

LEGISLATIVE ASSEMBLY OF SASKATCHEWAN
3rd Session — Seventeenth Legislature
8th Day

Monday, February 5, 1973.

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

WELCOME TO STUDENTS

Mr. E.C. Whelan (Regina North West): — Mr. Speaker, through you I should like to introduce to this Assembly 60 Grade Eight students from Rosemont School, seated in the west gallery. These young people from Regina Northwest are accompanied by their teachers, Ernie Gaschler and John Bateson. Members, I am sure you will join me in extending a warm welcome and expressing the wish that their stay with us will be pleasant and educational.

Hon. Members: — Hear, hear!

Mr. T.M. Weatherald (Cannington): — Mr. Speaker, I should like to introduce to you a group of Grade Ten students from Maryfield School in my constituency that have come to this Assembly this afternoon. They have had a fine tour of the building and they are here to watch the democratic procedure in our Assembly. I know that all Members will want to express their delight in having them here.

Hon. Members: — Hear, hear!

QUESTIONS

MR. McMILLAN — CLERK ASSISTANT

Mr. A.R. Guy (Athabasca): — Mr. Speaker, I wonder if I might direct a question to you, Sir, in clarification. On Friday, January 26th, you informed the Legislature that Mr. McMillan had been appointed Clerk Assistant. I should like to have clarification as to whether that means he comes under your jurisdiction as Speaker and through you to the Legislature as a whole?

Mr. Speaker: — I think questions to the Speaker are better taken up in the Speaker's office and not on the Assembly floor. I will be willing to discuss it with the Member any time he wishes to come to my office.

STUDIES ON CHURCHILL RIVER DEVELOPMENT

Mr. T.M. Weatherald (Cannington): — Mr. Speaker, before the Orders of the Day, I should like to direct a question to the Minister of Environment (Mr. Byers). Over the weekend the Minister announced that studies would be taking place on the Churchill River development project, environmental studies. He said they would begin today. Is the Minister prepared to tell the House the names of the groups of people who will be undertaking these studies, whether they be

independent studies conducted outside the Government or whether the studies are conducted by the Government themselves?

Hon. N.E. Byers (Minister of Environment): — Mr. Speaker, I do not have the names of the persons other than the various departments associated with this study. If the Member would like to put a question on the Paper for the groups other than the Department of Natural Resources, SPC and Highways, we shall be glad to provide this information.

Mr. Weatherald: — Mr. Speaker, the most immediate question that I think is of concern to all Members is, are the studies being conducted by the Government agencies or are the studies being conducted by independent groups outside the Government of Saskatchewan?

Mr. Byers: — Well, I draw to the attention of the Member the announcement which may or may not be on his desk. I would draw to his attention that these studies will involve ground survey and aerial reconnaissance and the survey crews are being co-ordinated by the Department of Natural Resources. They are using staff from SPC and the Department of Highways as well as some private contractors. I expect that his first question was related to the question of what private contractors were involved. We can get that information for him if he wants it.

AMENDMENTS TO UNIVERSITY ACT IN CARILLON

Mr. C.P. MacDonald (Milestone): — Mr. Speaker, I should like to direct a question to the Minister of Education (Mr. MacMurchy). I have in my hand here a copy of the Carillon, the latest edition of the Carillon, and in it there is a complete outline of the amendments to the new University Act. I should like to know, Mr. Minister of Education how they got this information. Was it made known to other members of the Press and is this the policy of the Minister of Education to give out this kind of information prior to it being tabled in the House?

Hon. G. MacMurchy (Minister of Education): — Mr. Speaker, in reply to the Member from Milestone, I should like to know how they got the information myself. It certainly is not the policy of this Government, or of this Minister, to make information available of this nature. I think that they have done a lot of speculating and the Bill will be coming forward in the House very shortly.

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. J. Wiebe (Morse): — Mr. Speaker, as I mentioned Friday when I adjourned the debate, I should once again like to congratulate the mover and seconder to the Throne Speech and I am sure that the honor which

which has been bestowed upon them is very gratifying to them.

Now, initially, Mr. speaker, I should like to join with the rest of my colleagues in welcoming back to this Legislature the Member from Athabasca (Allan Guy).

Some Hon. Members: — Hear, hear!

Mr. Wiebe: — It is especially gratifying for me having spent some time in the Athabasca constituency during the campaign working with Allan Guy, to have been afforded the opportunity of meeting and getting to know the people whom Allan Guy represents in the northern part of this great province. It gave me the opportunity of better understanding the North and some of its problems, as well as to see first hand the tremendous potential which we have in the North.

Having a better understanding of the North, I realize Allan Guy truly is the voice of the North. His understanding of the North and its people will certainly benefit this Legislature and, in turn, the people of this province.

Since becoming a province in 1905, Saskatchewan's major industry has been agriculture. Agriculture over the years has played a major part in the development of this province. It is a heritage of which we all can be proud. Agriculture, if developed properly, will continue to be one of our major industries. Our efforts inside and outside of Government must be directed to developing a sound and stable economic base that will provide for meaningful expansion of this very vital industry. We must insure that agriculture continues to expand, continues to provide opportunities for new farm units, for diversification and for stability. In this complex world stability is difficult to achieve.

Because of this instability in world markets on which expansion of Saskatchewan agriculture depends, we must be careful not to put all our eggs in one basket, we must not ask for, nor expect agriculture to carry the entire burden of our economic future in this province. We have talked about diversification in agriculture itself, we must also talk about the economic diversification of this province. If we wish to grow and provide a good standard of living and opportunity for all people in this province, we must look to our other resources as well.

We have vast mineral resources which are crying to be developed. We have renewable resources other than agriculture, such as forestry and fishing, second to none in Canada. These, too, are crying to be developed. We must make use of these resources — resources which belong to each and everyone of us. They must be developed if we wish to provide Saskatchewan with that broad economic base.

1965 saw a start in this diversification, the province became alive with development. Industries began to be established, confidence returned to our business community. Our youth who did not wish to farm were given the opportunity to stay in their own province and contribute to its development. The spring of 1971, under the NDP, brought an abrupt end to this development. For the past two years, we in Saskatchewan are again being by-passed by industry and will soon be dependent again only on agriculture and Federal Equalization Grants.

Not all of our youth wish to farm, Mr. Speaker. If we are going to keep them in Saskatchewan, if we are going to allow them to contribute to the development of Saskatchewan, we must again begin the development of our mineral and renewable resources. We must stop this farce of nationalizing our industries, we must return confidence to our business community, we must encourage public and private involvement. An economy based only on agriculture cannot afford the tax burden that would be required to develop our natural resources under a socialistic program.

As I mentioned earlier, not all our youth in Saskatchewan wish to farm, but for those who do we must initiate programs and provide opportunities that will encourage them to take up a career in farming. If we are going to put more young farmers back on the land we must make it economically feasible for them to do so. We must ensure that they can see a future in the agricultural industry of this province.

The land, regardless of whether you own it or lease it, is not much good to our youth if they do not have the resources and credit to obtain the machinery needed to farm that land. As well, to have an economic farm unit, incentives must be provided to enable diversification of that farm unit, incentives to expand into livestock, into other fields of agriculture and to relieve the dependency upon grain. Incentive programs must be initiated. Time does not permit too much elaboration, but for the benefit of Members opposite I should like to mention just a few of the incentive programs designed for diversification that were implemented by the previous Liberal Government.

1. An imaginative program that made available grants to assist farmers to construct modern hog-rearing facilities. A program which by the end of 1971 saw over 700 barns built that were capable of turning out an average of 350 hogs each per year.
2. For the first time in the history of this province loans were made available through SEDCO for farm diversification into livestock.
3. Grants were made available for individual irrigation projects.
4. Encouragement was given for forage production and incentive grants provided to construct hay and fodder shelters.
5. Lease land was sold to young farmers at reasonable prices.
6. Payments were made to producers as an incentive for the production of quality hogs. Just one more program that was cancelled by the NDP.
7. Acreage in community pastures were increased from 425,000 to over 630,000 acres.
8. Improved acreage nearly tripled, from 70,000 to over 200,000 acres.
9. Community sheep pastures were constructed.

10. Co-operative grazing associations were expanded by over 50,000 acres and almost half a million dollars paid out in earned assistance.

The list goes on, Mr. Speaker, but I would be remiss if I did not mention the Guaranteed Livestock Loan Program. A program which besides guaranteeing the loan also paid a grant to offset the high interest rates. This single piece of legislation alone did more for the livestock industry in this province than did 20 years of socialism under the CCF-NDP. These are just a few examples to show how the Liberal Government realized the need for incentives and farm diversification. We came up with sound and imaginative ideas and put those ideas into practice.

It might be interesting to note, Mr. Speaker, that during the past two years of NDP Government, there have been no new incentive programs introduced by this Government. It is also interesting to note that in the Throne Speech mention was made of their intention to introduce legislation that would provide for low-cost, supervised credit related to livestock. And yet last week the Minister of Agriculture (Mr. Messer) introduced a Bill to amend the Guaranteed Livestock Loan Act. All that this amendment does is to extend the Bill for one more year. It makes no provision whatsoever to provide for low cost supervised credit for our young farmers who wish to diversify into livestock. Just one more indication of how the Government Members opposite are only willing to pay lip service to these problems and are not willing to act positively upon them.

I should, at this time, like to direct my remarks to some of the concerns which I have regarding the direction in which this Government is taking the agricultural industry in this province. As was mentioned in the Throne Speech and from the record of the NDP Government during the past 18 months, it is becoming very evident that they are determined to undermine and do away with the individual freedom of the farmer, the livestock producer and those involved in the agricultural industry of this province.

Individual freedom, Mr. Speaker, which since confederation has helped to build the West and this great province, freedom to make up our own minds, freedom to decide what we want and how we wish to shape our future.

Some Hon. Members: — Hear, hear!

Mr. Wiebe: — The ethnic origins of Saskatchewan are comprised of thousands of people who left their native land to build a new life. To get a new start in a country that allowed them to own property, to own land, to rise above their present situation and create the life style they wanted for themselves. Freedom, Mr. Speaker! They came to Canada, to Saskatchewan, for freedom; and freedom is what they got. And today, freedom, a very basic right of every individual, is being threatened by this arrogant Government and its Cabinet. This Government's desire to undermine this freedom and gain complete state control and state ownership of the agricultural industry in this province is becoming more evident each and every day. The Land Bank, designed to nationalize the farm land in Saskatchewan; the proposed limitations to the size of individual farm units; the restriction of ownership under the abortive Foreign Ownership Bill; combined

with the disastrous effect the new estate and succession duties have on individual farmers — are just a few examples. The inability of the individual farmer adequately to voice his opinion prior to the implementation of these programs — programs which affect their very livelihood is of very great concern to me.

Some Hon. Members: — Hear, hear!

Mr. Wiebe: — The new Hog Marketing Commission is just one example of the NDP Government's desire to ignore the individual. At this time, Mr. Speaker, I do not wish to get into a debate of the pros and cons of the Hog Marketing Commission as I feel this is not the time nor the place. But I do wish to comment on the arrogant attitude of the Minister of Agriculture (Mr. Messer) in his determination to deny the hog producers an opportunity to voice their opinions.

Some Hon. Members: — Hear, hear!

Mr. Wiebe: — An opportunity to voice their opinion through the means of a plebiscite. When questioned in the House last Monday, the Minister stated that he had the backing of the National Farmers' Union, he had the backing of the Saskatchewan Wheat Pool, the Saskatchewan Federation of Agriculture, and Saskatchewan Hog Producers, the Saskatchewan Swine Breeders' Association, a very impressive list, Mr. Speaker. Now, if this is the case, then with this kind of backing and support, why in heaven's name is he afraid to listen to the producer members and allow them that request for a vote? Is he admitting to these various groups whose support he states he has, that in effect they do not actually voice the opinion and the true feeling of the hog producers which belong to their individual organization. When he stated that 48 members of the Saskatchewan Hog Producers had voted in favor of the Commission, why doesn't he tell the whole story? Why doesn't he say that of the 48 members, 26 voted in favor of a resolution saying that they approach the government regarding the feasibility of a Hog Marketing Commission, but that the second part of that resolution stated that if considered by the government, a vote by producers be held. I maintain that the Minister of Agriculture misrepresented the true meaning of that resolution. I charge the Minister as well that when he introduced The Natural Products Marketing Act he misrepresented his feelings on that Act and that he misrepresented his intentions of that Act to the producer organizations and the people of this province. He indicated in his remarks that under Section 11 of the Act which gives him the power to implement a marketing commission without the 60 per cent favorable vote, that the only time these powers would be used, and I quote from Debates and Proceedings, 1972, page 2034:

The need for a commission I think can be better outlined if in the future a need for quick action by government to correct or approve a deteriorating market condition arises.

The hog producers of this province believed that before a marketing commission would be introduced, they would have the opportunity to understand the functions of that commission and they would be given the opportunity to then voice their opinions through a vote.

Some Hon. Members: — Hear, hear!

Mr. Wiebe: — I feel, Mr. Speaker, that if an orderly information program were undertaken and a vote held with 60 per cent of the producers accepting a commission, they would do everything required to make it work. That basic right to obtain information on what the Commission will do, how it will function and their desire to vote has been denied them. Of course, the producers are not happy. They are unhappy with the commission because they don't know anything about it. They are unhappy with the Minister of Agriculture because of his dictatorial attitude.

Some Hon. Members: — Hear, hear!

Mr. Wiebe: — He is denying them the right to information, he is denying them the right to vote, he is going to ram this commission down their throats whether they like it or not.

Some Hon. Members: — Hear, hear!

Mr. Wiebe: — Does the Minister of Agriculture feel that hog producers in this province are sheep and that they have to be told what is good for them? It is very discouraging to me to see individuals or people who when they hold high office begin to give the impression that they are more intelligent than the people that they represent.

In an article in the Leader-Post the Minister of Agriculture stated that opposition to the province's Hog Marketing Commission is being fostered among poorly informed producers by a few who are against the measure. Mr. Speaker, if that is the case, then I say it is because of the Minister's own negligence.

Some Hon. Members: — Hear, hear!

Mr. Wiebe: — Not one producer has received a letter or been informed about what the commission will do, how it is made up, how it will function and what its benefits are.

Some Hon. Members: — Hear, hear!

Mr. Wiebe: — The Minister of Agriculture has completely ignored the hog producers of this province. In his appointment of members to the commission he completely ignored the Hog Producers' Association. He didn't even ask them for a representative on the Board.

An Hon. Member: — Oh, no!

Mr. Wiebe: — This type of attitude, Mr. Speaker, is a slap on the face of all hog producers in this province. I urge the Minister to allow producers a vote, to allow them to obtain the information regarding what the commission is all about. I am sure that the Minister is not naive enough to think that there are only a handful of producers against his method of introducing this commission. I maintain, Mr. Speaker, that he does realize that there is a tremendous amount of opposition to his conduct and to the way in which he has handled the introduction of this commission.

Some Hon. Members: — Hear, hear!

Mr. Wiebe: — The hog men at Saskatoon certainly made that clear to him. Going back to the Minister's comments when he introduced The Natural Products Marketing Act, I should again like to repeat his quote:

The need for a commission I think can be better outlined if in the future a need for quick action by government to correct or improve a deteriorating market condition arises.

Last November when he formed the commission, where was the need? Prices were not deteriorating, in fact, they were increasing daily. Markets were good. The future looked bright. What was the need for this great rush? Why was it necessary for the Minister to renege on his statement? What he should have done is to have had meaningful consultation with the various farm organizations, started a program to inform the hog producers of this commission, given each individual producer an opportunity to understand those proposals. Then, and only then, should he have announced the commission, allowed a vote and given the producers the right to become involved in the decision that would affect their very livelihood. It is very unfortunate that through the Minister's attitude and his dictatorial actions he has created this mistrust and the unrest among hog producers in this province. I once again urge the Minister to reconsider his stand and begin a program of informing the producers and clearing up these misunderstandings.

Some Hon. Members: — Hear, hear!

Mr. Wiebe: — I urge the Minister to find out what the producer wants included in the plan and above all to allow them their right to voice their opinion through the means of a plebiscite.

In closing, Mr. Speaker, I must remind the Minister that you cannot legislate loyalty to a program or to an ideal, that you cannot legislate efficiency nor viability, that you cannot legislate acceptance. This can only be accomplished by trust and adhering to the basic rights and freedoms of individuals whom you govern.

Some Hon. Members: — Hear, hear!

Mr. Wiebe: — Mr. Speaker, I will support the amendment.

Some Hon. Members: — Hear, hear!

Mr. J.K. Comer (Nipawin): — Mr. Speaker, I would like first of all to begin by congratulating my seatmate, the Hon. Member from Nutana South (Mr. Rolfes) and the Member for Gravelbourg (Mr. Gross) on their very effective moving and seconding of the Address-in-Reply to the Speech from the Throne.

Some Hon. Members: — Hear, hear!

Mr. Comer: — These Members have brought honor to their constituencies, to their constituents and to the Government. Mr. Speaker, I should also at this time like to congratulate the three new Ministers that were appointed last spring — the Hon. Member for Biggar, Minister of Finance (Mr. Cowley), the Hon. Member for Kerrobert-Kindersley, Minister of Social Services (Mr. Taylor) and the Hon. Member for Humboldt, the Minister of Culture and Youth (Mr. Tchorzewski).

Some Hon. Members: — Hear, hear!

Mr. Comer: — I should like also to congratulate the Hon. Member from Athabasca (Mr. Guy) on his landslide. I should like later on in my speech to turn and deal with some of the concerns the Hon. Member from Athabasca claims to have close to his heart.

I should like also, Mr. Speaker, to once again thank the people of Nipawin constituency for giving me this honor of representing them in this House.

Some Hon. Members: — Hear, hear!

Mr. Comer: — I shall now turn for a few moments and deal briefly with a few of the remarks that were made by the Hon. Member for Morse (Mr. Wiebe). He talked about the drop of population in this province. Time and time again we have heard Members of the Liberal Party get up and decry the falling population of this province when, in fact, the decline of population in this province is very effectively being stemmed by this Government as it was effectively stemmed from 1944 until 1964. Mr. Speaker, the Hon. Member also talked about agriculture. I realize that later this afternoon the Minister of Agriculture (Mr. Messer) will be speaking so I won't be dealing in any length with agriculture.

He talked about the Land Bank. The Land Bank, I think any fair-minded person in this province will agree, is one of the most popular and positive programs that has been brought in in this province in agriculture since the beginning of this province.

Some Hon. Members: — Hear, hear!

Mr. Comer: — We have in the Throne Speech been told about the new FarmStart program, a program to help people even more to get into farming, help keep people on the farm.

And then the Hon. Member from Morse talked about resource development. He talked about socialism in resource development. I should like to turn and deal for a few moments with the development by the province of the forest resources of this province. I welcome and I know that the people in northern Saskatchewan welcome the announcement in the Speech from the Throne that the Government will be moving to get the maximum utilization and the maximum job creation out of timber resources. When the New Democratic Party became the Government of this province 19 months ago, the vast majority of the timber resources of this province were held by Parsons and Whittemore and Simpson Timber. The timber industry in this province was being concentrated in Meadow Lake, Prince Albert and Hudson Bay. I think it was clear

that in a very short period of time those three communities would have all of the timber industry in this province. And I think that this Government has an opportunity at this juncture to spread the benefits of the timber industry over many communities, communities along the forest fringe and communities in the North. We have an opportunity to maintain the viability of communities along the forest fringe, communities such as Green Lake, Smeaton, Carrot River, Sturgis, as well as maintain the communities that already have major timber developments. There is a mill operating at Green Lake once again under the New Democratic Party.

Some Hon. Members: — Hear, hear!

Mr. Comer: — Let's make sure that this mill continues, and if possible, expands. There is a mill at Carrot River. Let's make sure that this mill continues and if possible, expands. An experimental mill has been established at Sturgis to saw aspen. We are all hoping that this experiment is successful and that a much larger permanent mill can be established in this area. Mills which not only make maximum use of our forests but mills which provide jobs in communities which very much need those very jobs to maintain their existence.

Mr. Speaker, I wish to turn for a few moments and deal with timber development in the North. The Liberal answer for timber development in the North was pulp mills. There was a lot of talk by the Liberals about the benefit to northern people, about the benefit to native people from the Prince Albert Pulp Mill. Looking at the statistics shows that very few natives are hired in those operations and they are always hired at the very lowest level. This summer I was in the North and at Green Lake the Hon. Member (Mr. C.P. MacDonald) for Milestone (quite a place to be an expert on pulp mills) was attempting to tell some of the people at Green Lake what a great advantage the Doré Lake Pulp Mill would have been to them. They told him what they thought of that pulp mill. And following that the Hon. Member for Milestone got on the bus and went to Meadow Lake, got in his car and never appeared in the North again until the Athabasca by-election.

Some Hon. Members: — Hear, hear!

Mr. Comer: — There was a lot of talk by the Liberals about what Simpson Timber Company has done for the natives. Look at Hudson Bay. I'm talking about the natives. In my constituency there are two reserves, Earth and Shoal Lake. Shoal Lake is just down the road from one of the camps supplying trees to Simpson Timber Company. The camp has maybe 60 or 80 men. I was out at that reserve about two or three weeks ago and was asking the people how many of them were working in the camp. It wasn't one-half or 40, it wasn't a quarter or 20, there wasn't one native working in that camp just a few miles from their own reserve. And that is exactly the benefits that source of timber development gave to the natives.

Some Hon. Members: — Hear, hear!

Mr. Comer: — In the North there is a need for an economic base for most of the communities. There are small mills now in some communities such as Green Lake and Cumberland House. These mills

help provide an economic base for these communities. In almost every community in the North, the people will ask for a sawmill. And I am not saying that this Government can put a sawmill in every native community. It cannot. But I think we must make room in our development of the timber resources of this country, of this province, for mills in many of these communities, mills that can fill the local needs for lumber. Communities like La Loche, Buffalo Narrows, Beauval, Patuanak, Molanosa, Pelican Narrows, La Ronge. You will notice I had to mention some of the communities in some of the Liberal Members' seats opposite because they represent their constituencies so poorly, someone has to represent them.

Some Hon. Members: — Hear, hear!

Mr. Comer: — These mills may not always provide balanced financial statements but the social benefits far outweigh the economics of the situation.

I should like to turn for a few moments and deal with the situation in northern Saskatchewan in general, some of the real problems I see and some of the problems I believe the Government is beginning to attack and hope that they will continue to attack. In the native communities of the North the thing that strikes me the most — it's not the poverty, it's not the cultural differences between natives and whites. There is a lot said about those things and they are very striking. The thing which strikes me the most is the powerlessness, the dependency that has developed in the North. Statements which you will hear in community after community across the North (native communities), any part of the North, are statements like, 'We want to make our own mistakes. We want to run things ourselves'. These statements imply a big order, big for the giver as well as for the receiver. It's a big order for the Government as well as for the natives. It's not an easy solution, it's not a quick solution, and it's not a cheap solution. It's hard, it's slow, it's expensive. But if it's not a solution, it's a beginning of a solution to return or give power to these people in the North.

