

LEGISLATIVE ASSEMBLY OF SASKATCHEWAN
Third Session — Seventeenth Legislature
9th Day

Tuesday, February 6, 1973.

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

WELCOME TO STUDENTS

Mr. C.P. MacDonald (Milestone): — Mr. Speaker, I should like to draw to your attention and to the other Members of this Assembly a group of students sitting in the Speaker's Gallery. There are 25 from Fort Smith, North West Territories and 30 from the community of Milestone. They are accompanied, the Fort Smith students, by Mr. Bill Hutchison and Winnifred Hyvas, and the Milestone students are accompanied by Bob Reese and Merv Riens.

I should like to point out, Mr. Speaker, that this is one of the very first examples of its kind and type of student exchange trips in the Dominion of Canada. It is part of the federal-provincial shared cost program whereby the Federal Government has initiated this program, like the Voyageurs many years ago. The Milestone students had the opportunity and the good fortune to go to the North West Territories earlier this fall and now these students have returned this visit and are now sharing the hospitality of the community of Milestone for one week. I should like to point out too that the students themselves indicate the diversity of the population in the North West Territories and we have a good portion of the students of native ancestry, both Indian and Eskimo. I know that all the Members of this Assembly will join with me in extending a very cordial welcome with the hope that they enjoy the afternoon's proceedings.

Hon. Members: — Hear, hear!

Hon. G. MacMurchy (Minister of Education): — Mr. Speaker, I might add a word of welcome on behalf of the Government to these students who are in a new experience of learning. Hopefully we can make travel as an integral part of school curriculum. I look forward to hearing from the students on how they enjoyed the program. I think we need to convey our special thanks to the staff members who have accompanied the students both from Milestone on the trip to the North West Territories and the North West Territories' students down here, our thanks to them and our welcome to the students.

Hon. Members: — Hear, hear!

QUESTIONS

GOVERNMENT ACTIONS AND ATTITUDES

Mr. J.C. McIsaac (Wilkie): — Mr. Speaker, before the Orders of the Day I have a question with respect to recent Government actions and attitudes that I would like to direct to the Premier.

Yesterday the Hon. Member for Milestone (Mr. MacDonald)

asked a question of the Minister of Education (Mr. MacMurchy) with respect to legislative details that appeared in an issue of the Carillon. Now the Minister appeared unhappy and I accepted his reply in that regard. But about the same time there appeared, on our desks in this House, a report from the Department of Education and on page 22 of that publication, here are the details and the two main clauses that are the backbone of proposed teacher-trustee bargaining legislation, printed and published through his own Department. It goes on to point out the two key principles at a time when this legislation we know is still undergoing discussion. The Minister was on the radio on it last night and again this morning. Certainly, Mr. Speaker, while we could accept his answer yesterday I am anxious to hear what reason he can give for this kind of attitude and this kind of disrespect as far as this House is concerned.

Some Hon. Members: — Hear, hear!

Mr. McIsaac: — Not only has that legislation not been placed in front of us here yet, as I say he continues to speak to the Press and on the air on this particular matter, and I know the difficulties of this particular legislation.

Hon. E. Kramer (Minister of Highways): — Point of Order, Mr. Speaker. It has been my understanding that you can ask a question before the Orders of the Day but you can't make a speech. Now how long is this nonsense going to be going on from the other side of the floor?

Mr. Speaker: — There are times in presenting a question that it may be necessary to preface it a little, but I would ask all Members to be as brief as possible on their comments and ask the question.

Mr. McIsaac: — Mr. Speaker, I will get to the question and I apologize for the lengthy comment but I think it is an issue .

Mr. Kramer: — Nonsense!

Mr. McIsaac: — It is not nonsense as the Minister of Highways would like us to believe, it has to do with the contempt this Government has shown for this Legislature. I think there was one other case in point, and I appreciate the problem Cabinet Ministers have in this regard, but here is the Minister of Agriculture (Mr. Messer) speaking in his home area giving details about a piece of legislation he didn't speak about yesterday.

Hon. J.R. Messer (Minister of Agriculture): — Point of Order, who is he directing the question to? He is now talking about agriculture and he started with the Minister of Education.

Mr. McIsaac: — I directed the question, and I said so earlier, to the Premier.

Mr. Speaker: — Order! I hope that the Hon.

Member will keep this question to one topic because we can't have half a dozen topics raised in one question. The Hon. Member started to ask a question on behalf of Education. I would ask the Member to stay with that and not pursue what other Ministers may or may not have done.

Mr. McIsaac: — Mr. Speaker, my question was and is directed to the Premier. It involves the Minister of Education's actions, it involves the Minister of Agriculture's actions and it involves their attitude, their disrespect and their contempt in my opinion for the fact this Legislature is now sitting. I want to ask the Premier if he will call his Cabinet together, if he will apologize for this action and if he will try to improve the situation in this respect and remember that the House is, indeed, sitting and this is where these Bills should be brought first.

Hon. A.E. Blakeney (Premier): — Mr. Speaker, this question, if question it was, I think cannot be effectively answered because it was a speech and contained many facets. If I may I will ask the Minister of Education to respond to what I thought was the nub of the question dealing with the contents of a booklet referred to by the Member for Wilkie.

Hon. G. MacMurchy (Minister of Education): — Mr. Speaker, in reply to the question put forward by the Member for Wilkie, I would hope that the Members on this side of the House and the Members of the Opposition would appreciate the efforts of Department officials to put forward a booklet which was distributed only to Legislative Members with respect to programs that had been carried on and programs that are underway. Certainly it is a basis for speeches before this House and I think Department officials should be commended for this action.

Some Hon. Members: — Hear, hear!

Mr. MacMurchy: — With respect to the issue of teacher-contract bargaining which I think the Member referred to. It is a well-known fact that we had a series of meetings a year ago, or a little over a year ago, toward reaching some kind of a compromise between teachers and trustees with respect to this issue. The co-operative approach did not work, the Government then presented a proposal known as the Toombs Report upon which there was a good deal of debate, a good deal of discussion. It has been evident in the past three months that these proposals of the Toombs Report have not been accepted by either party. I met with the Saskatchewan Teachers Federation and Saskatchewan School Trustees Association officials last Wednesday to see if we could clear up any matters or come together with an agreement. The meeting was very worthwhile. We did not, however, see any daylight in positions that each side had taken. I was requested at that meeting, and I have been requested since then, to put forward a proposal for discussion. You will note in the booklet it says, "A proposed draft." I have informed the SSTA and the STF as of yesterday that the draft as presented in the booklet will be proposed for discussion for a meeting tomorrow morning. I think that should be an adequate reply to the Member's question.

Mr. McIsaac: — Mr. Speaker, may I be

allowed one supplementary on that. I don't quarrel with what the Minister has done and is doing with respect to the legislation. I appreciate the problem in arriving at something, more so than most, but the question is just this: that I think it is real contempt of the House to put this kind of proposal in front of members from department staff. It should be brought forward in the form of a bill, it should be debated. It shouldn't be put forward in this particular manner to spell out proposed details, distribute it on our desks .

Mr. Speaker: —Order, order!

Mr. MacMurchy: — Mr. Speaker, I think it is common knowledge to Members on this side of the House and to Members on the other side of the House that the Member for Wilkie, who was then Minister of Education in 1968, in fact did present a proposal to both SSTA and STF which became public.

Mr. McIsaac: — Not when the House was sitting.

Mr. MacMurchy: — I think in an issue like this it is important to present proposals to see if an adequate agreement can be reached before legislation is brought forward in this House. This is what we are trying to do.

Some Hon. Members: — Hear, hear!

ADJOURNED DEBATES

ADDRESS-IN-REPLY

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

Mr. T.M. Weatherald (Cannington): — Mr. Speaker, it is now my privilege having made an initial start last evening to come into the debate on the Speech from the Throne and in doing so, Mr. Speaker, I should like to congratulate the appointment of some new Members to the Government benches, the Member for Humboldt (Mr. Tchorzewski), the Member for Biggar (Mr. Cowley) and the Member for Kerrobert-Kindersley (Mr. Taylor) on their appointments to the high rank of the Executive Council in our province.

Mr. Speaker, I want to talk at length on some of the remarks I made last evening but first I also should like to congratulate the Member for Athabasca (Mr. Guy). A very hard-working, diligent Member and I might say, Mr. Speaker, a Member who is very capable and does a great deal of research work to look up his facts which the Government at times doesn't like, Mr. Speaker, but which nevertheless need to be brought to the public's attention.

Today I want to go into in some depth some of the characteristics that the Government has been developing in recent years. It is a truism in our province, Mr. Speaker, and is becoming even better known that in the one and one-half years that this Government has occupied the Treasury Benches in our province that it has become one of the most blatant, political patronage

machines that has ever been seen. This Government, Mr. Speaker, has added a new dimension by having made unprecedented political appointments but the continued political activity of many of the persons appointed are the major cause of concern, I think, for the majority of the population.

Mr. Speaker, I want to deal at some length with some of the appointments made to the Civil Service by the Government and I intend, Mr. Speaker, to document the activities of some of these people who have been appointed by the New Democratic Government of this province. I will cite as my example and as my reference, the NDP Commonwealth of November 22, 1972 edition, which lists very, very well, Mr. Speaker, some of the continued political activities of people who have been appointed by the Premier of this province. Mr. Speaker, I don't think that the Members opposite will dispute the authenticity of the Commonwealth, the New Democratic Party paper. And I want to tell the people of Saskatchewan some of the things that the Commonwealth documents of activities by these appointees.

Number one, Mr. Speaker, Joe Zakreski, Secretary of the Special Committee of the Legislature on Alcohol. November 22 Commonwealth says that Joe was not altogether spending all of his time working as special secretary for the Legislative Committee on Alcohol. He was on the convention planning committee at the recent NDP convention.

Then, Mr. Speaker, we come to Gerry MacDonald, defeated NDP candidate for Regina Albert Park, salary \$9,887 but he didn't work all of his time for the Civil Service in the Province of Saskatchewan because the Commonwealth says that Mr. MacDonald served on the credentials committee of the NDP convention.

Mr. Speaker, then we come to the situation of Roy Borrowman. \$19,750 is his salary. He didn't spend all of his time working for the people of Saskatchewan as a Civil Servant might. In fact, Mr. Borrowman served on the balloting committee at the NDP convention.

Then, Mr. Speaker, we come to the case of Jim Eaton which I mentioned last night. As has become characteristic of the Premier whenever something that he doesn't like shows up in the newspaper, he jumps to his feet and says, well, what it says in the paper isn't always correct, he was misquoted in some way. I checked this morning and I think Mr. Eaton's activities were very well stated in the Carlyle paper because the Carlyle paper indicates that Mr. Eaton's activities on August 17, 1972 were in speaking to the Cannington NDP convention. Now, Mr. Eaton gets \$11,340 salary and on this particular Wednesday the Carlyle paper reports:

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

Well, Mr. Speaker, I hardly think that on a Wednesday that this is entirely legitimate Civil Service work.

Now, Mr. Speaker, let's take a case and look at Frank Buck. Mr. Speaker, Frank Buck gets \$13,864 from the Government of Saskatchewan. I think there are many people who may well question his qualifications for this type of salary because I believe that from his previous experience he would not be able

to obtain such remuneration in any other field of activity. He is a defeated candidate in Qu'Appelle-Moose Mountain. Now he is a civil servant very rapidly after his defeat, in the Department of Finance and also was elected at the recent NDP convention to the Federal New Democratic Party Council. So Mr. Buck's continued political activities are practically ensured on the NDP Federal Council for at least the next year or so.

Mr. Speaker, then we could come to the case of David Miner. \$14,820, Mr. Miner gets. A very, very well known supporter of the Member of the Legislature for The Battlefords, formerly an NDP official campaign manager, I believe, for the Member of The Battlefords (Mr. Kramer) in the last election, a diligent campaigner, one of the vice-presidents of the Land Bank Commission which the Government expects us to believe is a non-political commission.

Now, Mrs. George Taylor, Mr. Speaker, wife of the defeated NDP candidate in Saskatoon, she got the appointment to The Human Rights Commission.

Well, Mr. Speaker, Mr. Burton, a well-known name in Saskatchewan politics by the name of John Burton, defeated candidate in Regina City in the last federal election. He wasn't looking for a job long because for \$19,344 he works for the Planning Department of the Government, along with writing many speeches for the candidates and the members of the New Democratic Party.

Then, Mr. Speaker, let's talk about Mr. Ed Shillington because he ran in Moosomin constituency. And the one characteristic about candidates in that part of Saskatchewan, they don't do too well in the election but they do exceedingly well as soon as it is over.

Some Hon. Members: — Hear, hear!

Mr. Weatherald: Mr. Shillington, \$17,976, Attorney General's Department.

An Hon. Member: — Oh, oh!

Mr. Weatherald: — Defeated New Democratic candidate in Moosomin.

Well, Mr. Speaker, we have the case of Bill Allan, Executive to the Minister of Northern Saskatchewan, salary \$10,500, and he spent at least a month in the North during the Athabasca by-election.

An Hon. Member: — Shame!

Mr. Weatherald: — Mr. Speaker, what is characteristic of all of these political appointments? It is that these people are carrying on, to a large extent, continued political activity after their appointments. Mr. Speaker, I have never honestly believed that a person should be eliminated from government service forever by being a candidate in an election, but, Mr. Speaker, it is very obvious that once a person is appointed to a position, that he should not continue his political

activities while being on the payrolls as a civil servant for our province.

Some Hon. Members: — Hear, hear!

Mr. Weatherald: — Mr. Speaker, it is on this basis that I charge the administration with crass political patronage, and what is more significant, continued political activity on the part of the NDP after becoming full-time civil servants in highly paid jobs.

Some Hon. Members: — Hear, hear!

Mr. Weatherald: — I have made only a partial list. There are many more as the Athabasca by-election proved. I have mentioned, Mr. Speaker, some of the people that keep the NDP political machine well oiled and in high gear at the taxpayers' expense.

I want, Mr. Speaker, to mention some of the Returns not filed in the session of the Legislature by the Member for Humboldt (Mr. Tchorzewski), the Provincial Secretary. And it is very interesting probably why they were not filed. Let's take a look at the questions not answered which the Government has had a year to answer. Executive Assistants to the Minister in the Government of Saskatchewan since July 1, 1971, not answered. Two, provincial candidates in the last election acquiring jobs in the Government, not answered. Trips made out of the province by Cabinet Ministers and Legislative Secretaries, July 1, 1971 to July 1, 1972 not answered. The list of reports and studies commissioned to external consultants, July 1, 1971 to March 1, 1972, not answered.

Mr. Speaker, the question on advertising and printing contracts with the Government of Saskatchewan, not answered. The cost of the Saskatchewan Government Insurance Office advertisement in the NDP paper, the Commonwealth, not answered.

Mr. Speaker, it is obvious that the answers to these questions would be a substantial embarrassment to the Government and after a year awaiting the answers to these questions, which are not at all difficult questions, it is obvious why the answers have not been forthcoming.

I want now to turn to two of the points that the Premier raised in his speech when he was addressing the Assembly, the first one being the pollution of the Saskatchewan River by the Prince Albert pulp mill which he maintained the Liberal Government allowed. Mr. Speaker, this is an outrageous untruth peddled by the Premier and his Government. He knows it is untrue and only degrades himself by peddling such nonsense.

Some Hon. Members: — Hear, hear!

Mr. Weatherald: — I want to document, Mr. Speaker, some releases to show that the untruth peddled in this regard will not stand the light of day and is more fiction than it is fact. First to quote to you from the Prince Albert Daily Herald of November, 1971:

To conform to tightening regulations consistent with upgrading the condition of the river and other new upstream

sewage treatment, the Prince Albert Company agreed to design and construct the secondary waste treatment plant. The design, approved by the Saskatchewan Water Resources Commission, was engineered during the winter of 1970 to 1971 and construction started this spring.

“During the winter,” Mr. Speaker, I want you to take note. It will be noted that this was during the time of a Liberal Government and it will also be noted that the announcement was made after the NDP took office. The announcement makes note that pollution control system was both approved and engineered and construction started previous to the June 23rd election. In other words, Mr. speaker, pollution control changes were well underway by the Liberal administration before the change of government.

Some Hon. Members: — Hear, hear!

Mr. Weatherald: — I then read to you a press clipping from the June 1, 1972 issue of the Leader-Post. The clipping says:

Prince Albert Pulp Company Limited added an extensive pollution control system at the 900 ton per day craft soft wood mill here with the opening of a 55 acre aerating lagoon equipped with seven of the largest aerators built and operating in Canada.

At the conclusion of the article, the last paragraph says, and I quote:

Prince Albert Pulp is now one of the first pulp mills existing in Canada to have complied with new pollution control regulations which were published November 4, 1971.

Mr. Speaker, for the Premier to try and tell the people of Saskatchewan that the NDP, when taking office, did one shred to obtain better pollution control at Prince Albert that was already in operation or in the process of being installed is false and the Premier and his Government do themselves discredit to try to peddle such nonsense. Mr. Speaker, the Prince Albert mill is now one of the standards for pollution control in Canada .

Some Hon. Members: — Hear, hear!

Mr. Weatherald: — . and none of that has come about due to the NDP. Pollution control which now meets the standards set by the Federal Government was partially installed and in the process of being improved to meet the new government regulations when the NDP Government was first elected.

Mr. Speaker, the Premier in his speech spoke of the Churchill River System and about consultation before changes were made. Last year, I would remind him, we in this Assembly moved a resolution requesting compulsory public hearings which his Government rejected. The NDP Government has said that they will conduct studies in the North and provide the necessary information for public discussion before any decisions are taken. Yesterday in the question period the Minister of the Environment (Mr. Byers) indicated that these are studies being undertaken by the Government themselves, in other words, studies

made by the Government for the Government. I want to tell the Minister of the Environment that these studies will be very suspect unless (a) totally independent groups are hired to conduct the studies; (b) unless environment groups in Saskatchewan have an input in the decision as to who will be conducting these studies.

In other words, Mr. Speaker, the Government must ensure that any reports produced are truly independent and the public must have an input in the determination of what firms conduct these studies. It does not appear that it will be a truly independent study that will be made and it is now a fair certainty that the Government is producing most of its own reports. As we all know, Mr. Speaker, governments can very easily get the type of report that they wish. I am sure that various conservation organizations would be pleased to be consulted before any of these firms are hired.

I want now to turn to agricultural matters that have been receiving a substantial amount of discussion here in this Assembly. The word "consultation" is often used by the Government and it is used in a very hollow manner.

Some Hon. Members: — Hear, hear!

Mr. Weatherald: — The proposed Hog Marketing Commission is a prime example. The Government stands up and talks about consultation, Mr. Speaker, but their consensus of consultation is much different than ours. The New Democratic Government with all resources of manpower and money are afraid to go out and explain to bona fide producers the merits of such a hog producers' plan.

Some Hon. Members: — Hear, hear!

Mr. Weatherald: — Apparently the word "consultation" is only applicable when it happens to suit them. And the Minister of Agriculture (Mr. Messer) explains it in a very haphazard and off-handed manner by saying that he has farm organization support. I want to make it absolutely and totally clear, Mr. Speaker, to the Minister of Agriculture that there are many bona fide farmers in our province who are people that work seven days a week in hog production. They are people who are not great public speakers. They are people who do not take time to go and fight through resolutions through various farm organizations. They are busy people. They are looking after their farms and they are not particularly interested in battling through marketing plans or ideas that they want to put forward at farm organization meetings. These producers, however, Mr. Speaker, are not willing and never would be willing to have various leaders of other farm organizations to represent them completely on matters that affect them so completely. The Government is totally remiss in its obligations if it denies these individuals a vote because these individuals are fully capable and fully desirous of having a vote on a matter that so vitally will concern them. It is simply not good enough for the Government to say that a number of farm leaders support them because there is no reason and there is a great desire on the part of the average individual producer to pass on a decision on whether the new hog marketing plan would be in his best interest.

The Government and various organizations should conduct

several public meetings throughout the province, explain their hog marketing plan. The Government has all of the resources and the money and the effort to conduct these public meetings and what is more, Mr. Speaker, the Government has not conducted or even attempted to put forward an explanation of the type of plan that they are anticipating.

An Hon. Member: — He should find out what's going on.

Mr. Weatherald: — Well, Mr. Speaker, in regard to that, if the Minister went out to some of these meetings, he would find out what's going on awfully quickly.

Some Hon. Members: — Hear, hear!

Mr. Weatherald: — Most producers say, Mr. Speaker, that were a legitimate vote taken, that they would be most pleased to accept whatever results that vote may indicate.

Mr. Speaker, I want to talk now for a little while about the Land Bank because it is a subject of much discussion in our province. I want, first of all, to outline the basic philosophical difference between this side of the House and the Members opposite. I think that the philosophic difference is very, very adequately explained in a press clipping I picked up from one of the British Columbia newspapers, a part of the country that Members opposite love to quote from now. The quote probably best illustrates the real intentions of the NDP Land Bank scheme in a very easy and forthright manner. I believe, Mr. Speaker, that when Karen Sanford, the NDP MLA for Comox, British Columbia was quoted in the newspaper of that area, that she illustrated the NDP feelings regarding land ownership across our country. Karen Sanford was quoted as saying:

Karen Sanford was first reticent to comment on the growing assessment squabble when contacted by the Free Press last week. However, speaking personally she said she would like to see all private property eliminated and leased even for life at a set rate to end speculation.

I would suggest, Mr. Speaker, that this is the socialist philosophy that spurs the Members opposite on in their effort to eliminate private ownership of land and the bringing about of the Government as a giant land corporation with all farmers as lessees. Miss Sanford concluded by saying:

Of several alternatives she favored public ownership with leasing of land.

I think it should be noted that when the Minister of Agriculture was speaking yesterday, he made the point that the Liberal administration wouldn't sell land except after five years. I think it should also be noted that this was a new policy and was a complete departure from the old CCF prior to 1964 when no Crown land was being sold. It also should be noted that when the Liberal Government instituted such a program at that time, that practically all lessees in the province qualified for automatic buying of that land and no similarity to the present Land Bank scheme was present. It is also worthy to note, Mr. Speaker, that the NDP administration discontinued this policy when they took office. The privilege of buying

Crown land after five years was discontinued by this NDP Government and this fact alone will be of concern to many people as a similar freeze could be enforced under The Land Bank Act.

