well could be as much as \$150,000 or \$160,000 if you were in the southeast part of Saskatchewan drilling to the very deep zones. But if you are in northwestern Saskatchewan, the Beacon Hill area, gas wells have been brought in there with an expenditure of as little as \$30,000 and dry holes as little as \$13,500. In the Kindersley and the Swift Current areas you find the sort of middle ranges for the cost of drilling wells, but even in the Swift Current area to go to 4,600 feet has required an expenditure of perhaps \$35,000 if it is a dry hole but of course if the additional expenditures of bringing a well onto production are incurred, it can almost double that. I think the suggestion that it costs \$150,000 per well is one which we should not leave unchallenged.

Just something about the cost of a barrel of crude oil in Saskatchewan to the producer. In the period 1960-64 the cost per barrel was almost \$1.30 and by 1967-71 the cost per barrel had risen to about \$1.60. Just comparable figures for Alberta and \$2.04 per barrel in British Columbia. The present cost to find, develop and produce a barrel of crude oil in Saskatchewan of \$1.60 can also be compared to the average net price per barrel received by the producers which is \$2.44 in 1971. If you add the recent price increases the average net price for a barrel of oil in 1973 is about \$2.70 and the cost of finding it in Saskatchewan is about \$1.60 — finding it and producing it.

Mr. Speaker, I have just a few minutes to say something about natural gas. In the past Saskatchewan has not had sufficient gas production to supply demand in the province. We have had to rely on some from Alberta. For example, in the year 1971 our domestic commercial and industrial demand was 82 billion cubic feet and we supplied 52 of that out of Saskatchewan or about two-thirds. The significant element of uncertainty has been introduced in our gas picture now with the events that are going on in Alberta in the industry and at the behest of the Government of Alberta in an effort to increase the well head prices for gas.

But we have large, untapped gas reserves in Saskatchewan in the Milk River formation in the southwest part of our province. Some authorities in the industry place the volume at over one trillion cubic feet which is approximately equal to the present proven gas reserves in Saskatchewan now. And as the price increases it becomes more and more economically feasible to produce gas from these Milk River horizons in Saskatchewan.

I just wanted to say, Mr. Speaker, that we can anticipate, not only increasing prices in gas because of the well head increases, but also because of the application of Trans-Canada pipe lines to the National Energy Board for an increase in its rates. The application has been in two phases. Phase one has been completed and the National Energy Board has already decided that Trans-Canada should receive an increased return on its investment. Phase two has not yet been completed and in that decision we will learn how that increase in cost of transporting natural gas to customers in Canada from Alberta is to be allocated among the various provinces.

If the Trans-Canada application is accepted as that company presented it, we can anticipate something over a 13 per cent increase in the cost of gas that we import from Alberta.

Hopefully, Mr. Speaker, when the decision is made in the spring of this year we shall not be penalized in Saskatchewan in being expected to pay higher prices for our gas than we should pay based on our proximity to the source of supply and the cost of transporting gas from Alberta to Saskatchewan.

Mr. Speaker, I had wanted to say more in this Throne Speech Debate, but I feel it only fair that I give way to one of the other Members before we adjourn for the day. We are, in the Government, Mr. Speaker, engaged in the process of building a better Saskatchewan.

Some Hon. Members: — Hear, hear!

Mr. Thorson: — We set out with some clear precision, so that no voters in Saskatchewan could be in doubt about where we stood, how we intended to do that when we published our New Deal for People. We presented it to the electorate in June of 1971 and they gave it a very resounding endorsement. As we go through month by month and year by year of our present term of office, we intend to fulfil the undertakings contained in the New Deal for People which has been endorsed by the people of Saskatchewan. I am confident, Mr. Speaker, as I said at the beginning, that this year 1973 will be an even better year than the year 1972 which was a good one. I am confident, Mr. Speaker, as we keep faith with the people of Saskatchewan, they will endorse our programs and we can look forward to a renewed mandate at some occasion in the future.

Some Hon. Members: — Hear, hear!

Mr. Thorson: — Now, Mr. Speaker, because it is altogether too pessimistic and gloomy and not based on the facts of the situation in Saskatchewan I cannot support the amendment and I will not. But I will enthusiastically support the motion.

Some Hon. Members: — Hear, hear!