May I deal for a moment with what I mean by powerlessness and dependency. Some of the things that we expect the local people will decide in southern Saskatchewan, many of the things are not decided for the people by those people of these communities. Who decides where the roads will be built? Who decides what roads will be built? Who decides what sort of school will be built? Who decides what teachers will be hired? Who decides how many houses will be built? Who decides the design those houses will have? Who decides even where in the community those houses will sit? Who decides almost everything big and small? Is it decided by the residents of the communities? In most cases it is not. It is decided by someone in the Department of the North or in Indian Affairs. The decision may be made by a civil servant in the community. It is more likely made in La Ronge and Prince Albert, Regina, Winnipeg or Ottawa. Often the natives will know nothing about what is happening for months, then suddenly action will occur. Or maybe they will know nothing for years and nothing will happen.

I might add that my impression in the North is that DNS has been a positive development towards consulting the people of the North.

Some Hon. Members: — Hear, hear!

Mr. Comer: — I am not claiming that all the problems have been solved, but I think there is a start in solving them. My impression of Indian Affairs has been that generally they get many ideas from Indians, from the Treaty Indians, they take them back to their offices and that is it. You very seldom find anything happening on them. When anything does happen, again, all of a sudden out of the blue something is done.

The Hon. Member from Athabasca (Mr. Guy) rose in his place and delivered his exhortation on what he thought of our policies in the North.

Hon. G. Bowerman: — Where is he now?

Mr. Comer: — Oh, he is gone. I am sure he is not up in his constituency and not in the House as usual.

He read a letter and I should like to read part of a news release that was given by the Métis Society of Saskatchewan regarding the letter that he tabled.

The Métis Society said there are a lot of bureaucrats that the native people would like to see let go. The ones that are suppressing rather than helping the people.

It is interesting to note that the ones that she refers to are some of the very few who they are trying to help and improve the situation of the native people by promoting local control of education, the economy and other aspects of their life. I think that news release is very revealing. I was talking to some white people from the North last fall. They were complaining bitterly about what this Government is doing in the North. They said to me and the other person who was with me, 'The trouble with you people is, you go into the North, you don't talk to the people of the North, you go and see the Métis Society in each community'. In other words, what they were saying was, you don't go see the white people, you go see the Métis Society. This is why people, like the Member from Meadow Lake (Mr. Coupland) and people like the Member from Athabasca (Mr. Guy) are miffed. Because we are not going to see their friends, we are going to see the real people that need help in the North.

Some Hon. Members: — Hear, hear!

Mr. Comer: — I should like to bring forth some suggestions about how we can transfer power in the North. Right now in various departments there are a number of positions called supernumerary positions which are held by native people. These native people, as I understand, were to be trained to take over a more responsible position. And what really happened to these people and this was originated under the Liberal government, was that the native people became nothing more than cheap help. Outside of the union, just sitting at the bottom, typing and answering phones. Now this Government has frozen the supernumerary program. I think we should re-open that program but let's hire supernumeraries and let's give them responsibility in the jobs they are in. Eventually they can become the welfare workers and the conservation officers and so on. In my constituency in Cumberland House there was a supernumerary some years ago. The people, I think it is fair to say, disliked that person because he had no responsibility. This Government has hired a person, I am not sure if he is classed as

supernumerary or what he is classed as to work with the welfare worker. I am very pleased and proud to say that that person, in over a six month stretch of time, assumed many of the responsibilities of the welfare worker. For the first time we have given to the people of that community, or we are in the process of giving to the people of that community, responsible positions. I think this is the sort of idea, the sort of development we should be attempting in many of our government positions.

Another thing that I think we should look at and I believe it is being looked at, is training natives in law, make them court workers, to help their people in the courts. Because so many times natives are taken before the courts on charges they don't understand, in a court they don't understand and almost all of them plead guilty when many of them don't need to.

I should like to turn and deal with one last thing in the North before I sit down. This has to do with the Local Community Authorities. The LCA's. This is the nearest thing to municipal government that one finds in the North. It is made up of an elected council headed by an overseer. The economic base of these communities is generally very small, and too small to establish any tax base. Provincial grants are small so that the LCA hasn't enough money to do anything and ends up spending a few dollars for odds and ends in most cases and passing bylaws about fairly inconsequential matters. I think we should move as quickly as possible to give these LCA's more decision-making power and also we must give them money which they can spend as they see fit. A fair amount of money goes into LCA's for certain specific projects, but very little money goes in that can be spent as the LCA's see fit.

I mentioned timber development. It is my hope that we can foster economic development such as the development of a timber industry. I think there are many other small projects, economic development projects that could be carried on in the North. I think the most important thing is not only transferring power but consultation. I mentioned this last year and should like to mention it again. I think we are a long ways down the track. We have made some very positive development in consulting the people of the North. I hope that we shall continue to develop in this manner as the years go by.

Mr. Speaker, I see that my time is up. I will be supporting the motion. I will not support the amendment.

Mr. H.E. Coupland (Meadow Lake): — Mr. Speaker, the Throne Speech is an indication of the continuation and expansion of state control in this province.

This is not surprising. Before I go any further though, Mr. Speaker, I should like to congratulate the Member for Athabasca (Mr. Guy) on his re-election to this House. He is a hard working Member and I am sure he will continue to warrant the support of the people of the Athabasca constituency. I want also to congratulate the three new Members to the Cabinet and wish them well in the couple of years they have ahead of them. Mr. Speaker, I wish also to congratulate the mover and seconder of the Throne Speech. It is not much wonder that neither of them mentioned the Speech very often because it doesn't say very much other than that the Government will continue its trend towards complete state control.

Mr. Speaker, I hope the people of Saskatchewan realize how much state control we have already. Take agriculture for instance. We are told by the Minister that hogs are coming under state control. We have a turkey board, broiler board, egg board, wheat board, milk board, now a hog board. Then there is the Land Bank.

Mr. Speaker: — Order, order!

Mr. Coupland: — What is there left for the farmer, Mr. Speaker, except cattle and I venture to say, Mr. Speaker, those people opposite have their eyes on the cattlemen too and are subtly looking for ways to get them under state control also.

Some Hon. Members: — Hear, hear!

Mr. Coupland: — We have state control of our health care. Dentistry is coming under state control. Insurance is state controlled in Saskatchewan and, of course, there is Power and Telephones. I am just mentioning these to show people how much state control there is already.

If teachers obtain the right to negotiate with the provincial government for salaries, then education comes under state control also. Mr. Speaker, the Throne Speech tells us that this Government is going to put our timber resources, also gas, oil and mining exploration under state control.

Can you imagine, Mr. Speaker, only one company supplying the petroleum products for our cars, as the Member from Saskatoon University (Mr. Richards) advocated the other day? All we have to do is know that when you get state control you have monopoly control and then they don't have to worry about services. We could run all over the cities trying to find some place that is going to give us gas.

Some Hon. Members: — Hear, hear!

Mr. Coupland: — It is hard to imagine, Mr. Speaker, why anyone or any Party would even have the remotest thought of such a thing.

Mr. Speaker, governments and especially this one opposite, are eroding individual freedoms at an alarming pace and I urge the people of Saskatchewan to take a serious look at what is happening to them. I'm as guilty as anyone, we let governments quietly erode our freedoms, thinking it won't bother us, but then when we finally wake up it's too late, our freedoms are gone.

Mr. Speaker, I want to say a bit about the timber industry. I think that's one place this Government should keep their, "cotton pickin' fingers" out of.

Some Hon. Members: — Hear, hear!

Mr. Coupland: — They had a disastrous experience in that field prior to 1964. They broke every small sawmill operator in the North. I hear one has moved into the Meadow Lake area from British Columbia. I bet you, Mr. Speaker, that if he operates under the timber board that he won't make enough money to move his

machinery back out of the province.

The Member who just spoke, from Nipawin (Mr. Comer) mentioned Green Lake. Well, I want to tell this House that Green Lake has had a sawmill operating for years and it has been operated by strictly Métis people in the Green Lake area and doing a fantastic job. He tries to convince us that it just started since they became elected.

Mr. Speaker, the Premier likes to quote a Mr. Lucas, I wish the Premier was in his seat today, I know he would have something to say. But, this Mr. Lucas, as the Premier quotes him, is supposed to have said, the Beaver River could not take the effluent from the pulp mill north of Meadow Lake. It's very strange that our Premier has so much faith in articles appearing in the newspapers when they seem to serve his purpose. But when it is something he is supposed to have said, he jumps up and says he is not responsible for what the papers print.

Well, Mr. Speaker, I took the time to write to Mr. Lucas, to find out what he really said, and I'm sure the Premier could have done the same thing if he hadn't only been grabbing at straws to defend his bad judgement of getting rid of the pulp mill, which cost the taxpayers of this province some 6 to 10 million dollars cash, plus thousands of jobs.

Here is what Mr. Lucas actually said, Mr. Speaker, when he spoke to the Canadian Society of Wildlife and Fishery Biologists on February 18, 1972, and I quote. I want to say that I wrote to Mr. Lucas on March 3rd last year and I didn't get a reply until May, after the Session was over, so I was glad the Premier brought it up again. Mr. Lucas sent me a copy of his entire speech to show how it was taken out of context. But he said:

We had looked at quite a number of alternatives, one of which includes the use of part of Durocher Lake for temporary effluent storage. When cancellation of the project was announced, we were about to embark in co-operation with the Saskatchewan Water Resources Commission on an intensive environmental study of the area to determine what the safest and most practical method of effluent disposal from this mill should be. At this point in time the situation was far from hopeless.

That's what Mr. Lucas said:

And it is possible that the environmentally acceptable solution could have been found.

Some Hon. Members: — Hear, hear!

Mr. Coupland: — Again, I say I wish the Premier was in his seat to hear this. In fact I will table the letter for him. He goes on to say:

The single sentence extracted from talk that appeared in the Press could not do other than lead to the conclusion that you reached.

This is how they use these things out of context to fool the people of Saskatchewan.

Mr. Speaker, I am glad that the Meadow Lake sawmill was far enough advanced that this Government did not cancel it as they did the pulp mill, because it is really a boon to the town of Meadow Lake and to the area with its 60 to 70 thousand dollars per month payroll.

People who were either receiving unemployment insurance or welfare are now earning anywhere from \$600 to \$1,200 per month.

Some Hon. Members: — Hear, hear!

Mr. Coupland: — When you go up there you can check it. Mr. Speaker, this is just a small example of what could have been the opportunities for the people of that area if the Government had the foresight to keep that pulp mill and hadn't played politics at the expense of the people in the Meadow Lake constituency and for that matter the whole province. The Premier and the Members opposite seem to take great pride in the fact that they cancelled the pulp mill. If it was such a terrible thing to have a pulp mill, I wonder why the socialists in Manitoba didn't cancel theirs. No, Mr. Speaker, they are proud of their pulp mill. We don't hear the socialists in British Columbia saying anything about cancelling pulp mills in that province and, of course, Alberta, it's still building pulp mills. You know, Mr. Speaker, even Russia is building pulp mills. I understand they are going to call their latest pulp mill the Meadow Lake Pulp Mill. Why can't you fellows open your eyes and your hearts and help the people of this province?

Some Hon. Members: — Hear, hear!

Mr. Coupland: — You know, Mr. Speaker, when they made such a to-do about cancelling the pulp mill in Meadow Lake, they promised the people up there some alternative programs. To date we have seen none. I will say though, Mr. Speaker, that they started a very small version of the vocational training school that the Liberal Government had planned for Meadow Lake. But I will say, Mr. Speaker, they were really on the bit, they hired the principal for the school before they even had any foundation laid, in fact, I think before they even let any tenders. I have an idea, Mr. Speaker, why he was hired so early. I seemed to run into him in every settlement in the North that I, and the Federal Liberal candidate happened to be in, and from the signs that were in his windows and on his lawn and on his vehicle, before October 30, indicated why.

Mr. Speaker, I have also been told by the people of the North that a Mr. Thompson who, I think, works for the Department of Northern Saskatchewan was

Mr. Steuart: — I wouldn't say he works.

Mr. Coupland: — out doing a little campaigning too. But he was threatening settlements in those areas with cancellation of provincial programs in certain areas, if the vote on October 30 was not favorable to his way of thinking.

Now, Mr. Speaker, I urge the Minister in charge to advise his staff to refrain from this type of politicking, it is not fair to the people of the North, or for anybody anywhere in the province.

Mr. Speaker, I should like to say a few words about highways. Since the Liberals left office, highway building in the Meadow Lake constituency has been virtually non-existent. Even the good highway, Mr. Speaker, that the Liberals built north of Glaslyn is being allowed to deteriorate and I urge the Minister of Highways to do something about it or he will have to get out that horse and ride to the Meadow Lake stampede like he did a few years back.

I would ask the Minister, Mr. Speaker, to get on with the oiling of No. 26 between Loon Lake and Goodsoil, the regrading and oiling from Peerless to Pierceland. You know, Mr. Speaker, we have a wonderful country there for tourism as was indicated by large turnouts in response to meetings, re the provincial master plan of the Meadow Lake Provincial Park. The first priority should be good roads.

Some Hon. Members: — Hear, hear!

Mr. Coupland: — For instance, Mr. Speaker, Green Lake is one of the best pickerel fishing areas in the province, but it hasn't a very good highway. Then there is the highway to Waterhen Lake and to the Waterhen Indian Reserve. This one concerns the people very much because they have to bus their children into Dorintosh and they are really concerned because of the many curves and dust hazards which is also a deterrent to our tourists.

I hope the Minister of Highways (Mr. Kramer) will be doing something about this and we shall hear more about it in the future.

Mr. Speaker, I should like to turn to Welfare for a minute. I am very concerned with the welfare situation in the North, especially when it doesn't have to be that bad, if the Government would supply opportunities for these people to earn their own livelihood.

I understand the post cutting operation at La Loche has folded again and once again I am told it was because of the welfare. You ask how this can be, Mr. Speaker. Well I know what happened the first time. Instead of co-ordinating the programs and their efforts in co-operation with work programs, Welfare seemed to do just the opposite. The Welfare people went right into the post camps and handed out welfare cheques to the workers and this, of course, disrupts the whole program and eventually kills it because it seems to be easier to get welfare than to work.

Mr. Speaker, there is a need for more programs to provide job opportunities for the North and to help people learn how to budget their money. I was hoping this new Department of Northern Saskatchewan would be a step in this direction, but apparently it is not. We need a program where the departments, namely, Welfare, Education, Natural Resources and, of course, I suppose now this Department of Northern Saskatchewan would work together so that when men are in a post cutting operation, they are not handed welfare, or when fishing or trapping is in season, they are not offered an upgrading course, and so on. I think this is where we have failed in the North by not co-ordinating programs

Some Hon. Members: — Hear, hear!

Mr. Coupland: — and getting the input of

the local people in those areas.

You know, Mr. Speaker, there are a lot of programs that could be formulated to help create job opportunities and I realize this Government wouldn't tolerate any industrial expansion in those areas, so that we have to go to some smaller community things. Just to name a few, Mr. Speaker; a lot of those areas could raise their own vegetables if the Government would put in a root cellar so they can take them out of there in the winter. Or community wood programs where they can get fire wood in the summer. There are a lot of these programs that could create work for the people in the North.

Mr. Speaker, I think my time has run out, but because of the continued trend toward state control and infringement on the freedoms of the people, I cannot support the motion, I will support the amendment.

Some Hon. Members: — Hear, hear!

Hon. J.R. Messer (Minister of Agriculture): — Mr. Speaker, it is with considerable satisfaction and even pride that I speak this afternoon in support of the programs outlined in His Honour's Address to this Assembly.

I should like to recognize and congratulate the mover and the seconder as well at this time.

You know, Mr. Speaker, I am always a bit confused when

Some Hon. Members: — Hear, hear!

Mr. Messer: — the Members opposite get up and talk about agriculture. We were told that they had some kind of shadow or shifty Cabinet or something like that who were going to keep track of the Government and its activities in regard to the programs that were being brought forward. Last year I know it was the Member from Cannington (Mr. Weatherald), this year I am told it is the Member from Moosomin (Mr. Gardner), yet the Member for Morse (Mr. Wiebe) seems to be doing a more adequate job of outlining the agricultural programs of Saskatchewan.

I just want for one moment, Mr. Speaker, to mention some of the areas that he made mention of earlier this afternoon. He said the former Liberal Government of Saskatchewan instituted a program to facilitate hog production by building barns. They built 700 barns by 1971, but then he stopped, Mr. Speaker, because he didn't want to go on and say that at that point in time hog prices in Saskatchewan were at an all time low and they did nothing.

Some Hon. Members: — Hear, hear!

Mr. Messer: — Nothing, Mr. Speaker, to correct that problem. He went on to say that SEDCO extended loans to farmers in Saskatchewan. Again, he stopped, Mr. Speaker, because he can't come forward with one family farmer in Saskatchewan that had a loan under that SEDCO program.

Mr. Speaker, he went on and said what the Liberal Government did in regard to the South Saskatchewan River irrigation project. Then he stopped, knowing full well that when we became the Government in 1971 there was complete chaos in the irrigated areas of the Province of Saskatchewan.

Some Hon. Members: — Hear, hear!

Mr. Messer: — He mentioned, Mr. Speaker, quality premiums for hogs. And, again, he stopped knowing full well that the records show that those premiums for hogs did nothing to improve the quality of hogs in Saskatchewan. And what he didn't say is even more important, Mr. Speaker. He didn't say anything about some of the Liberal programs that the Federal Government was involved in at the time that they were the Government, or programs that they should now be involved in, programs such as LIFT, programs such as the Task Force, which they tried to implement during their seven years. We don't hear them talking about freight rates, Mr. Speaker, and we don't hear them talking about railway abandonment. So I want to make the recommendation and the suggestion to the Leader of the Opposition (Mr. Steuart) that he get an agricultural critic who picks on areas where there are problems for Saskatchewan farmers.

Some Hon. Members: — Hear, hear!

Mr. Messer: — Now, Mr. Speaker, that Address that was given one week ago here indicated clearly that this Government is going to move forward with vigor and with determination to overcome those problems and difficulties which have prevented this province in the past from achieving its legitimate place in the national economy.

Some Hon. Members: — Hear, hear!

Mr. Messer: — It also indicated that this Government will continue to give high priority to continued progress and innovation in social legislation and social programs. Economic development and social development go hand in hand, and you may rest assured that this Government and the New Democratic Party, out of which it is constituted, will take whatever steps are needed to ensure that each and every family in this province has access to a standard and quality of life equal to that anywhere in Canada.

Foremost in this Government's mind, at the present time, is the challenge that lies ahead in terms of meeting our province's legitimate needs and aspirations in terms of continued economic development and growth.

Saskatchewan has the potential of being a productive and growing area in Canada. We have a reserve of natural resources much of which is still to be identified, with potential to equal that found anywhere in Canada. We have an energy generating and distribution system with a fantastic capacity to support and develop economic activity. And most importantly, we have a food production base which could play an essential role in meeting the nutritional needs of an ever-growing world population.

All of these factors put our province on the threshold of a new and exciting period of dynamic growth and development. In

order to cross that threshold and realize our full potential in the future, we must mobilize our vast resources and our tremendous capabilities in order to move ahead aggressively in all aspects of our economic life.

The task that lies ahead of us, Mr. Speaker, will not necessarily be an easy one to accomplish. We must overcome numerous obstacles — including the Liberal Party in Saskatchewan — in the path of success and rapid growth and development. We must be positive in our attitudes, Mr. Speaker.

It is essential that we avoid falling into the trap of the Hon. Members opposite, with their fear of change and their lack of courage to face the problems and difficulties that lie ahead.

Some Hon. Members: — Hear, hear!

Mr. Messer: — We must strive for change in national economic policies which discourage and inhibit economic growth in the prairie region. We must mobilize the capital and labor needed to meet the challenge that lies ahead. We must take steps and measures to counteract the effects of the vested interests of major multi-national corporations which dominate industry in this country and on this continent, and which prevent the mobilization of the necessary capital to bring about the development which rightfully should be taking place in this province.

I am confident, Mr. Speaker, that one of the greatest economic tragedies this province has ever experienced was the unfortunate and, indeed, unnecessary trend which developed and took full force after two or three years of Liberal mismanagement and paralysis.

Liberal Governments, comfortably ensconced in Regina and Ottawa during this period saw no need to take positive and courageous action to reverse the trends that became so evident. A declining crisis-ridden economy was, in their view, an unfortunate but acceptable result of an economy unfettered by government interference. Consistent with this philosophy and this principle, they remained determined to let things take their so-called natural course. A few token, highly-visible sell-outs to major multi-national corporations were the only types of responses that the Provincial Government in Regina was able to come up with when faced with the true magnitude of the difficulties as they developed.

The proceedings to date in this Session indicate to me, Mr. Speaker, and I think to the people of Saskatchewan, that the Liberal Party in this province has learned nothing from that experience. The hysterical and outrageous tirade by the Leader of the Opposition (Mr. Steuart) in response to His Honour's Address indicates clearly that the Liberal Party has not been able to formulate a progressive and forward-looking program for economic development in Saskatchewan.

Some Hon. Members: — Hear, hear!

Mr. Messer: — A do-nothing negative policy is still apparently the order of the day for the Liberal Party in Saskatchewan. Yes, Mr. Speaker, we find them completely incapable of coping with the thinking and philosophy that underlies the mixed economy that we are developing in this province under this Government, which has

become the basis of growth for all progressive economies in the world today.

I am confident that the people of Saskatchewan want and demand the programs we are developing to strengthen both the farm and non-farm economy. Contrary to the impression left by the Opposition, there are very few people in this province who are not willing to take their courage in their hands, and to press on with developing the new credit institutions, the new farm transfer institutions like the Land Bank, the new marketing institutions, namely, the Hog Marketing Commission

Some Hon. Members: — Hear, hear!

Mr. Messer: — and the whole host of other new and innovative activities so badly needed to get this job done.

Nothing is more illustrative of the Opposition's continual policy of obstructionism and sabotage than their current campaigns to destroy the Land Bank and the newly-formed Hog Marketing Commission.

Some Hon. Members: — Hear, hear!

Mr. Messer: — Mr. Speaker, let me turn to this matter of the Saskatchewan Hog Marketing Commission. I have outlined to you already the fact that our programs and our policies in agriculture in rural areas are being based on expanding and productive capacity of our farm areas and taking advantage of the great potential we have in this province to meet the growing needs of a hungry world.

Now it is clear, at least to any thinking person, that if we are going to produce ever-increasing quantities of farm products we are going to have to be seriously concerned about doing a business-like job of marketing these products. There are major markets in Canada, in North America and in the world demanding meat products in large quantities and markets where an adequate price to farmers can be obtained if we do a business-like job of marketing our products into these areas. The world market for pork is without question one of the most rapidly growing markets today. Saskatchewan has a tremendous capacity to utilize the grain and farm resources at its disposal to produce pork and to meet the dual objectives of feeding a hungry world and providing an income to Saskatchewan farmers.

The benefits to the whole provincial economy of doing this will be absolutely fantastic. In order to do so we must market products. It has been clear to me for some time that this whole question of marketing is one we are going to have to sort out if the province is to move ahead in an aggressive way into the world markets for our agricultural products.

It has been a question that has been greatly on the minds of producers. The farm organizations of this province involving hog producers — and I mean the Saskatchewan Hog Producers' Association, the Saskatchewan Swine Breeders' Association, the Saskatchewan Federation of Agriculture and the National Farmers' Union, the Saskatchewan Wheat Pool — these organizations have all been thinking about this question too.