Well, Mr. Speaker, periodically the Attorney General gives us a few words on agriculture. We all know that the Attorney General couldn't tell a wheat field from a strawberry patch but in any event his favorite subject is the Task Force Report. I want to tell the Attorney General (Mr. Romanow) that he should give that speech that he makes to the Minister of Agriculture. Let's make it very clear, Mr. Speaker, that the Government opposite is going to eliminate farmers at a very, very rapid rate with the Land Bank program. They are going to eliminate farmers at a very rapid rate. Every time the Government opposite buys a farm, in 99 per cent of the cases they are going to lease it to another farmer, so if you take one farmer out, instead of two farmers you have one farmer, Mr. Speaker, and that is precisely what the Attorney General is always telling us he is against, and for the Government to tell us that they are not going to eliminate farms through the Land Bank program is absolutely inaccurate.

I am just going to conclude my remarks by reading a quotation to the Members opposite, because they love to listen to labor leaders and their opinions. They don't like this quotation very well, but I will read it to them for their edification: "A labor leader's opinion of socialism."

I want to tell you socialists that I have studied your philosophy, read your works upon economics (and . of them) studied your works both in English and German, have not only read them but 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, have been closely associated with many of you and know how you think 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 it to you I am not only at variance with your doctrine but with your philosophy.

Mr. Gompers sums up by saying:

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

Some Hon. Members: — Hear, hear!

Mr. Weatherald: — Mr. Speaker, I think it is obvious that I will not be supporting the Speech from the Throne.

Some Hon. Members: — Hear, hear!

Mr. H.H.P. Baker (Regina Wascana): — Mr. Speaker, after listening to my friend Tommy Weatherald from the Cannington constituency, you would almost think that in the shadow cabinet they appointed him as "Minister of Miscellaneous and Mischief."

Some Hon. Members: — Hear, hear!

Mr. Baker: — I would have thought they

should have kept him as the agricultural critic, because I think the replacement hasn't made much of an improvement, if at all.

Mr. Speaker, I am very happy to be able to rise on this occasion to support the Throne Speech, a document which will continue to fulfil the programs envisaged by the people of Saskatchewan and our party for a truly better way of life. The mover and seconder did a fine job in their presentation. At this time I congratulate those who were given the portfolios over the past year. I welcome back and congratulate Allen Guy on his re-election in Athabasca. As he lives in my constituency and seeing I didn't go into the by-election I would expect him to vote for me from here on in.

Some Hon. Members: — Hear, hear!

Mr. Baker: — Had I been there the situation might have been different. To my Regina Wascana constituent. residents and to the good people of Saskatchewan I firmly believe you will not regret sending 45 New Democrat Members to the banks of Wascana to look after your affairs.

The University Campus in Regina, located in my constituency is of real benefit, not only to those wanting higher education, but as an asset to our business community. Our Regina Campus which I like to refer to as the University of Regina will, as indicated in the Throne Speech, have the University Act amended making major changes hopefully providing complete autonomy which I may say is long overdue. I thank and commend the Minister of Education (Mr. MacMurchy) who in his short term of office is moving rapidly to rectify some of the problems that exist for faculty members and students. We need autonomy to bring a university closer to the people within its serving area, autonomy will give effective internal administration to both campuses. No institute of higher learning can produce effectively without its local autonomy and this must be preserved. The amendments to the Act, I hope, will do just that for Regina and southern Saskatchewan, as well as for Saskatoon and the North. Predictions had been made at the last session that enrolments would drop at the Regina University. Recent figures indicate that this year's enrolment as of January 1 compared to last year's semester shows a marked increase. For this reason I say again, this year's planned building program should be accelerated and gone ahead with so that we can keep abreast for present and future needs of new and expanded colleges.

In line with this our engineering building as planned and promised should be started now. The decision made by the Board of Governors is really confusing because the resolution says that the campus engineering faculty will continue its extension and related activities for a period of three to five years, a nice way to wipe it out. The new building as planned was to house civil, electrical, mechanical and chemical engineering. The Board's decision means that the Regina University will not be able to enter these fields nor does it make provision to take in new students.

The farm economy is still and always will be our primary industry. It is the industry that produces the real wealth for our province and our nation. The produce from agriculture will always be necessary for man's consumption and his very life.

I cannot stress too emphatically that we in this House and those at Ottawa must see that it is kept on top as an economic and viable industry. Too long have the farmers been neglected and kept barely above the poverty line. Oh, when I think of that LIFT Program, Mr. Speaker, and how we opposed it in Opposition and yet they went ahead with it in Ottawa, what a disgraceful let down for the West. One Tory Member in Ottawa estimated the loss to be \$600 million. I don't think that any government that would pull off such a faux pas deserves to rule.

The smaller farmer and the family farm must be preserved. The farmer today must be guaranteed security and stability. Just as I advocate a guaranteed income for the laborer, I also say we must have a guaranteed income for the farmer. To have stability, the farmer must first of all have a decent price for his produce, floor prices for hogs and cattle and other livestock, would give him measures of security and stability for those engaged in mixed farming. The Speech from the Throne asks us to strengthen the hog marketing commission and to expand livestock production and other new farming operations through an incentives and a credit plan, to be known as FarmStart and these are all good. However, I say the best way to give security and stability to farmers is to have a proper and regular cash flow of money to him for current needs. This cannot be established through credit and advances on grain. Yes, he must have a regular guaranteed income. A two-price system is needed with some teeth in it, not the two-price system for wheat bought that is used domestically, this is not the answer. In this day and age the farmer should be paid \$3 per bushel for the 2,500 bushels of wheat sold, giving him a guaranteed income for that number of bushels of \$7,500. The remainder of his grain could be sold at regular prices. This is what is needed for the small and family farmer. This is a correct two-price system, not only will he remain on the farm, but others will anxiously be looking to start farming. Ottawa and the Wheat Board must act soon and with a minority government this is our opportunity to get things done for once for the West.

Some Hon. Members: — Hear, hear!

Mr. Baker: — Farmers must stand together if politicians don't do their job. In order to help the farmers steps must be taken to achieve full collective bargaining, so that you can negotiate prices for your produce. I strongly advocate this. We also need rapid diversification in the farming industry, similar to the days of mixed farming we had in Saskatchewan in order to help solve the exodus of farmers. We must continue to support and keep our Wheat Board, but it is time that all grains be included to handle the produce of farmers. I commend the young dynamic Minister, Jack Messer, and our Government for the Land Bank program.

Some Hon. Members: — Hear, hear!

Mr. Baker: — This will also give security and stability to our farm economy and save the family farm. I am sure that the Minister of Agriculture will keep abreast with needed and changing conditions.

I suggest that the Minimum Wage Board keep a sharp eye on the high costs of living so those on minimum wages do not in the

future get below the poverty line. I am sure there isn't one in this House who would like to see his married daughter or son on a \$1.75 minimum supporting two or three children. If there are, I suggest they stand up and be counted now. Let's keep the purchasing power of our low wage earners within reason so they can have a decent standard of living too. Those who have served an employer for 10 years or more, certainly deserve four weeks holiday with pay. I would hope this House will give serious consideration to such a proposal this year.

Because of what I have discovered throughout the province regarding shopping and store hours, I am looking forward to action within the next year to provincial legislation giving a two-day weekend back to back around our Sundays. I found that many towns and villages now have Monday closing, others have Saturday closing, this keeps Saturday and Sunday or Sunday and Monday closed for their staff and owners. I suggest we pass a law giving this sort of choice to all centres in Saskatchewan which provide two consecutive days off over the weekend. Monday closing has worked well in Regina over the years and I strongly suggest we keep it that way.

It is our democratic government in Saskatchewan that is taking definite steps toward implementing an insured dental health care plan for children under 12 years of age. Once again pioneering a new field for the rest of Canada to adopt. Hopefully this will not take too many moons until it becomes law. We showed courage in assessing the hearing aid situation to reduce costs. Firm steps will also have to be taken over the next while in the field of drug costs too.

Our Government of today in Saskatchewan passed the law including chiropractic care at the last session. An agreement is now reached to provide these services to our people in this province.

Some Hon. Members: — Hear, hear!

Mr. Baker: — While I am not the type of person that boasts, I can say the mission I started on when I was first elected to this House in 1964 is now achieved, or in other words, "mission accomplished." I thank my colleagues on this side of the House for making it possible and those in Opposition who were sincere in their support too.

This Government has always shown concern for rural Saskatchewan, smaller family farms, and small towns which are a way of providing a good quality of life for rural people. Two fine steps taken last fall to create better living conditions in villages and towns were: 1. Operation Open Roads, providing dust-free access roads and, 2. Operation Main Street which assists small towns to blacktop and hard surface their main streets. Natural gas extension services are being built to many towns and villages, a program started by us years ago.

Small towns and villages which serve the farmers and rural people must be preserved, even at great cost. People living in these communities are crying for much needed financial and supporting help if they are to continue to exist. Governments in the past and now did not sufficiently recognize local preferences in the purchasing of marketable and sales goods. contracts were being let without duly giving local people opportunity to bid or sell consigned goods. Over the years while I was with the city

of Regina, preference scales were established for local bidders, whether for contractors or the purchasing of inventory. If the products were up to standards and bids were within a percentage preference, we bought Regina and then Saskatchewan before going beyond our borders. We must cater first of all to our local people and encourage the slogan, "Buy Saskatchewan first." Let's develop our home markets first as other provinces are doing, particularly with our taxpayers' money.

To establish a Crown corporation to participate for exploration of oil and gas in Saskatchewan is certainly a correct one. In fact, I suggested that this be carried out years ago, side by side, with private developers, co-operative efforts, and through provincial public funds. I believe that this step will be a real impetus to create more and new explorations from all sources. We need more petroleum and natural gas at home and abroad, let's get in on this gravy train and by the same token develop our energy resources. We must have increased production, let's become and maintain self-sufficiency as well as provide it for sale to others.

Business, primary and secondary industry in our cities, towns and villages need financial help in the form of loans and grants to expand, to help them to carry inventory and to establish new businesses. While we have set up a small business branch in our industrial branch and extended SEDCO loans to retail businesses and other commercial enterprises, it is still not sufficient to cope with needed demands. Financing and capital requirements present major concerns to our business and industrial firms in cities, towns and villages. Businesses, large or small need long-term loan capital, working or inventory capital, on a short and long-term basis, at low, reasonable interest rates.

Suggestions have been made that we as a government provide more risk capital which is not being made available extensively enough by our present lending institutions. If we as a government do not wish to provide all loan capital, then we should underwrite or co-sign the loans through our banks and credit unions.

There seems to be wide-spread agreement among tourist operators that the legislation and regulations regarding highway signs have resulted in a great loss of business. Changes must be made and fair treatment given to tourist camps, tourist operators in small towns for adequate signs. I am confident that our new Highways Minister (Mr. Kramer) will rectify these inadequacies and protect our tourist trade and business.

Plans to expand our recreation and tourist industry I am sure will be well received. More regional parks are the order of the day for our Saskatchewan people as well as tourist attractions. In line with this, I propose we establish a winter sports and recreational area in the Lumsden and Craven district, including professional and amateur skiing, tobogganing, skidooing and other winter activities for children and adults. \$100,000 was provided last session for the Regina Kings Park extension to be known as Regina Woods and to connect with Condie Dam. I hope the Department of Natural Resources has this in mind and that speedy action has been taken.

To meet increased living costs for our pensioners and to give them the dignity that they deserve, through a proper

standard of living, I hope that Ottawa in conjunction with provincial governments will provide increased pensions. For a single person in need of a supplement the rate should be increased to around \$200-\$225 a month. Also in line with this, the Canada Pension Plan should be revised to pay pensions at 60 years of age for men and 58 years of age for women. A new program to assist our senior citizens in repairing and improving their homes is an outstanding measure for those in need. The retired teachers deserve proper minimums for pensions rather than maximums. We need adequate pensions for all retired teachers. My plea today, particularly, is for those who retired when pensions were low and when living costs were lower.

I am pleased to refer to the Throne Speech indicating that a substantial increase will be made to the Property Improvement Grant, this will be of great help to our property taxpayers and particularly to our pensioners who own homes.

Some Hon. Members: — Hear, hear!

Mr. Baker: — The former Government referred to this as a Homeowner Grant for which they like to take credit. They don't dare tell the Saskatchewan people that I was the first in this Legislature to advocate homeowner grants for property owners. I also advocated that people who rent houses and suites should get a property Improvement Grant too. I mention, too, that Alberta gives a \$100 tax credit to renters on income. I am sure that our fine New Democratic Government will in the future be the first to give some concession to renters in Saskatchewan. The Opposition said we made promises in our New Deal for People, many of us made promises locally to our constituencies but never carried them out. I want to list the promises I made. I said if we were elected we would first remove the cursed deterrent fees. Deterrent fees removed. I said, too, if the NDP were elected I would press for medicare and health care cards for those 65 years of age and over. Plan completed. I said I would continue to press for an insured program for chiropractic treatment. As I stated earlier, "Mission Accomplished."

Some Hon. Members: — Hear, hear!

Mr. Baker: — I have fought for autonomy for our Regina Campus since I was first elected to this House in 1964. I am pleased to see a Bill is to be brought in, as the Speech from the Throne indicates, to assign responsibilities to each campus.

Some Hon. Members: — Hear, hear!

Mr. Baker: — The Dental Care Program I advocated for children under 12 years of age will soon come to fruition.

I promised, too, higher minimum wages for workers, better holidays with pay, equal pay for equal work and free collective bargaining. The plan is completed and will continue.

Some Hon. Members: — Hear, hear!

Mr. Baker: — I also recommended we pay higher Homeowner or Property Improvement Grants. I am sure when the Budget is brought in,

you will see another promise kept.

Mr. Speaker, I could go on and on and enumerate promise after promise fulfilled under the New Deal for People and promised by us as local candidates and Members.

If I had time I would tell of the fine record from 1944 to 1964 of the great things accomplished for those 20 years under the CCF. We should never forget to tell the true story to our people of what Saskatchewan accomplished in those days. We should continue to tell what harm the former government did to our people in this province during their seven years in office .

An. Hon. Member: — Those seven long, lean years.

Mr. Baker: — . particularly in driving out 104,000 people to other parts of this country.

We, as a government, must make sure we keep in touch with our Saskatchewan residents by informing them of the many fine things we are again doing as a government for a more secure and better quality of life.

Mr. Speaker, I support the Motion.

Some Hon. Members: — Hear, hear!

Hon. R. Romanow (Attorney General): — Mr. Speaker, my first words must be congratulations to all of those who have already been congratulated so ably and so much better than I could; the new Members of the Cabinet, to the mover and seconder, the Member from Athabasca (Mr. Guy), to all those I extend my congratulations.

Mr. Speaker, on February 24, 1971, not quite two years ago, the now Leader of the Opposition, then Deputy Leader of the Liberal Government (Mr. Steuart), delivered a dynamic speech to this Legislature in defence of the Prince Albert Pulp Mill agreement and in defence of the proposed new Meadow Lake Pulp Mill. Those of us in the Legislature who heard that speech then, vividly recall the statements of the Leader of the Opposition explaining the forest utilization policy of his Liberal Government. The Leader of the Opposition heaped scorn on those of us who suggested that the timber policy as enunciated by his Government, perhaps, was unwise; Quite understandably that speech, only two years ago, was a passionate statement of policy on forest use in Saskatchewan by the man who was its principal and chief architect.

What was that Liberal policy? Clearly the Leader of the Opposition believed firstly, that large sums of Government financial support was necessary, in fact desirable, to attract pulp mills and other forest operators to the woods of Saskatchewan. Secondly, the Liberal Party believed that there was so much timber available in northern Saskatchewan that such practices as clear-cutting would be permitted, and in fact, were permitted. Thirdly, emphasis on reforestation was minimized and, fourthly, with respect to pollution, in that speech the Leader of the Opposition told this Legislature that he was satisfied with the pollution controls and standards of the new mill and of the Prince Albert mill two years ago because they were the best of

any mill in existence in Canada at that time, notwithstanding the fact that they were generally inadequate throughout all of Canada including in Saskatchewan. That's what we said was wrong with the Liberal policy. But to sum it up the Leader of the Opposition, then Deputy Leader of the Liberal Government, said that the policy was in effect an open-door policy for all private enterprises from everywhere to come in and to make use of the trees and forests of Saskatchewan.

Some Hon. Members: — Hear, hear!

Mr. Romanow: — Clearly, the development of our forests was to be left to private enterprise. Trees were not viewed by the Liberals as property of all the people of this province, to be utilized as such, but rather they were viewed as another commodity for sale, for giveaway, not for sale, for giveaway, for private enterprisers for their own use, for their own profit. As a corollary to this policy, Saskatchewan at the same time, witnessed a sharp reduction in the role played by the Crown owned Saskatchewan Timber Board. In fact, not only a reduction for saw mills operated by the Timber Board that interfered with private enterprise were quickly done away with by the Liberal Government, but even at the expense of many jobs being lost, by many ordinary people working in the Province of Saskatchewan, as was the case in Reserve, Saskatchewan, when that action was taken by the Liberals.

But there was one notable occasion that the Liberals did try their hand at using Crown corporations in force. That one notable occasion turned out to be the fiasco of Big River. Here was a sawmill to be built at Big River, Saskatchewan, by the Deputy Leader, Deputy Premier of the day, for about \$250,000. When we became the Government last year, up to \$600,000, in fact over \$600,000, had been spent and still no completed sawmill in sight at Big River. Its location, its design, its management, was a long series of comical but tragic errors at public expense.

Some Hon. Members: — Hear, hear!

Mr. Romanow: — \$400,000 worth of public expense. \$400,000 worth of expense already made, hundreds of thousands of more dollars yet to be needed if this mill is ever going to be put into an operable position. That was the Liberal attitude and that was the Liberal policy with respect to timber utilization.

Mr. Speaker, I welcomed this year's Speech from the Throne because it firmly puts an end to this give-away policy of the Liberal Party with respect to forests and its use. This Speech from the Throne acknowledges the fact that our forests are a great resource that belong to all the people of our province.

The Speech says that we as Legislators have a duty to utilize that precious resource in the best interests of those who own it — the people. Clearly that Speech from the Throne is an alternative program to the program of the Liberals, the Liberal give-away that I just explained. To the Liberal policy of clear-cutting, to the Liberal policy of no concern for environment control. By greater involvement by Government we are going to ensure that our forests are viewed, not from the narrow perspective of short-run profit and loss for the friends of the Liberal Party, but in the long-run interests of all the people of

the Province of Saskatchewan.

Some Hon. Members: — Hear, hear!

Mr. Romanow: — Now, Mr. Speaker, one must speculate as to what position the Leader of the Opposition and the Liberal Party will take today, in 1973, on forest use. What position will they take when our Government moves to implement this new forest utilization policy announced in the Speech from the Throne?

We know, for example, that in December 1972, about a month and a half ago, the Liberal convention was held in Saskatchewan. It passed the motion which censured the Leader of the Opposition and the former Liberal Government on this issue.

The Leader-Post, December 5, 1972 says this, quote:

Liberal Leader Steuart said at a news conference he understood that (referring to the resolution) to be a clear indication. A clear indication that the Party membership felt that timber use policies of the Party when it was in Government were not good enough.

Not good enough, Mr. Speaker, that's a mild understatement to say not good enough. If the policies of the former Deputy Premier so strongly advocated by him and by his cohorts in this House in 1971 are today, less than two years, not good enough, then Saskatchewan voters will want to know what it is exactly today that the Liberals do think is good enough.

Now essentially there are two alternatives for the Liberals to take. On the one hand the Liberals can restate their position of two years ago and say that we are going to allow the forests, if they should become the government, to continue to be harvested and used by private enterprise, for private enterprise, as was the case in February of 1971. On the other hand, the Liberals can support greater participation by government on the principle that this being done on behalf of the people of the province. These are clearly the two choices.

The Speech from the Throne has told Saskatchewan what road we intend to travel. We intend to travel down the road of government involvement because that forest is for the people.

Some Hon. Members: — Hear, hear!

Mr. Romanow: — That's the road we will travel. But what road will the Leader of the Opposition travel? If he strongly believed two years ago in a policy of private resource give-away, can it be assumed that he will be consistent today and support that policy today? If he so strongly believed two years ago in a policy of private resource give-away, will he reject that policy today and support the Speech from the Throne? What if he supports our approach in the Speech from the Throne, will his Liberal Party followers say that he has left the boys to join the men? What if he rejects our policy then will his Party followers say that he has failed to follow the Liberal convention resolution, that he isn't listening to the Liberal Party when they condemn him on his former policies and practices and that they want to change? And if the Liberal leader fails to follow our policy and fails to follow Liberal convention

direction, will the Liberals still permit him to be one of the boys, or at least leading the boys?

Mr. Speaker, that is truly sitting on the horns of a dilemma and feeling it too.

Some Hon. Members: — Hear, hear!

Mr. Romanow: — That's the position of the Liberal Party today.

Mr. Speaker, this whole issue of forest utilization points up an even wider problem facing Saskatchewan Liberals and in many ways facing politics in Saskatchewan today. It illustrates the major political problem of the Liberal Party in this province. For seven years in Government and 18 months in Opposition the Liberal Party has committed itself to the principle of political expediency at the expense of public credibility. Virtually every day Saskatchewan sees a change in issues by the Liberals opposite. Many examples abound, many of the changes are so blatant as to be absurd.

As early as two years ago the Leader of the Opposition vigorously believed in and implemented deterrent fees. For political expediency today he opposes deterrent fees. As early as two years ago the Leader of the Opposition vigorously believed in and implemented compulsory arbitration on our working men in Bill 2. For political expediency today he opposes Bill 2, or so he says, he opposes Bill 2. Less than two years ago the Leader of the Opposition voted against the NDP when we sought to institute an Independent Electoral Boundaries Commission.

Some Hon. Members: — Hear, hear!

Mr. Romanow: — For political expediency today, he says he is for an Electoral Boundaries Commission.