Mr. J.G. Lane (Lumsden): — Prior to entering this debate, Mr. Speaker, it gives me a great deal of pleasure to welcome back to this Assembly the junior Member from Athabasca (Mr. Guy). The man who keeps winning elections in spite of the many devious and controversial methods used by the Government opposite to attempt his defeat.

I congratulate the mover and the seconder. It was certainly an excellent effort in self-deception or self-hypnosis if they really believe what they were saying.

I note in particular the efforts made by the Member from Nutana South (Mr. Rolfes) to extend the hand of co-operation to the Opposition.

I also note his expression that perhaps it will have to be the newer Members of this House that will have to take the lead in this regard. I ask him where the hand of co-operation was when the Members of the Opposition last session tried to bring in legislation to prevent discrimination because of age. And I ask him how he could, if he is attempting to co-operate for the best interest of the people of Saskatchewan, participate in the perversion of the democratic process that went on in

Athabasca which was detailed by the Member from Athabasca (Mr. Guy).

We note the remarks of the Hon. Member from Hanley (Mr. Mostoway) who spoke in this debate when he made one of the classic statements in this House, 'Our Government is committed to democracy and the giving of information.' I We wait with

Some Hon. Members: — Hear, hear!

Mr. Lane: — a great deal of anticipation your stand when we start getting answers turned down or refused on the Orders of the Day.

We commend the Hon. Member from Gravelbourg (Mr. Gross) on seconding the Speech from the Throne, the youngest Member I believe in this Legislature. I am sure that the Hon. Premier looks forward to the day when the junior Member becomes a great orator in this House, the day that his voice changes, whenever that happens.

We note the comments by the Hon. Member, the Minister of Industry and Commerce (Mr. Thorson). He took the most positive approach to the stand that this Government has taken on the Roumanian tractor plant. He was so positive to state that the Roumanians are coming, if DREE is favorable, then I think it will go ahead, he only thinks it will go ahead at that point. We are no closer to having Roumanians in Saskatchewan now than when the promises were first made by the Government opposite.

Some Hon. Members: — Hear, hear!

Mr. Lane: — I should like to take this opportunity, Mr. Speaker, to commend the appointment of the new Cabinet Ministers and we note other than the flying circus that seemingly they were all appointed because of their lack of participation in the Athabasca by-election, rather than their participation.

I am sure that some of the Members with ambitions in the very back rows over there, like Mike and some of the other Members, now look with trepidation when they think of the new Cabinet post coming along and they know that they are ruled out. I know that the Members opposite wait with a great deal of anticipation the Premier's promise of a new Cabinet post. Certainly the citizens of Regina will feel more than slighted if the former mayor, the most experienced Member of the back benchers of the Government opposite doesn't receive his just and due consideration. I am sure that the Hon. Member from Arm River (Mr. Faris) regrets his unfortunate statement of comparing Liberals to "dogs returning to their vomit" when he looks over at his competition from the cloth who now has the new Ministry of Social Services. I would hope before we get into this debate, Mr. Speaker, that the Hon. Member from Kinistino (Mr. Thibault) has his seat belt done up so that we don't get interrupted as the Hon. Member from Nutana South (Mr. Rolfes) was.

Mr. Speaker, the allegations made and proven by the Hon. Member from Athabasca (Mr. Guy) should put to rest once and for all the sanctimonious hypocrisy of the Government opposite when it comes to elections. It should also make it clear to the people of Saskatchewan that not only an Independent Boundaries

Commission is in order, but that a Chief Electoral Officer

Some Hon. Members: — Hear, hear!

Mr. Lane: — of Saskatchewan should be independent of any political party.

There has been some thought, Mr. Speaker, that the NDP Government has been concerned with the rights of the individual. And somehow the false impression has got through to the people of Saskatchewan that a person is more than a person who simply marks an X on his ballot. As a matter of fact, Mr. Speaker, some people even believed that they are voting for the old CCF party and that there were no differences between the old CCF party and the present NDP when they voted on June 23, 1971. But, Mr. Speaker, the people of Saskatchewan were conned, misled and deceived by one of the autocratic forms of democratic socialism ever perpetrated on the people of Saskatchewan.

The predecessors of the Government opposite did create and did implement legislation dealing with individual civil liberties. Legislation called the Saskatchewan Bill of Rights was implemented in 1947. I believe, the first in Canada.