During the past year, these organizations have been in extensive discussions with my Department about the to do something in the marketing area for pork.

Some Hon. Members: — Hear, hear!

Mr. Messer: — During the course of our discussions, the representatives of these organizations pointed out with great clarity the need for a marketing agency that would make it possible for us to contract with the large foreign buyers who are now entering the Canadian market, and would make it possible for us to stabilize and improve prices to producers through improved pricing arrangements.

They emphasized a fact which is absolutely clear to me also, namely, that unless we do something soon we in Saskatchewan are going to lose out to the other provinces in the prairie region who are actively pursuing the market opportunities that exist in the world today for pork.

Now, Mr. Speaker, this area of marketing is one that we cannot afford as a province to fall behind in. One of the most unfortunate aspects of the seven years of Liberal Government that this province had was that that government remained absolutely opposed to any type of aggressive marketing organization for any products of the province. That Government, which pretended to be interested in forward-looking and progressive economic development refused to do anything about this area.

Some Hon. Members: — Hear, hear!

Mr. Messer: — Refused obviously because they had sold out to the large corporate interests which did not want this kind of activity for the little man of Saskatchewan — the farmer, the businessman and the laborer.

The decision to organize a Saskatchewan Hog Marketing Commission was made after full and extensive discussion with farm organizations. The urgency of this matter and need to get on with the job, made it absolutely necessary that the Government move ahead quickly in this area, and for this reason we have established the Saskatchewan Hog Marketing Commission, and for the further information of the Members to your left, Mr. Speaker, there was representation from the Hog Producers' Association and the Swine Producers' Association and all the other organizations that I talked about.

Some Hon. Members: — Hear, hear!

Mr. Messer: — We discussed with them for eight months the implementation of a Commission and they unanimously, with the absence of one person from the representatives of the Hog Producers' Association, directed the Government to establish a Hog Marketing Commission with all haste.

Some Hon. Members: — Hear, hear!

Mr. Messer: — Now, the Member from Cannington, (Mr. Weatherald) says that I

said in the introduction of the Natural Products Marketing Bill in 1971 that there was no reason for the establishment of a commission unless we were in some difficulty re the pricings of hogs, when prices were low. The contrary is also the case, Mr. Speaker. Manitoba and Alberta, because they both have organizations, one a Commission, one a Producer Board, neither of them put to a vote in those provinces, have already sold the negotiated contracts with Japan for large quantities of pork, which we have missed because we have no Commission.

Some Hon. Members: — Hear, hear!

Mr. Messer: — I have no question, Mr. Speaker, in my mind as to where the Liberal Opposition would stand on this question. I knew that they would become engaged in a game of political sabotage trying to kill this agency which is obviously in the interest of Saskatchewan farmers and Saskatchewan people.

The Liberal Party of this province knows only one kind of game — they know only politics in the crassest and lowest sense; and, as a result of this, we cannot expect them to think through and support these kinds of activities which are obviously essential in order to move ahead in the development of this province.

Mr. Steuart: — That's what Stalin said.

Mr. Messer: — There's a close resemblance sometimes. Mr. Speaker, I think the Opposition should be told that the people of Saskatchewan and the hog producers of Saskatchewan will not be fooled by this kind of political footwork. The majority of the people in this province realize the great importance that must be attached to this marketing question and the majority of the farmers of this province support the establishment of marketing agencies that will make it possible to market ever-growing quantities of products at reasonable and stable prices.

Some Hon. Members: — Hear, hear!

Mr. Messer: — People will not be fooled by the propaganda inspired by the Liberal Party of Saskatchewan as being directed from the Leader of the Opposition's office in this Legislative Assembly Building.

Let me for a moment, Mr. Speaker, quote to you from a statement made by Mr. E. A. Boden, President of the Saskatchewan Federation of Agriculture and Vice-president of the Saskatchewan Wheat Pool, in response to the kind of political

Mr. Steuart: — Poor old Ted!

Mr. Messer: — He may be poor old Ted, but he is respected by farmers in Saskatchewan, Mr. Leader of the Opposition.

Some Hon. Members: — Hear, hear!

Mr. Messer: — In response to the kind of political opposition being drummed up against the Saskatchewan Hog Marketing Commission.

Mr. Boden said this, and I quote:

We are getting somewhat tired of the very obvious political manoeuvring aimed at obstructing the creation of a more rational marketing system. I want the actual producers of this province to know we recognize the real motives of certain groups who want to scuttle the plan.

He said further, and I quote:

If there is a need for a wholesale educational program to tell the full story, then we will be ready to go to work on behalf of the producers.

As President of the Saskatchewan Federation of Agriculture and Vice-president of the Saskatchewan Wheat Pool, Mr. Boden said he had no hesitation in saying that the two organizations, which represent a large percentage of Saskatchewan producers, support the establishment of the provincial Hog Marketing Commission.

Some Hon. Members: — Hear, hear!

Mr. Messer: — Only Liberals appear to be against this program, Mr. Speaker. The people of this province and this Government, have no objections to an Opposition which will come up with positive criticism, and will take a positive view about what's being done and for that matter, what needs to be done. We make no pretence about being able to have perfection at the first try; and we welcome the thoughtful criticism that may come forward from any quarters.

But, Mr. Speaker, I challenge you to look at all the statements being made by the Members of the Liberal Party and their pawns who are stirring the pot out in the country now. You cannot find one rational statement regarding the need for and the operation of hog marketing, or any marketing agencies for that matter. They have given no thought to the kinds of marketing organizations we need and to the kinds of things that marketing agencies should be doing in the marketing of our products today. Rather, the Opposition is out there attempting to undermine the program before it even gets off the ground — to destroy the Saskatchewan Hog Marketing Commission and thus to destroy any possibility of Saskatchewan becoming a major supplier of pork in the world today or for tomorrow.

Mr. Speaker, this is a scandal. It's a scandal that a major, or maybe more correctly, Mr. Speaker, a minor political party in this province can attempt, for obviously misguided political advantage to destroy the future possibilities of this province. We cannot afford this at this time and date in our development and we will not tolerate it.

It is clearly recognized by all thinking people in this province that rural and farm development is going to be essential to the future stability and growth of the province and, to do this, Mr. Speaker, we must have the kind of clear rational thinking that will lead to the right kinds of organizations, agencies and programs to do the job. We cannot afford these games of what may be hoped to be political opportunism that has the effect of destroying our future.

Some Hon. Members: — Hear, hear!

Mr. Messer: — The legislative program which we have put before this Assembly serves notice to all and sundry that we do not intend to sit idly by and see the development potential of this province ignored because of the narrow-vested interests of this Liberal Party.

Some Hon. Members: — Hear, hear!

Mr. Messer: — Interests this party condones and advocates. We intend to take the steps necessary to mobilize capital and to get on with the job of economic development and growth.

Now, Mr. speaker, the Land Bank is an integral part of our program to modify trends and improve conditions of farming in Saskatchewan. It was developed because we recognized the family farm after years of Liberal neglect, was truly being threatened in Saskatchewan. Rising capital needs of farmers and highly inflated interest rates are making it impossible for talented young people with a future in farming to get an effective start.

We recognized that there is something wrong with the traditional view that the farmer should have to buy and pay for all his assets. Only by reducing the burden imposed by high-priced land and high interest rates are we going to be able to modify this trend toward ever-declining farm numbers.

The family farm can only continue to exist if many of the talented young farm people who come of age in this province are given a chance to get started without being doomed to failure before they start. The Land Bank will give them this chance.

We believe we have a sound program. It will no doubt need improvement and no one stands more ready to make positive changes than I.

Some Hon. Members: — Hear, hear!

Mr. Messer: — The fact that the Land Bank is needed and accepted has already been established. The commission was absolutely swamped by those wishing to lease from it. I might point out to the Hon. Members opposite the complaints we were getting, and they were not numerous, were almost without exception, related to the fact that not enough land was bought to satisfy the demand.

This is the program the Leader of the Opposition, when it was introduced into this Assembly last session, called, and I quote, "State-owned communistic farmers." Farmers farming land that belongs to the Government, as if they never farmed any land that belonged to the Government. In fact he went on so far as to say, "outside the iron curtain there's not a scheme like this."

Mr. Speaker, there is no question that this Land Bank program is a popular program.

Some Hon. Members: — Hear, hear!

Mr. Messer: — There is no question, Mr. Speaker, that this Land Bank program is a much needed program.

Some Hon. Members: — Hear, hear!

Mr. Messer: — It is making it possible for many, many young people who could never have got started farming to do so through renting land from the Land Bank Commission.

Some Hon. Members: — Hear, hear!

Mr. Messer: — It is, more importantly, an accepted program, accepted not by the Liberal Opposition, but by the farmers of Saskatchewan.

Some Hon. Members: — Hear, hear!

Mr. Messer: — It is making it possible for our older generation of farmers to retire, to retire with dignity and withdraw from the farm taking their saved capital with them.

Without question, Mr. Speaker, the Land Bank combined with numerous other programs we are developing on our own, and in some instances co-operatively with the Federal Government, providing the Leader of the Opposition keeps his nose out of them, will lead to a much changed picture in Saskatchewan.

The one real concern I have, however, Mr. Speaker, is this campaign against the Land Bank being carried out by the Liberal Opposition. It's almost impossible to tell whether the Liberals are saying that they are opposed to the Land Bank in total, or whether they favor it in principle and are only opposed to parts of it. Their story changes from day to day. It changes depending on which Member across the way is speaking on their behalf.

This campaign of sabotage that they are carrying on in the country, in Regina and in Ottawa, is obviously politically motivated. The principles underlying the campaign are impossible to detect and I maintain that there are no principles underlying it. Let me give you some examples of the crass political nature of this campaign being carried out by the Liberal Opposition.

First of all, Mr. Speaker, when the Land Bank legislation was first introduced our friends from across the way said that it would never work because the rents were too high. They said that we would never rent the land, that if we did rent it the farmers could never make a go of it. The Honorable Member from Morse (Mr. Wiebe) says why did we lower the rent. I want to bring to his attention that we had 350 written applications for land before the rent was lowered. There was never any indication that the plan would not be a success or any need to make it more advantageous.

I should like to remind the Leader of the Opposition of a statement he made in this Assembly last year, he said and I quote:

Then you set an extremely high rent because you are going to base it on interest and don't use 7 per cent because your Government can't get money at 7 per cent. The rate you will have to pay for long-term money when you get this plan into action, will be closer to 8 or 8 1/2 or 9 per cent.

However, Mr. Speaker, you'll notice that they are not saying that this year. No, they have a different basis of campaigning against it this year because they know the rents are acceptable. In fact, some to your left now say that the rent is too low. They know that renting from the Land Bank will provide a clear and obvious advantage to young people who wish to start farming.

This year, the theme of the complaint seems to be a new one. The Hon. Member from Moosomin (Mr. Gardner) introduces an amendment to the legislation suggesting that lessees do not have to rent their land for five years, a satisfactory tenure before being able to buy from the Land Bank. This, says the Member from Moosomin, and the Member from Prince Albert West (Mr. Steuart), and all the other highly-principled men of the Liberal Party, this is a matter of principle to them, they say. It is a matter of high Liberal philosophy. It is a question upon which they can make no compromise whatsoever.

Some Hon. Members: — Hear, hear!

Mr. Messer: — Their philosophy (new word for them), their philosophy is built on the suggestion that people must own their land, not rent it. They must own it immediately and if the Government has land to make available to farmers they must sell to those farmers immediately.

Well, Mr. Speaker, let's just test how highly-principled this Liberal Opposition really is. One would assume (that's dangerous), one would assume that when they were in the Government there would be no such requirements as a five-year leasing period before land could be sold. This is obvious because of the principled Member from Prince Albert West and the principled Member from Moosomin and their highly-principled cohorts. They could never have accepted such a philosophy when they were the Government.

Well, now Mr. Speaker, I should like to read to this Assembly from a policy statement issued by the Saskatchewan Department of Agriculture during the periods 1964 to 1971 and in this case signed by Mr. D.T. McFarlane, the Minister of Agriculture, in that well-known and for them, too well-remembered Liberal Government of the period, (that's why Mr. McFarlane is now somewhere in Ottawa). The policy relates to the sale of provincial land, which was operating during that period. Now the first line under the eligibility criteria says this, and I quote:

The Lessee must have held the land under disposition for a minimum of five years satisfactory tenure.

Now, Mr. Speaker, is that one year before purchasing? No, what that means, Mr. Speaker, is that before purchasing land from the Saskatchewan Department of Agriculture under the Liberal administration from 1964 to 1971, anyone who wished to purchase land from the Provincial Government had to lease that land for at least five years before he was eligible to purchase.

Now, Mr. Deputy Speaker, I emphasize, that was the policy of the Liberal administration. I don't disagree with it; I believe that it was a good policy, and the right one. Good, Mr. Deputy Speaker, because they inherited it from the previous CCF administration.

Some Hon. Members: — Hear, hear!

Mr. Messer: — I believe that if you are disposing of public assets that every step must be taken to assure that these assets are being disposed of to the people who can handle them adequately and to the people who are in real need of them.

Some Hon. Members: — Hear, hear!

Mr. Messer: — The point I want to make is this, the Liberal Opposition claims to be carrying on a campaign of principle against the Land Bank. They're opposed to it as a matter of high Liberal principle and high Liberal philosophy. They claim not to be carrying on a campaign of political sabotage but rather, they are questioning some of the basic principles of the program.

You know this Provincial Cultivated Land Policy is an interesting document. I should perhaps table it for all Members opposite. Some other interesting points are here which Members opposite obviously aren't aware of. The second point of eligibility criteria states, "Sale of a parcel may be refused where it is in the public interest to do so."

Some Hon. Members: — Hear, hear!

Mr. Messer: The Member opposite who is the Opposition critic says the Government has no such right to make those kinds of decisions. Yet for seven years of Liberal Government they made those decisions and he never made any observation in regard to that power of government.

It further states that instalment purchase will require a minimum of 20 per cent of the price in cash. I notice now when they are in Opposition they say that the purchase price or down-payment should be reduced to ten per cent. It also goes on to say that the interest rates charged will be 6 1/2 per cent. They now say, when they are in Opposition and have no responsibility, that the interest rate has to be 5 per cent.

Now, Mr. Deputy Speaker, what I wish to ask the Members of the Opposition, is when did this magic transformation and Liberal philosophy of principle take place? Did it take place sometime between June, 1971 and September or October '71? Maybe right after June '71. But was this a great period of thought and philosophizing within the Liberal Party leading to a new statement of principle about the disposition of land owned by the province. Did the period of great thought lead the Liberal Party to come up with a new highly developed school of thinking about to whom provincial land should be sold?

Mr. Deputy Speaker, it's quite clear that there was never a change in the Liberal philosophy on this question and for that matter it's clear that there never was any particular philosophy of any sort or kind in the Liberal Party of Saskatchewan. The Party, led by Mr. Steuart, is not guided by philosophy and principles, they change horses on questions of politics and public policy without any qualms or conscience whatsoever. They do this because they continue to pursue a course of vandalism for their own political gains

Some Hon. Members: — Hear, hear!

Mr. Messer: — without thought as to whether the program is a good one, a bad one, without thought as to whether it is needed or not needed, without thought as to whether it is in the interest of the province, or not in the interest of the province. Every move made by that group of Machiavellian politicians across the way is made for pure political advantage.

Some Hon. Members: — Hear, hear!

Mr. Messer: — The Honorable Leader of the Opposition even has convenient lapses of memory and simple arithmetic when it comes to the Land Bank.

When he appeared on a hotline program recently, one caller suggested that renting land at 5 per cent rental rate was a better deal for him than paying interest at 7 per cent to the Farm Credit Corporation.

An Hon. Member: — Who wrote your speech?

Mr. Messer: — We write our own speeches on this side, that is why when we were sitting over there we changed and came over here, Mr. Member for Morse (Mr. Wiebe).

Some Hon. Members: — Hear, hear!

Mr. Messer: — If you would do a little more of that yourself, instead of hiring those poisoned pen writers that are running around the corridors of this building you might stand a better chance

Some Hon. Members: — Hear, hear!

Mr. Messer: — The Leader of the Opposition assured this caller that he would be paying for the land anyway under the Land Bank program, only he still wouldn't own it. All of us who have a grasp of simple arithmetic know that in order to payoff a mortgage one must make payments against the principal as well as paying interest on that mortgage. All of us know that the rental at 5 per cent is less than the interest at 7 per cent. The Hon. Member from Prince Albert West (Mr. Steuart) has invented his own version of the new math, Liberal mathematics, that don't add up to anything but a deliberate attempt to deceive the public for their own political end.

Mr. Deputy Speaker, I mentioned in my introductory remarks that it is time, indeed past time for us to get down and deal with some of the basic economic questions of rural economic development in this province. Our Government is trying honestly and sincerely to develop a program which will be meaningful in meeting the needs of rural areas of this province. We don't criticize, Mr. Deputy Speaker, an Opposition that can criticize with thought and with care and that can help us in this process. But thought and care is not the case, they are out in the country telling one farmer that the Land Bank pays too little for land, telling another that the Land Bank pays too much. The Member for Moosomin, (Mr. Gardner) the agricultural critic —

apparently the Member for Moosomin knows all about it, ask him — speaks of inflated sale prices of land on the one hand and depressed prices of land on the other being offered by the Land Bank Commission. The Member for Moosomin should name the cases he refers to, name the people involved and tell us who got paid too much and who got paid too little. He should also stand up and tell the people of Saskatchewan that it is a voluntary program and no one has to accept a price which they think is too high or which they think is too low.

Some Hon. Members: — Hear, hear!

Mr. Messer: — He knows as well as I know that the Land Bank prices are determined on the basis of a carefully developed formula and that there is no arbitrary juggling of prices so that some are being paid too much and some are being paid too little. He knows the truth about this matter, Mr. Speaker, but he doesn't want to tell the truth because it doesn't fit his plan to sabotage this program and destroy this interest.

Some Hon. Members: — Hear, hear!

Mr. Messer: — The Member, Mr. Deputy Speaker, when he spoke in this Legislature last Friday made several statements in regard to Land Bank purchases on which I should like to make some comment. The agricultural critic as it is reported in the Leader-Post of Saturday, February 3rd, stated and I quote:

Mr. Gardner cited the case of a young couple who rented land and were saving money in order to put a down payment on it. A few weeks ago the Land Bank Commission came along, bought this farm for a big price and cancelled their lease.

Mr. Speaker, I ask the agricultural critic to bring forth the name of the couple that he made reference to in this House last Friday. I challenge his credibility in maintaining that such a case in fact happened.

Some Hon. Members: — Hear, hear!

Mr. Messer: — The Member for Moosomin, as do his colleagues which sit to your left, know full well that if the tenant and the lessor of the land have a binding agreement it would have to be worked out between themselves and that a lease agreement is a legal document and could not be broken. It certainly, Mr. Speaker, could not be broken by the Land Bank Commission, nor would the Land Bank put itself in a position of purchasing land whereby it would be confronted with a parcel of land that had a formal agreement made by the former owner with a tenant on that farm that had not yet expired. These kinds' of tactics, Mr. Speaker, are to my mind the lowest that one can resort to and try

Some Hon. Members: — Hear, hear!

Mr. Messer: — the lowest that one can resort to in trying to

mobilize a scare and terror campaign in regard to a program that has been accepted by Saskatchewan farmers.

The Member for Moosomin (Mr. Gardner) and his colleagues should be ashamed at having attempted to use and resort to this course of action. I ask him again to apologize or bring forward the names of the people and the evidence that would show that, in fact, the Land Bank Commission is actively participating in the cancelling of leases anywhere in the Province of Saskatchewan.

Some Hon. Members: — Hear, hear!

Mr. Messer: — The agriculture critic also said last Friday, and again I quote from the Leader-Post:

That prices paid for land by the Commission range from occasionally too low, but usually ridiculously high. Mr. Gardner cited an example of a farm worth \$34,000 that was purchased by the Land Bank for \$50,000 and another of a farmer who had been advertising his land for sale at \$27,000, had it appraised by the Land Bank and sold for \$30,000.

I ask the Member for Moosomin whose figures of worth he uses when he says a farm is only worth \$34,000 but the Land Bank pays \$50,000. We have a formula, Mr. Speaker, a fair formula in appraising and assessing the values of farm land. When the Land Bank is considering an offer to purchase they have in my mind and in the minds of farmers been most fair in their offers. We certainly have some who complain about the prices offered being too low and there may be on occasion prices offered by the Land Bank that in the minds of some people are too high and this is to be expected, Mr. Speaker, but in no way indicates unfairness nor deliberate manipulating in land pricing. I again, therefore, and I stress, Mr. Speaker, that Mr. Gardner either apologize or bring forth documented evidence of the Land Bank paying excessive prices for land purchases.

Some Hon. Members: — Hear, hear!

Mr. Messer: — You brought it up, you bring us the names, because you know full well, Mr. Speaker, that there is no fact to those statements and again I say the Member should be ashamed of himself for trying to impress on the people of Saskatchewan those kinds of activities by the Land Bank Commission.

Now, Mr. Speaker, if I may for a few moments turn to another matter, a related matter though, and that is the question of the Small Farm Development Program. The Members of the Opposition led by their leader are going about this province and this country on a campaign urging the Federal Government and for that matter, whoever else they can convince/not to co-operate with this, as they attempt to interpret, this evil Saskatchewan Land Bank Commission. The Leader of the opposition (Mr. Steuart) knows the truth about this matter. He knows that both myself and my officials have spent a great deal of time with Federal Ministers and Federal Government officials discussing ways of making these programs work together. He knows we have never said that there is no place in Saskatchewan for the Small Farm Development Program. He knows that we have argued for improvements in that program and that indeed we have seen improvements made as a

result of these arguments. The Leader of the Opposition knows perfectly well that when this program was first brought in it was nothing more than a bribe to move small farmers off their land. A substantial grant was going to be paid to anyone who would sell his land and promise not to farm again. The Government of Saskatchewan went to Ottawa and argued with the Minister of Agriculture, then Mr. Olson, that he also had to be concerned about the person who receives the land when it is sold. It was with some difficulty that we were able to convince the then Minister of Agriculture that he should attach to this program a system of special credit facilities for those with little equity so that they would have an opportunity to purchase this land that was being freed, so to speak, by the Small Farms Development Program.

If I may, Mr. Speaker, digress for a moment, I should like to bring to the attention and knowledge of Members sitting to your left, that the Small Farms Development Program as it is now referred to was not always called by this name, nor did it constitute or have incorporated into it some of the benefits that it now has.

Mr. Romanow: — Called the Federal Task Force

Mr. Messer: — This program emanated from the Federal Task Force Program, yes. This program was first brought to the attention of the farmers in Canada in March of 1971, it was introduced and referred to as a farm plan, which was an abbreviated form for Farm Adjustment Resources Mobility Plan. That plan, Mr. Speaker, was devised simply to reduce the numbers of farmers that we now have in Canada and especially in the Province of Saskatchewan. This plan was not accepted by those who were in a position to speak for farmers at that time. In fact, all farm organizations, and at that time all provincial governments were most apprehensive of accepting or considering the plan as it was proposed. In fact, Mr. Speaker, I think the publication entitled, "The Grain Grower" best summed up the proposal as it was initially brought forward. May I refer to an article outlining the farm plan in the August 1971 "Grain Grower" where it quotes:

One thing is certain, regardless of the fine words the proposal aims to reduce the numbers of farms in this country. One drafter of the proposal said the ideal number would be one-third what there is now. He also said, just as big a proportion will be relocated from Western Canada as from Eastern Canada.