As I said, Mr. Speaker, this Legislature is full of such unashamed reversals by the Liberals opposite. What is the effect of this commitment to the principle of political expediency? In order to have public credibility as a political party, there must be an underlying philosophy and a consistent overall program to implement that philosophy. Program and philosophy of a party don't change daily as one would change his shirt daily. When there are repeated contradictions and reversals there can be no identifiable policy and thus the public has a difficult time, I would say an impossible time, to know exactly where the Liberals stand on anyone of the major issues facing Saskatchewan today.

Some Hon. Members: — Hear, hear!

Mr. Romanow: — Quite naturally, Mr. Speaker, political expediency soon becomes the password of individual Liberal MLAs as well.

For example, December 23, 1972 the Leader-Post quoted the former Minister of Welfare, now the Member from Milestone (Mr. MacDonald) on the matter of Mr. Loyde Holmes, Deputy Minister of Highways, taking up duties as the head of the Saskatchewan Government Computer Corporation and the Leader-Post

says this quote:

Cy MacDonald called Mr. Holmes' departure from the Highways Department the worst political firing yet perpetrated by the NDP.

Well, Mr. Speaker, moving from one high paid job, as head of the Department, to another high paid job as head of a Department is some political firing.

Mr. Speaker, the Member from Milestone will take part in this debate. That's an example of the type of statements made by him and all of the Members opposite. The people of Saskatchewan should never believe anything that the Leader of the Opposition and the Member from Milestone tell them about political areas.

Some Hon. Members: — Hear, hear!

Mr. Romanow: — Then we had another incredible example yesterday. The former critic on Agriculture, the Member from Cannington (Mr. Weatherald) was making a tremendous speech, in fact he continued this afternoon on political patronage, and he said that this Government had a terrible record on political patronage and then he went on to say, and I quote from Hansard of last night, referring to the Minister of Highways (Mr. Kramer) quote:

In any event the Minister of Highways in his usual fashion got underway and talked about political appointments. Well I'll give him one from the Parks system, the construction superintendent at Battleford. You can try that one, (the Member from Cannington said). 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 (he said to the Minister of Highways) your seatmate made it, (referring to the Minister of Natural Resources of Northern Saskatchewan, Mr. Bowerman).

Well, today, Mr. Speaker, the Minister of Natural Resources tabled the answer. Question 184 and lo and behold when do you think this great political patronage appointment was made by the NDP — April 1, 1970.

Some Hon. Members: — Hear, hear!

Mr. Romanow: — Do you know that this man has been an employee of the Department of Resources since that time. The job was advertised and he got the position that was referred to.

Mr. Steuart: — Name him!

Mr. Romanow: — I won't name him. The answer is tabled but I am not going to use his name because I have no axe to grind against the man. I am not going to bandy around names of people as carelessly as you do over the radio and off the radio in the course of this Legislature.

Some Hon. Members: — Hear, hear!

Mr. Romanow: — But, Mr. Speaker, the Member

from Cannington, said that that was a political hiring and political patronage was rampant. With those types of facts I wonder if he was thinking about the 1970s. Was it a political patronage of the 1970s or of the 1973s? The Member from Cannington doesn't know what he is talking about when he talks about political patronage.

Some Hon. Members: — Hear, hear!

Mr. Romanow: — The Member from Cannington, the Member from Milestone, the Leader of the Opposition, none of them know any political patronage about this Government. They knew less about political patronage when they were in government though. I could tell you, Mr. Speaker, a list that would take for the balance of the radio time, Members such as George Trapp, former Minister of Education, hired by them with the SPC; Paul Dojack hired in Social Services; Betty Sear, Alcoholism Commission; Ron Atcheson, SGIO, and may I say, Mr. Speaker, still working for this Government, based on merit.

Some Hon. Members: — Hear, hear!

Mr. Romanow: — Provincial Liberal candidates Frank Kleefeld, Pat McCarrow, Walter Erb, Bill Clarke, working for the Provincial Youth Agency, Fred Larson, Lou Duddridge — all of these were candidates at one stage or the other for the Liberal Party and the Member for Cannington today while on radio time in the House, in this Legislature, said, Mr. Speaker:

What bothers me is not that these are political appointments, what bothers me is that political parties who make these political appointments and these boys still continue politicking.

Not that anyone would ever accuse Mr. Walter Erb, the former Minister, the former Chairman in charge of Workmen's Compensation Board, as ever politicking.

An. Hon. Member: — No, no!

Mr. Romanow: — No. Where was the principles of the Member from Cannington at that time? Where are the principles of the Liberal Party when they had all sorts of men running around this province from a variety of political patronage jobs doing the work for the Liberal Party, where were his principles then?

The simple fact of the matter is that the Liberal Party had the biggest political patronage machine ever that this province has ever seen and we are trying to clean it up, Mr. Speaker.

Some Hon. Members: — Hear, hear!

Mr. Romanow: — Mr. Speaker, I tell you about political expediency. Let me give you another example. The Leader of the Opposition said in his speech during question period, before one of the debates, he got up and he talked about the Legislative Committee on Welfare. Oh! All of us recall how he came bursting through that paper door of the Opposition, like a superman, about how

outrageous it was, that the interim report on Welfare was so short, a waste of money. What he didn't tell the House was that the Liberal Members on that Committee voted unanimously for that Welfare Report. What he didn't tell the House was that there wasn't even one voice of objection or one minority report and yet, he would have the people believe that somehow the Government was at fault because all of his Members had agreed with all of the other Members that no report in a final form should be made at this particular time.

Mr. Speaker, this is an image of the Liberals of contradiction and confusion. They say that the Cabinet is inaccessible to the people. They criticize the Minister of Social Welfare (Mr. Taylor) for going out to meet the people and then when he goes out and travels to meet the people they say we misuse public funds. They say the Premier is inaccessible to the people when the Premier goes on a summer tour to meet the people, then they say he is politicking. Mr. Speaker, crass political expediency. I say to the people of the Province of Saskatchewan, don't believe anything the Leader of the Opposition and the Liberals say.

Some Hon. Members: — Hear, hear!

Mr. Romanow: — Now, Mr. Speaker, when a party has no consistent policy or program then it has to resort to clichés and slogans, slogans that it hopes will gain them temporary favor. One example is the Leader of the Opposition calling the Speech from the Throne a socialist document. He said that this socialist document would separate the boys from the men. To the Opposition I say, boys, it will certainly do that.

Some Hon. Members: — Hear, hear!

Mr. Romanow: — I suppose the most blatant example of sloganeering is found on the Liberal attack on the Land Bank. Simply put, the Liberal Party would have the Saskatchewan farmer believe that the Land Bank is somehow a gigantic plot to socialize the farmers' farm lands.

Mr. Gardner: — Hear, hear!

Mr. Romanow: — Hear, hear, the Member from Moosomin (Mr. Gardner) says. I know two or three others that just repeat what I have said, Mr. Speaker, they agree. Is that position really believable today in the 1970s? I am told that in the middle 1940s when the CCF first came to power, the slogan of the then Liberal Party was that the CCF would nationalize farm lands. Liberals ran around the province playing on the fears and prejudices and good faith of our hard working farmers in the '40s, especially those farmers who came from Eastern Europe. They wanted to come to Canada for special reasons. They were determined, the Liberals were in the 1940s, to tear down the CCF on the slogan of socialism even if it meant in the process destroying programs for farmers.

Some Hon. Members: — Hear, hear!

Mr. Romanow: — Yet, I don't know of one case, of one piece of farm

land that was socialized anywhere in the Province of Saskatchewan. Can anybody on the opposite side tell me? Can the Leader of the Opposition tell me? Of course not. It is nonsense, it is silliness to talk of socialization of farm lands and for 20 years at each election honest and hard working farmers simply didn't believe the Liberal Party. Credibility? They defeated the Liberals every time out for 20 years at the polls. So Members of the Legislative Assembly and, Mr. Speaker, you will excuse my somewhat muffled laughter when today in 1973 lo and behold again, Saskatchewan sees Liberalism of the '40s rejuvenated and riding high in the '70s with a brand new slogan, 'Steuart or Slavery.'

Some Hon. Members: — Hear, hear!

Mr. Romanow: — Now, Mr. Speaker, it may be a different slogan from the 1940s but I want to tell the people of this province that it is the same old Liberal Party. I want to tell the people of this province that it is the same old Liberal men populating the party opposite. And it is the same old Liberal purpose. Destroy the NDP and gain political office even at the price of Saskatchewan hard-working farmers.

Some Hon. Members: — Hear, hear!

Mr. Romanow: — So once again, Mr. Speaker, we see the big single problem of the Liberals' incredibility. Farmers know that Liberals won't tackle problems of marketing, farm population or diversification. I haven't heard them in this debate once talk about those issues. Farmers see right through Liberal slogans. They see right through Liberal slogans and at the other end they see the Federal Task Force Report on Agriculture and the Liberal Party waiting for them.

The Federal Task Force on Farming is the basis of Liberal farm policy. Every farmer in this province knows that it wants to remove two out of every three farmers from the land. Federal legislation such as the Stabilization Bill was to achieve that object. Operation LIFT which could go down as one of the cruellest hoaxes in the history of this country was part of that plan.

Some Hon. Members: — Hear, hear!

Mr. Romanow: — Those were Bills introduced in Parliament and promoted by the Liberals opposite and the Liberals in Regina. When the Stabilization Bill was brought in, we New Democrats said we would not accept it. We fought it. We defeated it. I am saying that the farmers of Saskatchewan are better and appreciated the fact that we had the guts to stand up for them.

Some Hon. Members: — Hear, hear!

Mr. Romanow: — We are not going to sell out our small family farmer at the expense of a Stabilization Bill, as you, Mr. Leader of the Opposition and the Liberals opposite are prepared to do.

Now comes the Small Farm Development Program. Every farmer knows that this program as it was first presented was the

continuation of Liberal policy of two out of every three farmers off the land. Because it was an inducement to make it easier to buy out the small farmer. Everything of that program was designed to make it easier to buy out the small farmer and to encourage him to sell out. When the Leader of the Opposition goes to Ottawa and tells Mr. Trudeau and his Liberal friends to force the Federal Small Farms Program down the throats of Saskatchewan farmers, I say I shows again that the Liberals don't believe in the preservation and maintenance of the family farm in Saskatchewan.

Some Hon. Members: — Hear, hear!

Mr. Romanow: — But I believe that Mr. Eugene Whelan, the Minister of Agriculture will have more common sense than to listen to the Leader of the Opposition. He will make changes as he has made changes already in this Bill. We congratulate Mr. Eugene Whelan in this area for making changes and congratulate the Minister of Agriculture for fighting for those changes for our farmers. I urge the Provincial Minister of Agriculture (Mr. Messer) to continue his fight on behalf of our small farmer and to not sign that agreement until those objections are removed so that the Small Farm Development Plan really becomes an instrument of support for rural Saskatchewan.

Some Hon. Members: — Hear, hear!

Mr. Romanow: — So, Mr. Speaker, the Liberal farm program is basically two things. First, bring down the Land Bank on the slogan of socialism. And secondly, show your steadfast commitment to the Federal Task Force Report on Farming.

I said they have been inconsistent. On one matter they have been totally consistent. They have been totally consistent against the principle of orderly marketing. In the old days every farmer in this province knows that the Liberal Party certainly fought the formation of the Canadian Wheat Board, tooth and nail. Everybody knows the Liberals were against the Canadian Wheat Board and orderly marketing. I recall two years ago in this House, and this will be the only reference I make to a Member who I know is ill and not in his seat and not able to defend himself, the Member for Rosthern (Mr. Boldt) when he attacked the Canadian Wheat Board. I can go on and cite other speeches of the now late Premier, the Leader of the Opposition sniping away at the principle of orderly marketing. It is not surprising therefore to see them oppose orderly marketing in the form of a Hog Marketing Commission.

No matter how the Leader of the Opposition portrays it, no matter what you say, I say that the basic stance of the Liberal Party in Saskatchewan is to oppose orderly marketing and the Hog Marketing Commission.

Some Hon. Members: — Hear, hear!

Mr. Romanow: — You, Mr. Leader of the Opposition have chosen to get your Liberal Party directly against the Saskatchewan Wheat Pool, the National Farmers Union and a whole host of our farm organizations and the benefits of all the farmers of the province of Saskatchewan. And you are supporting him, Mr. Member

From Morse (Mr. Wiebe).

Mr. Wiebe: — Name the time, the place, the date .

Mr. Romanow: — When the Liberal Caucus calls for a vote on the Hog Marketing Commission I can only say in rebuttal that the vice-president of the Saskatchewan Wheat Pool, Mr. Boden, has got the right answer, reported by the Minister of Agriculture and I repeat, we are getting tired of the very obvious political manoeuvring by certain groups who want to scuttle the plan. And I say high on Mr. Bowden's list should be the Liberal Party who as political manoeuvring through this call of a vote want to scuttle the principle and the plan of orderly marketing.

Some Hon. Members: — Hear, hear!

Mr. Romanow: — That is what is behind this vote. And let no farmer be fooled.

Mr. Speaker, I guess what I am really saying is that Saskatchewan is truly disappointed in the Liberal Opposition. What I am really saying is that they are still the same old bunch of boys that nearly brought Saskatchewan down in their seven years of government.

Mr. T.M. Weatherald (Cannington): — Mr. Speaker, on a point of privilege. The Attorney General saw fit to lay a charge that I was incorrect in a statement. I may well have been incorrect .

Mr. Speaker: — Order, order! An incorrect statement as a matter of debate can be raised at the end of his speech. If it is a personal matter it is different.

Mr. MacDonald (Milestone): — On a Point of Order, Mr. Speaker. The Attorney General stood in this House and accused him of being deliberately misleading and a falsehood. That's a question of personal privilege.

Mr. Weatherald: — The information the Attorney General wanted immediately, Mr. Speaker, and I may have been incorrect in the job description, but I was not incorrect in the political appointment and the man's name is Alex Colthar and the Minister of Natural Resources can get up right now and deny that it was not a political appointment.

Mr. Speaker: — Order, order! That is a debating point.

Mr. Romanow: — Mr. Speaker, as I say and nothing could illustrate my point better. I believe the Member for Cannington said a Point of Order.

Mr. Weatherald: — It was a political appointment .

Mr. Speaker: — Order, order! The Hon. Member realizes that is a debating point and can't be raised. If it is a personal attack then it is a Point of Privilege. But if information is not the same that is a debating point.

Mr. Romanow: — Mr. Speaker, in many ways I am very thankful for the interjection by the Hon. Member because it illustrates to all of Saskatchewan, which is another stock and trade tactic for the Liberal Party, obstructionism and disrespect for this House and you, Mr. Speaker.

Some Hon. Members: — Hear, hear!

Mr. Romanow: — What I was going to say, Mr. Speaker, was that people in Saskatchewan can see this. It is the same old bunch of boys that nearly brought Saskatchewan down in its seven years of government, seven years of inept management. They are losing supporters quickly. Things are really serious when the true blue allies of the Saskatoon Star-Phoenix describes the Liberal Opposition in this way, quote:

One wonders why they sometimes resort to tactics of attack which fail to satisfy logical analysis.

That was the Star-Phoenix editorial dated Friday, February 2, 1973. The Star-Phoenix says to you, Mr. Leader of the Opposition with respect to the Speech from the Throne, he said your speech was, quote:

Reminiscent of the red scare tactics used by the Liberal leaders during the 1950s.

Some Hon. Members: — Hear, hear!

Mr. Romanow: — Please note, Mr. Speaker, that this is the Star-Phoenix. This is the Star-Phoenix saying that the Liberal Party is using tactics of the 1950s, scare tactics. Now if the Star-Phoenix says it, then it truly must be a very old scare tactic by the Members opposite.

Some Hon. Members: — Hear, hear!

Mr. Romanow: — Then the Star-Phoenix went on to say Liberal criticism should be based, quote:

On sound and scientific analysis, and not scare tactics.

Then the editorial writers conclude by saying:

In using the word socialist in his remarks will not produce positive results for Mr. Steuart in Saskatchewan. The people may be wary of socialism but they are not frightened by it.

Some Hon. Members: — Hear, hear!

Mr. Romanow: — Mr. Speaker, the postscript to my remarks on the Speech

from the Throne debate, my postscript to that Star-Phoenix editorial is that the people not only are not frightened by socialism but they realize in this province that socialism provides a consistent philosophy, an overall program of believability that farmers, working men and small businessmen can identify with in all of Saskatchewan.

Some Hon. Members: — Hear, hear!

Mr. Romanow: — My postscript to that editorial is to say this to the Opposition. Saskatchewan begs the Opposition Leader (Mr. Steuart) to stop being irresponsible, be positive. Saskatchewan says reject slogans, clichés and name calling and obstructionism in this House. Reject the tactics of your party of the 1950s as the Star-Phoenix is urging you to do.

Mr. Leader of the Opposition this speech you said, divides the boys from the men. Well boys, I say come on over and join the men.

Some Hon. Members: — Hear, hear!

Mr. Romanow: — Join the men who are working for a positive tomorrow, but alas, I believe that your party dominated by men from the '50s, calcified boys from the '50s. Calcified in the program and the slogans of the '40s that Saskatchewan can do nothing else but to continue to look to the future and the dynamic leadership of Premier Blakeney and this Government. I will support the motion.

Some Hon. Members: — Hear, hear!

Hon. G. Snyder (Minister of Labour): — Mr. Speaker, I should first of all like to take this opportunity to extend my warmest and my most sincere congratulations to the mover and the seconder of the Address-in-Reply for the very able and very enthusiastic manner in which they performed their time honored duty.

The task is one, Mr. Speaker, which implies a recognition of the sincerity and the ability of those who are chosen to move and second His Honour's Address. These two Members and their constituents from Nutana South and from Gravelbourg have every reason to be proud of the contribution made by these two new Members.

Some Hon. Members: — Hear, hear!

Mr. Snyder: — I should also like to take this opportunity, Mr. Speaker, to offer my congratulations to the newest additions to the Provincial Cabinet. Those of us who have responsibility for various departments of this Government have welcomed the enthusiasm and the diligence and the very capable performance of these new and youthful Ministers who have joined us since the House last met.

I trust my remarks will not be misunderstood, Mr. Speaker, when I refer to them as new and youthful, I don't wish to represent myself by any stretch of the imagination as being old and seasoned. But I believe it is, however, a rather awesome spectacle to contemplate that only two Liberal Members opposite,

Mr. Speaker, have been able to withstand the scrutiny of the electorate for more than a decade. Of the 60 Members that were elected to this Assembly in the 1960 general election, only the Member from Athabasca (Mr. Guy) and the Member for Rosthern (Mr. Boldt) are still able to occupy a seat in this chamber, representing the Liberal Party. I think this fact, Mr. Speaker, must have impressed Liberal advocates who will question the relatively short life of Liberal Members in this House in recent years. The high mortality rate is not a suggestion that many of these Members lacked ability, nor can it be said that they failed to make known the principles and the objectives of the Liberal Party. Perhaps they did it too well and perhaps this is how they failed.

Saskatchewan people, Mr. Speaker, are keen, sensitive and discerning people. They sense by a political antenna which is peculiar to Saskatchewan people, the degree to which political parties and individual Members genuinely feel about the needs of the people whom they represent.

Over the years, Mr. Speaker, the Liberal Party, especially when in the majority position in the government has been callous and it has been arrogant, it has been unmindful of the needs of those who are least able to speak for themselves. When Saskatchewan people needed leadership most they were neglected and forgotten by Liberal Governments — both federal and provincial. Charges of arrogance levelled by the Leader of the Opposition when he spoke in the debate on Monday last, had a very hollow ring about them indeed.

I ask you to recall the period in time when Saskatchewan farmers suffered their most severe economic depression since the very dreadful days of the 1930s — recall the Liberal Prime Minister of that day and the question — “Why should I sell your wheat.” Or recall the classic observation of the former Minister of Health, the Member for Whitmore Park (Mr. Grant) when discussing health care and deterrent fees for the sick and the aged, when he suggested at that time to quote him:

That people felt better if they contributed financially to their own recovery.

Or recall if you will, Mr. Speaker, the rather coarse and callous suggestion of a former Liberal Premier a few years ago in relation to the Indian and Métis problems, when he observed among other things, “They breed like rabbits.”

Well, Mr. Speaker, the list of these intemperate Liberal utterances is a lengthy matter of record. For seven years the Thatcher administration exhibited a genuine contempt for Saskatchewan’s working men and women. Each time the cost of living climbed by a single point, some Liberal spokesman was ready to place the entire burden of responsibility on the doorstep of Saskatchewan’s wage earners and those so-called evil labor bosses who represented them.

In 1971, Mr. Speaker, the Liberals suffered a defeat as a result of a systematic accumulation of enemies caused by Liberal arrogance and Liberal contempt. One grain of arsenic in your system won’t kill you, Mr. Speaker, however arsenic like Liberal sins of office, accumulates in your system and finally they become fatal, explaining I believe the existence of the corporal’s guard which sits to your left in this House, Mr. Speaker.

There is a lesson to be learned, I believe, from the composition of the Members in this Chamber. We, on this side of the House, are delighted with the youthful and the vigorous attitude of the new Members and we are also very gratified that the Saskatchewan electorate had indicated the trust and faith of any Members who have served their constituencies for many, many years.

The Speaker of this House, the Hon. Mr. Dewhurst, I expect exemplifies this trust best of all having enjoyed the confidence of his constituents since the year 1945 and I understand is the only man to be elected to this Legislature on eight successive occasions.

The Minister of Highways (Mr. Kramer) whom the Leader of the Opposition likes to chide from time to time has been elected in consecutive elections in the face of saw-offs and Liberal-Tory gang-ups ever since the year 1952.

The Minister of Municipal Affairs (Mr. Wood) has served in this House since 1956 and I expect that he will hold that Swift Current seat just as long as he chooses to seek re-election in Swift Current.

The Member for Melfort-Kinistino (Mr. Thibault) is another hardy perennial who has increased his majority each time around since his arrival in this Chamber in a by-election in 1959.

The Member from Touchwood (Mr. Meakes) and the Member for Souris-Estevan (Mr. Thorson) arrived in 1956 and both returned after an absence.