The old CCF Party even gave the person the right to rest assured he would not be faced with prohibitively high medical bills and the right to medical assistance. The myth that the party opposite was concerned about the individual had its germination during 20 long, gaunt, depressing dreary years of hypocrisy. But this party that the Government opposite hearkens back to, Mr. Speaker, is dead. The party that this Government hearkens back to has been shot, hung, guillotined and cremated and been put away to rest by the executioners of the Government opposite.

The Human Rights legislation passed by the CCF was broken by the present Attorney General. Legislation proposed in this House by this Opposition to extend the rights of the individual to prevent discrimination by reason of age was rejected in a high-handed manner by the Government opposite.

In the field of health, Mr. Speaker, we have had a history of health programs under the now deceased CCF party. The recent announcement by the Minister of Public Health (Mr. Smishek) regarding chiropractic care was welcomed by the Members of this Assembly.

But let's look at some of these programs. Medicare and the proposed dental care for children, they have not, notwithstanding the remarks of the Members opposite, improved the quality of the medical care to the poor of Saskatchewan. There are no incentives in the programs for doctors to practise in rural areas, or on Indian reservations in Saskatchewan.

Hon. W.E. Smishek (Minister of Public Health): — What have you done in seven years?

:

Mr. Lane — There are no changes in the basic causes of ill health

among the poor in Saskatchewan. I am personally sympathetic, Mr. Speaker, to the premise set out by the Brookings Institution, which the Members opposite may be well aware of. That our social programs and the social programs of the Great Society in the United States have failed to improve health services and have failed to improve the health of our citizens.

But I condemn the Government and the Members opposite, Mr. Speaker, for creating an atmosphere in Saskatchewan. An atmosphere that the addition of more money to health services and health programs will improve the health of our citizens. You have created this atmosphere through the use of and the cheap political ploy of buying votes.

Free medicare to those over 65, did not do one thing to improve the health of our senior citizens. It was crass politics. Unfortunately because of the climate you had created it was effective. You promised a right to good health in your New Deal for People. But you haven't delivered.

You have refused when you were the Opposition party to create an atmosphere in the field of health that the whole problem of health must be looked at in the total context and must be looked at rationally. Unfortunately, Mr. Speaker, it caught up with the Hon. Minister of Public Health. I am going to quote from a press statement, Mr. Speaker. The Health Minister said (in an unexpected and emotional outburst) — now that I should like to have seen, Mr. Speaker. Did he throw his shoe? Did he throw the Commonwealth? What did the Hon. Member do to give this unexpected and emotional outburst? He said:

One major goal of one of his projects was to cut costs.

Costs had risen by 37.5 per cent to this year's \$132 million since 1968-69. If costs were to continue to increase at this rapid rate, in the next five years we could be spending more than half of the current provincial budget on medicare and hospitalization.

"Costs" the word "costs." Sorry that the Hon. Member, Mr. Feduniak, isn't here with his dictionary. Costs, a word that wasn't even in the old CCF dictionary. Now the Hon. Minister of Public Health is going to cut costs. The man who was going to save the small hospitals has now moved to cut the approved bed rate in Saskatchewan. You have not delivered the right to good health and your petty political approach has convinced the public that simply more programs is the answer.

But what was promised by the NDP Government — good health and good education are the right of every Saskatchewan citizen.

Some Hon. Members: — Hear, hear!

Mr. Lane: — Who said that? The New Deal for People. What had a right under the old CCF Party had become a base political ploy under the executioners opposite.

A right to good education and, again, I refer to the yellow journal of a booklet about Saskatchewan. An election fought on promises that had no basis in reality

or in truth. Promises of a New Deal in education, an end to student-teacher ratios and an end to supposed education strife in Saskatchewan. Not one effort by the NDP when it was in opposition to be constructive when our whole process of education is in the throes of some of the most drastic and far-reaching changes in the history of formal education.

Not one constructive approach when our teacher status and security were being threatened. When our trustees are losing local control, when our system of higher education is being drastically changed. Just a crass, cheap Populist approach to play on the fears and legitimate concerns of those involved in the educational process. One of the secrets, Mr. Speaker, to being a successful Populist is to make sure that those who voted for you at least seem to be happy. We, in the Opposition, Mr. Speaker, look forward to the Government's proposals of several important changes in the field of education.

But the people involved in the field of education are not looking forward to some of your several important changes. They know and they know full well that they were misled on the question of student-teacher ratios. They know they were conned on the promise to make good education the right for every Saskatchewan citizen.

Your promises and your practices and your political tactics struck fear into all citizens in the Province of Saskatchewan. You are dividing the people against themselves and causing them to fight against themselves.