It was in reaction to this kind of attitude which was common to all of those who are supposedly concerned about farming and farmers in Canada that we went to Ottawa and asked for changes to be made in that plan. In fact, Mr. Speaker, it was because of our representations in seeking amendment and change to that original proposal and our references to the need for a Small Farm Development Program that the Federal Government chose to change the name of their program and use the terminology that we referred to in our proposals. I am pleased that they saw fit to accept some of our proposals, not only the name which in fact may be a minor change, but their adjustments of their program to accommodate farmers with \$60,000 net worth which is one of the more obvious changes. I am highly critical of them taking some of the advantageous proposals that we made

in still refusing to accept some of the key elements that would make the two plans harmoniously operative for the Province of Saskatchewan. Some of these changes were eventually made at the urging of myself and other Provincial Ministers.

Now, Mr. Speaker, if we the Government of Saskatchewan were intent on destroying this plan surely we would have never urged Mr. Olson to make the kinds of improvements that have been made in this program today. The truth of the matter is that we would be happy to see the Small Farm Development Program operating in Saskatchewan now that some improvements have been made and with some further future changes. It is important that we work together, the Federal Government and provincial Government and that the Small Farm Development Program and the Land Bank work together effectively in doing the job of providing equitable land transfer systems for farmers.

Prior to the first of this year, I found that there was general agreement on this, including the Federal Government as well. I was extremely hopeful that we were going to come up with an agreement to work co-operatively in this whole area of land transfer and farm tenure. But then, Mr. Speaker, the Leader of the Opposition (Mr. Steuart) made his famous sojourn to Ottawa, his sojourn of political sabotage against Saskatchewan. He went down there and he demanded, and he ordered the Federal Government not to co-operate with the Saskatchewan Government and with the Saskatchewan Land Bank. He said to the Federal Government:

We Saskatchewan Liberals are opposed to this Land Bank as a matter of principle and as a matter of high philosophy. We are opposed to it because they will not allow people to purchase the land immediately, but require them to lease the land for five years.

That, he said to the Liberal Government, is a matter of high principle and something which we as Liberals in Saskatchewan would never stand for if we were in government and we cannot stand for with an NDP Government. As I have just indicated to you the Liberals had exactly the same policy in regard to selling Crown land while they were in government, for the whole time they were in government. This is where the high principles of the Liberal Government stand, Mr. Speaker, and I want all people of Saskatchewan to know and to understand that fact.

Now, Mr. Speaker, the Opposition objects to government action aimed at mobilizing capital and developing the resources and the production potential of this province. It is clear that the great resources of this province will never be developed effectively for and in the interests of people of Saskatchewan unless the people of Saskatchewan themselves take the action necessary to ensure that development takes place.

Mr. Speaker, I now want to be more specific about the things this Government is doing and is proposing to do to ensure that this province does not go through the kind of doldrums we experienced during the last four years of Liberal Government. We are placing first priority at this time on agricultural development, we make no apologies for that. Agriculture is the fundamental basis of existence for the provincial economy. A full 50 per cent of the net value of production of this province comes directly from our farms. When we take into

account machinery manufacturing, feed manufacturing, fuel sales, retail sales to farmers, marketing activities, processing of farm products and the multitude of similar economic activities — agriculture assumes an importance unequalled in any other economic activity of this province. Our Liberal friends across the way have a lot to say, unfortunately, most of it ridiculous, about the agricultural programs we are implementing. They are full of big talk of how they would do things differently if they were in power. What gall these people have, Mr. Speaker, the brashness and the arrogance of their statements is beyond comprehension when you look at their record during their seven years of office. The fact of the matter is that during those seven dismal years agriculture and rural Saskatchewan was almost completely ignored, the people of Saskatchewan universally recognized and demanded that something needed to be done about the plight of farmers. But our friends across the way, and in particular the Hon. Leader of the Opposition when he was Provincial Treasurer and letting everyone in Saskatchewan know it, said No, we have no money and we can't afford agricultural programs. He was right, we couldn't afford it. Why we couldn't afford it was because the Hon. Leader of the Opposition and his henchmen were pouring millions of dollars of taxpayers' money into the foreign bank accounts, their pals in Toronto, New York, London or Paris and other places with equally well-known concern for the people of Saskatchewan. But when it came to the little man, the individual about whom they claimed to be so concerned, the farmer, the storekeeper, the implement dealer, the small businessmen, they had virtually nothing to offer. Parsons and Whitemore and their kind already had first claim on the hard-earned tax money of the individuals in this province.

The people of Saskatchewan made their feelings quite clear on this subject in June 1971, their message was quite clear. They were saying, let's get the economy going, and let's do it by helping the little man, the individual and not the big foreign corporate friends of the former Liberal Government. Now that we have an honest government that is honestly trying to get the economy rolling and improved standards of income, by helping the family farm and the family business, the Liberals are busily crying the blues. The Member for Moosomin (Mr. Gardner) as Minister of Agriculture — heaven forbid — the Liberals never saw fit to appoint him as Minister of Agriculture during their term of office and it won't likely ever get the opportunity, judging by their presently dwindling support in this province; he would have had a Land Bank, but he would have done it differently, he would have made it possible to buy the land immediately. He would have made it part of Bud Olson's and Pierre Elliott Trudeau's Task Force program of getting as many people off of the land as quickly as possible. The Member for Moosomin has the unmitigated gall, or he is so ill-informed with the Federal Government program that he called the Land Bank a monster which could well destroy our rural way of life.

If the Liberal Party here and in Ottawa had their way we would no longer have a rural way of life in Saskatchewan. The Member for Cannington (Mr. Weatherald) would have done something about marketing, particularly hog marketing. But he too would have done it differently than we are doing it. Now we are proposing an Agricultural Incentives Act and a FarmStart Program of low-cost credit and grants to assist the family farm to develop and reach its full potential. Already the old familiar rumblings and mumblings are beginning on the other side of the House about how the Opposition would have introduced the program

if they were in Government, that they would have switched it a bit here and changed it a bit there.

Let's all of us in this Assembly be clear about one thing. Mr. Speaker, the people of Saskatchewan will not be swayed by the claptrap claims of the Opposition about their basic support for these programs. The people know that there is not one Member across the way who has ever had an original thought about a new agricultural program and policy. They know that the Liberal Party would not do anything for farmers when they were in office before and they will not do anything if they are ever in office again. And why won't they? Because their great corporate friends don't want them to. The Liberals oppose the Land Bank because the big banks tell them to oppose it. The banks are afraid that the Land Bank will be cutting into their mortgage business. The Liberals oppose the Government credit programs because the banks tell them to. They oppose marketing boards and commissions because the multi-national packing companies tell them to. It is absolutely impossible to believe that the Liberals would ever take positive and progressive action to improve the farm economy. Their hands are tied by the vested corporate interests which so generously fill their party coffers. Despite the claims of opposition Members they do not support these new programs in any way, shape or form. Quite the contrary. They are deeply engaged in systematic sabotage of each and every new program we propose for agriculture. They are playing politics of the very worst kind.

We cannot afford this kind of nonsense at this critical time in the development of our economy, Mr. Speaker. We must revitalize agriculture and the family farm before it is too late. We must provide the means whereby young people will find the prospects of farming attractive enough to take up that vocation if they want to. The job will not be easy, Mr. Speaker. We will have to alter fundamentally the income-earning potential of smaller farms in the province. We will have to improve long-term prices of farm products and take the measures necessary to stabilize these prices. We will have to have continuous growth and expansion in agricultural production and we will have to provide the mechanism and institutions necessary to assure markets with stable prices for these products. That, in a nutshell is what our agricultural programs will do.

It is because of this, Mr. Speaker, that I serve notice here today that I will not be party to such a result as would obviously come about if we followed the recommendations of the Opposition. Nor for that matter do I think the people of Saskatchewan want that course of action set out for them.

For those reasons I will not support the amendment, but will support the motion by the Member for Saskatoon Nutana South (Mr. Rolfes) and seconded by the Member from Gravelbourg (Mr. Gross).

Some Hon. Members: — Hear, hear!

Mr. D.L. Faris (Arm River): — Mr. Speaker, I am very pleased to enter this debate to congratulate the Member for Nutana South (Mr. Rolfes) and the Member for Gravelbourg (Mr. Gross) for the moving and seconding of the Speech from the Throne. They made a very fine job.

I wish to congratulate the Member from Biggar (Mr. Cowley), Kerrobert-Kindersley (Mr. Taylor) and Humboldt (Mr. Tchorzewski) for their elevation to the Cabinet and for the excellent job they have been doing in their positions.

I wish also to congratulate the Member from Athabasca (Mr. Guy) for his return to this House. Each of us on the Government side has to rationalize some grounds for congratulating him on his election. I think perhaps my reason might be that he can complement the Member from Meadow Lake (Mr. Coupland). That Member made a very distinguished speech here this afternoon. I congratulate him on his maiden address in this House but I was rather amazed that he went through his speech talking about the “state control” in education, the “state control” in hospitalization, “state control”, “state control”. This is all we heard. Then what was his solution for northern Saskatchewan? It was that the Government should provide root cellars in northern Saskatchewan. That was the highlight of his contribution to the Throne Speech debate and I hope that the Member from Athabasca will advise his people of this great Liberal program.

Mr. Speaker, I am very pleased to speak in support of the Speech from the Throne. In it we can see some of the broad strategy for economic development that is needed to strengthen the economy of this province. I would hope to see this Government come up within the next year with a whole white paper on economic development strategy. I think that the strategy is fairly clear but I think that it should be spelled out so that the public can know what we are doing and why we are doing it. The new initiatives to strengthen and to diversify agriculture should be set in the context of increased emphasis on secondary manufacturing. But perhaps even more important is that the public be made aware that our Government is a social democratic government and that we intend to fully utilize every means available to promote social planning and democratic control of an economy composed of a public, a co-operative and a private sector.

The Liberal Party in Saskatchewan has historically tried to run a scare campaign against the socialists. The Member from Redberry (Mr. Michayluk) has shown me a pamphlet published by the Yorkton Liberals, 1944. It warned the Ukrainian people that the socialists would close all of their churches and nationalize all of their farms. Mr. Thatcher and now Mr. Steuart continues this great tradition. They try to persuade people that the CCF-NDP want to nationalize everything — all industry, all businesses, all farm land.

In point of fact the CCF have issued two statements of basic principles — the Regina Manifesto in 1933 and the Winnipeg Declaration in 1956. These both dealt with the role of public ownership in a democratic-socialist society. Basic principles run through both of these documents. Social planning, democratic control of an economy made up of a public, a co-operative and a private sector. These principles were further elucidated in the speeches of J.S. Woodsworth and M.J. Coldwell and T.C. Douglas. They have been explained time and time again in the Federal election platforms of the CCF.

The Regina Manifesto was largely based upon work done by the League for Social Reconstruction, which was a scholarly research group modelled after the British Fabians. The end product of a large convention the Manifesto contains some fairly

vague phrases which party leaders were required to defend and explain. It discussed a public sector. The public sector would include banking and insurance, transportation, communications, electric power, mining, pulp and paper, the distribution of milk, bread, coal and gasoline. The Manifesto refers to the public ownership of the “principal” means of production, or “main” industries, or “industries essential to social planning.” The co-operative sector was first discussed under the heading “Agriculture”. There is mentioned consumer co-ops and extension of co-operative institutions for the processing and marketing of farm products. In a separate section on co-operative institutions there is mention of co-ops to distribute staple commodities such as milk and to enter into wholesale distribution and to manufacturing. The private sector in the Regina Manifesto is not defined in a positive way, but rather by exclusion. One is left with the view that those businesses which are not “principal means of production”, not “main industries”, or not “essential to social planning” and not in the co-operative sector, will be allowed to continue in private ownership. Included in this private sector was the family farm where the need was for, “Security of tenure for the farmer upon his farm”. The CCF Leaders in the 1930s spent much of their time explaining their basic principles to their opponents in the House of Commons. On April 19th, 1934, Woodsworth explained the word ‘socialism’ as follows:

I know that a great many Members in this House are prejudiced against the word ‘socialism’. I am not particular whether or not that word is used. But I take it that we have reached the stage when we must have some sort of social control, if that term sounds any better.

Woodsworth had earlier in the year explained that:

The body which we have been working nearest to the lines which we advocate is the British Labour Party.

This moderate social democratic approach led him to criticize the Conservative Natural Product Marketing Act because:

The Government in this Bill goes much further in the direction of bureaucracy that, we in the CCF would like to see because we believe that while there must be some sort of social control, we should do our utmost to avoid centralized control and on the other hand rather encourage the development of co-operative institutions. In this particular Bill it would seem as if the state itself undertakes not merely the supervision but the actual administration of the marketing of goods. We, in our part, would rather see a larger measure of local co-operation.

Here we see Woodsworth’s preference for co-operatives as embodying both social control and democratic participation. His flexibility is further shown when he discusses what should be done about private monopolies. He said:

Under these circumstances some of us believe that the only possible way is for government monopoly or centralized government control over these monopolies, which if effective would be much the same as actual ownership.

February 5, 1973

Woodsworth taught that public ownership was not an end in itself, the co-operative movement or social controls would achieve the same ends sometimes with even greater effectiveness. His position in regard to the family farm is clear. He said on February 5th, 1934:

We recognize that the farmer is not an exploiter, rather he is one of the worst exploited.

Today farming is still in the family farm stage and as long as that is maintained there is no reason why under our scheme there should be any alteration in the ownership of farms. In 1936 he said:

The Co-operative Commonwealth Federation has never advocated the socialization of farm lands in the sense of the government taking them over. We have always held that it is desirable that a person working on his own land should be made secure in his tenure of that land.

M.J. Coldwell in this same debate praised the Scandinavian countries and their great co-operative institutions. In regard to public ownership he decried the practice of taking over, "bankrupt facilities mismanaged by big business". He preferred the Swedish example where they had, "taken over and organized some of these great profitable industries which had become monopolistic in their nature and which, therefore, ought to be a matter of public concern."

T.C. Douglas summed up this argument with characteristic wit and clarity:

There is no reason why the Government should run a little shoe store here or an ice cream parlor there. They are not monopolistic. Only where a monopoly exists do we say that there should be government ownership.

In the 1944 platform, the CCF stated:

Only large scale public investment and expenditure under social ownership or control and carried out with a national economic plan will meet our needs.

The platform explains social ownership to mean, "The socialization and democratic control under either public or co-operative ownership of industries which are being operated to the detriment of the Canadian people." The role of the co-operative sector is dealt with in a separate section. It suggests:

The promotion of co-operative ownership wherever possible as a desirable form of social ownership.

He desired Federal legislation to encourage co-operative enterprise to enter new fields and sought a program of education on co-operation as a means of achieving democratic self-help and self-government.

The role of the private sector is quite explicit in the 1944 platform:

The socialization of large scale enterprises, however, does not mean taking over every private business. Where

private business shows no signs of becoming a monopoly, operates efficiently under decent working conditions and does not operate to the detriment of the Canadian people, it will be given every opportunity to function, to earn a fair rate of return and to make its contribution to the nation's wealth.

The 1944 platform states further:

The CCF have always stood for the private ownership of family farms, family homes and other personal property.

Mr. Speaker, the fullest explanation of the social democratic program of the CCF was in fact in the 1949 Federal platform. It deals openly with public, private and co-operative sectors of the economy and I quote:

The CCF is often accused of being doctrinaire. In reality the CCF critics are the doctrinaires. They believe in the doctrine of free enterprise complete and uncontrolled no matter what the results. They persist in this experience in spite of our experience in peace and war. Free enterprise has not and cannot meet with people's need. In the light of this experience the CCF believe that some parts of the economy must be brought under public ownership. Some more are suited for co-operative ownership. In a Federal state like Canada, many resources can be developed only through the combined efforts of Dominion and Provincial Governments. Finally, there are large areas which can best be left to private enterprise. The CCF is determined to build a working balance of all of these methods. It believes that each should be used where most effective to achieve the fullest possible production.

It follows with a section on social ownership and says:

The purpose of bringing any industry under social ownership is to increase the freedom and welfare of all of the Canadian people. By social ownership the CCF does not mean only ownership by the Federal Government, on the contrary the CCF have always recognized that owing to the Federal nature of the Canadian Constitution there are many fields in which provincial and municipal ownership is the most appropriate form. And, in particular, the CCF has always emphasized co-operative ownership in view of the opportunities for direct participation by the people which co-operatives present. The CCF program, therefore, comprises all of these forms of social ownership, federal, provincial, municipal and co-operative. The program outlines the policy for CCF Federal Government and is, therefore, mainly concerned with Federal socialization but in every possible and appropriate case a Federal CCF Government will vigorously assist provincial, municipal and co-operative ownership as well. It cannot be too often emphasized that the CCF regards socialization of industry as a means to an end and not an end in itself. It believes in social ownership and economic planning because only through such policies can we lay the basis in Canada for a much greater freedom and security for the

individual and his family than today exists.

The statement goes on to say:

Social ownership will free the people from the power of private monopoly. It will make possible a higher standard of living through increased production and lower prices. It is an essential part of any plan for maintaining full employment and for providing a fairer distribution of wealth. In some cases socialization may also be necessary to restore efficiency to a disorganized and undeveloped industry.

The 1949 statement goes on to deal with a section on co-operative ownership. This section states:

The growth of the co-operative movement in Canada has the full backing of the CCF which in Parliament and throughout the country has fought to protect co-operatives from every attempt to tax or limit their activities. Although co-operative ownership is not government ownership the CCF use it as a most desirable method of producing, processing and distributing many of our basic commodities. The CCF Federal Government will encourage and assist co-operative development in all appropriate spheres. It will remove Federal taxation of patronage dividends of co-operative enterprise.

The 1949 statement then went on to deal with a section entitled “The Role of Private Enterprise”:

The application of these measures of socialization will considerably extend the area of public ownership under social and co-operative ownership. But it will also leave a large section of business in private hands. In order to achieve effective production and distribution in both the public and in the private sectors of the economy a CCF government will help and encourage private business to fulfil its legitimate functions. Experience has shown that where public business flourishes, private business thrives also. The private trader or industrialist freed from the domination of industrial and financial monopoly will have a better chance to exercise his enterprise and initiative to earn a fair rate of return and to make his contribution to the nation’s wealth.

The 1949 Federal platform again stated the CCF policy in regard to farm land saying:

Since the ownership of agricultural land is widely distributed amongst individual members the CCF have always opposed the nationalization of land.

Having studied the thoughts of G.S. Woodsworth, M.J. Coldwell and T.C. Douglas in the 1930s and the CCF Federal programs in the 1940s, we can see that the Winnipeg Declaration in 1956 was a good precise summary of these teachings. It said and I quote:

In the Co-operative Commonwealth there will be an important role for public, private and co-operative enterprises working together in the people’s interest. The CCF has always recognized public ownership as the

most effective means of breaking the stranglehold of private monopolies on the life of the nation and facilitating the social planning necessary for economic security and advance. The CCF will therefore extend public ownership wherever it is necessary for the achievement of these objectives. At the same time the CCF also recognizes that in many fields there will be need for private enterprise which will make a useful contribution to the development of our economy. The Co-operative Commonwealth will, therefore, provide appropriate opportunities for private business as well as publicly owned industry. The CCF will protect and make more widespread the ownership of farm lands by those who till them, of homes by those who live in them and all personal possessions necessary for the well-being of the Canadian people. In many fields the best means of insuring justice to producers and consumers is the co-operative form of ownership. In such fields every assistance will be given to form co-operatives and credit unions and to strengthen those already in existence.

We can see that in the 1930s, the 1940s and the 1950s the CCF constantly maintained social democratic principles of social planning and democratic control of an economy made up of a public, a co-operative and a private sector. J.S. Woodsworth, M.J. Coldwell and T.C. Douglas clearly stand in this social democratic tradition. It can clearly also be seen that the 1973 Throne Speech stands in this same tradition. We find references to specific areas of public initiative. We find specific reference to areas of co-operative enterprise and we are awaiting the report from a committee of this Legislature set up on small businesses. This broadly based approach to economic development is in stark contrast to the policy of the former government. The Liberals sold out our Crown corporations. The Liberals ignored the co-operative movement. The Liberals did nothing for small businessmen. Their entire development strategy was based on loans and grants and give-aways to giant corporations. I am proud, Mr. Speaker, to support an economic development strategy based on social planning and democratic control, of an economy composed of a public, a co-operative and a private sector. Therefore, I am pleased to support the Speech from the Throne and to oppose the amendment.

Some Hon. Members: — Hear, hear!

Hon. A. Taylor (Minister of Social Services): — Mr. Speaker, may I first take this opportunity of congratulating the mover and seconder of the Reply to the Speech from the Throne. Both of these Members have done an outstanding job and have had much to say that is deserving of the attention of every Member in this House. I would also like to take this opportunity of congratulating the two other Members of the House who were appointed to the Cabinet at the same time as myself. I appreciate very much the opportunity of working with them and know of their dedication and of their effort.

Mr. Speaker, the Throne Speech presented by His Honour, was an indication that this Government intends to pursue its policy of providing a New Deal for the people of Saskatchewan. There is no need for me to remind this Assembly of the benefits which were provided to the people of Saskatchewan during the preceding

two sessions of this House. Many giant strides have already been taken in the fields of health, agriculture and in many other areas.

The present Throne Speech indicates a continued awareness of the problems facing the people of our province and the willingness to meet and to overcome these problems. I am particularly pleased that once again the emphasis is placed on our farm economy. Our Government has recognized that farming is the prime industry in this province and as such the health of our whole economy depends on the agricultural industry. We look forward to the introduction of The Agriculture Incentives Act, for we recognize that one of the major problems facing the farming community is indeed a lack of reasonable credit. There is no question but what one of the major difficulties faced by young men entering the agricultural field is that of obtaining sufficient credit to enable them to enter diversification. The new program called FarmStart commits us to a system of both low-cost supervised credit and also of grants. I am certain this will be looked upon with favor by everyone in our farming community.

Our farmers will likewise be most happy to see that amendments are being brought forward for The Agricultural Implements Act. Of major concern to many of our farmers is the availability of parts and also the warranty performance of manufacturers. This is particularly true during the harvesting operation, when frequently our farmers are held up and face costly hold-ups because of parts delayed.

The Speech from the Throne also indicates that a Saskatchewan Housing Corporation will be created. We look forward to this corporation and the expectation that it can help to meet many of the needs for housing in our province. It is my hope, Mr. Speaker, that this corporation may be active not only in the cities but also in the smaller towns of our province. There is no question of the need for better housing. Up until now the lower-middle income families and lower income families have found it almost impossible to obtain home ownership.

In the same way our Government, through the Speech from the Throne, indicates our continuing concern and interest in the needs of our senior citizens, by announcing a new program to assist senior citizens in the repair and improvements of their homes. This, too, is a program that will benefit many of our people and will be, I am sure, acceptable to all.