Those of us who arrived in 1960 included the Premier (Mr. Blakeney), the Member for Regina North West (Mr. Whelan), myself and the Member for Redberry (Mr. Michayluk) whom Liberal gerrymanders except for one thing, and that was the fact that Dicky Michayluk kept coming back with victories, which appeared to be almost impossible if assessed on paper.

My point is this, Mr. Speaker, the New Democratic Party and its predecessor the CCF represents a political philosophy which wears well. Our Party is composed of people who are dedicated to principles which are rooted in humanitarian ideals. The members and the supporters of our Party are people who have contributed unselfishly without the question being asked by them, 'what's in it for me?'

This has been the soul and the spirit of the political party which we represent and of this Government and it is that which makes the distinction which is so very apparent, so very obvious in this House, Mr. Speaker.

On other occasions, Mr. Speaker, I have had the opportunity to draw attention to a number of the very severe economic problems which has plagued the city of Moose Jaw, the constituency which I represent in this House. It will be recalled that Moose Jaw suffered a number of severe economic blows over the past number of years. It will be recalled that Moose Jaw suffered a loss of employment with the dieselization on the Canadian Pacific Railway, the closure of Swift Canadian Packing Plant, the shut down of the Robin Hood Flour Mill, the conversion of the Gulf Oil to an asphalt producer.

Because of its relative location in the shadow of the capital city it is unlikely that Moose Jaw will ever become an industrial giant. I, for one, would be perfectly satisfied to see a modest and orderly growth which will provide sufficient job opportunities to allow for additional employment for our young people to stem the flow from our city to other provincial centres and beyond.

During 1971 and 1972, Mr. Speaker, the pendulum began to swing back with some economic stimulus to the community which I believe gives us reason to be optimistic about the future. We have seen a very substantial recovery in terms of retail sales volumes which has been attributed in the main to improved conditions in agriculture, which effects our city as a major trading area. In addition, there has been activity generated in the form of major expansion to Canaday's Limited with a substantial increase in production and payroll.

The big story in Moose Jaw, however, has to do with in the field of construction — in all fields, in dwellings, commercial, industrial and institutional construction. 1971 and 1972 saw the surge forward in housing starts with house building grants playing a significant role in encouraging this kind of activity.

In 1971 permits to the value of over \$2.3 million were realized with an increase to \$2.5 million in 1972, making a total for the last two years of almost \$5 million compared to only a little over \$1 million in the two previous years, 1969 and 1970. Commercial, institutional and industrial construction showed even more significant gains with permits to the value of \$4.9 million and \$4.8 million being issued in 1971 and 1972, totalling almost \$10 million. This compares to a figure of about \$3 million for the years 1969 and 1970. The total value of construction then, Mr. Speaker, is well in excess of \$14 million making 1971 and 1972 the two best years back to back that Moose Jaw has enjoyed in its history.

The city of Moose Jaw may not be overcrowded with industrial smoke stacks, Mr. Speaker, but our credentials are adequate. It is the best city in Saskatchewan to make your home. We have the newest and possibly the best Y.M.-Y.W.C.A. and newly completed hospital facilities to supplement existing facilities. We have a good recreational system and we have the finest school plant to be found on the Prairies, I believe, and most important, good people with the kind of vigor and kind of tenacity which explains the success of the annual Kinsmen Band Festival, the Provincial Air Show and the first edition of the Saskatchewan Summer Games which were held last year.

Some of the people who are responsible for the success of these ventures have also indicated a vital concern with the prospect of a new Western Development Museum for Moose Jaw and they also wait the consultants report with respect to the possibility of the conversion of the present Wild Animal Park to a Provincial zoo.

Probably the most overpowering preoccupation revolves around the Qu'Appelle Basin Study which was completed just a short while ago, and the need for the reclamation of the Moose Jaw River in order that this God-given resource may be restored to its original state. I am happy to say that the Minister of the Environment (Mr. Byers) has indicated that the study is not intended to gather dust on some obscure shelf.

I feel obliged for a moment, Mr. Speaker, somewhat reluctantly, to comment for a brief moment on the performance of the Member for Moose Jaw North (Mr. MacDonald) when he spoke in House on the Throne Speech Debate on Thursday last. And I say I comment somewhat reluctantly, it is in light of the fact that when he is criticized for any of his actions in this House he takes on an air of injured innocence and immediately reports to his executive and to the Times Herald that he has somehow been wounded when the inaccuracies of his statements are drawn to his attention.

When he entered this House a few months ago, Mr. Speaker, this Member attempted to present the image of responsibility and objectivity. An early statement placed him on record as deploring partisan political wrangling in these Legislative Chambers.

Well, Mr. Speaker, this Member has been surrounded by his Liberal colleagues for a year and a half and the company that he has kept has had a detrimental effect on his thought processes and his approach to the work of this Legislature. In a few short months he has appeared to adapt very well to the Liberal environment and he has learned to quote out of context, inaccurately and use facts with wild abandon. A complete lack of originality or imagination, he joined other Liberals in charging that this Government had somehow failed to listen or to consult with Saskatchewan people. At the same time, as the Attorney General (Mr. Romanow) mentioned only moments ago, his colleagues have consistently deplored the cost of intersessional committees and other methods of dialogue and communication which this Government has used very effectively over the past year and a half.

This Member, Mr. Speaker, accused the Minister of Agriculture (Mr. Messer), the Premier (Mr. Blakeney) and myself and other Ministers of failing to consult with the Saskatchewan electorate with respect to legislative changes and policy decisions. I believe we can say, without fear of contradiction, Mr. Speaker, that no other government in the province's history has ever made such a genuine and sincere effort to communicate with and to listen to Saskatchewan people as has been the case over the last 18 months.

Members will recall the series of meetings that were held to discuss the Land Bank where the Minister of Agriculture travelled about the province for the purpose of informing and listening to Saskatchewan farmers prior to the introduction of the program. The Agricultural Committee has provided the opportunity for many thousands of Saskatchewan residents to communicate with the Government through this medium.

The intersessional committee on Welfare has provided a very useful vehicle for Saskatchewan people to make their opinions known to the Government and for the people to make their voices heard. The Small Businesses Committee has provided the opportunity for dialogue with the business community and has opened up lines of communication here.

We, in the Department of Labour, have made ourselves readily available to the Saskatchewan community by making it known that the office of the Department of Labour is one which is readily accessible to both employers and employees for the purpose of providing information, assistance and advice. The Deputy

February 6, 1973

Minister of Labour and myself spent two full weeks in September in visiting employee groups, both organized and unorganized, meetings with Chambers of Commerce, Boards of Trade, service clubs and other organizations, during that period of time. We discussed with them proposed legislation and I believe we benefited by the advice which they offered during that September visit which took us to nine different cities.

It is our intention to lay the findings of the Workmen's Compensation Task Force before similar bodies and enter into discussion with them before recommendations contained in that report are implemented.

In light of this, Mr. Speaker, I am somewhat appalled that Members opposite can claim that this Government has, in effect, failed to communicate with Saskatchewan people.

The most incredible statement of all came from the Member of Moose Jaw North (Mr. MacDonald) — and I am pleased that he is back in the Chamber — when he repeated on several occasions that he, too, had a mandate from the people. I believe, Mr. Speaker, that it is fitting for just a moment, perhaps, to have a look at the mandate to which the Member from Moose Jaw North refers.

It will be known, Mr. Speaker, that the city of Moose Jaw has approximately 20,000 eligible voters. After two successive blatant Liberal gerrymanders, the constituency of Moose Jaw North was drawn to encompass approximately 6,000 voters, with approximately 14,000 residing in Moose Jaw South. This is sort of a classic understanding that Liberals seem to have with respect to the principles of representation by population.

Following this very delicate adjustment of boundaries, which has to be described as probably the most bare-faced gerrymander in Canadian history, the Member for Moose Jaw North managed to emerge from the 1971 general election with a majority of 135 votes. Had the city of Moose Jaw been divided equally into two constituencies, with 10,000 voters in each, the Member for Moose Jaw North would have seen this Legislative Chamber from the visitors' gallery and from the visitor's gallery only.

Some Hon. Members: — Hear, hear!

Mr. Snyder: — If the city of Moose Jaw is divided into two equal constituencies by a straight line, running north and south, or east and west, or dividing the city diagonally from the northeast to the southwest, or from the southeast to the northwest, there is no conceivable way, no honest way, that a Liberal can be elected to the Saskatchewan Legislature from the city of Moose Jaw. Yet, Mr. Speaker, the Member from Moose Jaw North is sufficiently shameless and imprudent to draw attention to what he regards as his mandate to take his place in these Legislative Chambers.

Although I want to say something, Mr. Speaker, about the achievements of the Government in general terms, my modest contribution to this Debate will lie primarily in the field of labor policy. I realize that some of the points on labor legislation have been mentioned in this House previously, however, in light of resolutions introduced at the recent Liberal convention another review is perhaps indicated because the topic of labor

seems rather belatedly to have trapped the imagination and the attention of the Members opposite.

Apparently in repentance for past sins, they have taken the magnanimous step of endorsing the system of free collective bargaining with a minimum of government intervention. Unfortunately, Mr. Speaker, their conversion didn't last too long, since another resolution on the Liberal Order Paper seems to be directed towards "right to work" legislation, a position in which they would be at home with the dinosaurs, but completely isolated from the realities of 20th century industrial society. They apparently, according to these Liberal resolutions, Mr. Speaker, also attempt to develop a piece of wizardry under which Workmen's Compensation benefits will be increased according to the resolution and at the same time assessment rates will be lowered. They express concern for the employees' rights, but at the same time they condemn The Technological Change Act, which is expressly intended to protect employees' rights with regard to job displacement caused by automation.

In all, Mr. Speaker, one is inclined to observe that inasmuch as the Members of the Opposition are somewhat unaccustomed to involving themselves in the inconsequential affairs of the labor force, they have managed at long last to produce a package of resolutions which are at once unnecessary, unrealistic, outmoded and contradictory.

I think, Mr. Speaker, that the severest of critics across the way can hardly maintain with any degree of credibility that this administration has been a do-nothing Government. In point of fact, this administration has of necessity been hyperactive in taking remedial action to fill an almost total void as a result of a lack of government activity from the years 1964 to 1971. And as a result of the morbid performance of the previous administration, the present Government has been forced to devote a good deal of its attention to the overhauling of the machinery of government, in order to make it possible to function effectively at existing activity levels. In addition, we have introduced a record volume of what we believe to be good legislation and program direction leading to the provision of more and better services to the people of Saskatchewan.

I should like to spend a few minutes of my time to draw to your attention, Mr. Speaker, a brief summary of some of the more significant accomplishments of the Government over the past 18 months. I suppose it is somewhat redundant to make too much reference to agriculture in the light of the very excellent job accomplished by my seatmate only yesterday. However, in the Department of Agriculture, we have seen the establishment of the Land Bank, which will facilitate land transfer and make it possible for older farmers to retire with security and for younger farmers to get started in agriculture with some hope of success. The first land sale that will be recalled was completed on January 10th. In addition, we have seen restrictions removed on the sale of margarine to strengthen the position of rapeseed growers in the province and to stimulate the growth of secondary industries in Saskatchewan. Assistance has been provided to the Saskatchewan dairy industry and the crop insurance program has been extended. In addition we have seen a year extension of the Livestock Loans Guarantee which has been provided to assist farmers to acquire cattle for breeding purposes. We have seen provision made for compulsory veterinary inspection at auction markets to prevent the spread of disease

in animals. There has been an increase in the ceiling on grants to veterinary districts and in the maximum government subsidy for the capital cost of veterinary Clinics. There has been an increase in the ceiling of sharable costs for irrigation projects. These and many other programs, a number announced in the Throne speech, have made the Department of Agriculture, under the direction of my seatmate, an active and alive department since the do-nothing years from 1964 to 1971.

I think it would have to be mentioned, Mr. Speaker, that significant progress towards the attainment of Government's objectives with respect to the provision of adequate health care for Saskatchewan people. Deterrent fees have been abolished and the Liberals opposite hardly dare to make mention of the story of deterrent fees which is well known to Saskatchewan people and which undoubtedly contributed to their downfall in 1971. In acknowledgment of our special health needs of our senior citizens, medicare premiums for those who are 65 have been removed, benefiting more than 98,000 senior citizens in our province. A dental therapist training program has been developed which will serve as a springboard for a dental care program for children as was promised in the New Deal for People.

Exemption from charges by the Government against the estates of the mentally ill were removed. Only last week the Minister of Health (Mr. Smishek) announced the inclusion of chiropractic service as an insured service under the Hospital and Medicare Plan. In addition, increased grants to the Alcoholism Commission have been made to provide in-patient services in Saskatoon. The increased grant will allow for the commission to assist in the development of alcoholism programs for people of native ancestry. The Core Services Administration has been set up to co-ordinate Government services to be provided to the mentally retarded and the Government has approved a centralized two-year psychiatric nursing training program under the Department of Education.

Turning very briefly to Highways, Mr. Speaker, the Government has moved to preserve our rural way of life through the implementation of the dual program, operation Open Roads and Operation Main Street. This program is providing dust-free access to all small communities on the province's highway system. At the same time, of course, the Department of Highways has continued to improve major highways and expand at a moderate rate- the four-lane highway network.

Reference should be made, Mr. Speaker, to the housing program operated by the Department of Municipal Affairs, the thrust of which has been aimed at the provision of housing for senior citizens and low-income people. Moreover, there is evidence of the Government's intention to revitalize the towns and villages which serve the rural community. We have introduced the Property Improvement Grant available to all homeowners, small business men and farmers to provide for more equitable relief for property taxes and to encourage property improvement.

The Government's Social Services Program has been modified and improved. Measures have been taken to increase food allowances for public assistance recipients keeping in mind the sharp increase in living costs over the last number of years. It is important to note that Saskatchewan Correction Study Committee Report which was released last July and a number of its

recommendations dealing with a need for community-based programs and for the integration of probational, institutional services and community correction services has been implemented.

Under a new government policy the development of non-profit Special Care Homes rather than commercial ones, is being encouraged. Particular emphasis has been placed on the development of community resources as an alternative to institutionalization through the encouragement, for example, of such services as meals-on-wheels and homemakers' services.

Probably one of the most significant programs to be consummated by this Government relates to the honoring of still another election pledge which was offered to the electorate of Saskatchewan in the 1971 New Deal for People. Provision of financial help to guests in Special Care Homes will mean that we will be paying the total cost of nursing care for those categorized as Level III at a cost of something in excess of \$3 million. We said in 1971 that a portion of the cost required because of sickness should be insured. By providing \$4.80 a day to Level III guests, \$1.80 to Level II guests and \$1 a day to those in Level I facilities, the Government has again indicated its genuine concern for the sick and the pioneers in this province in particular.

It would be remiss of me, Mr. Speaker, not to make some reference to unemployment at this time. In Saskatchewan the Government has assigned high priority to the identification and to the solutions to be applied to this problem. Remedial action has included the supplementing of federal-provincial employment loans programs involving the matching of Federal loan forgiveness in connection with loans advanced for municipal winter employment projects. Our participation has involved the Provincial Government Loans program under which provincial loans were available for winter projects undertaken by municipalities, school boards and hospital boards. We have seen the introduction of Provincial Initiatives Program under which grants are paid toward local government winter employment projects. We have seen the provision of housing grants available to individuals for house building purposes. We have seen the provincial employment programs established to provide summer employment for students, the unemployed and social assistance recipients. Also the development of the 1972-73 municipal Winter Works employment program and the accelerated Public Work's program. I think from this, Mr. Speaker, it can be indicated quite clearly that the Government has had a genuine preoccupation with respect to the problem which is a general one across Canada and one which has vexed us in the Province of Saskatchewan in spite of the fact that there are 12,000 people in the active work force in addition to those who were working only a year ago.

I could go on and on, Mr. Speaker, to cite many positive measures which have been initiated by the Government since assuming office. Action has been taken to stimulate the creation of business opportunities and to revitalize existing enterprises.

Our tourist industry has been assisted and 1972 saw an increase in a number of tourists despite the fact that the previous year, 1971, was Homecoming year. New attention has been focused on recreation and the first annual Summer Games were successfully carried out in the summer of 1972 in Moose Jaw.

Innovative policies have been introduced in the field of education, resource development, environment, consumer affairs and so on.

I do want to take just a moment or two, Mr. Speaker, to do something of a review in a more detailed manner in the Government activities as they relate to the Department of Labour inasmuch as this is the area which involves my more direct responsibility.

I make no apology for the fact, Mr. Speaker, that the Government has assigned a high priority to the updating and the extension of Saskatchewan labor laws. We have recognized what the previous administration refused to accept, that the social and economic progress since our pioneer days has been largely dependent on the energies and the resourcefulness of our working people. Our concern for the welfare of Saskatchewan's working men and women is reflected by the introduction to this date of no fewer than 20 significant changes in labor legislation, regulations and administrative procedures, all of which are intended to help restore Saskatchewan to the pre-eminent position which it enjoyed in the late '50s and early '60s when we were the home of the most advanced labor laws in Canada and at the same time, Mr. Speaker, we established a record for labor management harmony that was unequalled by any other province in the whole of Canada.

We started out in the summer of 1971, Mr. Speaker, by repealing Bill 2 to re-establish the free collective bargaining system, so necessary for the maintenance of effective labor-management relations. And it is refreshing to see at this late point in time, Mr. Speaker, that Liberals have finally agreed that the course of action taken by this Government, in spite of the fact that they fought the withdrawal of Bill 2 tooth and nail when the amendment was passed to remove it from Saskatchewan Statute Books.

We have established, Mr. Speaker, by an amendment to The Labour Standards Act the principle of the 40-hour week, after which overtime rates must be paid in order that all employees will have the opportunity to enjoy the benefits of increased leisure made possible by the technological revolution. It is worthy of note, Mr. Speaker, that some 25 years have passed since the last adjustment in the hours of work, back in 1947.

Our attention was next turned to the minimum wage which as of July 1 of last year was increased to \$1.75 an hour, as recommended by a reconstituted Minimum Wage Board, which is now functioning with genuine decision-making powers rather than the action of the previous Minimum Wage Board which acted merely as a rubber stamp to the Executive Council decisions. Not only has the higher minimum wage provided thousands of employees with a better standard of living, it has also exerted a very solid impact on the whole economy, through the expansion of purchasing power.

A number of subsequent amendments to labor standards provisions have been made over the past 18 months. Entitlement to eight statutory holidays was extended to additional categories of employees. The equal pay requirements for female workers has been made more workable. Through an amendment to the human rights legislation, employment discrimination on the basis of sex has been prohibited. An employee now has the right

to obtain a leave of absence to seek political office if he so chooses. The Department of Labour initially increased its efforts to provide protection to employees to whom wages are owing and a new educational program has been launched to better acquaint employees and employers with details of labor standards legislation.

It is hardly necessary to mention that Saskatchewan's labor relations legislation required a total overhaul to re-establish the rights of workers, which have been eroded in amendments passed by Liberals in recent years, more particularly in 1966 and 1969. To this end an entirely new Trade Union Act was proclaimed in force on August 1, 1972 which we feel will furnish additional protection of the freedom of employees to organize into trade union organizations of their choice and which will promote effective and harmonious labor-management relations.

It is important to note that the new Act, as has been mentioned earlier, provides a mechanism to safeguard employees whose livelihood is threatened by automation. Provision is made for 90 days notice of technological change and the re-opening of bargaining on its effects.

Mr. Speaker, you may have noticed on this side of the House and I believe a couple of places opposite, large and colorful orange buttons in these Chambers that bear the inscription, "It's contagious." The theme, "It's Contagious", could very appropriately be used to describe the NDP's philosophy of good government, which is contagious, in its positive effect and its sensible approach. These particular buttons, however, Mr. Speaker, are a part of a campaign to encourage the mounting enthusiasm that is being expressed throughout this province for the increasingly successful results of the Government's Occupational Health Act, which formed a part of our legislative program in 1972. This Occupational Health Act passed in 1972 came into force last October. This statute represents a legislative first in North America in the field of employment, health and safety, inasmuch as its operative clauses apply specifically to people. Other relevant labor laws in this particular area elsewhere establish regulations governing machinery, equipment, building standards and so on. In addition to this kind of application, however, the new Saskatchewan legislation has been consciously directed towards the protection of the more valuable commodity, the working people of this province.

Among the major provisions of the Occupational Health Act is one calling for the establishment of labor-management occupational health committees in all places of employment with ten or more employees. The Occupational Health Branch within the Department of Labour, has been extremely active in assisting in the formation of these occupational health committees. In the fall of 1972 seminars and informal discussions were initiated to familiarize all concerned with their responsibilities and with the philosophy of the Act. Since December 11, 1972 the Occupational Health staff have made over 600 visits to places of employment, meeting with employers and employees to assist in the formation of these committees. These organizing campaigns will continue for only another few weeks until committees are formed in all eligible places of employment. Substantial progress has already been made in the implementation of the program with over 1,000 committees having been established and functioning well. It is important to note that through these 1,079 committees, over 53,000 employees in

Saskatchewan are now directly represented on committees that will, I believe, be vitally important to their health and safety at work in the years ahead.

This significant achievement in the very short time since the proclamation of this legislation, has been made possible by the serious and co-operative efforts of employers, employees and trade unions within the province. Mr. Speaker, I hope to be able to report, within a very short while, that the first and crucial stage in this pioneering program has been satisfactorily completed. I am confident that we shall soon be seeing throughout Saskatchewan positive effects of achievement in the reduction of health hazards and an increasingly good safety record that will benefit both employers and employees through I suppose what could be described as the most people-oriented working conditions in Canada.

I should like to take this opportunity before leaving the whole question of occupational health to congratulate all of those enlightened employers and employees who have co-operated in the setting up of these committees and who have demonstrated their concern for the health and safety of employees. In many cases the transition was accomplished with hardly a ripple in cases where voluntary committees had been established and had been functioning well for some time. Already these new approaches to health and safety are paying dividends in the form of the correction of existing hazards and the identification of unhealthy and hazardous working conditions.