You have already caused hatred between towns in this province

Some Hon. Members: — Hear, hear!

Mr. Lane: — between relatives in this province, between trustees and between teachers. (The Hon. Member from Qu'Appelle-Wolseley, Mr. Hanson, knows of what I speak). And between parents and children over your cheap political approach to education. The right to a fair education system has died under the present NDP Government.

You promised to end student-teacher ratios — you didn't deliver. You, Mr. Premier, promised autonomy to the Regina Campus — you haven't delivered. You promised a good education and you deliver division. The rights of the old CCF have been buried by a band of democratic socialists. The NDP promised leadership in education and delivered conflict, confrontations, crisis and controversy. And you may want to look up that slogan in the New Deal for People.

The divisive politics of the NDP have carried from the towns and village of Saskatchewan, Mr. Speaker, to all the provinces of Canada.

We have had the Premier's statement that his policies and his position is not divisive of Canada. Perhaps he was misquoted. Perhaps we are not doing as well under DREE as we should. Perhaps Quebec is doing better.

But to take this message into other parts of Canada during a federal election, when the speech is purely for the political benefit of the local audience, I say his statements and his

approach is divisive. We note the quietness of the Premier in Saskatchewan and the truth was not told in Saskatchewan of the Premier's actions in the rest of Canada until the Prime Minister spoke in Regina. All because of the silence of the Hon. Premier when he was in Saskatchewan. And to show the political approach that the Premier had taken in the rest of Canada and why his credibility is in question, I am going to refer to a press clipping from Charlottetown in the Leader-Post Mr. Minister of Agriculture (Mr. Messer). Here is the statement made by the Hon. Premier in Charlottetown when he is trying not to be divisive.

There is not a Cabinet Minister of any importance in the Trudeau Government who is from east of Quebec City or west of Hamilton.

That's the Premier of Saskatchewan. No Cabinet Minister of any importance west of Hamilton. Now that's the difference between the Government and our party. We take pride in our accomplishments. We don't constantly deride and degrade the people of this province. We may disagree or oppose, but to disparage our own accomplishments, Mr. Speaker, is strong evidence of the lack of pride the NDP has in the Province of Saskatchewan.

Since Confederation in Canada, Mr. Speaker, and historically in England, one of the prestigious and important positions in any government has been that person charged with administration of justice. It is a position in which partisan politics should enter as little as possible. It is a position where the responsibility to ensure justice for all is the overriding responsibility.

It has always been that way in Canada, and it has always been one of the most senior prestigious Cabinet positions in Canada.

Yet the Premier of Saskatchewan says that we don't have a Cabinet Minister of importance west of Hamilton. The fact that we have a native son from Saskatchewan who is Minister of Justice for Canada is a source of derision for the NDP and the Premier opposite. The fact that he said it outside of Saskatchewan and not in the province certainly brings into doubt the Premier's sincerity and credibility on the question of Saskatchewan's constitutional politics.

Some Hon. Members: — Hear, hear!

Mr. Lane: — We have had individual pieces of legislation, Mr. Speaker, passed in the 1972 Legislative session which began an assault on the individual liberties in Saskatchewan. Land Bank legislation introduced by the biggest small farmer in Saskatchewan took away the right to own farm land. We will propose legislation, Mr. Speaker, and we have proposed legislation to restore basic rights to individuals.

Some Hon. Members: — Hear, hear!

Mr. Lane: — I might add, Mr. Speaker, that our intention in proposing legislation is to correct what we feel is wrong in existing legislation. We have no intention in rehashing legislative principles that have been approved by this House.

We will propose amendments, for example, Mr. Speaker, to an Act to establish a Department of Consumer Affairs. Mr. Speaker, while criticizing the “cease and desist” powers in the Act, we asked on several occasions that reasons be given for the need for such power. We were unable to get an answer from the Minister. The new Minister of Social Services (Mr. Taylor) went so far without a reason to welcome the power and even suggest that it be extended for 10 days. This power, Mr. Speaker, has cast a strong shadow and lack of credibility over Saskatchewan business and it’s a power that should be repealed. We received no reasons for such power then, we see no reasons for such power now.