Mr. Speaker, I am particularly pleased at this opportunity to devote a few minutes to review some of the major activities of the Department of Social Services over the past year. This Department, which I have been given the responsibility for, touches the lives of a vast number of Saskatchewan citizens. It is this Department that is charged with the responsibility for assuring that no resident of our province shall be allowed to live in economic circumstances below that which is described as minimum standard. It is the Department which is responsible for assuring that the young and the old residents of our province are provided with adequate care and sustenance. It is this Department that has the responsibility for those who run afoul of the law, and have been confined to one of the provincial correctional institutions or placed on probation. The responsibilities are large, and at times of a very sensitive nature. I suggest that because of this, this is why there is

much criticism at times aimed at the Department and the people who receive our services.

I would also like to suggest, however, to those critics, that it is always easy to criticize those who at any given point in time are considered to be at the bottom of the social ladder. They have little power in our social system and few spokesmen with the necessary skills to gain access to the public consciousness. Too often those who criticize us for assisting those they like to call “drunks, loafers, deadbeats and people too lazy to work”, are, to put it simply, unaware of the situation in which we operate, or else they are attempting to make cheap political gain at the expense of the unfortunate. For myself, I cannot believe the Opposition to be ignorant of the facts, and that leaves only the other answer.

We are the first to acknowledge that we have always had with us a minute group who live off the system we operate; but the vast majority of those in receipt of public assistance are those who are socially disadvantaged for a number of reasons — health, education or other reasons. It is these people who have little control over the circumstances they find themselves in that our Department is organized to serve. The problem we face, Mr. Speaker, is how to provide adequate social services to this group of people to allow them to escape from a life of welfare support. We are further faced with problems over which we have little, if any, control. It was not our Government’s decision to create huge pools of unemployed people in this province and throughout the country. It was the decision of a Federal Liberal Government and those who support it. A decision carried out with more efficiency than any other program the Federal Liberals have ever embarked on. But it is our Department that carries a large portion of the burden created by these ill-advised and ill-conceived Federal-fiscal policies.

Before going into a description of some of the Department of Social Service’s functions over the last year, I would like to take a moment to congratulate the Hon. Member from Regina Lakeview (Mr. McPherson) on his appointment to what the Opposition Leader (Mr. Steuart) has termed his shadow cabinet. As a critic of our Department I can assure him that his comments will be closely listened to and his criticism, where constructive, will be given the full consideration of my staff.

Some Hon. Members: — Hear, hear!

Mr. Taylor: — I would like now, Mr. Speaker, to discuss some of the directions our Department is moving in. The first subject I would deal with is the new approaches we have laid down for the mentally retarded persons in Saskatchewan. Through the co-operation of the three provincial departments of Health, Education and Social Services, we have established an interdepartmental administration called Core Services Administration. The direction of future developments under Core Services involves three important concepts. First, there is agreement that programs for the retarded should be viewed in the broader context of programs for handicapped persons generally. Second, there is agreement on the importance of co-ordination and services provided by the three Government departments involved. Third, we have agreed that the mental retardation program should be moved into a broader education and social service framework. These steps will insure that needed mental, social and physical

health needs can be provided in a community rather than always in an institutional setting. We have recognized, in other words, that the treatment of mental retardation is similar to the treatment necessary for any social problem; and we have, in fact, said that mental retardation is a social problem rather than a mental problem. The isolation that previously existed for many persons will in a great many cases be removed.

The new interdepartmental co-ordination comes under the leadership of the Department of Social Services. This move to Core Services of the mentally retarded program, as well as allowing a fuller development of community-based services, will also enable the province to obtain cost sharing under the Canada Assistance Plan. The test of financial eligibility becomes necessary because of the cost-sharing Federal regulation. It will affect only a small percentage of those under the plan. The benefits to the province as a whole will be extremely important. Core Services personnel will be responsible for the progressive program development of services for the mentally retarded at the community level to allow the retarded a more normal, non-institutional life wherever possible. It will also guarantee co-ordination between the community program and the institutional facilities currently being operated at the Moose Jaw Training School and Prince Albert Training School. It is expected that Core Services will also absorb the functions of the Provincial Co-ordinator of Rehabilitation. It will co-ordinate a number of specific service areas. The Executive Director of Core Services will administer and co-ordinate services that affect the three departments involved. This co-ordination of existing programs will lead, we believe, to a more effective utilization of both personnel and facilities than now exist.

The beneficiaries of this step to interdepartmental co-ordination will, of course, be the residents of our province who require these services.

One of the first tasks being undertaken outside the field of retardation itself is the task of planning a conference for the handicapped. A provincial conference of the handicapped will be held in Moose Jaw, probably around the last week in March of this year. The main participants in this conference will be members in the handicapped community including the mentally retarded, the physically handicapped, the blind, the deaf and other similar groups. The conference is being organized to give the handicapped an opportunity to make their needs known and to voice their concerns directly to the people responsible for the programs. The main speakers at this conference will be the handicapped themselves. This is the first time, as far as we know, that a government agency has arranged such a conference in order to allow the handicapped to speak to the Government. This is being done to make sure that we are not being blocked off by the so-called professionals and experts in the field.

Mr. Speaker, my Department is also involved in the Senior Citizens Commission recently announced by the Premier. The nine-member commission will be chaired by the Rev. Bruce Wartman of Regina. The most recent review of senior citizens' needs in our province was in 1963. In the past ten years there has, of course, been rapid social change. The impact of this change on our senior citizens, the pioneers of our province, has not, we believe, received sufficient attention, analysis and consideration. It was our Government's feeling that more current data about the needs of senior citizens now, problems as they

themselves see them, and their own ideas about the solution, is an urgent requirement for relevant programming.

While there has been much progress in the provision of nursing home accommodation for the aging with long-term illness needs, modern programming trends emphasize de-institutionalization, more home care and support services to sustain aging people as participating members of their community. This approach emphasizes the provision of more mid-way resources for aging people to enable them to continue their choice of living situations longer and delay entry into the expensive nursing facilities until that type of care becomes a real necessity. The intended goal is to offer senior citizens a meaningful way of life as an integral part of their community for as long as possible. Planning for services to provide for those needs we need to know more about the extent of the needs and the type of alternatives that senior citizens not only need but also want. Not enough is known about their differing aspirations and needs. The information that there is requires updating.

While there has been much community involvement in nursing home programs, and more recently into home support services, such as meals-on-wheels, activity centres and others, it is vital to keep communities involved in assessing needs and alternatives, planning developments and the whole process of change.

Mr. Speaker, the task of the Commission will involve initiation in searching out elderly people who cannot or do not turn out for public meetings, or write briefs, or even letters. The nature of the population to be studied requires an imaginative approach, some innovative methods and aggressive strategies to bring out data from the less vocal segments of the population. The task requires the Commission to be available and accessible to the public. The Commission must be mobile, ready for travelling and for an active schedule. To be readily apparent to the public during its six-month tenure it will require the full-time identity of an office, a phone number and address and full-time staffing.

It will be vital, Mr. Speaker, to get and to keep the public participating in the assessment of needs, consideration of alternatives, and the planning of developments throughout the whole process of the study. Publicity to the work of the Commission, public statements about progress with the assignments, and public relations are implicit in the mandate given to the Commission members.

It is my hope that all Members of this Assembly and members of the general public will view this study with consideration and seriousness so that its findings will lead to the best possible life situation for the senior members of all Saskatchewan communities.

The Commission has representation from all stages of life, Mr. Speaker; senior citizens, middle-aged people, young people, all are represented. Middle-aged people are, or at least should be, planning and preparing for their future. Unfortunately that future has been viewed far too often as declining years, rather than as the continuation of an active life. The preparation of it emphasizes the terminal features like wills and estate planning, rather than that of continuing a vibrant life role.

Some of the most successful projects under the Opportunities

for Youth program indicate as well that youth are concerned, innovative and active in their interests in the elderly citizens of their communities. A fully rounded body will bring the best possible approach to the question at hand.

This Commission has been instructed to report to myself within a six-month period. Two full-time staff members, an office secretary and a research officer will assist the Commission members in their work.

It might be appropriate at this time, Mr. Speaker, to briefly remind the Assembly of the fate of the 1963 study commissioned by the New Democratic Government under the able leadership of Woodrow Lloyd.

At that time a study was established to look into the needs and the concerns of the senior citizens. The original report was complete, work was completed in setting up a study group to carry out some action. And then the Liberal administration came in and abolished the study committee. Mr. Speaker, we have now moved to try and do something. Our Government has taken further steps to ensure a better quality of life for our senior citizens.

You will recall that a little over one year ago my predecessor the Hon. Minister of Labour, set up a study committee to research and develop alternatives for the programming and financing of special care homes services in this province. This committee has completed its task and made its report to the Government. The Government has reviewed the philosophical goals of the Special Care Home program relative to the study committee report. The Government, as well, has given serious consideration to briefs, proposals and resolutions on this subject advanced by individuals and organizations associated with the program.

In resolving this question now the Government has adopted a program of assistance that will provide financial relief for all guests in special care homes that are not now receiving financial benefits from other programs administered by the Provincial Government.

This new program will be available to all guests in all Special Care Homes in Saskatchewan. It will provide financial assistance to eligible Level III guests in an amount of \$144 a month.

Some Hon. Members: — Hear, hear!

Mr. Taylor: — At the same time eligible Level II guests will receive assistance of \$54 per month. Assistance will be available to Level I guests now residing in Special Care facilities in amounts of up to \$30 per month depending on the financial position and the rate structure adopted by the Special Care Home in which they reside.

Mr. Speaker, this means that as of March 1st of this year the system of block grants as a means of subsidizing Special Care Homes will be abolished and replaced with the new grant structure designed to ease the financial pressure of nursing home care on the patients. This combination of grant payments that I have just outlined will mean a total expenditure of almost \$3 1/2 million the first year. But it also means, Sir, we have completed another promise; that we have completed our election promise

of providing nursing care to all guests in special care homes.

Some Hon. Members: — Hear, hear!

Mr. Taylor: — Rates in these special care homes have been frozen since May, 1971, Mr. Speaker, with the Government providing extra funds to enable these operations to break even. This was not a very equitable arrangement since some patients were paying a much higher proportion of their costs than others. And since, in effect, it meant that the costs of chronic care patients were often subsidized by patients in Level I and II. It also meant that guests in new homes did not receive the benefits of the grant.

The new grant structure represents serious attempts by our Government to place the financing of Special Care Homes on a rational basis, and to provide a basis for the further development of services for the aged in the years to come. I point at this to contrast our actions with those of the former Government when they were in power.

They froze the rates and thus perpetuated the inequalities. It is interesting, however, to note the date on which the rates were frozen so that there would be no increase in costs — May, 1971.

Mr. Bowerman: — What was that date again?

Mr. Taylor: — May, 1971. Mr. Speaker, we have also publicly announced since I took this portfolio that this Government would not permit the further development of commercially operated Special Care Homes in this province.

Some Hon. Members: — Hear, hear!

Mr. Taylor: — We do not feel that this is an area where profit making can be justified, and we do not intend to support efforts to this effect. But in making that announcement we didn't forget that there are a number of Special Care Homes, commercially owned, already in operation. Since we favor municipal, church, or other charitable organizations filling the role in the operation of these homes on a break even basis, our Government has announced that grants are available towards the cost of purchase of these commercial homes by non-profit groups.

The Government grant for the purchase of the existing homes is similar to the construction grant given to groups constructing or building new homes. We hope that this grant system will eventually remove commercialism from special care operations in our province.

This is not to say, as some Members opposite would have you believe, that we are against private enterprise in every field. Mr. Speaker, our Government simply believes that the care of the older residents of this province, who have given so much of their lives in building what we now have, is not an area in which we can encourage the making of a profit.

Some Hon. Members: — Hear, hear!

Mr. Taylor: — Our Government was pleased with some of the steps announced over the past few months on the Federal level for senior citizens. Mr. Speaker, we were very pleased to hear that we could expect a substantial increase in old age pensions and we look forward to this coming.

The new Horizons program is another step, we think, in the right direction, but it also has some difficulties. This program, like Opportunities For Youth and the Local Initiatives Program, is based on priorities established — if established at all — at a Federal level. The priorities at the Federal level are not always the same as those established by a provincial government. Many of the projects are excellent and have an ongoing function after the original Federal grant has run out. The problem my Department is now facing is that we are in a position of tremendous pressure to continue funding these projects, even though they may not have fitted within the priorities previously established.

At a recent meeting of Provincial Social Services Ministers, just a short time ago, it was the unanimous feeling of the provincial representatives that Ottawa should more actively and readily seek the advice of those working at the provincial level before giving final approval to any new projects. This was agreed to by all the provinces present. We hope that this problem can be cleared up in the next months by holding another meeting with the Federal Minister responsible. We should like to see the problem cleared so that government spending at the two levels can be made more effective. And we certainly assure the Federal authorities of our co-operation in working towards this.

Mr. Speaker, as the Hon. Members of this Assembly are aware, my Department has moved ahead in implementing recommendations contained in the Saskatchewan Corrections Study Committee report submitted to this Government. In the past year corrections have already been integrated as a full division within the Department of Social Services.

We have appointed a Director of Corrections and a Chief Probation Officer. As well, we have recently appointed a Director of Community Corrections to continue the move to place increasing emphasis on community based programs as an alternative to incarceration. The appointment of additional probation officer has already resulted in a significant decrease in our correctional population. A community training residence has been established in Saskatoon and we now, therefore, have three in operation in the province. The others are in Regina and Prince Albert. In an effort to integrate corrections with other government programs, an interdepartmental committee has been established.

In accordance with a further recommendation of the Corrections Study, the Provincial Correctional Centres are now receiving inmates on a geographical basis instead of the age division. We have also established elected inmate groups in all Correctional Centres to improve the relationship between those incarcerated and the staff who are working within the institutions.

Mr. Speaker, as has been announced some time ago, the Provincial Government set aside \$5 million for provincial-municipal winter works. There are already over 425 projects approved. The main objective of the Winterworks Program is to

provide useful employment for people seeking work. We have made it a requirement of those receiving grants under this program, that they contact the regional office of the Department of Social Services, before awarding a contract or hiring any personnel for a project. We do not yet know the full effect that this provision will have on those now receiving social assistance who are, indeed, capable of working.

Many projects are just now getting under way, and there are more applications to be processed. We do know, however, that a good number of people receiving social assistance have been placed in jobs on these projects. This is the first time, the first year, that this type of approach has been initiated. I can report at this time that with a number of projects still to get underway over 150 of the clients of our Department have been successful in obtaining employment through this program.

Some Hon. Members: — Hear, hear!

Mr. Taylor: — We hope that through continued emphasis on this approach that job placement from the list of the Department of Social Service clients, will continue and provide a valid alternative for those needing public assistance in times of high unemployment.

It might be pointed out too, Mr. Speaker, when Members opposite complain about those on assistance who are not working and who are capable of working. Up until this point the Federal Government has been willing to pay half the welfare costs, and have steadfastly refused to pay any share of work creation. This, it seems to me, when we travel to Ottawa for discussion, is a good item for such discussion.

Mr. Speaker, turning briefly to the area of Federal-Provincial relations, I was pleased to note the recent remarks of the Federal Minister of Health and Welfare. In a recent speech he said that income security for Canadians is one of the highest priorities in the eyes of the Federal Government. In this, I may say, our Government concurs wholeheartedly. The whole area of income security is one that has been dealt with in the past on a piecemeal basis. I am pleased to see the Government moving towards a more comprehensive approach in this area.

Mr. Speaker, may I also briefly mention two pieces of legislation to be dealt with by this House from my Department. I refer, of course, to The Family Services Act and to The Children of Unmarried Parents Act.

The Family Services Act was introduced to the Assembly during its last session. Since then it has been widely discussed and examined by many segments of Saskatchewan society. Changes have been made, clauses adjusted, and we are now ready to ask the House to go ahead with this Act.

The Children of Unmarried Parents Act goes with The Family Services Act. I will have more to say on these particular Bills at a later time.

I should like to comment also, very briefly

The Assembly recessed from 5:30 p.m. until 7:00 p.m.

Mr. Taylor: — Mr. Speaker, I should like to take this opportunity of commenting very briefly on some of the questions that have already been raised during this debate regarding the work of the Department of Social Services.

The first comment refers to the supposed great increase in assistance being paid out by our Department. Something that I discovered rather interestingly as I examined the last four or five years was that I noted that the greatest increase in assistance came in the year 1970 to 1971, when the former administration increased its payments by approximately 40 per cent, which is probably one of the largest increases in history. I am not sure whether this had anything to do with it being an election year, it is probably just coincidental.

One or two Members of the Opposition have also talked of our so-called advertising campaign, as though we were urging people to get on welfare. Mr. Speaker, I realize that the world has a problem with illiteracy, but I didn't really understand that it had affected the Opposition. Anyone who takes time to read the advertisements, as they call them in the newspapers, would note that the so-called advertising comments were nothing more than a means of informing people of the services offered by the Department, and explaining the work carried on by the Department of Social Services. The real emphasis on the ads, if they were read, was on the handicapped, the senior citizen, the foster child and, yes, the criminal.

One of the reasons for the need for such a brief as it was, and short campaign, was to correct some of the false impressions that I can only suggest are being placed in the minds of people by those in the Opposition, something that I think is nothing more than a cheap political gimmick to try and take away from the work that is being done.

Mr. Speaker, I was also rather disturbed to hear the Leader of the Opposition (Mr. Steuart) speak of young people in receipt of assistance. And to speak of them as feeding at the welfare trough.

An Hon. Member: — Oh, oh!

Mr. Taylor: — This to me was a rather detestable type of comment to come from anyone who would try to have the population believe that he cares about people. They were talking mainly about 16 and 17 year olds. I think it's a most reprehensible attitude, but really hardly surprising considering its source.

Some Hon. Members: — Hear, hear!

Mr. Taylor: — Certainly, there are some young people in need of assistance. But assistance is only provided as a last resort after a family breakdown occurs and not before the fact. We, like all Members of this House, at least I assume all Members of this House, are concerned with the necessity of protecting family life. However, there are situations where young people can no longer exist in the family atmosphere. In these exceptional cases, assistance is provided.

May I also remind this House of when and how this program

was initiated. This may be of some interest to the Members. The impression left on Members by some opposition Members that this is a new program on which we have embarked. Such is anything but the case. It was a new program all right but it was new in November of 1970 under the Liberal administration.

An Hon. Member: — Oh, oh!

Mr. Taylor: — I would like to take just a couple of minutes to quote from two of Saskatchewan's daily newspapers concerning this particular program. The first from the Star-Phoenix, December 19, 1970 and the second from the Leader-Post, December 15, 1970. The Star-Phoenix, and this is talking about the new program of providing assistance to young people who leave their parental home.

This is without a doubt a courageous initiative and one that promises to trigger hostile reaction from some quarters. Some will charge that it is interference in domestic affairs, support of youthful rebellion, a contribution towards the weakening of the family unit an important part of our social structure.

And then it goes on,

Therefore, the department is by no means abetting family breakdown but is intervening after the fact.

Some Hon. Members: — Hear, hear!

Mr. Taylor: — Then from the Leader-Post,

The Minister

and later we will see which Minister,

The Minister said it would be incorrect to call them all socially disoriented or long-hairs.

and this is a quote,

Most are having difficulty at home. The situation may not be entirely the teenager's fault. There are two sides to all these stories. Mr. MacDonald said the increased number of teenage welfare applications has become a real concern and that is why the new policy was instituted.

Mr. Chairman, the situation has not changed. There is still a need for assistance when young people are separated for one reason or another from the parental home. The government has changed, and certainly the program is being handled in a more humane manner.

Some Hon. Members: — Hear, hear!

Mr. Taylor: — I should also like to point out, Mr. Speaker, that in May 1971 under the Liberal administration 582 young people were in receipt of assistance. In May, 1972, under our government, 545 were in receipt of assistance. This hardly indicates the vast increase in the use of this program by our Government. It

is, and it will continue to be our policy, to do all that we possibly can to reconcile families. Failing that, we will provide the assistance necessary to help young people get on their feet.

Some Hon. Members: — Hear, hear!

Mr. Taylor: — Mr. Speaker, I should also like to say one or two words about the increase in the number of public servants. While I don't have the figures available at this time, there is no question but that there has been an increase, and I believe a substantial increase. For this I make no apologies. As you are aware, new departments have been set up, and new departments require staffing. But more than this, it was necessary to increase the staff of some of the present departments in order to carry out the job that was necessary to be done.

Some Hon. Members: — Hear, hear!

Mr. Taylor: — My own Department is a good example of this. We have increased the number of social workers and the number of probation officers along with supporting staff. And for this, I am in no way sorry. The increase in probation workers has already cut about one hundred of the population of the two correctional centres. These increases in staff were necessary because these necessary programs were in the past suffering from a diet of starvation. Our workers were overloaded so that they had little time to carry out the kind of counselling that is both necessary and required. And I hope that we can add additional staff even in the future.

Some Hon. Members: — Hear, hear!

Mr. Taylor: — The establishment of the Land Bank Commission will also require additional employees if they are to do their job properly. It seems to me the question is not how many employees are in the public service, but is the public service staffed to do the necessary job.

Some Hon. Members: — Hear, hear!

Mr. Taylor: — I want to suggest that under the previous administration, it was not staffed to do the job that needed to be done. As long as this Government remains committed to working for the betterment of our people, then it will be necessary for us to increase the services offered, and as we increase the services, we will need the people to staff the programs. This we intend to do.

Some Hon. Members: — Hear, hear!

Mr. Taylor: — Once again, Mr. Speaker, I believe that the Throne Speech indicates a continuation of the direction of providing a new deal for the people of Saskatchewan and for this reason I am pleased and proud to support the motion and to oppose the amendment.

Some Hon. Members: — Hear, hear!

Mr. A. Thibault (Melfort-Kinistino): — Mr. Speaker, first of all I want to congratulate the mover and the seconder of the Speech from the Throne, the Member for Saskatoon, Mr. Rolfes, and the Member for Gravelbourg, Mr. Gross, for the excellent job they have done. I am sure the speeches they have delivered can assure the people of this province that there is a New Deal for People.

Some Hon. Members: — Hear, hear!

Mr. Thibault: — I also want to congratulate the three new Cabinet Ministers, the Member for Humboldt (Mr. Tchorzewski), the Member for Biggar (Mr. Cowley) and the Member for Kerrobert-Kindersley (Mr. Taylor). I can assure you that this evening following shortly after the Minister of Agriculture (Mr. Messer) is going to be a pretty tough job to fill in. I can assure you that the way I feel after his speech, that there isn't much for me to say because he has done an excellent job in delivering that speech.

Some Hon. Members: — Hear, hear!

Mr. Thibault: — I also want to refer to safety in the Chamber. One of the Members across the way recommended seat belts. I think it wouldn't be a bad idea at all. But what happens when the chair breaks down — I don't know what seat belts could do. One purpose that the seat belts would serve quite well is to keep the Members in their seats when the debate is on.

Some Hon. Members: — Hear, hear!

Mr. Thibault: — I think it would help the Whip a great deal if he had the key. He would be able to keep them in the House. I can recall the former Member for Saltcoats when he went for a spill. He was sitting in Mr. Lane's seat now. Actually it's not funny when it is taking place. Mr. Whelan, Member for Regina North West went for a spill. If these chairs are in such rotten condition, I think it's time to have a good overhaul job done before something really happens.