You will be aware, Mr. Speaker, that Workmen's Compensation legislation was amended during the 1972 session of the Legislature to provide for increases in the maximum amount of average earnings on which compensation is based for compensation payments. In addition, provision was made for a compensation advocate in that legislation. That advocate is now operating from an office in a downtown area and is actively assisting employees and their dependants in obtaining compensation, with the service of this advocate being of particular benefit to injured workers who are unorganized and do not have the services of a trade union or a trade union representative to assist them in placing their case before the Workmen's Compensation Board.

It will be remembered also, Mr. Speaker, that during 1972 The Pension Benefits Act was amended in order to ensure that all employees will receive their fair benefits from a pension plan upon the winding up of the business.

The re-organization of the Department of Labour which was announced last year went into effect on April 1, 1972. Under the new structure, which involves the grouping of branches with related functions in one of four major divisions, the Department of Labour is now in a position, I believe, to provide more effective and better co-ordinated services to the public.

It would be appropriate, Mr. Speaker, I think, before I take my seat to devote a moment or two to the time losses attributable to work stoppages in Saskatchewan in 1972. Naturally the Government of Saskatchewan is not satisfied with the situation which has brought about a record time loss due to work stoppages in this province, a situation which was duplicated across the entire country. I might say in this connection that Saskatchewan is going to, once again, assume leadership in

encouraging a healthy industrial relations climate. We are certainly not about to press the panic button as has been the case in the past.

The present administration will continue to guarantee that the collective bargaining process will operate in an unrestricted manner in determining the level of wages and working conditions in our province.

In all fairness it should be pointed out that the impact of work stoppages on the Saskatchewan economy is not nearly as great as was the case for Canada as a whole on a per capita basis, based upon the number of workers in each province. As a matter of fact, the man days lost in Saskatchewan account for less than one per cent of the Canadian total and when expressed in terms of time lost per employee in the province, the Saskatchewan figure is equivalent to only one-quarter of the corresponding measure for Canada as a whole.

Moreover, I think that it should be remembered, Mr. Speaker, that 1972 was a year during which we saw the culmination of many critical agreements which were due for negotiation in the province, not the least of which involved the construction industry, in which the real points at issue between labor and management were merely postponed by the imposition of the nefarious piece of legislation Bill 2 in 1970.

It should be remembered that hundreds of collective bargaining agreements are successfully concluded each year without any work stoppage. In 1972 the time losses in Saskatchewan actually represents only one-tenth of one per cent of the estimated total annual lost time of the non-agricultural employees of this province.

Nevertheless, Mr. Speaker, I think that it is obvious that there is room for improvement in the whole field of labor relations. To this end, it is to be hoped that the New Trade Union Act, proclaimed in force on August 1, will in the first complete year of its operation, lead to the streamlining of bargaining processes and to the stimulation of productive and peaceful labor-management relations.

In addition, the Department of Labour will be focusing renewed attention on the development of a more constructive bargaining relationship and upon the introduction of a system of joint employee-employer consultation on a regular basis. We will be working very closely with labor and management to initiate new strategies, designed to make the negotiating process function more smoothly.

As is indicated in the Throne Speech, Mr. Speaker, we are contemplating several changes in labour law during this Session of the Legislature and as was mentioned in the Throne Speech the matter of maternity leave is one which will be legislated. I believe that indicates a reflection of our concern about the developing role of working women in our Saskatchewan work force. In addition, steps are being taken to expand the women's bureau in the Department of Labour to enable the bureau to make a more complete contribution in coming to grips with the problems of the increasing number of female employees in our work force.

The question of part-time employment is still of considerable significance and the Government is presently evaluating the

need for regulatory legislation in this particular connection.

In the field of occupational training, we are assessing the validity of a compulsory apprenticeship system and a post-journeyman training.

We are taking a look at a mechanism whereby activity counselling services would be made available to members of the labor force, both before and after retirement. We are contemplating the creation of an employment adjustment service to assist in the continuation in employment of workers who have been displaced by advancing technology.

We continue to be concerned about the changes in Workmen's Compensation, all of which will be assessed in the light of the recommendations contained in the final report of the Workmen's Compensation Task Force. Consultation with various groups will be held after the report is received.

In conclusion, Mr. Speaker, may I reiterate that the Government of Saskatchewan intends to pursue a policy under which our labour legislation will be continuously assessed and reviewed, to determine appropriate program directions and to create a working environment favorable to the development of effective and democratic participation in the life of the province by our expanding non-agricultural work force.

Mr. Speaker, the 19 months which have passed since the New Democratic Party assumed office have been productive ones. However, I believe, that it is reasonable to suggest that our preoccupation has been in honoring the pledges which were offered to the electorate in the 1971 general election.

We believe, Mr. Speaker, that our performance has been a creditable one and we believe that most Saskatchewan residents are inclined to agree with us.

The Throne Speech provides reason for optimism and reason for confidence in 1973 and the years directly ahead. This province is enjoying the kind of leadership which it has lacked since 1964 and I am proud to be a part of a government with a Premier who has exhibited the qualities of leadership of depth and understanding which will cause other jurisdictions to look to Saskatchewan for guidance and inspiration.

Mr. Speaker, I will be pleased to support the motion.

Some Hon. Members: — Hear, hear!

Mr. D.M. McPherson (Regina Lakeview): — Mr. Speaker, as many of the former speakers have done I should like to congratulate the Member for Nutana South (Mr. Rolfes) and the Member for Gravelbourg (Mr. Gross) for the job that they have done in moving and seconding of the Throne Speech. I should also like to congratulate the three new Ministers who have been appointed. They have their jobs cut out for them and we shall see the performance of the Minister of Finance (Mr. Cowley) on Friday. Certainly the Minister of Social Welfare (Mr. Taylor) has a big job ahead of him along with the Minister of Consumer Affairs (Mr. Tchorzewski). I should also like to welcome back the Member for Athabasca (Mr. Guy) and he will be heard from.

Some Hon. Members: — Hear, hear!

Mr. McPherson: — Mr. Speaker, in the provincial election campaign of June 1971 the NDP slogan was ‘A New Deal for People’ blazoned forth from every vantage point proclaiming, in its connotation, that by electing an NDP Government, a new social and economic order would emerge to bring all the good things of life to the people of Saskatchewan.

It is now 18 months since the NDP was given a mandate by the electorate of our province to fashion the New Deal for People but I submit, Mr. Speaker, that there is little evidence of a new day having dawned for our citizens. Indeed, this New Deal in its cardinal aspects is becoming a disaster for Saskatchewan and its people, whose horizons have diminished and darkened.

Some Hon. Members: — Hear, hear!

Mr. McPherson: — Except for the agricultural economy, Mr. Speaker, with improving buoyancy as a result of record export grain sales and prices — also the beef and hog industry, the two-price system for wheat and a viable livestock industry, for which no government can take any credit except the Federal Government — Saskatchewan remains in the doldrums due to the policies of this socialist administration.

It is significant, Mr. Speaker, that since the NDP took 11,000 people have departed from our province, and the tragedy is that they are, in the very great majority, our young many of them well educated or trained in technology given the proper opportunity, would have contributed greatly to the economic growth of Saskatchewan. Not only does the exodus from our province of our young unemployed continue, but also that of our older citizens, who seek a tax haven since the re-imposition of estate taxes by this Government.

It is further significant that there has been more labor unrest, work stoppages and strikes since the NDP took office, than at any time in the history of this province.

Some Hon. Members: — Hear, hear!

Mr. McPherson: — Equally disturbing with the foregoing, is the lack of resource development and industrial growth and which situation is clearly identified with the attitude of the NDP administration toward the private sector.

In a period of 18 months since assuming office, the NDP Government has procrastinated and has failed to develop any sound policy in respect of resource development. In this interim, the Minister of Industry and Commerce (Mr. Thorson) and in particular the Premier, in addressing the oil industry, indulged in a typical socialist harangue, belaboring the industry for what the Government considers are its faults and shortcomings and threatening it with vague suggestions of a variety of alternatives, failing the industry's compliance with — and I quote from the Premier's address as reported in the Leader-Post, January 13, 1973:

What we think to be reasonable objectives for the development of Saskatchewan's oil resources.

Is it any wonder, Mr. Speaker, that with this kind of approach by the Premier, a pall of uncertainty should hang over the industry like a sword, causing it to react as it has?

This province, Mr. Speaker, has prospered over the years from resource development by private industry. Hundreds of millions of dollars have enriched the Provincial Treasury and thousands of job opportunities were made possible by this development. Industry, of course, profited also thereby this was the name of the game. It was good for both parties. For the Premier to now accuse the oil industry of failing to pull its weight in Saskatchewan is almost as callous as it is irrational.

The Premier bemoans the fact that a series of refinery closures has cost the province a total of 350 jobs. Where, Mr. Speaker, was his concern for jobs when he and his Ministers scrapped the proposed pulp mill at Meadow Lake that would have provided directly and indirectly upwards of 3,000 jobs?

Some Hon. Members: — Hear, hear!

Mr. McPherson: — The scrapping of the pulp mill and the closure of refineries in my view and, I am sure in the view of my colleagues on this side of the House and that of the people of Saskatchewan, has been a bad deal for our province. I contend, Mr. Speaker, that on both these counts the Premier and his administration are responsible, directly and indirectly, for the loss of employment opportunities as a result of their economic philosophy which is alien to the traditional concepts of a free economy.

Not only has Saskatoon, Regina and Saskatchewan and all its people been short-changed by the NDP administration in the foregoing areas, but in the broader areas of resource and industrial development. No new industry of any consequence has been set up since the NDP was elected to office. Not even the highly publicized Roumanian Tractor Assembly Plant, the pursuit of which by the NDP Government had the characteristics of a comic opera. This has failed to come to fruition. We, on this side of the House, hope that the Minister of Industry can put this plant into Saskatchewan and we will be proud to support it.

If, as the Premier contends that the decisions of the major corporations work harshly against the development of this province, leaving us with an increased burden of human problems and social costs, then I say to him and his colleagues and their socialist advisors, experts and planners, that it is time they made an agonizing re-appraisal of their pronouncements, tactics and actions and, above all, the doctrinaire philosophy out of which these arise and which are the root cause for the estrangement between the Government and the business community of this province.

It is crystal clear, Mr. Speaker, that investment capital is shunning Saskatchewan like the plague and it will continue to do so unless this NDP Government creates the kind of political climate that engenders trust and confidence and an atmosphere of mutual respect.

Some Hon. Members: — Hear, hear!

Mr. McPherson: — But I submit, Mr. Speaker, such an eventuality is not about to occur because their desire for intervention and control is about as irreversible as the immutable laws of the universe. It is becoming increasingly apparent that the old Regina Manifesto is once again beginning to emerge to become a blueprint for the direction in which the NDP administration proposes to move.

There was a time, Mr. Speaker, when the more prudent and rational elements of the old CCF Party, faced with the realities of their day, concluded that the Regina Manifesto was not consonant with the aspirations of the people of Saskatchewan or the traditional economic framework within which a free economy will function.

Consequently, at the Party's convention at Winnipeg, a more realistic document was designed that would be more compatible with business enterprise. And it must be said, Mr. Speaker, with credit to the CCF Government of that day, that as a result of their reappraisal of the economic realities, Saskatchewan did tend to move forward in resource and industrial development.

But the protagonists, Mr. Speaker, of doctrinaire socialism die hard. They sit to your right, Mr. Speaker. A new breed of them who obviously have failed to learn from the past history of their forerunners.

Some Hon. Members: — Hear, hear!

Mr. McPherson: — While the failures of socialist experiments lie in moth balls, like the shoe factory, tannery, the box factory and many others, which lost hundreds of thousands of dollars of the taxpayers' money, they should serve to remind the new generation to your right, Sir, that to venture into areas of economic activity in which they and their socialist planners and experts have no expertise, is really a disaster for the province.

The Speech from the Throne, Mr. Speaker, reveals that the NDP Government now intends to move directly into the exploration for oil and natural gas via a Crown corporation, as well as becoming directly involved in the manufacture of forest products. In both these proposed ventures it is to be noted, Mr. Speaker, that they hope for a hedge in such costly and risky undertakings by joint participation with existing companies.

It would appear, Mr. Speaker, that the suitor will contend with a reluctant bride, because the chairman of the Saskatchewan Branch of the Canadian Petroleum Association, Mr. LaBerge, as reported in the Leader-Post of January 26, said that neither his company nor any other large firms in the exploration industry would likely join the Government in any ventures. Mr. LaBerge also questioned whether the Government would be any better at finding the untapped oil and the gas reserves than private industry.

Now, Mr. Speaker, in the light of the expressed reluctance of the industry to join in the Government ventures, where then does that leave the NDP administration? Well, it

leaves them very much out in left field, as one of my colleagues has said. I might add, not even getting away from home plate.

Faced with this situation, will they now go it alone? The NDP administration is unhappy about the industry spending only \$47 million on exploration, how much would they propose to spend of the taxpayers' money towards, what they would consider a satisfactory level of exploration — \$100 million or \$150 million, Mr. Speaker, or what would it be? Certainly the people of Saskatchewan like to know who ultimately would be the victims of such an ill-conceived costly venture.

Mr. Speaker, I think if we examine carefully what has happened in Saskatchewan over the years in exploration, I personally think that the oil exploration companies have been good corporate citizens. Good for the province. They have spent millions of dollars looking for oil and I would like to list the number of wells that have been drilled over a period of 20 years. A total of 17,344 wells have been drilled in Saskatchewan since 1953 to the present time. In 1953, Mr. Speaker, they drilled 677 wells and then in 1957 the oil industry increased their drilling to 1,027 wells. In the year 1965 the number peaked and it went up to 1,284 wells. It went down to a figure of 620 wells in 1972. What I am really saying, Mr. Speaker, is that it does run in cycles and if we examine the tables year by year over the 20 years there are peaks. I really do not think we can blame the oil companies for not doing their share of work in this province. One can see the millions of dollars, Mr. Speaker, that have been pumped into this province by the industry, through wages, purchase of supplies, materials and services. Saskatchewan has been good for the oil industry since 1953 and the industry has been good for Saskatchewan.

It is a two-way street, Mr. Speaker, and I urge the Premier and the Minister of Industry to examine very closely what they are getting into.

The federated co-operatives, Mr. Speaker, in the '50s decided that it would be a great thing if they got into exploration. Mr. Speaker, it didn't take many years for the federated co-ops to realize that they did not have the technical staff to run an operation of this magnitude and they pulled in their horns and got completely out of it. I say again, Mr. Speaker, that the oil industry will search and find new fields. They have the money to do this and the technical staff that will examine the areas that should be drilled in.

Now, Mr. Speaker, with the drillings in the deep strata, it does not seem right for the spending of taxpayers' money when private companies will put up risk capital and carry on the job.

Surely, Mr. Speaker, there is a lesson to be learned from federated co-ops that there aren't the technical people available and the Government is not the right party to get into oil exploration. Really, Mr. Speaker, governments should not be discouraging the oil industry, but, the Premier and the Minister of Industry should encourage them.

The Member from Saskatoon University (Mr. Richards), Mr. Speaker, wants to nationalize the oil industry. Surely, the Members to your right must realize that this kind of

approach is not good for the Saskatchewan business community. Mr. Speaker, when they read and hear that Members of your Government want to take over industry, whether it be oil, potash or minerals, I really think they take a dim look and this is why they are avoiding our province. Let's encourage them and not discourage them.

Some Hon. Members: — Hear, hear!

Mr. McPherson: — While the NDP Government must, of necessity, find more revenues from resource development in order to assist in meeting the mounting costs of proliferating government bureaucracy, with its commissions, probes, thrusts, task forces, committees and the almost endless appointments of high salaried researchers, planners, advisors, experts, defeated NDP candidates and so forth. The underlying motive for the direction in which they propose to move is ultimate provincial control.

It is an age old dream of the socialists to gain control of the means of production and distribution. It is the way of their ideology and they will not rest until they achieve this long sought after goal.

My criticism of the NDP administration is not aimed at those areas, Mr. Speaker, that make for better health and more meaningful social service, better care and facilities for our mentally retarded, better roads and tourist facilities and better education for all. These are the products of an enlightened society throughout the world and fall within the traditional framework of government responsibility and concern.

But, Mr. Speaker, our quarrel with the NDP is directed against their increasing intrusion into the lives of our people in Saskatchewan and their freedom for decision-making which is repugnant to all concepts of a free society. More and more intrusion by the NDP Government in the affairs of our citizens, under the guise of helping them with their problems, eventually becomes an infringement on their liberties and the erosion of their freedom.

Some Hon. Members: — Hear, hear!

Mr. McPherson: — For example, Sir, they contend that, of necessity, the NDP set up the Land Bank to preserve the family farm. But this necessity, Mr. Speaker, results in the denial of the right of ownership of the land by the son of the farmer who has sold his farm to the Land Bank, for the son is allowed only to lease that farm on which he grew up and instinctively feels it is his land. But of necessity, this NDP Government has decreed he shall not own the land until after five years of leasing it.

Two hundred years ago, Mr. Speaker, the great English statesman and Prime Minister, William Pitt said this:

Necessity is the plea of every infringement of human freedom. It is the argument of tyrants; it is the creed of slaves.

The people of Saskatchewan would do well to ponder these words of wisdom, spoken in the 18th century and to observe their accuracy in the light of the actions of the NDP, to the present

day.

I submit, Mr. Speaker, that government should exercise a positive role, but not in the manner that can be interpreted as a paternalistic one.

Some Hon. Members: — Hear, hear!

Mr. McPherson: — It can only be a positive role when the government provides the kind of leadership for people that will enable them to meet their social and economic problems in such a way that they become increasingly less dependent upon the state.

The axiom is, Mr. Speaker, that the loss of individual freedom is in direct proportion to the increasing power that government takes unto itself.

The Leader of the Opposition, in his address, set forth the manner in which the NDP has taken unto itself unlimited power and authority, which is undermining the rights, freedom and liberty of the people of our province.

The late president of the United States, Woodrow Wilson, in speaking about liberty said:

Liberty has never come from government. Liberty has always come from the subjects of it. The history of liberty is a history of limitations of governmental power, not the increase of it.

The Leader of the Opposition, in his address, expressed the view that the Premier, the Attorney General and other Members of the Government, no doubt mean well by their regulations and policies they have adopted in an attempt to mitigate the serious economic and social problems facing our people of Saskatchewan; that their intentions are ostensibly beneficent and benign. But therein, Mr. Speaker, lies the danger.

Of special significance in this context is what a former Chief Justice of the Supreme Court of the United States, Louis Brandeis, had to say:

Experience should teach us to be most on our guard to protect liberty when the government's purposes are beneficent. Men born to freedom are naturally alert to repel invasion of their liberty by evil-minded rulers. The greatest danger to liberty lurk in the insidious encroachments by men of zeal, well-meaning and without understanding.

Mr. Speaker, the Liberal Party in its long and honorable history has demonstrated that it is sensitive to all those areas of human need in which the involvement and responsibility of government is indicated. That it recognizes the dignity of every individual of our society. That the individual is supreme and not the state. That the measure of the moral and spiritual fibre of a nation lies in the extent to which each individual, within the limits of civil and moral laws, is able to make his best contribution in his time and place. That in a free, democratic society human progress must come through evolution and not by revolution. And that such progress is best achieved through individual initiative and enterprise.

I would think that with the bold new housing proposals as the Federal Government, that this Government use its energies with a greater thrust on land assembly programs. The other programs that are available to improve conditions in Saskatchewan with federal assistance are: 1. The loans and assistance for co-op housing. 2. Loans for Indian reserve house purchases. 3. Protection for the home purchaser against builder bankruptcy. 4. Assistance to municipalities to improve city facilities and housing conditions in their neighborhoods. 5. Grants for individual home improvements. 6. Loans for low income groups to build or purchase homes. 7. Loans for building low income housing by co-ops and non-profit organizations.

As the Member from Regina Lakeview, I realize the city of Regina is facing many problems. At the present time the city of Regina comprises 12 to 15 per cent of the provincial population. More and more rural people are moving to the cities. The city of Regina now has to depend on 57 per cent of the property taxes to meet their expenditures. This figure in 1964 was 49 per cent, Mr. Speaker, a rise of eight per cent in eight years. This forcibly draws to the attention that if this trend increases, the tax rates must increase and it appears necessary, therefore that other source of revenue must be found to balance the bad situation.

I would strongly urge the Minister of Municipal Affairs (Mr. Wood), Mr. Speaker, to increase library grants, to increase police grants and to generally look into assistance for the cities in our province, they surely need it.

Some Hon. Members: — Hear, hear!

Mr. McPherson: — The cities need this help, Mr. Speaker, and they need it badly when you consider that the police and fire budget in the city of Regina is taking 45 per cent of the tax dollar. The Government is providing unconditional grants of \$3 million per year and surely the cities in this province should be included in the program as well as the municipalities.

The Minister of Environment (Mr. Byers) knows how bad the pollution of our lagoon is in Regina. He has studied the Qu'Appelle Basin Study and surely there will be assistance for the citizens of Regina and Moose Jaw, to stop the pollution of the Qu'Appelle chain of lakes. This must be acted on now and I urge the Minister to do so.

Each individual, Mr. Speaker, must be given the opportunity to seek his own destiny without infringing on other's rights — to climb his mountain and to be able to say at the journey's end — I did it my way.

I am sure I speak the sentiments of my colleagues on this side of the House when I say that we shall support legislation that in our view meets the legitimate hopes and aspirations of our citizens, legislation that will help move Saskatchewan ahead.

But we will resist with all our energies any encroachment on individual freedom by the Government, under whatever guise it appears and to the extent that we are able to see to it that where individual rights and freedoms have been lost, that they once more be restored.

To this task we have been elected, and to this end we shall serve with dedication and determination, confident of the approval of a majority of Saskatchewan people.

Mr. Speaker, as you can see I will not support the motion.

Some Hon. Members: — Hear, hear!

Mr. D.H. Lange (Assiniboia-Bengough): — Mr. Speaker, in beginning my Speech to the Throne, I should like to sincerely apologize for the harsh weather that we have been receiving lately. But I think you would probably be the first to admit that this is pretty well the first mistake that this Government has made since taking office.

Some Hon. Members: — Hear, hear!

Mr. Lange: — This may be a somewhat facetious manner to introduce a speech but I think I can draw an analogy between the contents of this speech which is a sometime history of the settlement of Western Canada and the vagaries of the weather.