I did, Mr. Speaker, receive a couple of possibilities and suggestions from members of the Intersessional Committee on Business. The first suggestion was that if a drug store is selling thalidomide, that the Government should be able to close down that drug store for five days. Not simply pull out the drug, they want to close down the drug store. I am sure the new ‘minister of secondary industry from Bruno’ is prepared to make comments on how to close down a drug store. I refer to secondary industry as a new approach to industry — if the first one is run by a Liberal close it down and then open up a second one. I might advise the Members of this House that question of harmful drugs is already covered under federal government legislation and such actions would be ultra vires of the Province of Saskatchewan. Again, we see no reason for that power. The second suggestion for that power was that an unsafe product might be sold. We certainly don’t feel, of course, that unsafe products should be on the market, but why the Government could not take the approach of stopping the sale of the unsafe product wherever it is instead of insisting on closing down the business for five days. Again, there is federal government legislation in this field. The power to close down any business for five days is unnecessary, unwarranted and discredits Saskatchewan business.

Some Hon. Members: — Hear, hear!

Mr. Lane: — We looked at trade unions, Mr. Speaker. The right to free speech by the individual trade union member was taken away by the Government opposite. We will restore this right if the legislation we propose passes this Assembly. We will give back to the individual union member the right to criticize his own union, the right to talk against his own union and the right to exercise his freedom of speech.

The Land Bank with its attempts to destroy the concepts of a right to private property, the blockade of the Small Farms Development Act by the Premier and the czar of agriculture simply because the land is for sale immediately is grounds for non-implementation of the Small Farms Development Act which would assist Saskatchewan farmers. The Premier says that the only reason the province has not signed is because the land has to be sold to a person who is already farming, an admitted weakness of that Act. Yet the first lease under the Land Bank, Mr. Speaker, was to the son of an NDP supporter who was already farming at the time.

Some Hon. Members: — Hear, hear!

Mr. Lane: — The only reason the

Government opposite will not join the Small Farms Development Act, Mr. Speaker, is because it will work and because the Government of Canada will not give the selling bonus and the option of first refusal to the NDP collectivization plan.

We have had announcements throughout the year by the Treasury benches opposite. One which gives us a great deal of concern is the NDP proposal to control cable television in the Province of Saskatchewan. The Premier of Saskatchewan has stated:

We believe that SaskTel must own its own broad band cable network and be able to cross subsidize from high profit urban cable systems in order to extend services to smaller, uneconomic rural centres.

An excellent principle, Mr. Speaker, however it falls down in what we think the practice will be. What will we see on cable television, I ask, Mr. Speaker? Certainly, if the Hon. Member from Saskatoon University (Mr. Richards) has his way, we won't see Archie Bunker. What are we going to see? We are going to see the terror of the highways, the man with the hat reading the road information program. We will have the Minister of Northern Saskatchewan (Mr. Bowerman) reading the fishing report on cable television. That's what we will see again if this type of advertising is indicative of what is going to go on television under the ownership of the Government.

Mr. MacDonald (Moose Jaw North): — What will Henry do?

Mr. Lane: — Henry will be on giving his own version of what should happen and what the Throne Speech and what the Budget Speech should be. This ridiculous picture of the Minister of Highways (Mr. Kramer), Mr. Premier and the Members of this House, is a prime example of the arrogant demagogue among Members opposite and it is that type of practice that we oppose.

We heard the hypocritical hysteria of the Members opposite when they were in Opposition. I am going to refer to a speech by the Hon. Member from Touchwood (Mr. Meakes). The Hon. Member for Touchwood speaking to the believing people in Dysart, Saskatchewan, said and I quote:

Above all a New Democratic Government will eliminate waste and mismanagement particularly in such areas as highway spending and partisan political propaganda.

An Hon. Member: — Oh, oh!

Mr. Lane: — That's what the Members opposite were going to eliminate. I think if the Members opposite don't believe the Member from Touchwood, that they could refer to the New Deal for People under the taxation category which says exactly the same thing. That the Members opposite when they formed the Government were going to eliminate the partisan political propaganda. And this is what we get, smiling Eiling! Smiling Eiling on the hotline for winter road information. But the control of cable television, I submit, Mr. Speaker, is just one step to control the political thought in this province and it is one step in the new demagogues' approach to electioneering.

Again some steps have been referred to by the Member from Athabasca (Mr. Guy).