An Hon. Member: — Put them on the other side.

Mr. Thibault: — Now, Mr. Speaker, I am glad to see that in the Speech from the Throne we do mention such things as repair parts for machinery to see that we get a better service. I know of combines that have stood for two and three weeks, brand new combines, waiting to go into the field, and have to sit there and the farmer has to get somebody else to harvest the crop because he couldn't get repair parts. I think that matter should be looked into. There is no doubt that better service should be available.

We also hear the opposition complaining about votes. Now they want a vote on the Marketing Board. I want to point out to the Opposition that in the New Deal for People, and they all have it they tell us, if you turn to page 2, they will see Item 12 and it says:

Establish a provincial controlled hog marketing board.

Well, Mr. Speaker, there was a plebiscite, there was the election. That's what the people said. They said 45 to 15.

Some Hon. Members: — Hear, hear!

Mr. Thibault: — We heard that similar story before. I can remember when hospitalization was brought in. They wanted a vote there again. They said, "We want a vote because what's going to happen, only the CCF will be able to get into the hospitals, there are so few hospitals." They said, "We are going to have to write to Regina before anybody can be let into a hospital. We should have a vote." It was called communism and so on. I can remember an old Liberal in my area and he said, "Look if that's what you call communism, we need a little bit of it."

Some Hon. Members: — Hear, hear!

Mr. Thibault: — So, hospitalization came about. Then we had Medicare. Again, they wanted a vote. Well, we said the election was the vote and we went ahead with it. But the funny part of the whole situation is this, that once we have done it they say it's a good thing, we're going along with it. If the CCF and the NDP had copyrights on their programs, I don't know what the Liberals would be able to do. But we have no copyright. And I hope that the Federal Government is going to come along with a farm program that is going to outdo the provincial government because they have the money to do it. If they don't want to co-operate, if they don't want to come along with a better program than ours, well then Saskatchewan is going to have to go it alone and that we will do.

Some Hon. Members: — Hear, hear!

Mr. Thibault: — Now, Mr. Speaker, there are a few other things I want to talk about. It is rather ridiculous that in a hungry world such as ours we had operation LIFT that was telling us to summer fallow land two years in succession.

Mr. Speaker: — Order, order! There is too much interruption. Let the Member speak without so much interruption.

Mr. Thibault: — Well, Mr. Speaker, I think when a world is hungry there is absolutely no reason whatsoever for having to summer fallow land two years in succession. We could have produced an extra 600 million bushels in Western Canada and sold it if we would have people on their toes to sell it. I'll say that's what we should have lifted.

Now, Mr. Speaker, I don't intend to dwell on the farm problems too long because we have had the Minister of Agriculture (Mr. Messer) who has done a wonderful job. I want to compliment the Minister of Highways (Mr. Kramer) and the Minister of Municipal Affairs (Mr. Wood) for their road program, especially the Open Roads program.

Some Hon. Members: — Hear, hear!

Mr. Thibault: — The Open Roads program has brought some of the kind of roads that our rural people have been waiting for, for a long time. And I am quite happy to cut down on a couple of miles of four-lane highway and give a few miles of oiled road to the main roads to the towns and villages and small hamlets including the oiling of streets. I hope that this program will be continued and when the time comes I should like to see an oiled grid road program undertaken in this province because that is needed also.

Now, Mr. Speaker, I should like to say a few words about social welfare. The former Minister of Social Welfare, who is now in the Opposition, knows very well that I don't play politics with social welfare, and I don't appreciate anybody playing politics with it. It's a department that will always be seriously criticized no matter what you do. But I think it's the job of every parliamentarian to see that it is properly represented no matter what happens. I always advocated that the local governments should be involved in this program to do a better job. Some are going for advisory boards at the present time. That's a move in the right direction so as to get the local input into this program. And I don't care whether it's administered by the Liberals or administered by the NDP. With all the best intentions in the world, there is going to be some abuse, but we will try our best to keep it down to a minimum. As I said before, I am not going to try and make any politics out of social welfare. \

Now, Mr. Speaker, I want to thank the Premier for having appointed me to the Liquor Committee to replace the former Russ Brown who passed away. One of the reasons I was glad to be appointed to the Committee was because the area of impaired driving interested me a great deal, not for the sake of drinking but for the sake of driving safety. On one of our trips to Cook County we encountered approaches to the problem which were some of the ideas that I had believed in for a long time. Also the Committee, to me, was a continuation of the studies that had been made by the Highway Safety Committee that had been brought in by the former Liberal government under Ross Thatcher in 1965 and 1966 and had good results. But where the government of the day failed was when it did not follow up the recommendations of the Committee to continue its work. I feel satisfied in saying that many people have been killed because the good work that was started in 1965 and 1966 was discontinued when the Highway Safety Committee was shut down.

I must compliment the Premier for the reinstatement of this committee and I feel that if it is manned by people who really have that type of work at heart, and I know we can find them from both sides of the House, I feel sure that we will see a drastic reduction in the traffic deaths on the highways.

At the present time there is a committee set up to recommend restricted licences for those who need it. Although I support restricted licences, I believe that unless the driver improvement program is attached to the package of restricted licences it will go down in history as a bad move. I strongly believe that if we can get the support of a good safety program from our education system, ask everyone to police himself, ask for the support of our churches and our clubs, our local governments

could get involved in this safety program. I feel we can get that support if we ask for it. Then we will see a great reduction in the death rate of this province. We must also develop a better social attitude towards the rule of law. That is one of our problems. I would quote you many other passages from Hansard, but at a later date we will be able to speak on the same subject so I will leave it off for now.

Mr. Speaker, we heard a lot about intersessional committees. My opinion of intersessional committees is that it is a good way to approach a problem. At the 18th Parliamentary Conference in Malawi when the question of bringing parliament closer to the people was discussed, it was indicated by several speakers that they were moving in that direction, bringing parliament closer to the people by the use of intersessional committees. It is one of the important methods that can be used to preserve democracy. I believe that 70 per cent of our problems could be taken out of the realm of politics if we use intersessional committees to the fullest. I think the Legislature would be a lot healthier if we did it that way.

Personally, I have served on several committees under the CCF, under the Liberals and I could never see that it was a waste of time and money. In 1965-66, the Highway Safety Program had good results. A reduction from 295 deaths a year was brought down to 207. That committee had recommended continuing its study but it failed to do so. And where are we today? Over 275 deaths on our roads last year.

I want to point out that intersessional committees give the Opposition a chance to operate in a very constructive manner. What more do you want?

I can recall the flag committee we had in this province. Ottawa went ahead with no committee to start with. They debated it for three months and finally they had to bring in closure to end the debate. In Saskatchewan, a flag committee was set up and when it was brought before the Legislature, in two hours we had a new flag. It was done by the Liberal Government, but the Opposition co-operated. They can't be all bad. A lot of difference, two hours and three months. I think it is well worthwhile.

In the last while we have heard the Leader of the Opposition (Mr. Steuart) strongly criticize the work of the committees. To me, it is an attack on democracy. But it is nothing new for him. He was involved in the worst gerrymander of constituency boundaries this province has ever seen.

Some Hon. Members: — Hear, hear!

Mr. Thibault: — Has he got love for democracy? I call it an attack on the parliamentary system as well. He seems to be very jealous of the Cabinet and the Premier for giving a chance to the people to express themselves. Now what is wrong with that?

I think the time is here for the Liberal Party to choose a new leader. The Member for Lumsden (Mr. Lane) is breathing down his neck.

Some Hon. Members: — Hear, hear!

Mr. Thibault: — The Member for Milestone (Mr. MacDonald) would like to have it too and the former Member for Elrose is going to take it the first chance he gets. If Davey was here, I would tell him this, “do your party a good turn, pack it up — you have had your day.”

Some Hon. Members: — Hear, hear!

Mr. Thibault: — Well, I think they will have quite a few candidates there, but there is no second prize, there will only be one.

An Hon. Member: — They are all second prizes.

Mr. Thibault: — Another matter I should like to talk about tonight is one of the most appalling attitudes developing towards our society today and it is the bad attitude towards the rule of law. A great deal of it stems from the handling of our traffic laws. I believe that many minor charges laid and which people plead guilty to, to save the court costs, have turned many people off, against the rule of law and makes the law become nothing but a farce, and provide a breeding ground for crime.

I have heard that officers get their promotions on the basis of charges and convictions. If that is some of the criteria and I have enough information that I believe it to be the case, then the rules of the game must change, as it lends itself to making professional liars out of some of our police officers.

I would say let us use the law, mainly for direction and for enforcement where it is absolutely necessary and do away with minor charges. I would much sooner work at it this way. Give me an officer who can come into a community and develop a good attitude toward the rule of law and we will have the young people respect the police instead of scorning them and also respect the law. Many feel that charges are laid in order to finance the government. Now that feeling is out in the country. When you look at approximately 9 per cent of the people who over the age of seventeen have been charged in 1971, and you multiply that by ten, you will see what you get. I will go into more detail of those figures in another debate. I would say that a large amount of this stems from unnecessary charges. It is creating an attitude that is not good in our society. I am not interested in a little game going on in a town or village of cops and robbers. I think a better attitude can be developed if we use a different approach. One thing that disturbs me is that every year that I have come to this House I have seen an increase in the estimates in fines and forfeitures. In the last few years, we can see that was the trend. It probably still is but I think it is a very poor way to finance the government because we create the breeding ground for crime. When a person has been hauled into court unnecessarily or on a cheap charge we keep turning people off at a rate that certainly will not pay off in the end.

Mr. Speaker, there is another matter that is before our society today, that concerns me and all of you. It is before the House at Ottawa now. The question of capital punishment. Mr. Speaker, the question of capital punishment is one that is facing our society today. At the present time it is strongly

debated at Ottawa. Although I would not support capital punishment, I believe if a plebiscite was taken today it would carry an overwhelming majority for its re-instatement. I have heard remarks that a society that has capital punishment is sick. With that I can agree. But who has made it sick is a good question. If we had not provided the breeding grounds for this sort of thing, perhaps we wouldn't have it. Unless we see an improvement in the handling of the situation, we can look forward to see capital punishment re-instated before 10 years go by. I think some serious thinking has to be done on the part of the do-gooders as well as the legal profession to come up with some answers that society can accept.

Mr. Speaker, I have one more subject to speak about and that is about our Indian friends. During my trip to Africa, I had occasion to speak to Members from Australia. The Australian situation runs very parallel to ours. People in jail there are about the same percentage of natives as what we have. The attitude of the natives toward the rule of law is very much the same as in Canada. Aboriginal rights are debated and it runs very parallel. But when you take another country, New Zealand, where they use a different approach, the situation has worked out much better. I think that Canada will have to look abroad to find some of the answers. You take for instance in New Zealand, out of a House of 87 Members they allowed the Maoris to elect four Members to the House. You may say that it is going to bring up a lot of problems. But I think one of the main things that they say that the problem of minorities is the fear of exploitation. Isn't that one of the problems? Suspicion and jealousy, isn't that part of our problem? Sometimes the numerical majority needs protection as in South Africa and Gibraltar. The true way to protect a minority is to eliminate the cause which creates the minority and majority. It is essential that the minority assimilate with the majority sufficiently in the main aspirations of the majority. It is essential for a minority at all times not to take advantage of any privileged position they have, but to promote the welfare of all its people of the country.

I think if you read the Commonwealth Parliamentary Conference report you will find all this in it. Now last, and I mean last.

Mr. Steuart: — Did you take my name in vain?

Mr. Thibault: — I'll give you a copy of it afterwards. You should have been here. I am sorry you are late for school again. But at last and I mean last, I must say a few words about the Member for Athabasca (Mr. Guy). I want to say that I did not take part in the election campaign. I want to say that I accept the decision of the people of Athabasca. Even though he had a small majority, there is no second prize. But when the Member for Athabasca said last week in the debate, with reference to the plane crash and the Premier and I quote:

I wish he had been on the plane.

Mr. Speaker, I would expect a remark of that kind coming from a drunk that has been booted out of a pub but not from a parliamentarian.

Some Hon. Members: — Hear, hear!

Mr. Thibault: — It is a dirty shame and especially when we have students in the galleries. It bothers me. We are supposed to set an example and hold our debates at a higher level. But I will answer it in this way. In the words of Martin Luther King, “Just love the hell out of people like that ”

An Hon. Member: — That’s going to be tough.

Mr. Thibault: — “and hope that as they get old and their shadows lengthen that they will wipe that hatred out of their hearts.”

Mr. Speaker, in closing you will see by my few remarks that I am going to oppose the amendment and support the motion.

Some Hon. Members: — Hear, hear!

Hon. E. Kramer (Minister of Highways): — Mr. Speaker, I had not intended to speak in this But there are a few things that I am prompted to talk Therefore, I hope the House will bear with me for a few I am in pretty good humor, Mr. Speaker, at the present spite of being a bear with a sore paw.

Mr. Speaker, I want to add my words of congratulation to those who have spoken before. I want to include the mover and the seconder and other speakers in this debate; I especially want to congratulate our Minister of Agriculture (Mr. Messer) for the tremendous speech that he gave this House

Some Hon. Members: — Hear, hear!

Mr. Kramer: — and his replies to the cheap criticism that has been levelled in this House and outside this House ever since he brought forward these bright new ambitious, adventurous programs.

Some Hon. Members: — Hear, hear!

Mr. Kramer: — Certainly it is the mark, Mr. Speaker, of the deficiencies of the Opposition and those who would want to criticize, that they would select, like the little urchin in the street who says, here is a nice white door, let’s sling mud at it. I listened to the new highway critic this afternoon and I was a little surprised that in his speech there wasn’t a single word about highways, so he didn’t even look over the road, he just headed straight for the barn.

Some Hon. Members: — Hear, hear!

Mr. Kramer: — He is a bit nostalgic. I think that is a good idea. He went right back to the farm. It wouldn’t have been so bad if he hadn’t got on to the manure spreader. That is where he stayed all the time he was on his feet. As far as highways are concerned, he was as mum as a dummy and dumb as a mummy. He had nothing to say. I think you had better look for a new critic there, Mr. Leader of the Opposition because I don’t think we really got a great deal from him this afternoon.

Mr. Weatherald: — You changed Ministry — might happen again.

Mr. Kramer: — Possibly, possibly. He spoke and I think it is only proper that we have to reply to one or two things that he said. He talked about selling the land and then taking the land away from the farmers as others have done. One of the advantages of having been around for a while is you develop a long memory. The Minister of Agriculture (Mr. Messer) pointed out that the policy of the former government was not to sell after five years. It was not and even though interest rates were lower at that time, it was six and one-half per cent, not five, if you were renting. Of course, we are not selling it at that rate. They seem to be obsessed with the idea that there is something sinister, in spite of the fact, Mr. Speaker, that since in the last 20 to 25 years we have seen our rural farm population drop from 140,000 farmers on the farm to something around 75,000 today. The programs of these people that sat opposite and those of their colleagues at Ottawa have brought this about (along with the short-sighted short-term Tories that sat in office for a while). There really isn't any difference. The only difference that there is between these two parties is that one is in and the other is out. Like someone once said, they are just two wings of the same bird of prey. Just like two empty beer bottles in the ditch — the labels may be different but they are both empty.

Some Hon. Members: — Hear, hear!

Mr. Kramer: — So we watch this attempt to belittle. You know they said that you wouldn't be able to get this land unless you had a CCF or New Democratic Party membership. Well, let me remind you — and some of you people are still there — Mr. Leader of the Opposition (Mr. Steuart), when that land was for sale (the lease land) I, for one, tried to buy and I was refused by these people opposite, by the former Minister of Agriculture. I didn't have a Liberal membership. I am talking first hand, not second hand. I was refused! And how many more New Democrats were refused? It was a special program for Liberals, Mr. Speaker.

It is amazing how they cry about this lease policy. You know some of the most rugged individualists we find anywhere in Saskatchewan are the ranchers of the short grass country in the South and they have lived all their lives on leased property. You know, I don't think very many of those are socialists, I don't think that any more than half of them carry a New Democratic membership. They still have their leases and they have done very well, thank you. But the Liberals apparently would say immediately, maybe next week, maybe we ought to tell the ranchers down in the southwest that next week, that we have a buyer, we put a price on it and make them buy it. Maybe that is what they want.

Maybe the Member for Shaunavon (Mr. Oliver) and the Member for Maple Creek (Mr. Flasch) and a few others would like to tell their ranchers that that is what the Liberals want to do to the ranchers down there and see if they want to put up the cash for that section after section of land and be the free enterprisers or the private enterprisers that this bunch opposite seems to think they want to be. Why don't you apply your policies there? Why didn't you apply your policies when you were in office for seven years?

Some Hon. Members: — Hear, hear!

Mr. Kramer: — A whole bundle of inconsistencies like an old maid getting ready for a wedding!

You know, the Leader of the Opposition hauled off early in the debate with a great deal to say. He reminds me of a neighbor a neighbor of mine had. He was a little guy who lived across the fence and this old Irish lady was telling me — after this fellow moved in, she said, “Oh, he is such a wonderful chap. He is so kind. Look over there now, would you. He never fails to light up a smudge when the flies and the mosquitoes are bad.” And sure enough! You know the amazing thing is that one of the best smudge makers in the House has to be the Leader of the Opposition (Mr. Steuart). To light a smudge, you first have to get some dry rotten wood and some straw and then cover it with wet manure.

Some Hon. Members: — Hear, hear!

Mr. Kramer: — Then you can throw up a real smoke screen. Well, Mrs. Murphy was so proud of this fellow because he was so kind to his animals. You know, Mr. Speaker, it was about one week later that I dropped over to Mrs. Murphy’s and I said, “How is that neighbor of yours doing?” “Oh, he is a blatherskite.”, she said. “You know I thought he was kind to his animals, but the only bloody time that he ever lit that fire was when the wind was blowing between the house and the hen house. And I went out there one day when he had a real big smoke going and I caught the little blighter in there sucking eggs.”

Some Hon. Members: — Hear, hear!

Mr. Kramer: — Smoke screens! That’s all you fellows have been able to put up because this program is so good that you can’t touch it.

And then another thing, he held forth not only here but at North Battleford, very little to do, but to try to make something of a sad situation there, where a patient had escaped from the hospital and unfortunately, I am very sorry about this because Steve Totchek’s family are friends of mine and have been for many years.

You know the last person to be talking about a situation at a Saskatchewan hospital is that little gentleman that sits across peeking over his desk. Even when he is standing up! It is not good when someone walks away or escapes. It happens and it has happened in jails, it happens all over, they walk away and escape. But under the jurisdiction of those gentlemen opposite, Mr. Speaker, they didn’t walk away, they chased them out of there. Regardless of what their condition was they sent them out, regardless of whether they were prepared for society or not and history shows and there are cases I can’t talk about because they are still before the courts, because you turned them loose, they didn’t escape. And that is the difference. That is the difference between your philosophy and mine.

The little gentleman that sits across the way said and I

quote from the North Battleford News Optimist:

The Leader of the Opposition suggested that one of the reasons for the disenchantment by the staff was the political interference of Mr. Kramer. He is trying to make his own private area of political patronage. Many recent appointments to the staff have certainly been made more on political consideration than on ability.

Now, Mr. Speaker, I challenge the Leader of the Opposition or anyone else across there, as I did in the Press when that statement was made to name one. Name one person whom I was influential in having fired or hired. I dare you! Just name one and, Mr. Speaker, if he doesn't I am going to break the rules of this House and use the word 'liar'. I want to hear from him before too long. It seems strange you know after all this talk from the wee blatherskite. Here we are. We have all the headlines in the same paper, Mr. Speaker, and I will be glad to table this. We have the "Patient care level declines", says Steuart. "Things are terrible over there." "Political interference", the whole bit. The same paper! — "Saskatchewan hospital accredited", and I read from the same paper:

Dr. John Gray, Executive Director of the Saskatchewan Hospital has announced his hospital received provisional accreditation. A two-man survey team from the Canadian Council of Hospital accreditation recommended accreditation following a survey in October. In making the announcement Dr. Gray noted that the Saskatchewan Hospital is the second psychiatric facility in the Prairie Provinces to be accredited.

Strangely enough, Mr. Speaker, it took a New Democratic Government to bring things about there, too, in Selkirk, Manitoba. Further I quote:

The next step in full accreditation will be made in a survey next year. Canadian Council on hospital accreditation has been authorized to conduct surveys on the accreditation programs in hospitals throughout Canada. Through its programs it establishes standards for hospital operation and assists hospitals to attaining these standards.

Mr. Speaker, I hope that will, at least, put things in their proper perspective and I want to be hearing from you Davey.

Mr. Speaker, I should like to compare that and if any of the Members here or across the way — some of the newcomers — haven't really got a clear understanding on what happened, I recommend the Frazier Report, that was commissioned by the gentlemen opposite.

Mr. Steuart: — We had the nerve to have a commission?

Mr. Kramer: — Yes, you did! You carried on the investigation, let's have your report. He (Steuart) said that he was investigating it, the Liberals are investigating it! The doors are open, the open door policy, remember! Let's hear your report, we would be pleased to hear it. Incidentally, Davey, there is a picture

here that may start your wee heart afluttering a bit! Friend of yours on that page too.

I'll get to highways now and some of the new programs we have heard a great deal of talk and a lot of blather about this, that and the other since last Spring, when we commissioned a general study on highways. The last study that was done was the Woods Gordon Report and many of the recommendations in that report were excellent. The problem was that the Liberals allowed the report to gather dust — they did nothing with it.

So now with the combination of the Woods Gordon Report and the Genereux Report (which incidentally has been completed and I will be tabling very shortly) will probably result in new directions and programs in the Department of Highways.

One thing that I should like to point out, Mr. Speaker, that we will not be doing. we'll not be wasting and frittering money away for non-existent industries and so on that I will go into a bit later. They even had the gall, some Members opposite, to criticize 'Operation Open Roads', 'Operation Main Street' and the municipal grid road program for the side streets that are under the jurisdiction of my colleague the Minister of Municipal Affairs (Mr. Wood).

I want to say at this time that I don't particularly want to take any credit as this is a government program. A great deal of the work and the planning that went into Operation Open Roads and so on was conducted by my colleague Neil Byers while he was the Minister and a lot of the credit for these programs certainly has to go to the Minister of Highways whom I succeeded.

There is nothing in this world that is constant except change. We have a good many things that we have to take a look at. Certainly there have been a good many programs that were excellent, but the problem is, Mr. Speaker, they were only excellent in some places, for some people, like the autobahn that my friend from Morse rides on back and forth to his particular constituency. When the traffic counts warranted a great deal in another direction. However, we won't go into that.

We are going to try from now on to serve as many as possible. as economically as possible, without any deterioration of quality. That is a pretty hard task but I am certain that we can accomplish it. Operation Open Roads was just a start and Operation Main Street was just a start on taking those roads back into the country where people really need them. Mr. Speaker, 283,000 people is more than a quarter of our present population. And certainly by the end of 1974 nearly 500 communities should have been served.

We heard from the dollar-a-head Member from Meadow Lake (Mr. Coupland) this afternoon and he was telling me what roads needed to be built and what roads should be built or should not be built. I appreciate that and we will take care of a great deal of it. A great deal has to be said. The interest of tourism in northwestern Saskatchewan is going up by leaps and bounds. Budgets, real meaningful budgets, were placed into both Meadow Lake and The Battlefords Provincial Park this last

year which had been starved for years in the Provincial Budgets under the former administration.