It was interesting to observe the other day, that the Leader of the Opposition in his vaudeville act, with dour melancholy, lamented the fact that while the NDP is in Government, multinational corporations are not being attracted to Saskatchewan. He cited another, well-researched truth, that the Kraft Company was not going to locate its new \$15 million, 'Garlic Turkey Bread' factory in Saskatchewan.

Let's assume for the moment, that the Leader of the Opposition for once, had his figures straight and that Kraft was interested in exploiting Saskatchewan farmers. I, for one, would be somewhat insulted if that insidious company were to even consider locating here. Where are Kraft's plans for community development? Where is Kraft's empathy for Saskatchewan rural life? All that Kraft knows is that dairy products come from farmers and mighty cheap too. Where is Kraft's respect for culture? The only culture Kraft knows comes in fermenting cheese and in the design of its packages. The philosophy of this Government and the nature of the Kraft Company make us mutually exclusive.

It is interesting and rather sad, that Liberals cannot project their minds beyond the dogma of this chamber to recognize that not only have they the wrong prognosis about what constitutes successful enterprise but they are poor enterprisers themselves. The follies of their administration, not the least of which are the Weyburn Distillery and the Prince Albert pulp mill, have been well documented in this House.

But to further illustrate the short-sightedness and lack of empathy of Members on the Opposition side, I have here a copy of Executive Magazine, November 1971. As you know, Executive Magazine is not reading material for our party. Executive Magazine is for people who think Liberal. For the big guys; Steve Roman and Carl Landegger.

Some Hon. Members: — Hear, hear!

Mr. Lange: — The bigees, the victims of

the Davey Steuart syndrome. People with embroidered socks and diamond stick pins and gold toothpicks.

Executive Magazine is a monthly of Southam Business Now, Southam is no stranger either. They are with us every day. They own amongst many publications, newspapers. In this particular issue of Executive, John Kettle, Special Projects Editor charts the future population of Canada by extrapolation of data gathered from Statistics Canada, the Conference Board in Canada and private sources. He analyses this data using techniques and projections of big business, the people who manage for profit, the Liberals. He points out in Liberal language that if present trends are unchanged, by the year 2,000 Saskatchewan will have a population of 300,000 people. 300, 000, not even enough people to circulate an issue of the Leader-Post, much less pay off a mortgage on a \$160 million pulp mill.

This is the projection of executives, the people with whom Liberals rotate, the big guys, the proponents of free enterprise, individual initiative and making it on your own. 300,000 population by the year 2,000, if that mentality regains office in Saskatchewan. The rationale behind it? The rationale of big business, of course. Take the people out of the areas where cost benefit is not successful and move them to Toronto or Winnipeg or whatever.

Davey Steuart was right about one thing though, multinationals aren't going to come to Saskatchewan as long as there is an NDP Government because we don't want them.

Some Hon. Members: — Hear, hear!

Mr. Lange: — In rising to support the Throne Speech, I should like to show how this same philosophy, the Davey Steuart syndrome has retarded the development of western Canada. The Throne Speech has in it some thoughts which have been in virtually every Throne Speech delivered since this province was inaugurated in 1905. Almost without exception Throne Speeches have pointed out the disparities between Saskatchewan and the central part of Canada. Almost without exception, the Lieutenant-Governor has urged the Federal Government to make concessions towards the West for improved freight rates, for better grain-handling and shipping facilities. Almost without exception the Lieutenant-Governor has requested a fairer price for wheat and livestock in relation to commodities that farmers buy from the East.

And, outside this Chamber, because they have not had the opportunity or the desire to use our means of accomplishing change, every year without exception, the Indian and Métis people have asked for more money from the Federal Government. Every year without exception the Indian and Métis have asked for the right to vote without losing their treaty rights. Every year without exception the Indian and Métis have asked to be allowed to develop a society in their own way with their own governing body and their own educational system.

And, every year without exception, the Federal Government has ignored the pleas of both the Lieutenant-Governor and the Indian and Métis.

Some Hon. Members: — Hear, hear!

Mr. Lange: — The common denominator of all Throne Speeches delivered in this Chamber is that they all point to the plight in which Saskatchewan finds itself with respect to Eastern government and Eastern or foreign business. And, we, as a Government find ourselves shackled in a very much similar manner as the Indian and Métis find themselves shackled with respect to the East. During the next few moments I will concentrate upon the plight of Saskatchewan within the Dominion of Canada and within Saskatchewan, the plight of the Indian and Métis and farmer.

Saskatchewan is regionally depressed and for good reason too. But Saskatchewan is not regionally depressed because it happens to have a semi-arid climate or because it has an abundance of mineral resources. Saskatchewan is not regionally depressed because it has some of the richest, most productive wheat lands in North America or because it has a large percentage of all of the fresh water in North America. Saskatchewan is not regionally depressed because it has some of the greatest potash reserves in the world nor because it has a tremendous electricity potential or because it is relatively unpolluted. Saskatchewan is depressed by design. Design by Eastern business-dominated federal government, business-dominated government that controls every facet of an individual's life from birth to death under the pretext of allowing freedom of mobility and decision and freedom of competitive initiative. And that same government, be it Liberal or Conservative, intends to keep Saskatchewan depressed.

In fact, the Federal Government is merely a puppet for business schools of thought which flaunt efficiency of management and money as their pennants. And the former Saskatchewan Liberal Government was an unprofessional protégé of the Federal Government.

We need not assume in Saskatchewan that urbanized technology is a destined alternative to our rural way of life. We need not assume that we will solve our Indian and Métis problems by attempting to force their cultures to assimilate into ours. We need not assume that the answer to our regional depression lies in developing the world's largest pulp mill. We need not assume that in order for Saskatchewan to have prosperity, we must have labor intensive industry with external sources of capital. Rather than looking for industry which pollutes the environment or industry which exploits human and natural resources, rather than contributing to the cycle of waste and obsolescence, we in Saskatchewan will instead look at what we have within the province.

We see that there exists in Saskatchewan two distinct indigenous cultures. These are the Indian culture and the farmers, the agrarian culture. Both have their roots and traditions embedded in the beginnings of history. I wish to show that these two cultures are closely related, indeed, that there is a generic thread running through both which sews a distinct embroidery on the fabric of Saskatchewan. I hope to show, moreover, that study of this embroidery by governments will reveal solutions to some of the major problems which confront society. The existence of these cultures is seriously threatened by forces which are common to both. They are threatened by lack of understanding of their significance, by

misused technology and by tremendous sociological pressure from large national and multi-national corporations. All of these forces are manifest in short-sighted, mismanaged Federal Government policy, policy which extends back over 100 years. I will show further that Saskatchewan because of its history is in a unique position to reverse trends of urbanization and alienation of people if it will simply study the Indian and the farmer. Neither the Saskatchewan farmer nor the Indian is doomed to extinction if its cultures are merely recognized.

However, pervading rural Saskatchewan today is a feeling of pessimism about the farm family and farming as a way of life. It is felt generally that farming as an enterprise will survive perhaps another decade with stop gap measures but as a way of life will last no longer. If this is true, the tragedy of it lies in the fact that the very human life styles of the farmers and the ranchers will be replaced by the austerity and alienation of the city.

The warmth of community living with its close inter-personal relationships, the grooming of animals, the nurturing of the soil affecting plant life, the affinity of the earth, and natural weather phenomena, which these people possess will subliminate into urbanization.

This prognosis of the future is totally contrary to the development of agriculture in Saskatchewan. Pioneers came here to rid themselves of European repression. They spanned a way of life which allowed them close association with each other. Association with the earth and independent life styles. Now, barely three generations later these life styles are in danger of extinction, and in danger of extinction in favor of urbanization. A life style which, because of its extraneous control is similar to the one from which the pioneers fled.

Why is it that now after three generations of organizing and struggling, now that Saskatchewan has power, telephones, grid roads, virtually all the amenities of urban centres, plus the added benefit of privacy, why is it that now when technology can provide every luxury of life in a rural environment, why is it that the trend is away from farming and towards urbanization?

And what happened to the Indian culture? Where is the richness of the Indian life that existed in such nobility for years on these prairies, yet has almost disappeared in almost 150 years?

A century ago the Indians had unique forms of art, music, poetry, drama. They had a system of government with little delinquency or drunkenness. They lived close to the earth. Their environment reflected in their life style. How could the culture be relegated to its present status in a few decades?

The answer to both questions lies in observing what is happening in Federal Government proposals today, a government totally entrenched in the big business syndrome of Davey Stuart. The answer lies in understanding the role of large companies and their influence in Canadian politics and in looking back in our history to companies like the Hudson's Bay Company, the Canadian Pacific Railway, to see what kinds of sordid roles they have played in our development.

The psychology associated with successful farming today is that in order to be successful, farms must be big and in order to be big, it costs big money which money can only be returned by big machinery.

Let's have a look at why successful farming must be big farming. The primary reason is that farmers are forced to use the economics of scale of large corporations and financial institutions. Corporate directors and financiers manage their business with only one motive in mind, monetary profit. It doesn't occur to a Harvard graduate in Economics that there may be another form of profit, that of social or aesthetic value. It doesn't occur to a graduate of the London School of Economics that there may be a virtue in farmers feeling an affinity for the land. It doesn't occur to a graduate of Queen's University School of Administration that centralization of management destroys inter-personal relationships. And it doesn't occur to a graduate of McGill's School of Engineering that plunking a hydro electric power dam in the middle of an Indian culture might be destroying a unique way of life. Nor does it occur, nor has it ever occurred, to the federal government politician that Saskatchewan has something in the farm life and in the rural life that is worth preserving both for its tangibility and its closeness to natural life.

Both Eastern government and Eastern business, if you'll pardon that redundancy, have consistently manipulated the Western farmer and the Indians by means of monetary and market pressures. Eastern business and government have perpetuated development of the West for only one reason, to exploit the West. I am convinced that even Members on the opposite side can interpret the history of the development of the West as a development which involved, for a hundred years, the violation of human and natural resources. From the very beginning the Indian and his way of life did not fit into the corporate plan. And, not too much later, it was clear that the farmer didn't fit into the corporate plan either. Exploitation of the West was the reason for the institution of the Canadian Pacific Railway and for the endeavors of the Hudson's Bay Company in Western Canada. In spite of the indoctrination of high school texts which emphasize the romance of the building of the great CPR, more people are becoming aware that the CPR has coerced, manipulated, cajoled and cheated Western Canada since the day of its inception. And 100 years later has not changed its tactics one iota.

One hundred years ago the CPR decided that the railway would go through Regina rather than through Prince Albert because the CPR could then determine where settlements would grow. It is easy to see why the CPR should wish to foster development of towns when we remember that at its inception, John A. MacDonald gave the CPR and its 106 shareholders \$25 million cash and various other concessions, 31 million acres of land with an added option to choose its location and profits from its sale. One must marvel at the magnanimity of the Federal Government, although the fact that most of the 106 shareholders were MPs and Senators may have colored their thinking somewhat. With this sort of a meagre start, one also must marvel at how the CPR, these free enterprisers, could manage to keep their heads above water.

Consequently, because of the whimsical averistic (sic) imperialism of the CPR and its goverment (sic) shareholders, many areas which should have been settled weren't and many areas

which shouldn't have been settled were. Is it any wonder that communities in Saskatchewan were doomed to their present plight. They were not planned within the context of a community. They were not planned for future expansion. They were placed here or no other reason than to suck as much profit out of the West as Bay street financiers could grab. Now, 100 years later, after the infra-structure of Bay Street has been built upon the farmers' grain and the Indians' fur (sic), the same body, the CPR, by pulling out rails is going to determine which areas will and which areas won't exist still for the same selfish motive. Then, they called it a national plan, now they call it efficiency. In both cases the Federal Government is a blind partner.

Speaking of the Federal Government's partnership reminds one that presently the delivery point of North Portal border has not yet been able to sell its six bushel quota because it can't get railway cars and yet, since December, 400 to 500 cars of American grain have come across the border, up the Soo Line, into British Columbia and down to Seattle. And all in Canadian owned CPR cars.

An Hon. Member: — Otto bought them.

Mr. Lange: — One must marvel at the magnanimity of the Federal time, to the Americans. Where is Edgar Benson and the Canadian Transport Commission?

One hundred years ago the Eastern government was controlling our markets by the manipulation of the CPR. Now, they still control our markets in the same manner. What was the past few years of economic depression in this province but a ploy on the part of the Federal Government to stem inflation and balance its coffers according to the Phillips curve of economics. What better place to curb inflation in agricultural areas where money moves twice as fast as in industrial areas. What better way to stop the movement of money than to stop grain sales, and what better way to stop grain sales than to retard railroad transportation. Do you think it was any accident that the Canadian Wheat Board didn't sell wheat during the past few years? Do you really think that miscalculated projections of grain on hand was an accident? Do you think that present increased sales are indicative of up swinging trends in agriculture? In spite of what Otto Lang may profess to have done during the past few years he has no intention of putting agriculture on a firm basis, because that means less profit for large agri-business corporations. Otto Lang thinks like an executive of Weston's. Where else would a Task Force Report come from? Otto Lang and the Federal Government have no concept of what farming is all about.

Some Hon. Members: — Hear, hear!

Mr. Lange: — In fact their lack of understanding is reflected in the collection of the ludicrous proposals foisted upon the West by the Federal Government during the past few years.

Mr. MacLeod: — . don't you think you should increase the age .

Mr. Lange: — The Small Farms Development Program .

Mr. Speaker: — Order, order!

Mr. Lange: — . the Grain Income Stabilization Plan, LIFT, telling Canadian prairie farmers, wheat farmers, not to grow wheat? All of the Federal Government's plans are designed to sabotage farming as an industry .

Some Hon. Members: — Hear, hear!

Mr. Lange: — . or at best, defining it in terms of eastern business. Not one of these abortions of eastern imagination assumes that there may be a way of life that is worthy of preservation. Interestingly enough, not one of these proposals assumes that a producer controlled marketing board is necessary to sell grain. This is because the Federal Government has as a tool the Canadian Wheat Board for the manipulation of Canadian farmers. The Canadian Wheat Board is capable of handling our wheat but is not capable of selling it. The average Saskatchewan farmer has forgotten more about the grain industry than the Canadian Wheat Board will ever know and yet, there is not even one producer on the Canadian Wheat Board. What more can you expect from an eastern dominated marketing board, except policies to serve the pandering of eastern businessmen. A producer controlled marketing board with its basis in the West is mandatory to gain decent stabilization in the grain industry.

But to parallel the injustices committed upon the western farmer by eastern business dominated government; let me draw some analogies which have placed the Indian and Métis people in their seemingly hopeless predicament.

One hundred years ago, the Hudson's Bay Company was the most vicious oppressor of the Indians. It was the illustrious Bay Company which kept the Indians in debt for traps so the Bay could reap the profits of furs serving the vanity of eastern Canada and Europe. Today, the Bay still controls the lives of the Indian by holding their welfare cheques, keeping the Indians in debt by charging exorbitant prices for damaged commodities. What did the Federal Government do to aid the Indians? First, it relegated the Indians to a particular trading post, they could trade at no other than designated posts all of which incidentally were Hudson's Bay posts. Since Indians were forced to trade at a particular post, a settlement developed around that post, a community of people who were forced into subsistence agriculture, wholly dependent upon the Bay store.

The Federal Government at the same time condoned the slaughter of the buffalo for profit from its hide and tongue. This doomed the buffalo to extinction and with it went the Indian life-style. The Federal Government relegated the Indian to reservations, giving him at the same time, one-half as much equipment as white settlers received. The Indian was to assume a life-style of the Europeans but only with half the tools and no experience. Is it any wonder that the Indians couldn't farm when we remember that almost half of the white settlers returned to Europe. The white settlers could at least leave.

The Federal Government also used the Métis for a pawn to build the CPR. Conditions were made so poor, by cutting rations to Métis by one-half and stripping the reservation lands of timber that they finally revolted. Here was an excuse to build

the CPR, a railroad was needed to quell the Métis riot for which the Federal Government was responsible. A hundred years ago the Federal Government used the problems that it created for the Indian and Métis as an excuse to build the CPR. Today the Federal Government uses the problems that it created for the Indian and Métis to perpetuate a white bureaucracy.

When the white man came West, he told the Indian to camp outside the NWMP fort and he would be taken care of. The white man took care of the Indian but in hand-to-mouth fashion. Today the Indian is still camping outside the white man's fort and being taken care of in the same degrading subsistence way. It is obvious that there has never been a place for the Indian and Métis in the profit rolsters (sic) of the eastern government. It is obvious that farmers and ranchers are no more than serfs for the feudal system of agricultural corporations.

Mr. Steuart: — Is Jack Messer a serf?

Mr. Lange: — But recognizing the plight of the farmer and Indian amidst threatened urbanization is one side of the story. Looking at the alternative, urbanization with its all too often cold, austerity and impersonalization, artificial values and caustic atmosphere is the other side. The alternative to deruralization is no alternative. For a government to recognize this is one thing, for a government to change it, much less reverse it, is quite another.

We have several options open to us. We can take the Davey Steuart approach and attempt to lure .

Some Hon. Members: — Hear, hear!

Mr. Lange: — . Carl Landegger back to Saskatchewan.

Some Hon. Members: — Hear, hear!

Mr. Lange: — Carl would build for us perhaps a candy factory at Lumsden. We could lure him back by putting up all of the capital and taking all the risk on the mortgage. If there is any profit, well Karl Landegger could have that of course. Or perhaps we could have a new distillery, a distillery in Assiniboia, surely there are some prominent Regina businessmen who would be willing to invest 10 per cent in return for a provincial investment of 90 per cent, and they would only be too happy to take the profits with them.

Or alternately, we could seek industrial development from corporations which are willing to take more risk in return for less profit, or we can recognize that we have an asset in our cultures, in our unique way of life. We can monopolize upon these ways of life, recognizing that they hold in their life styles the key to stemming of urbanization.

Let us look again at the trends. The family farm may be in serious danger of extinction. The alternative of corporate and absentee landlord farming makes the agricultural future somewhat bleak. Perhaps there is another way of looking at it. We have a vibrant agrarian culture, with a desire to remain on the land. We have good roads, power, telephones, we can provide

all of the amenities of the city in rural areas. What is more we have technology. Using technology unwisely, it is possible, remember, to farm all of southern Saskatchewan under one corporate conglomerate, the Liberal approach. But using technology wisely it is perhaps possible to repopulate rural Saskatchewan for there is also a growing desire for people to return to the land and a heightening distaste for the city. More than anything else we have to study a culture which has been here for a thousand years, one which knows well how to use the soil as the basis for an ecological unit. The North American Indian has in his culture elements which our society needs. The Indian has a life style in which a man can concretely grasp his identity and his relationship to the world. A life style with an affinity for the land and community which nurtured him and the culture which educated him. The Indian has not the problems of the business executive where man is divorced from himself and his environment, where others are treated as objects to be manipulated, where conspicuous consumption and emulation drive men to lead the lives of alienated labor.

The Indian knows nothing of life which fears leisure, a life where man must be surrounded by blaring electronic gadgetry or useless chatter in order to insulate himself from having to think. The Indians' was a world in which environment had spiritual significance, where beauty was found in a harmonious balance with nature and not in concrete and neon signs. Life was not a struggle in which man played the role of a conquistador of natural forces. Elements of this life style still appear in Saskatchewan rural life where there is a spiritual love for community and environment. In rural Saskatchewan one can see men who treat land and animals with the same thoughtful compassion. Here is a life style in which the clock does not govern the responses of men. This is a culture unique in present day North America which must, at all costs be preserved. The Indians still possess all of these qualities in spite of their harassment by the white man during the past 150 years. This demonstrates the depth of their culture and values. Indians are grounded in the terms of local, rural ways, they resent urbanization.

Surely here is a clue for our own industrial, cultural development. When the white man came to North America, the Indians had the kind of life style the European was seeking, but in his greed, the white man has almost destroyed both cultures. Perhaps here is our direction for rural development, an option to the pressures of modern business and large corporate farming exists in the co-operative approach of the Indian. Now, because of technology, not in spite of it, we can put people back on smaller farms. The same forces which depopulated rural Saskatchewan can repopulate it. But since the Federal Government is totally insensitive to present Western problems, the only way both the farmer and the Indian can fight the Federal Government is through the Provincial Government. This reflects the dependence of these two cultures upon our political strategy.

To achieve these measures people in government must be prepared to make substantial investments in the form of money and energy. We must also remember that we still have much to learn, particularly about the decision-making process amongst Indians and Métis. We as a government can produce the wherewithal for those who come from a particular ethnic group to determine their own future. But are we going to allow these cultures to develop on their own or to be stifled by corporate

design? Who is going to make the decisions for Saskatchewan, those who read Executive Magazine or can we make the decisions that contain more for the individual? Who can make the decision better, those who are not indigenous to society like Federal-Liberal corporations or those who live with the problems like the Saskatchewan farmers, Indians and Métis.

Saskatchewan is in a somewhat unique position to nurture cultural development. We are not irreversibly fettered by large corporations, our environment is not polluted beyond redemption. We have natural mineral resources which can be used intelligently to our benefit. But there is one more important benefit. It is because of the colonial attitude of the past Federal Governments towards the West that the New Democratic Party has evolved as a reform party in Western Canada. Ottawa based political parties are presently only starting to experience the abrasion of the New Democratic Party, the party they themselves created in conspiracy with nefarious organizations like the Hudson's Bay Company and the Canadian Pacific Railway. The problem of exploitation of people by eastern business and government doesn't stop in the West. The Maritimes have been the victims of the same ravishing tactics as have the lower classes throughout middle Canada. It is because of the abuse and exploitation of the West by the Federal Government along with companies like the Hudson's Bay Company and the Canadian Pacific Railway that the New Democratic Party originally gained a foothold in Saskatchewan. Now, barely 40 years later, New Democrats govern three Western provinces and just recently, with only 31 Members, the New Democratic Party formed the Government in Ottawa.

Some Hon. Members: — Hear, hear!