This House has debated and argued about the complete lack of political ethics on the part of the Members opposite in providing government contracts to its party owned printing company and printing service, Service Printers Limited. In the previous 20 years of CCF rule Service Printers did over \$460,000 worth of business for the Government, \$466,000 to be exact. Let's assume because it is not a large multi-national corporate ogre, that Service Printers only made a 5 per cent return. Over \$20,000 of the taxpayers' money went into the CCF and NDP campaign kitties and it has started all over again, Mr. Speaker. The profits of Service Printers paid for by the people of Saskatchewan will go to maintain the arrogant Government opposite.

The new demagogues are hiring their defeated candidates to establish a political machine again paid for and supported by the people of Saskatchewan. Edward Shillington — \$17,976, paid for by the people opposite. Jim Eaton defeated candidate for Cannington — \$945 per month, paid for by the people of Saskatchewan. Clifford Arthur Lloyd, defeated candidate, Regina — \$815 a month. Gerry Pout-MacDonald — \$9,887 a year, defeated candidate for Regina Albert Park. John Burton, Administrative Analyst V — \$1,612 per month, paid for by the people of Saskatchewan. I am convinced that John Burton lost the election on purpose because he couldn't afford to go to Ottawa. Frank Buck didn't do as well and the Premier is going to have to fit him in the ranks. He ran, he lost and he only got \$1,147 a month.

That's why we fear cable television under your control, Mr. Premier. We will see smiling Eiling and we will see programs designed to ensure that the party propaganda machine is carried into nearly every home in this province.

The proposed legislation to control candidates' expenditures will mean absolutely nothing in the Province of Saskatchewan. The propaganda machine is being assembled, party hack by party hack, defeated candidate by defeated candidate, partisan civil servant by partisan civil servant, contract by contract, Lank Bank committee by Land Bank committee and advertisement by advertisement. When the Government opposite is finished, Mr. Speaker, their candidates won't have to spend a red cent for election expenses. The democratic socialists want a divided province but they also want the complete control of the economic, social and educational life of this province.

Mr. Speaker, let's look at the blueprint for democratic socialism laid before this Legislature. We have a torrent of Crown corporations notwithstanding that everyone of them is in the highly competitive field. Social democrats from Europe — I am going to refer to a treatise that I referred to last year — "The American Challenge" by Jean Jacques Servan-Schreiber facing the same problem in France as here. I am going to repeat what I said last year in light of the Government's attempt to get into Crown corporations in competitive fields.

Suppose a new regime (and he gives this example) wanted to nationalize IBM France which has several modern plants. Having taken control of these handsome installations the government would find that it had mistaken the shadow for the substance. What counts today for a corporation is

not walls or the machines but the intangible elements that cannot be nationalized. Just as in biology the cell is different from the sum of its component molecules, so a modern corporation is different from the production factors that go into it. By nationalizing IBM we would simply force its managers and technicians to emigrate. We would be committing on the scientific and strategic level the kind of intellectual suicide that Hitler's anti-Semitic policies produced in Germany 30 years ago.

These Crown corporations are not the best way of utilizing provincial capital investment. As a matter of fact, in competitive fields they are probably one of the worst ways of doing so. In a society of great changes in man's knowledge and man's technology, the imposition of a form of management which is basically static cannot work. The box factories and the shoe factories failed because of management. I am assuming that the CCF had some evidence that there was a market for these products and I am assuming that the CCF had some reason to hope that they would be successful ventures. But they imposed a static management on a highly changing field and it does not work. Again, we are doing this in these proposed Crown corporations, we are imposing a static, basically self-serving form of administration on an entity which must constantly change in order to succeed.

I hope to be able to find out in Crown corporations the number of new inventions discovered by SaskTel or Sask Power. Without a doubt, the new technologies of these two Crown corporations came from privately owned and free-enterprise industries.

Mr. Speaker, more verbiage came out of the Government opposite when they were in the Opposition regarding the risk of public moneys. No greater risk of public moneys has ever been proposed before this Legislature. An admission was made by the Minister of Industry (Mr. Thorson) that the only major petroleum reserves are in the deep horizons. Figures that such drillings will cost approximately \$150,000 per hole with no guarantee of success. One hundred dry wells means a loss of \$15 million, a figure well within the realm of reality. As was mentioned in the House last year, if there is any fault for not having adequate returns to the people of Saskatchewan from our oil and gas, the fault lies with the now defunct CCF Government. That government watched and stood idly by while wells were being drilled, watched and stood idly by when oil wells gushed, watched and stood idly by while office employees of petroleum companies moved to that province. And now this Government wants to watch and stand by while millions of dollars of the people's money go down to the high risk, high class deep horizons.