Please remember, because I made pleas time and again. All the budgets were down. Down in southwest around the main centres, down in the southeast and so on, but as far as the west half of the province, again, they were ignored under the former administration. I am pleased that the Department of Natural Resources gave The Battlefords Park and the Meadow Lake Provincial Park, in the constituency of the Hon. Member from Meadow Lake, a great boost this year. And, again, judging by the hearings that went on last week, the interest in tourism is not dead by any means.

The native people were mentioned. Roads for the native people. Well I didn't need any prompting, because we were up there and we talked to them, and the Member for Meadow Lake (Mr. Coupland) well knows it. They said that the Federal Government had built a very good road on their reserve. I suggested to them that I didn't think the responsibility of the Federal Government went to the edge of the Indian reserve, and stopped there. Surely, Mr. Speaker, the native people are not going to be condemned to stay on their reserve. They are a Federal responsibility and the roads off the reserves are our responsibility, true. But with the amount of money that the Federal Government spent last year and the year before in other provinces on road assistance and airport assistance and so on, surely they can throw a bit into Saskatchewan.

I suggested that they should apply to the Federal Government and if they were willing to go on a share basis, we would be prepared to improve their roads out to the main highway, because on any of those roads are mainly used by Indians. And certainly we are upgrading them this winter in spite of the weather and so on. There have been some bad turns removed now.

I want to draw the attention to this House and put it in the record, over the past seven or eight years, the Federal Government spent \$454 million on assistance to provinces in roads, railway crossings, airports, etc. Saskatchewan's share was \$2.7 million about one-half of one per cent of the national total budget. The Maritimes and Eastern Canada got the great bulk. Our sister provinces to the east and west got \$8 million to \$9 million respectively. We got a half of one per cent, slightly more! When we have a little less than five per cent of Canada's population it doesn't take much to figure out that the figures should have been closer to \$30 million on a shared basis.

Some of the main problems were that planned programs were never devised, the DREE program was never taken advantage of by these gentlemen who sit opposite. It isn't all the Federal Government's fault by any means. The requests were not made for the type of assistance we needed. Lord only knows that the North that is talked about so much could have participated in road improvement programs if the requests had been put forward to the Federal Government. I am sure they would not have turned a deaf ear to them. It's a matter of planning and it's a matter of consistent planning and consistent requests.

Now, Mr. Speaker, another thing that surprised me a bit was the Leader of the Opposition when he went through his little bag of industries that had been bought, he had the nerve, once

again, to mention Anglo-Rouyn and I was surprised. I thought that he would like to put that under the rug so that nobody would ever say anything about that again, because he reminded me of the kind of roads we aren't going to build. The people of Saskatchewan, Mr. Speaker, built, and that was in 1965, upgrading and so on, approximately \$5 million worth of roads to encourage the Anglo-Rouyn mine, which was a subsidiary of a wealthy mining corporation, belonging to the late Robert Winters another former contestant for the leadership of the Federal Liberal Party. They brought in their obsolete machinery and they high-graded that little pocket of ore that the former Member for Cumberland (Bill Berezowsky) said was a peanut mine. Well you know, Bill was wrong. It wasn't a peanut mine and I'm going to tell you why — after 1965, 1966, 1967, 1968, about 1968, Mr. Speaker, you will remember in this House I put a question on the Order Paper, what were the royalties? No, I didn't have the question on the Order Paper, I asked an oral question — “What were the royalties? What did we receive from Anglo-Rouyn?” The former Member for Maple Creek (Mr. Cameron), Minister of Mineral Resources, said “Well, approximately \$90,000.”

Mr. Speaker, I wondered a little bit about that. The next year I put the question on paper. The Minister refused to answer. He said it wasn't in the public interest. You bet it wasn't, Mr. Speaker. The fact of the matter was, that last year when I asked the question and got the answer, over that whole six years the Provincial Government got less than \$100,000 after we built \$5 million worth of roads to get the ore out to Flin Flon.

Some Hon. Members: — Hear, hear!

Mr. Kramer: — Talk about subsidies. You know, Mr. Speaker, that makes the shoe factory and the box factories and the rest of the things that these people like to chatter about, it makes them look like peanuts.

Mr. Lane: — Free enterprise.

Mr. Kramer: — and Bill Berezowsky said “it was a peanut mine.” You know he was wrong, as I said. We didn't even get peanuts out of that ruddy mine. All we got was a hole in the ground last summer, a lot of unemployed people and some empty houses. It was well named, as I've said before in this House; the promoters and the Government, or somebody had the angle and the taxpayers got the ruin.

Well, there will be no more primrose paths either and I'm not going to tell that story all over again, but it's a sad one and there will be no more Boldt's bends to accommodate Langham, or Saskatoon where you swung around with a great expensive interchange after all the land along 22nd Street West had already been purchased, then you could have got into Saskatoon three miles shorter. We're still struggling. It will cost millions to get down to 22nd Street from the way we are going. Mr. Speaker, the taxpayers are going to have to pay dearly for every inch of ground that is purchased on Avenue 'A'. Pay through the nose as it were, because they (the Opposition) had to keep a cheap political promise. We could have black-topped a highway right into Langham and Dalmeny and brought them all in far cheaper than when the final cost is in

on that expensive fiasco which comes in on the North side of Saskatoon and down Avenue A. A disgrace, Mr. Speaker, a waste of public money and while the public back in other areas, the taxpayers at Rabbit Lake, Meeting Lake and back in Punnichy and up in Hudson Bay are without good roads. The people of Hudson Bay have got a highway there that would knock the head off of a woodpecker driving on it this summer. The money has been wasted on some of these expensive road operations. The former Government at Swift Current built bridges and interchanges when there wasn't even a highway around them. These sat out there in the open with the birds roosting on them for three years waiting for a highway to be built to them. Waiting for the highway. The highway is there now, eventually — it came.

Mr. Steuart: — Tell us about Highway #55.

Mr. Kramer: — I imagine that one is still sitting out there.

Mr. Speaker, the cost of those millions of dollars down the drain, down the ditch, millions and I'm going to present a list of these, I'm going to present the bill to the former provincial treasurer as to what it really cost for these kinds of high falutin' pie-in-the-sky type of things that they pulled off, just as show pieces, rather than thinking of the length and breadth of Saskatchewan out where the people live.

I should like to report to the House that the Gulf Road which has been mentioned in this House before, is well on its way. There is a funny thing about it — something happened to that road on the way up to Wollaston Lake. You know it used to be costing about \$45,000 a mile and now this last summer it's costing about \$15,000 a mile to build that road. Amazing.

Mr. Steuart: — It's a jackrabbit trail.

Mr. Kramer: — Once again you are out of line and I'm going to call you — we'll take a trip up there and you show me the difference.

Mr. Steuart: — I'll drive.

Mr. Kramer: — You'll drive? We'll both drive. I'll not take a chance like that. There's just no way Davey — we'll both drive.

Mr. Speaker, we'll take a few of the boys along and we'll go this winter. I suggest, Mr. Speaker, that if these boys can tell me where their buddies stopped and the Government crews started, I'll pay the expenses of the trip.

Some Hon. Members: — Hear, hear!

Mr. Kramer: — The trouble is it may be a bit better where the Government crew started and I may have to pay anyway.

Mr. Steuart: — I'll tell you how much the road cost.

Mr. Kramer: — Oh yes! Would you like to

put a question on the Order Paper? You've got everything else, how about throwing in the Gulf Road. Throw Cluff in We built that last winter incidentally, the one to Cluff what it cost you people to clear a snow road

Some Hon. Members: — Hear, hear!

Mr. Kramer: — so let's not fret about it. Davey is getting a little peevish again. He's about ready to start another smudge.

I want to congratulate the Premier on the speech from the Throne and the good things that have been suggested. One of the good things that I believe in and it's in line with what we are already planning in the Department of Highways, is to put a tremendous amount of emphasis on safety. That just didn't start yesterday. We placed a lot of emphasis on it last summer. We set aside about \$400,000 in order to improve various areas that were accident prone. There were questions put on the order Paper last winter about Sintaluta and that problem is being corrected. For a number of years I asked the former Minister of Highways to put lights on the Borden Bridge. The lights are there now and it's a very nice sight if any of you folks get a chance to drive up there. Besides that, you are not driving into a bottomless pit on a bend as you were before.

We are also planning to remove, wherever possible, as many of the old, unused approaches in order to take those obstacles out of the way. We are hoping, Mr. Speaker, to improve the road signs so that there is a better identification of where accidents occur. This may be done with mileposts. There is no doubt it is a serious situation, as my colleague from Melfort-Kinistino mentioned (Mr. Thibault). Our accident rate is up and it is a serious situation. I should like to point out, however, that less than 30 per cent of those accidents occurred on provincial highways. The balance are on urban streets, municipal roads and other roads. I guess there are no other roads, are there? Urban and rural municipal roads. That's the situation. The situation is serious, that is why, again, we had a first this summer when we sponsored and paid for, along with the Saskatchewan Safety Committee, a safety seminar which was attended by people from all over Canada and with some resource people from the United States. It was hailed as a great success and I'm sure a great deal of information will be available for the Legislative Committee from that seminar when the Legislative committee sits.

Education, prevention, there are a good many things that have to be done and I think we can expect the co-operation of all Members in this House and everybody outside the House to stop this mounting tragedy on our highways. We are going to do a little more about the signs. We have set up a sign committee. One of the things (I'm not saying this critically) — it seems to me that over the years we were almost indirectly saying to tourists who were coming through, especially from the South of the province, there's a long straight road, get down it and get out of here as quick as you can. We had a very austere sign policy which told you as little as possible, except where to go to get on and out. I believe that if we are going to sell the beauties of Saskatchewan, in both the North and the South, that we have to loosen up and start to tell people as often as we can and with as much imagination as we can, what there is in Saskatchewan that they ought to see. Why we ought to stop here

rather than keep on going.

I know that the Department of Tourism and Industry is working on tourist information booths; Chambers of Commerce are working on this and I believe that we can glamorize Saskatchewan to the point where people will be anxious and eager to stop here rather than simply regard it as a place to go through as quickly as they can.

You know, hind sight is usually 20-20. If we had it to do over again, I suppose if we were building No. 1 Highway, we wouldn't take it on through the wide-open prairies and miss that beautiful Qu'Appelle Valley. We could have built that highway along where it could have had a view of the beautiful lakes and an overview of the valley occasionally. It would have cost a bit more money, but there would have been something more for people to see as they pass through Saskatchewan. Similarly in the North, we do everything we can to accommodate high speed traffic. But I think we could have done a little more to give people a little better look at what Saskatchewan is all about.

Some Hon. Members: — Hear, hear!

Mr. Kramer: — So I am hoping that when we get together with the various departments; Tourism, Natural Resources; Park's Branch and so on, that we can, along with the Saskatchewan Tourist Association and Northern Developers, co-operate and do a real job on selling the real Saskatchewan to those people who come through.

We are going to have another bit of a first and I should like to inform the House and they have already probably read in the Press, where next week we are having a Western Highways Ministers' Conference which will be held at North Battleford. We will be holding one session at least in the historic old Northwest Territories Legislative Building and which will, to some extent, glamorize a bit of the history, do a little bit towards publicizing one of the former homes of the RCMP, the North West Mounted Police. It will give the Western Ministers and the Federal people a first-hand look at the museum. It will be a short conference, a two day conference and at which we shall be discussing those things that are common to the western prairies and I think to a certain extent British Columbia. We shall be discussing the advantages of the Yellowhead route; we shall be discussing conformity of load limits and trying to get out of this jungle where you cross the border, you're hooked if you have 2,000 pounds more or less; we can do many things this way. Everyone of our provinces has its own research facilities. I don't think we can abandon research, but I think with some liaison the various departments throughout the provinces can select certain areas for research and probably do some economizing and come up with better answers.

Mr. Speaker, there are many things that we hope to have come out of the meeting next week and I certainly hope that all of the western ministers are able to come and although the Federal Minister, Mr. Marchand, indicated he won't be able to come himself, he has said that he will send a representative there to assist as resource personnel.

Mr. Speaker, I want to say that it is a pleasure, as I said at the outset, to stand up and speak in support of the Throne Speech. We have, as I indicated, made greater strides

and will make greater strides in improving the farm economy. Certainly Industry and Tourism is working very hard to upgrade, especially in the small business area and so on, to do a job with them. Tourism is one of our great resources for the future. I believe sincerely that the North half of Saskatchewan is going to be the Mecca for North American tourism as the years go by. We have indicated that we want to do better out of the forest resources that we have and that, contrary to some of the people opposite, this doesn't mean in any way that we want to destroy or inhibit any of the industries we now have. We simply say that we believe there is a better way to utilize our forests for the total benefit of the economy, the total benefit of the forest industry, with no harm whatever to the existing industries. Anyone in this House who suggests that we are out to try to destroy the existing industries. has. to put it plainly. just got some great big holes in his head.

Our Minister of Social Services (Mr. Taylor) has indicated the terrible problems we have in trying to rehabilitate people and I will agree that this is a continuing problem. I believe, a little like my colleague from Melfort-Kinistino (Mr. Thibault) that we will have to probably be in some areas more militant once people are in place and once there are alternatives. I am a little impatient, Mr. Speaker, when somebody says those lazy, good-for-nothings don't want to work. How can we say that when they have no opportunity? But I say this, if you have given them an opportunity to work and they refuse I think at this point in time there has to be a little militancy and I would be the first one to be going along with that. I do believe that there are a limited few that are out to get as much as they can for as little work as possible and no work preferably. However, I agree, our Minister of Social Welfare (Mr. Taylor), is right and I also will not demean people who have no opportunity for gainful employment and say that they are no good, that they don't want to work. They are just like the old colored man who said his dog didn't eat meat. The fellow says, "Why don't your dog eat meat?" He said, "My dog don't eat meat because I don't give him any." A lot of these people don't work because we don't provide them with jobs. It's just as simple as that.

Northern Saskatchewan — Rome wasn't built in a day, Mr. Speaker. I am sure there are many things that still need to be settled but a determined effort is being made by my seatmate. The organizations are being set up now, it is a new way to go, it is an adventurous way to go, it's an expensive way to go for the time being, but certainly it is better than sitting there and doing nothing. The late Woodrow Lloyd said in this House one time, "It is better to light one small candle than to sit and curse the darkness." I refer that particular statement to the gentlemen opposite. Let us just give these things a chance because if you are going to have a new way, if you are going to break new ground. There may be the odd farmer sitting across there — when you break new ground it is pretty rough at first. There are a few roots and stones that need to be picked and the soil has to be worked down and mulched before you can grow a crop. Mr. Speaker, I suggest that we need a little patience and above all we need some sensible co-operation if we are going to get out of this rotten morass. It isn't peculiar to Saskatchewan. The cost is 25 per cent higher in Alberta per man than it is here. The problem is, as the Minister of Welfare said, we have to have a sharing program that is going to reward provinces when they create work and wage programs. We had some

of those back in 1964 that were thrown to the winds by the people opposite when they got into power. There were sawmill operations; there were wood clearing operations and various other things. The rusting axes are still lying in the brush or were a couple of years ago up in the Meadow Lake Park because people were told before the election, "We wouldn't make you work." We have got to drum politics out of this business, forget about it. We have got to handle this thing in a constructive basis so that we can present both federally, provincially and politically a united front and tell these people, "Look, here is a program, and it doesn't matter which government is in power, you are going to have to adhere to it in order to pull yourselves out of the hole."

May I say that I am proud to support this Speech from the Throne because of the forward-looking programs and the kind of work that my colleague, Mr. Taylor, is doing. We will have later on this year a full-scale transportation conference which will take in Federal and Provincial Governments on property tax relief. I am again happy because I believe that we will this year, or next year, be very close to that 25 mill reduction in education tax. It may be that again these people will squawk and cry and talk about the increase in income tax which is picayune unless you are in the \$8,000 or \$10,000 category and it is still picayune. A carton of cigarettes a month will pay it. I say this and so do a good many businessmen say this that if you earn you can pay but owning a vast amount of property Mr. Speaker, does not guarantee that you are going to have an income every year, especially if you are farming. Those taxes roll up, roll up and roll up on property if the income is not there. So if I had my choice it is going to be for income tax, even sales tax or gasoline tax because the indication is in most cases that you have the ability to pay. But to simply put tax and more tax on property regardless of whether that property is productive is just not good enough in this day and age.

My colleague from Last Mountain in Education (Mr. MacMurchy) is making great strides. He is having a problem here and there convincing a few people and again if some of these politicians who have only politics in mind and not the good of the country would keep their nose out of it, I am sure Gordon would be getting along much better. So I am pleased with the education program. I still have six children in school and I am very interested in the education program. I am not happy generally and I say this as a parent, I am not happy with the total education program. I believe we pay too much for far too little and there has been far too much attention put on many things rather than on the nuts and bolts of a good education system. I am inclined to agree with some of the critics who say, maybe we have gone a bit too far with the frills and the frippery of education and maybe we had better be taking a good look and getting back to something sound and sensible. I don't want to go back to the little red schoolhouse and the three 'Rs', but they had a lot going for them, Mr. Speaker, at that. Maybe it is somewhere in between if we could get back to a little more of a common-sense approach to this total education program.

Well, Mr. Speaker, I believe it is about time, I said I was only going to say a few words and that I hadn't intended to speak in the first place. I hope I haven't usurped the time of the House too much. I think it goes without saying that I will not be supporting the amendment but take great pleasure in supporting the motion.

Mr. E. Kaeding (Saltcoats): — Mr. Speaker, I should like to join with those who have spoken before me to add my congratulations to the Members from Biggar, Kerrobert-Kindersley and Humboldt (Mr. Cowley, Mr. Taylor and Mr. Tchorzewski), for their elevation to their new responsibilities in the Cabinet. I am sure that their choice will be a popular one and is well deserved. I should also like to congratulate the Member from Athabasca (Mr. Guy) who has returned to us for a second time. His fairy tales and horror stories will be enjoyed by all but will be believed by few.

The Throne Speech this year once again highlights the importance of agriculture in the economy of Saskatchewan. With the return of more realistic prices for most of our farm products and the tremendous activity which has resulted from the improvement of farm income, proves again the great dependence for the well-being of not only the rural communities but also the larger centres in the Province of Saskatchewan on the viability of the farming industry. This recognition is borne out in the nature of legislation coming before the Session with regard to agriculture. It will be evident that we have embarked on a deliberate program to maintain and upgrade the rural communities.

Mr. Speaker, I was astounded last Friday when the Member from Moosomin (Mr. Gardner), who is from a rural constituency, launched his vicious and unfounded attack on the Land Bank program. Many of his statements were false and he knows they were false. His statements on the air were meant solely for the purpose of creating division in the country, just as he and his kind are attempting to create divisions in the country among the hog producers. Because he happens to have a viable farm unit which he can supplement with income from other sources and can get all the credit he needs, he conveniently forgets there are many less fortunate than himself who need help desperately. And, Mr. Speaker, we are prepared to give it to them in spite of the efforts of the Members opposite. He attempts to convince farmers that this Government has concocted some sinister plot to take over all the farms of Saskatchewan. Nothing could be further from the truth, Mr. Speaker. We have provided in the Land Bank a convenient and inexpensive means of transferring land from one generation to another and providing a means whereby someone not now farming can get into the business without committing all of his assets to the purchase of land. Through the Option-to-Buy Agreement which is written right into the lease any farmer leasing land can purchase the land after five years. We will stand behind that commitment. His statements that we are conspiring to bring farm land under public ownership is as ridiculous as it is false.

Last year when the Land Bank Bill was being debated the Members opposite were loud in their claims that the 6 1/2 per cent rental fee then proposed was too high and should be reduced. Now that the rate has been struck to 5 per cent are they pleased? Oh, no, Mr. Speaker, now they are violently protesting that the rate is too low. It was lowered because no one would rent the land and they continue to say it in spite of the fact that young men are lined up at the Land Bank Office daily for leases. Truly, Mr. Speaker, another evidence of Liberal logic.

The response to the Land Bank program which our friends opposite would like us to believe is so unpopular has been almost unbelievable in my constituency of Saltcoats. To date

at least 45 quarters of land has been purchased and at very satisfactory prices. I understand that the number of applications for the lease of these parcels far outnumber the land available. If this indicates rejection, Mr. Speaker, I hope all of our programs are as enthusiastically rejected.

The constituency of Saltcoats, as most of you know, is in a Parkland area where farms are relatively small compared to the provincial average. However, we have one of the highest livestock concentrations in the province. Our cattle numbers, both in cow, calf and feedlot enterprises have risen sharply in the last few years. We also have many good, viable hog operations with sufficient size to make money for their operators. I am sure, Mr. Speaker, that these farmers will appreciate the new FarmStart Program which is being brought forward into this Session.

We have in common with most agricultural areas a large number of farmers who have now reached the age of retirement. Because their sons have not been able to get the credit they needed either to purchase the land or to expand into a viable livestock operation of sufficient size to ensure a decent income many have left the farm for what appeared to be more acceptable employment. Many of these young men would have preferred to remain on the farm. Now, in fact, with the Land Bank and the assistance they can get under the FarmStart Program I am sure many of them will consider returning to the farm.

Mr. Speaker, the Premier mentioned the other day that we are doing all we can to encourage the more complete processing of our farm products in our province. One of the major industries insofar as our area is concerned is the Milk Processing Plant at Yorkton. Because of the higher rainfall in our area and because of the abundance of pasture and forage crops we are particularly suited to take advantage of this new plant. We have many young farmers particularly in the area around Langenburg who are expanding their dairy operations to take care of this new market. With the new FarmStart Program now available I am sure many others will be considering this rewarding enterprise.

These farmers also appreciate the efforts of the Department of Agriculture in making available to them at reasonable prices some of the high producing young cows from Eastern Canada which will aid them to become successful in the industry.

Our farmers will also appreciate the substantial efforts being made by the department through their marketing development branch, both on their own and through the cost-sharing with marketing boards, marketing commissions, private groups and co-operatives. We feel that with proper promotion and with the establishment of a marketing commission to promote the orderly pricing and assembly of products we should be in a position to penetrate many new markets. A target of doubling our livestock output in ten years should not be unrealistic.

Farmers will also appreciate the changes being proposed under the new Farm Implements Act which we hope will give them much more help in obtaining parts.

Mr. Speaker, many of you will know that the I.M.C. Potash mine is in my constituency, the first major potash mine in Saskatchewan and the world's largest. This company has now been

in operation for over ten years and has become very much a part our community. The towns surrounding this operation have benefited over years from the payrolls which are generated from industry, both on its own, and through related satellite industries such as trucking fleets, mine supply companies, fabrication shops and so on. However, because it was one of the few non-unionized mines in Saskatchewan many problems arose with respect to job security, seniority, pensions and plant safety.