Mr. Lange: — Mr. Speaker, to demonstrate that Indian culture is alive vibrant in Saskatchewan, you notice that I am wearing, for the occasion of this speech, a hand made suit of Indian design. This suit was hand sewn at the Southern plains Handicraft Co-op at Fort Qu'Appelle. As you know this co-operative has a membership drawn from Cree, Sioux, Saulteaux and Chippewyan Indians, all indigenous cultures from Saskatchewan. The membership comes from 16 reserves. This garment was styled and sewn by Norma Bird and Elizabeth Pinay, both Cree Indians. Marita Swaine, a Sioux Indian, did the bead work on the moccasins, on the belt and, of course, on the tie, which one must wear to breach (sic) the hallowed sanctity of this Chamber — it doesn't matter what you say once you are in, but you have got to say it wearing a tie. It is fitting that this suit should be made by Cree and Sioux, since they were two of the most significant Indian cultures on the prairies. I would like to have it go on record in the debates and proceedings that Elizabeth Pinay, Norma Bird, and Marita Swaine are presently with us in the west gallery.

Some Hon. Members: — Hear, hear!

Mr. Lange: — Not only has it enhanced my speech, but moreover this suit demonstrates that Indian culture can mesh very nicely with our own without destroying either. This speech employing the elegance of Indian craftsmanship is a plea for respect for the Indian and Métis culture and respect for the agrarian culture. And, as a corollary, a respect for all cultures. It is a plea to ensure that out of this respect these cultures are

destined to become an intrinsic part of the mosaic of Canada.

Some Hon. Members: — Hear, hear!

Hon. E L. Tchorzewski (Minister of Culture and Youth): — Mr. Speaker, after seven days of debate in this House I must say that as we draw to a close it is very encouraging to hear the quality of the debate that we have just heard from the Member of Assiniboia-Bengough.

Some Hon. Members: — Hear, hear!

Mr. Tchorzewski: — I should like to congratulate the Member for the thought-provoking speech which he has just given us in this House, and I am sure that his remarks and the way in which he delivered them should be a guide and a lesson to all of us who are here as elected representatives of the people of Saskatchewan. I know that his concerns are our concerns and he offers challenges that we must recognize and we must proceed to meet.

Mr. Speaker, it is with a great deal of pride that I rise to take part in this Throne Speech Debate of 1973. I am proud to be able to be part of programs and directions announced by His Honour The Lieutenant-Governor the other day. Programs that are imaginative and meaningful. Programs that show a great deal of courage. Programs which clearly state the confidence and concern that our Government has for this province. Programs and legislation that will build on the foundations set by the last session of this Legislature, so that Saskatchewan people can better share in the wealth and good things that Canada is fortunate enough to be blessed with.

Mr. Speaker, before I proceed to comment on the Speech from the Throne and this debate, I, too, should like to extend my congratulations to the mover and the seconder of the Speech, the Hon. Member from Gravelbourg (Mr. Gross) and the Hon. Member from Saskatoon Nutana-South (Mr. Rolfes). I believe that they have both shown why their constituents showed faith in them by electing them to this Assembly. They have been hard working Members on behalf of their constituencies and they have ably understood the problems and needs of Saskatchewan people and made valuable contributions to the development of solutions to those problems and needs. Their constituents surely must have been very proud of the capable manner in which their representatives in this House moved and seconded His Honour's Address.

I should also like to join with other Members of this House in congratulating the Hon. Member from Athabasca (Mr. Guy) on his re-election to this House. One would have hoped, Mr. Speaker, that after narrowly winning in the by-election he would have realized that his approach and his attitude should change.

Mr. Guy: — It was double the majority.

Mr. Tchorzewski: — It would have been a great deal of pleasure to myself and I am sure to many others in this House who have spoken before me to congratulate the Hon. Member on his speech and on his humility if he had it, but unfortunately he seemed intent and determined to be the bear lumbering to the garbage as my

colleague, the Hon. Member from Maple Creek (Mr. Flasch) described him the other day.

Probably his actions and performance in the House would not have drawn a comment from me, Mr. Speaker, because I would much rather talk about positive things, but there were 23 Grade Five students in the gallery that day — 23 eleven year olds who came to watch government at work. They were eager and they were interested and they were children watching grownups who are thought to set an example for them. Now children in our schools, Mr. Speaker, as the Member from Milestone (Mr. MacDonald) should very well know, are taught to respect their parents and their teachers. The teacher directs the activities of the classroom as you, Mr. Speaker, direct the activities of this House. Those children, I found when I spoke to them later, were amazed and they were confused and they were disappointed about the refusal by the Hon. Member to take his seat when you called for Order. Mr. Speaker, they came to listen and they came to see and I am afraid that their lesson was not of a very high grading.

Mr. Romanow: — He's a teacher, too.

Mr. Tchorzewski: — Well even in the teaching profession there are some . I said, Mr. Speaker, that it should be preferable to hear debates in this House that are positive and constructive. We have yet to hear such debate from the ranks of the Members opposite and that is why I said when I began that it was very encouraging to hear the Member from Assiniboia-Bengough (Mr. Lange).

A Member opposite in this debate claimed at one point that the Opposition was elected to oppose. Well I might add that they have done little else and if that is what they were elected to do they have done a pretty good job. The people of this province are asking for constructive government and they have a right to expect constructive government and constructive opposition. Well, Mr. Speaker, a constructive and positive government is proven by the Throne Speech. All that has come from the Members opposite unfortunately is destructive and twisted criticism.

Saskatchewan people deserve far better than that. I wonder what happened to the new image, the new approach the Liberal Party was going to take. Wouldn't it have been refreshing? But just as Liberal promises in government between 1964 and 1971 never bore fruit, so their suggestions in opposition never seem to surface.

Democracy and a parliamentary system of government were not won easily. Our political democratic system of government took hundreds of years to develop. People were beheaded and burned at the stake in their struggle for democracy. People were exiled to strange lands because they fought for it. People fled their homelands and settled in places like Canada in search of a better way of life and in search of a better government. And in the wars of recent times young men offered their lives to protect that democratic process. It is not a perfect system of government. It has its shortcomings and because it appears at times to work slowly, some people become impatient with it. Nevertheless no one has yet been able to propose a system that works better over a long period of time. There is a need to continuously improve on it, and this we must be always prepared to do.

Mr. Speaker, the struggle for our parliamentary system of government was a difficult one and a long one. We must make it work in the best way that we can for the benefit of all people.

This legislative Chamber is a place where debates take place and it provides all of us parliamentary immunity so that Members can speak with frankness, clarity and honesty. But this privilege should not be abused. I think it is disgraceful and shameful when Members are heard to call people liars and refer to them by names that they wouldn't use out of this House.

It's fair game for the Opposition to criticize programs of this Government. Hopefully they would be prepared honestly to admit that some programs are such that even they can agree to them, and if they do I will congratulate them. But their performance today leaves little hope for that. I only suggest that when Members oppose attack personalities who do not sit in this House, they lend to a destruction of the credibility between people and this Legislature. Members of the Opposition have stood up behind their desks and charged this Government with limiting people's individual rights. They have done this in regular fashion like the clowns that pop out of a Jack-in-the-Box toy. The Member from Moose Jaw North (Mr. MacDonald) stated that the Premier is inaccessible and he said that this Government does not consult people. Well, Mr. Speaker, let me comment on the record.

There was never a greater restriction of freedom on this continent, Mr. Speaker, than the gerrymander of constituencies perpetrated by the former Liberal Government, now led by the Hon. Member from Prince Albert West (Mr. Steuart). He, of all people, Mr. Speaker, should know that. He was on the committee that drew those boundaries. Compare .

Mr. Steuart: — I was .

Mr. Tchorzewski: — Very interesting. Obviously, Mr. Speaker, he didn't do a good enough job. Mr. Speaker, compare that Liberal gerrymander to the action of this Government in establishing an Independent Electoral Boundaries Commission. An independent commission that will establish electoral boundaries on the basis of population, not politics. I ask, Mr. Speaker, who should be judged guilty of restricting the rights of people to elect the government of their choice? The Members opposite, Mr. Speaker, and none other.

This Government, Mr. Speaker, is committed to the principle of involving the citizens of Saskatchewan in the decision-making process. Prior to the election of 1971 the New Democratic Party presented to the people of this province its program — its New Deal for People. People had time to look at that program and to decide. On June 23rd they decided and as a result a large part of that program has been implemented.

This Government has established several special legislative committees to travel about the province and listen to people, to get the recommendations of Saskatchewan people on foreign ownership of land, the problems and needs of business, on social services, on our liquor laws and there will be a committee on highway safety this year. This, the Members opposite say, is a government that is not open to people. I ask them: did they tell the people of Saskatchewan in the campaign of 1967 that

they would impose deterrent fees? Did they ask the people of this province for an opinion on any matters that were of concern to all of Saskatchewan?

Mr. Speaker, which government is not open to Saskatchewan people? Guilty are those Members opposite, who were part of that cold, that heartless, that cruel Liberal Government of 1964 to 1971.

Some Hon. Members: — Hear, hear!

Mr. Tchorzewski: — Politicians, Mr. Speaker, who get elected and then forget those who elected them until the next election are not worthy of reconsideration by the electorate. This Government has provided the opportunity for Saskatchewan people to discuss, to recommend, and to take part in decisions that will affect them. This Government has opened up to the people.

Now the Hon. Member from Moose Jaw North (Mr. MacDonald), Mr. Speaker, he condemned legislative committees. This must lead one to conclude that he does not believe that people have the right to be heard between elections and that is unfortunate. I want to say to him, Mr. Speaker, if that is the way he feels then nobody forces him to act on legislative committees. It is something that one can act on his own choosing and if he does not want to serve on a legislative committee he need not and he can let the electorate then judge him on that.

Mr. Speaker, I submit that our Government has made great strides in opening up to people. Legislative committees are only one of the ways that this had been done. Let me mention another.

Why do the Members opposite not talk about the Provincial Inquiry Centre established by this Government? This toll-free telephone centre is a place where people can get directions to departments and programs. They can now be advised which department they need to go to with a particular issue without being bounced from one to the other, finally giving up in frustration as they did during the former Liberal Government. If this Government is not open to people how is it that the amount of mail coming to the Ministers' offices is double that which came to the Ministers of the former Government?

Mr. Steuart: — How do you know?

Mr. Tchorzewski: — Mention has been made of the Premier's tour throughout Saskatchewan in 1972. Once again the Members opposite criticize this tour while they say that our Government is not accessible. Let me say that the Premier's tour was of benefit and just one more way in which Saskatchewan people have had an opportunity to make contact with Government. On that tour local government leaders and individuals had an opportunity to present concerns and ask for explanation of Government programs.

In my constituency in the town of Humboldt, the town council arranged an evening public meeting. A member of the council chaired the meeting and the council welcomed this opportunity because they saw value in it.

An Hon. Member: — He is now the mayor, a

former MLA.

Mr. Tchorzewski: — The Premier's tour was of great value. He used a bus so that he could be in contact with more people. Let the Members opposite compare that to the former Premier's hopping around in an aeroplane thus avoiding as many people as he could. I hope that the tour will be continued again next year because it is one more of the many ways in which this Government has helped Saskatchewan people to be a part of Government. It is another example of taking government out of Regina, out of the capital and into rural Saskatchewan, as well as other cities in Saskatchewan.

Mr. Speaker, my colleagues in this Assembly campaigned on many issues in 1971, one of them was human rights. Saskatchewan led the way in human rights legislation in the 1940s and 1950s with the Saskatchewan Bill of Rights and Fair Employment and Fair Accommodation Acts. But the 1970s saw further needs that were not being met. There was a need for broader legislation with more teeth. It is the right for every citizen to have easy redress for grievances and access to information. In the New Deal for People program it was written that, "We need to open up government so that there is true equality of rights, remedies, and access to public services."

I have outlined some of the achievements of this Government in this important area but other achievements have been made. The New Democratic party promised to enact a Human Rights Code and this has been done. We promised to set up a Human Rights Commission to administer the Code and provide an accessible remedy for any person with a complaint. This, Mr. Speaker, has been done. We promised to establish the office of an Ombudsman responsible only to the Legislature, to investigate grievances against any activity of the Provincial Government. This, Mr. Speaker, has been done. This the Liberals opposite call restriction of individual rights. surely, Mr. Speaker, they must not be serious. If they are not serious, then they are abdicating their responsibilities as Members of this Legislature. Our Government has been and is concerned about human rights, Mr. Speaker. We think that they are important, we talked about it and we have done something about it.

Mr. Speaker, the Speech from the Throne indicated new actions will be taken by this Government in the area of Consumer Affairs. I would like to make a few comments on Consumer Affairs.

Over the past several years interest by governments in Consumer Affairs has been growing. There are several reasons for this, one of which is the increasing complexity with which consumer transactions develop and evolve in North American society. No longer does society accept the principle that the marketplace should go totally unregulated and that the consumer's interest should not be heard in the councils of government.

Complex technological changes have taken place in the marketplace. A hundred years ago the marketplace was so simple that lawmakers decided no legal protection to the consumer was warranted. The consumer was left to his own devices. At that time such a position may have been justified, however, Mr. Speaker, the situation has changed drastically. A hundred years ago the marketplace consisted of a consumer who personally knew the merchant and was familiar with the goods that he was buying.

Now, the consumer has no information on the character of the person or the business with whom he deals, because likely it is a corporation. He, likewise, has difficulty in judging the quality of the goods he buys.

It is in recognition of these factors that governments everywhere are placing increasing emphasis on consumer protection. Our Government acted in the last session of the Legislature and established the Department of Consumer Affairs. Consumers now have a specific department that they can go to. Prior to this consumers found it difficult to determine exactly where to turn. It could have been the Attorney General's Department or the Department of Agriculture, or the Provincial Secretary's Department or somewhere else. Since June 1, 1972 the Department has received a total of 580 formal complaints. In addition to these, many inquiries have been answered for our consumers.

It is interesting to note that of the 580 formal complaints 405 of them originated from southern Saskatchewan; 252 from Regina and immediate area. This indicates the need for decentralization of Government services. The Address by His Honour showed that our Government recognizes this need. It stated that there will be the establishment of an office in the city of Saskatoon and this will make the services of the department more easily accessible to more people.

Some Hon. Members: — Hear, hear!

Mr. Tchorzewski: — Now, Mr. Speaker, it is very disturbing to me, and I am sure to others, and I am sure to many people in Saskatchewan to hear the Members of the Opposition consistently criticize consumer legislation. Obviously they still think in the caveman philosophy of dog-eat-dog.

Members opposite have repeatedly tried for cheap, political reasons to stir up the business community against consumer legislation.

Some Hon. Members: — Hear, hear!

Mr. Tchorzewski: — Mr. Speaker, they have failed because the business community agrees that good consumer legislation is beneficial to the businessman just as it is to the consumer.

No responsible businessman in Saskatchewan wants to see a pyramid franchise operation like Dare-to-be-Great taking Saskatchewan consumers for a ride.

Mr. Romanow: — The Liberals do.

Mr. Tchorzewski: — The Liberals did. No responsible businessman in Saskatchewan wants to see fly-by-night operators move in for a fast buck only to disappear before the goods are fully delivered. No Saskatchewan businessman wants to see an unscrupulous operation on his street because he knows that in the eyes of the public it may be a reflection on the whole business community.

Mr. speaker, Consumer Affairs legislation is of benefit to the business community as well as to the consumer. I am proud that our Department of Consumer Affairs has established itself as an effective protector of consumer rights, and at the same time has established excellent rapport and co-operation with the business community of Saskatchewan.

Some Hon. Members: — Hear, hear!

Mr. Tchorzewski: — Now, Mr. Speaker, I should like to make a few comments on this Government's concern and initiative regarding our most important industry, agriculture. Since June 23 of 1971 many important things have been done to stabilize our agricultural community.

Rural life is a way of life worth preserving and building on. Over the years it seems the Ottawa Liberal and Conservative Governments and for a period of seven years in Saskatchewan, aided by a provincial Liberal Government, set a deliberate course based solely on short sighted economics. That course has led family farms to the edge of extinction as larger and larger farm operations emerged.

Federal Governments have closed down rural post offices; allowed or encouraged shutdowns of railway stations and branch lines; they considered plans calling for a drastic cutback in the number of Saskatchewan delivery points, and attempted to implement parts of the Task Force on Agriculture Report. These things, Mr. Speaker, were supported by Liberals and Conservatives in Parliament. Only NDP Members fought long and hard on behalf of the Saskatchewan family farmer.

Some Hon. Members: — Hear, hear!

Mr. Tchorzewski: — People like John Burton and John Skoberg, Les Benjamin, Lorne Nystrom and Alf Gleave, Rod Thompson and Bill Knight, will long be remembered for their dedicated and strong battles for Saskatchewan and Saskatchewan farmers.

Some Hon. Members: — Hear, hear!

Mr. Tchorzewski: — While Conservative Members thought only of themselves and gaining power, as they are now doing, these New Democratic Party members remembered and cared about the people who elected them. Their efforts bore some fruit and in the present Parliament ripened some more as the Trudeau Government looks hard and long at NDP programs in order to stay in power.

Now, Mr. Speaker, even the odd Liberal Member of Parliament has had to admit to the valuable contribution of the New Democratic Party Members in Parliament.

Some Hon. Members: — Hear, hear!

Mr. Tchorzewski: — Paul St. Pierre, who was Parliamentary Secretary to the Minister of External Affairs, writes in the Canadian Business Magazine of October, 1972, and I quote:

With apologies to some fine individuals, I register the

opinion that, both before and after, the official loyal opposition of the Conservative Party was outmatched, pound by pound and party by party, by the little band of New Democrats in our House of Commons.

Some Hon. Members: — Hear, hear!

Mr. Tchorzewski: — The New Democratic party of this province took a stand on behalf of the family farm. When we formed the Government not too many months ago, steps were taken immediately to revitalize family farms and rural communities. One of the most important actions was the establishment of the Land Bank Commission which has been met with popularity and enthusiasm.

Some Hon. Members: — Hear, hear!

Mr. Tchorzewski: — And in spite of this, Mr. Speaker, in spite of this the Member from Morse (Mr. Wiebe) who unfortunately is not in his seat tonight, makes such comments as, and I quote from the Humboldt Journal, “Farmers in Saskatchewan have no confidence in the Land Bank,” and I quote again, “The Land Bank commission is having an extremely difficult time in finding young farmers who are interested in renting the land.”

Well, Mr. Speaker, as a new Member to this House, I am disappointed that the Hon. Member has chosen to sidestep his responsibility as an elected representative of the people to do everything possible to distort the facts and discredit this program and join his senior colleagues in arrogantly claiming anything if they think that their political futures may be enhanced.

Land Bank statistics show that in the constituency of Morse there has been a higher than average number of applicants to sell. I would suggest that the Hon. Member begin taking an interest in the affairs of his constituency before 1975 or he may find himself sitting behind the rail in the next House.

The Member’s claim that young farmers are not interested is just not true, Mr. Speaker, It is inaccurate. There have been over 300 written applicants to lease and all of these prior to the announced five per cent rental rates.

Mr. Speaker, Liberals have led the family farm to near annihilation and Liberals still show this disregard for the needs of farmers.

This Government will continue to provide agriculture incentives. The FarmStart program which will be explained by the Minister of Agriculture (Mr. Messer), will provide much needed assistance to farmers who wish to expand or improve or start their livestock operation.

Now the Member from Lumsden (Mr. Lane), Mr. Speaker, the Member from Lumsden in his address made it very clear that the Members opposite will fight for Federal Liberal programs. I hope that he meant also those programs that the New Democratic Members will force Federal Liberals to implement as well.

Some Hon. Members: Hear, hear!

Mr. Tchorzewski: — But the Member from Lumsden has got a problem, Mr. Speaker.

An Hon. Member: — Does he ever!

Mr. Tchorzewski: — Because somewhere along the line the Member from Lumsden will have to decide which Federal Liberal programs he will support. Will he support Otto Lang's LIFT Program, which may yet result in a severe shortage of wheat in Canada, or will he support the new Minister of Agriculture who was quoted in a newspaper as saying, "Grow all the wheat you can," and we have heard that before. And I wonder if the Member from Lumsden will support Otto Lang's position on the family farm when Saskatoon Member of Parliament referred to it as a myth? Will he agree with Mr. Lang's statement, and once again I quote, and it is accurate:

Capital will not and should not be expected to bring to the farmer the same return which it would obtain off the farm. This is the sacrifice, this loss in turn is the sacrifice, which the man who wants to be a family farmer will have to be prepared to make in the course of maintaining his family farm. It is the sacrifice he will have to make in return for the non-economic benefits which he gets and can get from the farm.

Mr. Speaker, that very evidently was the philosophy behind the stabilization Bill of 1971.

Mr. Speaker, New Democrats fought that stabilization Bill because we believed in the values of our rural way of life. We believe in the family farm and we will continue to provide legislative programs to encourage and assist the development of Saskatchewan agriculture and Saskatchewan rural communities.

Mr. Speaker, the Members opposite supported that Stabilization Bill. They supported the Stabilization Bill which was a bill to guarantee that farmers in Saskatchewan would have to live in poverty. They supported a Stabilization Bill which provided some stabilization of income, but on gross income, which means they gave no consideration to the cost of production and the increasing cost of production. And I think, Mr. Speaker, that the people of Saskatchewan remember that and will continue to remember that.

Now, Mr. Speaker, the Member from Lumsden and other Members of the Liberal opposition on the other side of this House, are going to have some difficulty in trying to figure out which of the Federal Liberal programs they are going to support.

One of the Members opposite, Mr. Speaker, spoke in this Debate and talked about the Kraft boycott, and I believe it was the Leader of the Opposition (Mr. Steuart). Right, I read it this afternoon. Now the Leader of the Opposition spoke at great length about the Kraft boycott and said how terrible it was.

Mr. Steuart: — I said it was phoney, that's all.

Mr. Tchorzewski: — And yet the Member from Lumsden said that the Liberal

Members of the Opposition are committed and determined to support the Federal Liberal programs. Somehow the Member from Lumsden is going to have to decide whether he will support the Leader of the Opposition or whether he supports the new Minister of Agriculture, Eugene Whelan, in Ottawa, who said that he supports the Kraft boycott.

Mr. Steuart: — No, he did not.