Mr. Speaker, we will be watching the Government's actions regarding the field of driver licences. We go on record as supporting a licence suspension period that has no restrictions if the driver has been guilty of impaired or related offences. I am aware, Mr. Speaker, of the slogan or the saying that no one is more converted than the convert and we note the appointment of Father Gorski to the Review Board. We should like to have assurances from the Attorney General (Mr. Romanow), Mr. Speaker, that the House will be given an opportunity to debate any proposals to grant restricted licences to those convicted of impaired driving or related offences. Perhaps it may even be time, Mr. Speaker, for the Government to bring in more draconian measures to stop the carnage on our highways.

Mr. Speaker, we note in the Throne Speech that there is going to be a new improved Litter Act. We condemn the Government opposite for its failure to take action in this regard and its failure to implement Liberal legislation of 1971 which would have been a simple outright ban on no deposit no return bottles and cans. That should have been implemented a long time ago, Mr. Speaker.

We would hope that the Government's welcoming of the forthcoming federal-provincial conference will mean a sincere effort on the part of the Government to alleviate the problems of Western Canada. The obstruction of the Small Farms Development Program means that benefits are not going to Saskatchewan farmers and this puts into doubt the sincerity of the Government in helping Saskatchewan farmers.

I can remember, Mr. Speaker, the stabilization fight which the now Minister of Justice was admitting from the start, that the program was only a start. His motives and his intentions were slammed and defeated and driven into the ground by Members of the party opposite. His motives were challenged and questioned. When the Foreign Ownership Bill was introduced in this House, the Minister of Agriculture didn't want his motives questioned yet he felt it's all right to question someone else's.

We are concerned that the Party opposite will make that conference a political arena which could set back equity for Western Canada for a generation.

Just a comment about the Premier's remarks in this debate about the tax increase. I just wanted to paraphrase a little slogan for the Premier that he may have heard that, "A tax increase, is a tax increase, is a tax increase." Mr. Speaker, we intend to take a positive approach in this Session. But we will criticize where such criticism is warranted or valid. We will continue to fight and fight for the implementation of Federal Liberal programs which the Government opposite has stalled or will sabotage. We will fight above all for a restitution of individual liberties. We will fight against the unnecessary control and the arrogance and the demagoguery of the Government opposite. Such arrogance and demagoguery has been proved during 19 long, gaunt, dreary months of democratic socialism.

Mr. Speaker, I should just like to take a moment in joining with the Premier and some of the Members opposite in expressing some happiness in the announcement of the end of the American involvement in Vietnam. The involvement was one of history's greatest tragedies as were the errors of American advisors that placed that country on the road to this tragedy. I would hope that the people who have vilified the American people for this tragedy would now turn their efforts to extending compassion to the American people as they try to heal their own wounds. We welcome the efforts of the Government of Canada and the speed with which it expedited the Canadian Peace Keeping Force into the war zones. I hope that the Members of the Opposition in Parliament were not serious when the Government was criticized for sending troops without the approval of Parliament. I commend the Government of Canada for its action and I hope for an atmosphere of compassion towards the American neighbors prevails.

Some Hon. Members: — Hear, hear!

Mr. Lane: — I will oppose the motion and support the amendment.

Some Hon. Members: — Hear, hear!

Mr. J. Wiebe (Morse): — Mr. Speaker, in the few minutes that we have remaining today I should initially like to welcome the junior Member from Athabasca (Mr. Guy) and at some later date I should like to dwell a little bit further on that. Of course it is customary to congratulate the mover and the seconder of the Speech from the Throne. I am especially pleased this year to be able to congratulate the mover and seconder. I think that they can be justly proud in their recognition and the honor which they have received.

I might mention here, just going back on what happened last year, that the mover and the seconder of the Speech from the Throne then, shortly after the House prorogued were both made Cabinet Ministers. I imagine that the Member for Gravelbourg (Mr. Gross) and the Member from Nutana South (Mr. Rolfes) are quite pleased that their possibilities of becoming Members of Cabinet this summer look very good. I am sorry though that the Member for Regina Wascana's (Mr. Baker) hopes have been shattered in this regard but I just might mention that if I had any influence with the Premier I would certainly put in a good word for you.

Some Hon. Members: — Hear, hear!

Mr. Wiebe: — There are many comments which I should like to make regarding the Speech from the Throne and, Mr. Speaker, I would ask leave to adjourn debate.

Debate adjourned.

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