This year the employees chose the Oil, Chemical and Atomic Union to be their bargaining agent and have been locked a struggle with the company since last July in an attempt to a proper labor contract. On January 15th the employees voted to go on strike in order to reinforce their bargaining team because no progress was being made on a contract. I am happy to report that only last Saturday a provisional settlement was reached. I should like to congratulate the company negotiators, the union representatives and the mediator sent out by the Department of Labour for the very responsible manner in which the negotiations were conducted. Hopefully the members will ratify the agreement and work at the plant can resume again. Many problems at the plant remain to be resolved. Last year I indicated that the working and safety conditions at K 1 plant were bad. Another year has come and gone and I am given to understand that they continue to deteriorate. Our safety inspectors have been lenient in the past because the management has indicated their intention of rebuilding the mill or building a new one. To date neither one has happened and I feel that this situation cannot be tolerated much longer. Some employees have told me that you need a map to know where it is safe to walk in some areas of the plant.

In this connection, Mr. Speaker, the employees of the mine would like me to convey my congratulations to the Minister of Labour (Mr. Snyder) for bringing in The occupational Health and Safety Act. Since that time I understand committees have been going at the mine and hopefully some of the more glaring hazards will be taken care of.

Another area of concern regarding the mining industry is the environmental aspect. It has been brought to my attention from time to time large amounts of highly mineralized water has been permitted to flow into Cutarm Creek which runs immediately north of both K 1 and K 11 mines. I have here, Mr. Speaker, an analysis of water which was permitted to escape into the creek last spring east of the plant. The sample contains a high concentration of sodium, potassium and chloride. I understand this water drained into the creek for several weeks. Because the Cutarm Creek is a tributary of the Qu'Appelle River which eventually flows into the Assiniboine in Manitoba and because both K 1 and K 11 plants as well as Sylvite at Rocanville are situated immediately above these watersheds, you can readily see what an impact contamination in this area can have.

I have requested the Department of the Environment to do a comprehensive study of all the environmental problems which are connected with this area, and I am certain they will make some major recommendations for improvement.

Mr. Speaker, I am sure that residents in my constituency will welcome the new legislation being proposed to provide a new and better grant structure for the building of homes and the remodelling of older homes. Senior citizens particularly

will welcome the assistance they will be receiving under the new Senior Citizens Housing Provisions. In many of our rural communities, a large part of the population consists of retired couples many of whom are living in what can best be described as mediocre housing. This program will give them an opportunity to upgrade their homes at very little cost, so that they can enjoy their retirement in more pleasant surroundings.

They will also be pleased to hear of the very substantially increased Home Improvement Grant being provided for this year. Through this program we will have come very close to meeting our election commitment of reducing taxes payable on property for education to 25 mills — a very major shift indeed for property owners.

I should like to congratulate the Minister of Highways (Mr. Kramer) for his very excellent program, the new Open Roads program introduced last year. Through this program a number of villages have already been connected to a main highway system and several others are going to be added this year. I can assure the Minister that this program is very much appreciated by all rural Members. We are hopeful that within the next 12 months a comprehensive oil grid network can be agreed upon so that we can proceed with oiling on some of our major grids.

We are fortunate, Mr. Speaker, to have two major areas in our constituency where tourist development can take place. With the completion of paving of the Yellowhead Highway this year we are confident that the number of tourists coming through our area will increase substantially. This will be of benefit to many of our people who provide services to the travelling public, such as service stations, motels and trailer camps.

The Qu'Appelle Basin study is now complete and recognizes the recreational potential of that beautiful valley which borders my constituency to the south. I was very happy to see the enthusiasm with which the Minister proposed that we should have a highway through that area. I was just going to suggest that to him.

The Premier indicated in his address that employment figures in the province have improved substantially. This is certainly true in our area. We have many communities which have taken advantage of our winter employment program and in those areas I do not believe there is one person who is willing and able to work who is not able to obtain employment. Unfortunately, some communities have not taken advantage of this program, but even in those areas the number of job seekers has declined. The assistance made available under the housing program has encouraged a large number of people to upgrade their homes and build new ones. Our construction people tell me they have sufficient work ahead to keep them busy all year. Some have had to take on extra help to meet the demand, a far cry Mr. Speaker, from the stagnation and demoralization in that industry under the previous administration in the late 1960s and into 1971.

Mr. Speaker, I believe a great deal more needs to be done to upgrade the recreational and environmental facilities of our rural communities and indeed in our cities as well. Far better to provide meaningful employment through a subsidized works program than to pay out huge sums in welfare and unemployment insurance. It is regrettable that some communities will,

through devious methods, seek to circumvent the intent of these employment programs and will use people already fully employed to carry out these projects when others desperately need those pay cheques. Hopefully, future regulations can be more strictly enforced so that all unemployed persons are given top priority.

Mr. Speaker, I should like to tell the Members of a new and a unique industry which has grown up in the town of Esterhazy Sapara Brothers of Esterhazy have over the past few years started a sauerkraut plant, known as Sapara Foods. We were pleased last year, through the Department of Industry, to assist them to expand their operations. This company started operations a few years ago producing a very superior sauerkraut and cabbage product, which they began marketing as a specialty in resort areas in Alberta. Since that time the popularity of their product has grown and they have had to expand their operations and their line of products. They now sell a variety of cabbage and sauerkraut specialties, both canned and frozen over much of the Prairies and are now going into the production of cabbage rolls. I am sure that the Member from Prince Albert East would enjoy those. Sapara Foods now employ up to 20 people and are processing over 250 tons of cabbage per year. They have markets in Vancouver, Edmonton, Toronto and are now starting to sell in the United States. Since much of their cabbage is now imported from outside the province, it would seem logical that we should attempt to establish a few small cabbage production units in the local area to take care of this market. I am advised that they could use up to 500 acres of cabbage. A good crop of cabbage they tell me will bring about \$500 per acre. You will know, Mr. Speaker, from what I have said that I will be supporting the motion and will be voting against the amendment.

Some Hon. Members: — Hear, hear!

The amendment was negated on the following recorded division.

YEAS — 14

Steuart	MacDonald (Milestone)	McPherson
Coupland	McIsaac	Lane
Loken	Gardner	MacDonald (Moose Jaw North)
Guy	Weatherald	Wiebe
Grant	MacLeod	

NAYS — 34

Blakeney	MacMurchy	Richards
Dyck	Pepper	Gross
Meakes	Michayluk	Feduniak
Wood	Byers	Mostoway
Smishek	Thorson	Comer
Romanow	Whelan	Rolfes
Messer	Engel	Hanson
Snyder	Owens	Oliver
Bowerman	Robbins	Feschuk
Kramer	Taylor	Kaeding
Thibault	Matsalla	Flasch
Larson		

The debate continued on the motion.

Mr. T.M. Weatherald (Cannington): — Mr. Speaker, I am happy to get this opportunity in the Throne Speech debate, I had to suffer through a long afternoon and an even longer evening, but I think in the long run it will be worth it.

Mr. Speaker, I want to deal with a few of the things that Members have been bringing up and in particular one or two of the comments brought up by the Minister of Natural Resources — the Minister of Highways — well they did have a pretty fast shuffle over there and I haven't quite sorted them all out. In any event, the Minister of Highways

Mr. Speaker: — Order, order!

Mr. Weatherald: — in his usual fashion got under way and talked about political appointments. I'll give him one from the Parks system, the construction superintendent at Battleford. You can try that one. If you want to talk about a political appointment you can try on the construction superintendent at Battleford Park. If you didn't make it, your seatmate did.

Mr. Kramer: — Table his name!

Mr. Weatherald: — You know his name, I don't have to table his name. Look at the job classification yourself. The job is there, you know what it is and I know what it is. You can look it up yourself.

Mr. Speaker: — Order, order! There's too much noise!

Mr. Weatherald: — Mr. Speaker, I want to go onto another accusation the Minister likes to throw around. It was about Crown land this time, it was about the land that he alleges that couldn't be bought. I happened to be here at that time. I'll tell you why the individual couldn't buy it. Because it was contrary to The Legislative Assembly Act at the time.

Some Hon. Members: — Hear, hear!

Mr. Weatherald: — He knows it, we know it, and everybody else in this Assembly now knows it. That is why he wasn't able to buy the Crown land at that time, because it was contrary to The Legislative Assembly Act. He gets up and tries to make a big man of himself and tells everybody it was because he was NDP.

Now, Mr. Speaker, we might even start to believe all this stuff we get from the Opposition benches about freedom and good rights or from the Government Benches

Some Hon. Members: — Hear, hear!

Mr. Weatherald: — Sorry about that. We may even start to believe all this we get from the Government Benches. I want to read you a

letter that came into my possession. This happens to include both the Premier and the Attorney General in the contents, I think most Members will find it most interesting.

A short time ago I signed a contract to be licence issuer. I wrote and asked the Commission involved and was told that there wasn't any remuneration. I then replied that I wasn't interested in taking the appointment without pay. Today I had a visitor, he didn't introduce himself, perhaps he was ashamed. I was told by this man that if I wasn't willing to work for his department without pay I would lose my job as licence issuer with your department.

There is a word for this, and I believe it is blackmail. Have you authorized these tactics? Well I could go on with the letter

Mr. Blakeney: — Table it!

Mr. Weatherald: — I will. You got a copy as a matter of fact, it is written to you. It is addressed, Mr. A. Blakeney, Premier of Saskatchewan, I'll be pleased to table it. That's fine. Apparently the answer to the letter didn't go too well together because she sent me the same copy as you got.

In any event, Mr. Speaker, I think that these types of things are showing up pretty rapidly under this Government. We can take another example of the political patronage which I intend to go into at greater length sometime in the near future. For example, today it came to my knowledge, through a question which was asked recently in the Legislature here. I think it exhibits the extent to which through Government control, political patronage and handling of the news media, the extent to which they are willing to go. When we were on our legislative committee on corporate Foreign ownership of Land, we noticed that there was a person (not a Member) constantly attending these meetings. We asked what his work was, we asked what his name was. He was Graham Barker. This is what he did according to the answer that we got. Mr. Barker was employed in the Planning and Research Branch of the Department of Agriculture, August 9 to December 29, 1972, as an Information Officer II, at which time he resigned. He is now employed with Information Services, as of January 31, 1973. I got that information today. Mr. Barker's job, it turned out, was to attend all the Foreign Ownership Land Committee hearings, attended at Leader, Gull Lake, Shaunavon, Weyburn, Saskatoon, Melfort, Wynyard, Kamsack and Regina. You know what Mr. Barker's job was? It was to report on the foreign ownership of land hearings for the Government of Saskatchewan to all the small radio stations in this province. Mr. Speaker, paid political propaganda for the Government of Saskatchewan!

Some Hon. Members: — Hear, hear!

Mr. Weatherald: — What is more, Mr. Speaker, one man suggested to me, that Mr. Barker was a good reporter, he is neutral. He is the first neutral reporter that has never said hello to anybody in the Opposition benches in a year and a half. Mr. Speaker, Mr. Barker knows which side his bread is buttered on, we know it, and to think that he could put out a news broadcast to cover

legislative committee hearings is purely ridiculous and it exhibits the extent to which this Government is ready to manage the news media if it is at all possible.

Mr. Speaker, we come to the Premier because we had some difficulty and I expect that we will have considerable difficulty in this Session, Mr. Speaker, on knowing just when a Bill presented by the Premier is a Bill. It is with interest that I picked up the Potash Miner Journal, and on his non-political campaign, the Premier sitting there with his MLA, which is perfectly legitimate, the Member of Parliament for Yorkton-Melville which I don't think was quite as legitimate, on a Provincial Premier's tour which was supposed to be non-political. I didn't see any Conservatives there sitting at the front with him. Anyway, it did turn out to be in the Potashville Miner Journal. It turned out that a question was asked of the Premier, if the Government intended to introduce any more Bills such as the Foreign Ownership Bill, which they didn't have any intention of passing. The Premier replied that they may introduce some more bills for discussion purposes. He will now have to tell us and the people of Saskatchewan which bills he really intends on passing and which ones are just for discussion purposes only.

Some Hon. Members: — Hear, hear!

Mr. Weatherald: — When, Mr. Speaker, the Premier introduced the Foreign Ownership of Land Bill, I do know that his basic intelligence told him that it should have been a White Paper rather than a Bill at that particular time. He back-tracked pretty fast and we are pleased that he did. He should have back-tracked a little quicker. Maybe he will do so in the future.

Mr. Speaker, I want to use another example, while we are on the subject of political appointments. I might say that NDP candidates have not done too well in eastern Saskatchewan in elections politically, but extremely well financially once they lose. This is particularly true of Cannington, Moosomin and Qu'Appelle Moose Mountain, because in all three cases they have come to their reward practically immediately after the election. Their political activities haven't exactly ceased though, because Mr. Buck the candidate who got appointed to the job in the Department of Industry also turns out to be the NDP representative on the Federal Council. He is certainly continuing his political work at a fairly ample reward at about \$13,000.

An Hon. Member: — Where is he working?

Mr. Weatherald: — I think he is working downstairs in the Department of Finance, part time when he isn't at his political activities. Let us talk about the NDP candidate in Cannington. This is taken from the front page of the Carlyle Observer, this is what the Carlyle paper had to say reporting the Cannington NDP convention, on Wednesday, August 17th.

Jim Eaton, provincial council member reported on caucus meetings and his work in the constituency.

Mr. Eaton happens to be the same man that was appointed and is in the civil service, but apparently just how he had time off and came down to report on political meetings in his provincial

Council work and his activities in the NDP caucus, I am not quite sure.

Some Hon. Members: — Hear, hear!

Mr. Weatherald: — I might add, Mr. Speaker, that there are many taxpayers in Saskatchewan who read this article in the Carlyle paper on the front page.

Hon. E.I. Wood (Minister of Municipal Affairs): — On a Point of Privilege. I didn't quite catch the date.

Mr. Weatherald: — Well, it is the August 17, 1972 edition of the Carlyle Observer.

Mr. Wood: — August 17, 1972?

Mr. Weatherald: — Right.

Mr. Blakeney: — What's the name?

Mr. Weatherald: — Jim Eaton, the same man who is head of the Emergency Measures Organization.

Mr. Blakeney: — Jack Eaton!

Mr. Weatherald: — No, no, no. Jim Eaton. I'll table the copy of the article.

Mr. Blakeney: — We'll take no responsibility for the Carlyle Observer, but I'll tell you one thing for sure

Mr. Weatherald: — We know your record with newspapers all right.

Mr. Blakeney: — Jack Eaton is the councillor and you know it.

Mr. Weatherald: — Jack Eaton? Well I only read what

Mr. Blakeney: — You know it is a different man altogether.

Mr. Weatherald: I don't know it is a different man at all.

Mr. Blakeney: — Oh yes you do!

Mr. Speaker: — Order, order!

Mr. Weatherald: — Mr. Speaker, the article says, Jim Eaton, provincial council. It doesn't say Jack Eaton, I don't usually go to the NDP conventions. I did not!

Mr. Blakeney: — I'll tell you something.

It never even occurred to me till you bring it up.

Mr. Weatherald: — You go ahead and check. I'll produce two or three more. I can show you two or three more that say the same thing. As a matter of fact, Mr. Premier, the secretary of the NDP sent this copy in. If there is a misprint that's her fault. I think, Mr. Speaker, that according to the various comments made by people around the constituency when they read the article, I don't think there was much doubt in their minds as to who was referred to in the article.

Now, Mr. Speaker, we can come to some comments of the Minister of Agriculture (Mr. Messer) today. I think one of the most revealing comments which the Member from Morse (Mr. Wiebe) brought up to date was the Minister's actions on the Hog Marketing Board. It's been quoted once but I think it's well worth the second time, Mr. Speaker. When the Minister introduced his changes in setting up the Hog Marketing Commission no mention was made whatsoever of his intentions that he has used to carry it out, in which he said:

The need for a commission I think can be better outlined if in the future the need for quick action by government to correct or improve a deteriorating market condition arises.

Then he goes on to say:

I think a good example would be the feed grains threat that was apparent last fall.

Then he goes on in great detail which is available to all Members to read, but nowhere in it did the Minister ever mention the suggestion that he would be taking away rights of individual producers to decide their own fate. When it was taken at face value, Mr. Speaker, I think that the Members in this Assembly did not really expect that he would embark on the type of action that he has because he never suggested that he would when he introduced that change last winter. Now he backtracks on the Hog Marketing Commission on the basis that he has the support of some individual organizations.

Well, I want to deal with that, Mr. Speaker, because it is well known in our province and well known amongst farmers that there are many farmers who do not consider themselves to be represented in farm organizations of any kind. These farmers are hard working individuals who work seven days a week if they are involved in a hog marketing operation. They are not great public speakers or debaters. They don't go to marketing meetings, Wheat Pool meetings and farm organization meetings of the NFU or hog marketing boards. They do not feel willing or able to fight great resolutions through and make their views known. I want to make one thing very clear, Mr. Speaker. These people do believe that they do have the capability and intelligence to make their decision on whether they should market hogs in this manner or not.

Some Hon. Members: — Hear, hear!

Mr. Weatherald: — Farmers in this province have not abdicated their

rights to the leadership of any farm organization, Mr. Speaker, and they never should.

Some Hon. Members: — Hear, hear!

Mr. Weatherald: — And I want to make that very clear to the Minister backtracks and rests on the false assumption that because he has the support of some of the officials of various organizations that we accept what he says on that particular version. It's a pretty weak argument, Mr. Speaker. It's a pretty weak argument to say that just because the leaders of the farm organizations made these suggestions that he is unwilling and incapable. To think that of all the power in the Government, of money, people and personnel, they are unwilling to even go out and sell a program that they apparently believe in. That has got to be one of the weakest arguments that has ever been put forward in this Assembly.

Some Hon. Members: — Hear, hear!

An Hon. Member: — They had information officers in the Committee.

Mr. Weatherald: — Well, I guess that's true, Mr. Speaker. As my colleagues say, we had an information officer to follow us around the province on our hearings but apparently we ran out of information officers or people who conduct meetings.

Also the Minister this afternoon talked at length about what the Government has done for agriculture. Let's take a look. Let's take a look, Mr. Speaker, at what the Government's program for agriculture really has been. Well, we got The Family Farm protection Act which we are all familiar with. We are all very familiar with the faults that were in it and the difficulties. Pretty nearly everyone in Saskatchewan hopes they never hear about it. I am sure this includes the Premier because he never mentions it when he goes out somewhere. Then we got The Foreign ownership of Land Act which nobody over on the Government side knew if it was a Bill or a White Paper and they found out that it shouldn't be a Bill because it was kind of unpopular and they knew that everyone in Saskatchewan knew that it had the approval of the Caucus and the Government and just about everybody over there but then they decided it was a pretty hot potato so they dropped it real fast.

Apparently we are not going to have a vote by hog producers because the Government thinks they don't have the basic intelligence to see a good plan when there is one put into operation. Then we have the Land Bank plan, and Mr. Speaker, there is one thing I want to say about the Land Bank plan. The Government tells us that we should have the courage or whatever it may take to accept the plan.

Let's take a look at this Government's record in political patronage in appointments. Let's take a look. And then I ask you, Mr. Speaker, on what basis should we accept the idea of the Government's basic goodwill as far as the Land Bank plan is concerned?

Some Hon. Members: — Hear, hear!

Mr. Weatherald: — We've got political appointments from one end of the Government to the other, Mr. Speaker. And yet the Government when they set up the Land Bank plan have it set up so they can make all appointments right from top to the bottom. The head man, the vice president, the second vice president, the third vice president, 12 regional directors and six men underneath them. Mr. Speaker, if there was a real good record by this Government of appointments then there might be some basis for them to say, accept our word that no political involvement will be taking place. Mr. Speaker, this Government's record is bad in that direction and that is exactly why we should never, we should never accept the bureaucratic administrative set-up that is made in the Land Bank program.

Some Hon. Members: — Hear, hear!

Mr. Weatherald: — Then, Mr. Speaker, we have about two other items put forward by the Government which was supposed to help farmers and one was The Succession Duty Act. I was amazed, Mr. Speaker, because the Premier, during the federal election campaign — I don't have the clipping right at hand, but he did go out and he said, "Oh, the Federal capital gains tax is a terrible thing on farmers. It's a terrible thing. It should be eliminated, done away with." No capital gains tax, especially, Mr. Speaker, if the land stays within the family. If it stays within the family we should do away with that capital gains tax. How can one man apparently say that we should do away with the capital gains tax and at the same time slap on the Succession Duty Tax on the very same person?

An Hon. Member: — He wants to get it all.

Mr. Weatherald: — Mr. Speaker, apparently one of the great disadvantages of this Succession Duty Tax as many people are finding out is that there is only a \$25,000 exemption between partners. As we all know, there are many partnerships around the province and, of course, this has worked a hardship on them in keeping the land and the farm in the family. As we well mentioned at the time, it is a tax against people who make their living from property which is a most unfair tax because they frequently, as one Member just a little while ago told us, they have a very low income, they make a low income from property. And yet, apparently the Government has decided they should be taxed fairly heavily with Succession Duty Tax.

Mr. Messer: — There's a \$200,000 exemption.

Mr. Weatherald: — Well, Mr. Speaker, \$200,000 doesn't make much difference if you've got to keep it for the next 100 years to keep the family farming. It isn't worth much that way. That's why the tax on the family farm

Mr. Messer: — About five per cent.

Mr. Weatherald: — No, no! That's just what you know about it. If you add up machinery and livestock, 100 head of cows is worth about \$40,000 these days, if you add that on top of land and machinery, you

would hit the target pretty quickly.

Then, Mr. Speaker, we have the agricultural program of the Government that they talked about this afternoon — The Family Farm protection Act, The Foreign Ownership of Land Act, and we are not going to get a vote on the hog producers because the Government doesn't think they are smart enough to be able to decide if it's good for them. Then we've got a Land Bank in which we have political appointments from top to bottom, The succession Duty Act. The administration to run the Land Bank is \$700,000 this year. So, Mr. Speaker, if you add all this agricultural program of the Government up, it's a pretty sad state of affairs.

Some Hon. Members: — Hear, hear!

Mr. Weatherald: — If it hadn't been for the Federal Government assisting and Minister in Charge of the Wheat Board assisting, well, they (the present Provincial Government) would be in pretty sad shape altogether.

Before adjourning this evening I want to say that I picked up an extract (some of the Hon. Members were with me on the committee trip) but I brought it home with me because I was afraid everyone may not have read it. We all know that the people opposite will certainly take the words of well-known labor leaders. I picked this up on our travels, a labor leader's opinion of socialism by Samuel Gompers. I'm sure the Members opposite put a lot of faith in him. This is the way he starts out. He says:

I want to tell you socialists that I studied your philosophy, read your works upon economics and not the meanest of them all, studied your works in both English and German. I have not only read them but I studied them. I have heard your orators and watched the work of your movement the world over. I kept close watch on your doctrines for 30 years. I have been closely associated with many of you and know how you work and what you propose. I know too what you have up your sleeve. And I want to say that I am entirely at variance with your philosophy. I declare to you that I am not only of variance with your doctrine but with your philosophy.

Mr. Gompers goes on:

Economically you are unsound, socially you are wrong, and industrially you are an impossibility.

Some Hon. Members: — Hear, hear!

Mr. Weatherald: — Well, Mr. Speaker, I am sure with those words, that the Members opposite will be able to contemplate a well-known labor leader's opinion on socialism which I am sure we on this side at least would believe wholeheartedly. With that, Mr. Speaker, I should like to ask leave to adjourn for this evening.

Debate adjourned.

The Assembly adjourned at 9:10 o'clock p.m.