Mr. Tchorzewski: — Yes, he did. Read the newspapers.

Now, Mr. speaker, I want to add a few words in the area of Culture and Youth. I am sure that all Members of this House would agree that the first Saskatchewan Games held in Moose Jaw in 1972 were an overwhelming success.

Some Hon. Members: — Hear, hear!

Mr. Tchorzewski: — And I want to say that much of the credit goes to the people who became involved in their communities and in their games.

Mr. Steuart: — And Cy.

Mr. Tchorzewski: — If the Member for Milestone was involved, I would congratulate him as well. I didn't see him at the Games but he might have been there.

An Hon. Member: — He was in the three-legged race.

Mr. Tchorzewski: — The city of Moose Jaw should be commended for the great work that the people on various committees did in preparing for and running those Games.

Some Hon. Members: — Hear, hear!

Mr. Tchorzewski: — It took a great deal of work, it took a great deal of patience and it took a great deal of people and I think that the kind of work that was done by the people in Moose Jaw and throughout Saskatchewan is just another example of the kind of people that we have in Saskatchewan. All these people, Mr. Speaker, made the Games what they were. In fact, the main purpose of the Games was people, and the fact that about 1,800 athletes and officials participated in the Games and thousands more participated in the various zones, is the greatest achievement of all.

Participation and involvement are what the Games were all about. There is a danger, Mr. Speaker, that our society is rapidly becoming one in which most people are becoming passive observers of a few very talented members of that society. We must do all we can to provide greater opportunity for people to become involved in athletic, recreational and cultural activities. Leisure time is increasing rapidly and we must keep up with the new needs that come with it. I maintain that all governments, be they provincial or federal or local, must consider sports, recreation and cultural opportunities one of their priorities in the '70s.

The Summer Games went a long way in this direction and they will be continued. I announced last Friday that in February or March of 1974 the Government will support a Saskatchewan Winter Games, which will again be followed in 1976 by another Saskatchewan Summer Games.

Some Hon. Members: — Hear, hear!

Mr. Tchorzewski: — Saskatchewan Games, Mr. Speaker, will continue in a four-year cycle, coming in between the Canadian Games. Because of the time lapse, Mr. Speaker, between 1974 and 1976 and because of the World Olympics which will be held in Montreal in 1976, we are not investigating the possibility of interesting the other western provinces in the establishment of a Western Canada Summer Games in 1975.

Mr. Speaker, I mentioned the cultural opportunity is one essential priority that governments of all levels must accept. I think the Member from Redberry (Mr. Michayluk) is very accurate in his comments about the gentlemen over there thinking only about an election year. They haven't displayed any great concern about the legislation and about the things that are going on in between election years, but they are very interested in 1975.

I believe that the evolution of nationhood for this country is far from complete, Mr. Speaker. Canada is clearly a developing country. This nation conducts its affairs from a stage somewhere between group societies (that is regional or economic groups) and accordingly to assume uniform national goals in the many areas of activity at this stage is to assume too much. It is, therefore, imperative that Federal decision-makers be culturally and regionally knowledgeable.

No Member in this Chamber will be unfamiliar with the special economic concerns of the prairie region or the growing dissatisfaction among western Canadians with their economic status within Confederation. While these are differences of opinion amongst the Members about a developmental strategy for the West and, in particular Saskatchewan, there is, I believe, genuine agreement that many national policies adversely affect Saskatchewan economic growth.

Western alienation in some quarters, stemming from economic concerns, is already having an adverse effect on Canadian nationhood. It is, therefore, particularly disconcerting to me to learn that cultural alienation is also a growing contributor to western alienation. While the Department of Culture and Youth has as yet too recent a history to identify all of the concerns or to give any accurate assessment of the magnitude of cultural alienation, there are a number of issues which I should like to bring to your attention.

First, with respect to Federal support for Cultural Development generally, there is a distinct lack of reciprocity regarding Ottawa's funding. Perhaps after Expo '67 and the construction of the now recurrent costs of the so-called National Centre of the Arts in Ottawa, perhaps Federal funds have been depleted. It is not that we begrudge Federal funding to Montreal or to Ottawa, or to Toronto or Stratford, however, the Federal Government and other national authorities funded by Ottawa have no business making grants of great magnitude

available in Ontario and Quebec, unless they are prepared and less they are able to provide substantial funding to other regions of the country as well. At the moment this simply is not the cure and not the case and the net effect of federal funding in the name of national unity and identity is, in fact, seeding further disunity.

Nor, Mr. Speaker, can we accept the explanations that federal criteria are such that many cultural endeavours in Saskatchewan or other western provinces, do not meet their standards. Criteria must reflect the state of cultural developments in the region, rather than the reverse.

To take another example, the Cultural Development Research Program of the Secretary of State's office recently conducted research to determine the role of language in cultural retention with the aim of determining the role of the Federal Government with regard to third language teaching. This study will be limited to the population centres, Mr. Speaker, of 250,000 and over, thus excluding rural Canada, and in particular, the Province of Saskatchewan, a province which is obviously vital to any multi-lingual or multi-cultural support program.

I am informed recently, Mr. Speaker, that the National Film Board has decided to develop a series of 13 one-half hour programs on western Canada, and we welcome that, their programs not unlike the *Adieu Alouette* series on Quebec which are presently being shown on CBC television. I sincerely hope that this autonomous, but federally funded Board, will engage Westerners in the actual production of that series.

Now we have, Mr. Speaker, a wealth in Canada that cannot be measured in dollars and cents. We have living here people who originated recently, or some not so recently, from every country of the world. This province is a prime example of this fact. We have not undergone the melting pot process that was attempted in the United States and in many ways has failed. We have a multi-cultural society. My hope can best be expressed by quoting Mr. Watson Kirkconnell:

Two centuries hence Canada should not be just a culture mosaic where the ethnic traditions each have been preserved for its own sake, but a cultural tapestry where the gifts of all in their myriad variety have been woven into a single national achievement. Create a nation like that and the gates of Hell and Hollywood shall not prevail against it.

Mr. Speaker, our society is greatly enriched by benefits of multi-culturalism while still attaining a state of unity. Canada must pursue this unity of diversity and if we do we will be all the richer for it. All Canadians stand to benefit from a multi-cultural society.

It is not enough to place the cultural heritage of the many ethno-cultural groups in traditional dress on a stage to sing and dance. It is not enough to place symbols, costumes and books in museums behind glass doors for all to see. But rather there must be the opportunity to develop and to create. There must be the opportunity for all to share from each other and benefit from this sharing.

Mr. Speaker, in Saskatchewan we will endeavour to

encourage and promote multi-cultural policies. To this end in 1973 the Department of Culture and Youth will sponsor a multi-cultural festival in the spring. Later in 1973, Mr. Speaker, a multi-cultural conference will be held to identify the needs and the problems of ethno-cultural groups in Saskatchewan. The Government will be looking for direction and guidance from this conference as it develops programs aimed at a policy on multi-culturalism. This Government believes in consulting with the people of the province and seeking their direction. This conference is an example of this conviction. Once again, Saskatchewan people will be given the opportunity to get involved in the decision-making process of government.

Mr. Speaker, Saskatchewan is experiencing a new surge of prosperity and optimism. The population flow out of the province has been significantly slowed down from the accelerated pace set during the Liberal years of Government. There is new hope in agriculture and there is new hope in rural communities that depend on agriculture. The Throne Speech indicated a new thrust by the Government in the development of Saskatchewan for Saskatchewan people. I am proud and I am honored to be able to be a part of it, Mr. Speaker.

I will support the motion, Mr. Speaker.

Some Hon. Members: — Hear, hear!

Mr. C.P. MacDonald (Milestone): — Mr. Speaker, I will eliminate the usual pleasantries that assume and express my congratulations to the mover and the seconder very quickly. I want to say a few words about some of the speakers who have just sat down, Mr. Speaker.

First of all I am glad that the Minister of Culture and Youth (Mr. Tchorzewski) has explained to this Assembly and to the people of Saskatchewan that we have an Ombudsman. The unfortunate thing is that he didn't tell the Attorney General. He didn't tell us and he didn't tell anybody else who he is and when you get his name I would appreciate hearing it as I am sure will all the people of Saskatchewan.

Second of all I should like to tell you that you didn't have the first Saskatchewan Summer Games. Go back to 1969 and the first Saskatchewan Summer Games were in effect and it was the Liberal Government — and you want to tell your friend the Attorney General or the Minister of Public Works how. they stood up and opposed the Canada Winter Games and the building of a mountain for the Culture and youth and for the recreation in Winter Games in Saskatchewan.

Some Hon. Members: — Hear, hear!

Mr. MacDonald: — I also just want to say a word about the Davey Crockett of the NDP. You know I like young Dave, but you know when he starts referring to the farmers as serfs, it is almost like referring to the servicemen as welfare recipients. You know some of the Members on our side of the House have seen his home and it is the nicest \$50,000 tepee we have ever seen. I want to tell you that he has a bath tub that you can swim in, just like the Minister of Agriculture's (Mr. Messer).

Mr. Speaker, I want to talk about the Attorney General

(Mr. Romanow). He stood up this afternoon like a wounded rhinoceros and he bellowed forth with all his normal mouthings and, Mr. Speaker, the first thing he did was try to justify the NDP going into the forest management business and the forest operation business in Saskatchewan. And you know he said that the only opposition that the Liberals had was because they used the old cliché of socialism and versus free enterprise. And he said that we have to get up in the 1970s and get away from the 1950s and 1940s, and I am going to tell him, Mr. Speaker, and the Members of this House we don't care about socialism. What we are concerned with is the bitter experience of the people of northern Saskatchewan.

Some Hon. Members: — Hear, hear!

Mr. MacDonald: — Mr. Speaker, when we became the Government in 1964 northern Saskatchewan was a desolation. The only job in northern Saskatchewan was welfare. There was one pulp or timber industry in the North and that was a chipboard plant that went bankrupt and the people wanted 60 cents on the dollar and were darn happy to get it, and the Minister of Agriculture (Mr. Messer) knows it.

People were unemployed. There were millions and millions of board feet of Saskatchewan lumber that were rotting in northern Saskatchewan. Rotting! There was no development. And if there ever was a Crown corporation in the history of Saskatchewan that was a miserable failure, it was the Saskatchewan Timber Board.

Some Hon. Members: — Hear, hear!

Mr. MacDonald: — And then we came along, Mr. Speaker, and of all of the policies and of all the programs that the Liberal Government put in from 1964 to 1971 look across the North.

On the eastern side we have McMillan Bloedel and Simpson stud mill; in the middle of the province we have the Prince Albert pulp mill; on the west we have the Meadow Lake saw mill. For the first time the forests are being harvested and the Attorney General says for the good of the people of Saskatchewan. I want to tell you they are getting more money, more resources, more royalties, than they ever got in the 25 years of NDP.

And then, Mr. Speaker, he stood up and talked about pollution. He talked about credibility. Since the NDP have become the Government, in two years or almost two years, they have not made one change in pollution control in the Prince Albert pulp mill other than that which was started by the Liberal Government. He talked about clear-cutting. Mr. Speaker, and then the Premier himself got up in this House and do you know what he said? "Oh," he said, "it is all right. We have changed the clear-cut pattern. We are still going to clear-cut but we are going to do it in little narrower strips."

Mr. Speaker, of all the things that this Opposition is concerned with is not socialism in the North, it is the abject failure of 20 years of the Saskatchewan Timber Board.

Some Hon. Members: — Hear, hear!

Mr. MacDonald: — I want to tell you, Mr. Speaker, it is an undisputed fact that the people of Saskatchewan are getting more in royalties, they are getting over \$25 million a year in transportation, in wages, in taxes from the Prince Albert pulp mill alone. Mr. Speaker, never has there been a time when there are more Saskatchewan jobs in the timber industry in the North and a higher wage, and better wages at any time, Mr. Speaker.

Here we have the Attorney General stand up and talk about socialism. No, it is not socialism, it is bad management of a Crown corporation that was an abject failure for 20 years. And then, Mr. Speaker, he stands up and talks about a resolution at our convention. Well, what the real intent of that resolution was that we should have junked the Timber Board in 1964. It was a mess in 1964 and the same people are still running it, the same people are still planning it and the same people will make a mess of it in 1973.

Mr. Speaker, isn't it interesting, too, that the Premier wouldn't give us the feasibility study about over-utilization in the timber industry? "Oh, no," he said, "that is a private one." Let me tell you the danger in the Saskatchewan timber industry in the North is the danger of over-utilization which will destroy a very successful operation.

Some Hon. Members: — Hear, hear!

Mr. MacDonald: — Mr. Speaker, the Attorney General got up and he talked about credibility. Well, if there is any political party in Canada that shouldn't mention credibility it is those fellows over there! Mr. Speaker, I should like to invite them all to go to Ottawa and watch their NDP counterparts in Ottawa, and watch David Lewis in Ottawa. They have lost their integrity, they have lost their order, they have lost every principle they have.

Some Hon. Members: — Hear, hear!

Mr. MacDonald: — Mr. Speaker, what was it that the Premier said the other day? He said that it is the NDP that are keeping the Liberals in power and I want to tell them that it is the Liberals that are keeping the NDP elected. Mr. Speaker, do you know that David Lewis would vote for the John Birch Society if they were the Government of Canada in order to stop having another election.

Mr. Speaker, I am going to have more to say about credibility as this talk goes on. Then the Attorney General talked about Loyde Holmes and he talked about the Minister of Highways (Mr. Kramer) who isn't here unfortunately. Oh, there he is! He said that he wasn't fired. But according to Mr. Holmes he said that the Premier said in very clear terms I either leave this position and if I don't accept the other job I am out of a job in the province of Saskatchewan. Mr. Speaker, he didn't talk about a devoted civil servant who has spent years on behalf of the Province of Saskatchewan. It was a political firing and let's make no mistake.

Mr. Messer: — Who appointed him?

Mr. MacDonald: — The NDP, that's right! But

that is the point about Loyde Holmes. The point is that Loyde Holmes was a kind of a good, hard-nosed business administrator who wouldn't stand for what the Minister of Highways is doing.

And then the Attorney General talked about the welfare committee and he said that the Leader of the Opposition (Mr. Steuart) had stood up in this House and he said that the Leader of the Opposition had criticized the welfare committee and which was an unanimous report.

Mr. Speaker, the only way that the Opposition can express disapproval on a Legislative Committee is by a reservation.

Mr. Blakeney: — A report.

Mr. MacDonald: — It is a reservation. Now you are going to tell me that we have to have a report before we can make a reservation. We have to have some kind of recommendation. That report was nonsense and, Mr. Speaker, I will enter into the debate on the Welfare Report when it comes up.

I want to talk for one minute about what the Minister of Labour (Mr. Snyder) said. He said, "We gave the highest priority to unemployment in this Throne Speech." Mr. Speaker, I have read that Throne Speech through and through and not once does it mention unemployment. And yet, Mr. Speaker, there is a higher rate of unemployment in the Province of Saskatchewan today than in any time since 1961 or 1962, since the last time the NDP were the Government.

Do you know something, Mr. Speaker? I remember a few years ago when the now the Premier of the Province of Saskatchewan, stood up and moved the amendment in this House against the Throne Speech, because there were 12,000 or 13,000 unemployed in the province. Today there are 19,000. Not one single word in the entire Throne Speech! Listen to David Lewis when he talks about credibility! The unemployed in the Province of Saskatchewan have a short shrift. Do you remember two years ago, Mr. Speaker, when we were talking about public works and they gathered that great Task Force? Today, they didn't even spend \$7 million, Mr. Speaker, of public works' money. Then the most interesting part of the Attorney General's remarks were his attempt to justify the political patronage of the NDP — and the way he did it! He selected three men, and I should like to refer to those three people — Walter Erb, Bill Clarke, George Trapp and even a fourth, Lou Dudridge.

He said, "Those dirty Liberals appointed ex-candidates and ex-ministers as civil servants." And I want to say, yes we did, but I want the Attorney General to stand on his feet and tell me when he ever saw George Trapp at a political meeting after he was appointed. Stand on your feet and tell me when you ever saw Bill Clarke. Never! Don't try to defend the NDP political patronage appointments by talking about three distinguished people who, when they were appointed to the Civil Service, they performed a job.

Some Hon. Members: — Hear, hear!

Mr. MacDonald: — It is not a laughing matter! They performed a job and they were not political hacks and leeches on the taxpayers of

the Province of Saskatchewan.

Mr. Speaker, I am going to tell you something. I don't think that the Liberal Party will accept the defence of the Attorney General and I don't think that the members in the Press gallery will accept that either, and the people of Saskatchewan won't. It is rather interesting why it was the Attorney General (Mr. Romanow) who leaped to the defence, because you know, Mr. Speaker, I happen to have a picture here. Do you know what this picture is? Well, it is of the NDP convention in Moosomin.

The convention officials at the NDP convention held in Whitewood last Saturday included left to right; Mr. John Gordon of Wapella; Mr. Eugene Doroshenko of Whitewood; guest speaker, Mr. Ned Shillington of Regina.

Some Hon. Members: — Hear, hear!

An Hon. Member: — So what?

Mr. MacDonald: — So what, is exactly it. Mr. Speaker, I want to tell you that political patronage has come up very much in this debate and they are laughing, but I don't think that the people of Saskatchewan are going to laugh because I think it is a provincial scandal. They have the audacity to come into this House and ask us to support a Bill, to limit campaign expenses.

They have .the audacity, Mr. Speaker, to come into this House and ask us to control campaign expenditures. I suggest that since they have become the Government they have spent hundreds and hundreds of thousands of dollars of the taxpayers' purse to promote their own political end.

An Hon. Member: — Prove it!

Mr. MacDonald: — I am going to in one minute. Hundreds of thousands of dollars, and I am going to tell the Attorney General that if he is going to bring in that Bill, that I am not going to support it. I am not going to support it until he puts .

Mr. Speaker: — Order, order!

Mr. MacDonald: — And I am going to tell you something else. I am not going to support it until you put some stop gaps and some checks on the public purse of this province.

Let me give you a few examples. Mr. Speaker, we talk about political appointments and I want to tell you a story about Athabasca, because everybody told a story about Athabasca. I went in to breakfast one morning and there were three NDP civil servants in there, Bill Allen who works for the Minister, Garry Thompson and Roy Mike. I said to them, "You know I didn't think civil servants were to be up in the by-election campaign." And they said that they were doing something else too. I had about three of my colleagues with me as witnesses. And then we went down to the Liberal committee room and it is right across the street from the NDP, and here is the picture from 9 to 12 — Roy Mike had a broom — this was the day they opened the NDP — Roy Mike had a broom and he was sweeping the committee rooms. Do you know what Garry Thompson was doing? He was washing the

windows! And then Bill Allen got a step ladder and he hung up the posters.

Mr. Speaker, I would say that those three men were earning \$3,000 a month of the taxpayers' money and they were out actively campaigning in that by-election. I just heard another one today, that the Minister of Municipal Affairs (Mr. Wood) had a young fellow by the name of Doug Archer working for him, the president of the NDY and then he hired, I think, the past president of the NDY. She was the assistant to the executive assistant. Mr. Speaker, from what the report is, or at least the suspicion is, that they ran the NDY operations out of that Minister's office.

Mr. Speaker, let us look at some of the .

Hon. E.I. Wood (Minister of Municipal Affairs): — Mr. Speaker, could I .

Mr. MacDonald: — Mr. Speaker, you said this afternoon that this was a debatable subject. We figure it is the truth. I am not going to tell you any more about .

Mr. Wood: — Mr. Speaker, on a Point of Privilege. The Hon. Member has indicated that the NDY was being operated from my office and I want to say that undoubtedly the two people whom he mentioned did work in the election campaign, but I want to say there was none of the taxpayers' money being spent.

Mr. MacDonald: — I am glad to hear that, Mr. Minister of Municipal Affairs and I am going to talk about that too. Building a political machine by hiring of executive assistants until election, because Mr. Archer went up to Mackenzie. That's where he went and you know it. And don't expect the taxpayers to believe it is just like all the other things you say.

Now, Mr. Speaker, I want to talk on other things

Mr. Wood: — Mr. Speaker, on a Point of Privilege. Is the Hon. Member saying I am not telling the truth?

Mr. MacDonald: — I didn't say that. I said you are hiring the executive assistants at the taxpayers' money and paying them out of taxpayers' funds then when an election comes you are giving them a leave of absence and having them run the election campaign. That is what I am saying.

Now, Mr. Speaker, I want to tell you another thing.

Some Hon. Members: — Hear, hear!

Mr. Speaker: — Order, order! I think there is just a little too much noise in the background and I hope the Members would remain quiet and let the Hon. Member continue his speech.

Mr. MacDonald: — Thank you very much, Mr. Speaker. I want to talk

about a few things. First of all the hiring of executive assistants. We are going to be very interested about the Return about the leave of absences. Outside the province travel during the British Columbia election and the Alberta election. Because what you are doing at the taxpayers' expense is hiring executive assistants just like Doug Archer, who is now buried in the Minister of Education's office. Mr. Speaker, you are hiring executive assistants, building a political machine at the taxpayers' expense. Giving them a leave of absence for a month and then hiring them again and they are nothing but political hacks.

Then, Mr. Speaker, we come to Service Printers. Why, after we ask for a Return over a year ago, do they not bring to us an account of how much money was spent in Service Printers. We dug out, when we were the Government, hundreds of thousands of dollars which were transferred to the NDP organization through Service Printers, a half a million and now you won't even do it now, over a year ago.

Mr. Speaker, I come to advertising Mr. Speaker, I have an Order for Return here. Here is one ad, \$142.00. Every Commonwealth is full of government ads at the taxpayers' expense to finance the NDP. I wonder what the Attorney General has to say about that.

Then, Mr. Speaker, the use of government ads. We had the Minister of Highways (Mr. Kramer), where somebody showed him a small ad, but, Mr. Speaker, this is the big one, he wasn't satisfied. I don't mind the Minister of Highways showing off his face but don't have the taxpayers pay for it. I would suggest that that cost \$100. Mr. Speaker, the worst of all is the Cabinet Ministers running around having political meetings at the taxpayers' expense.

I have here, 'Its our Government, yours and mine,' Alec Taylor, a Member of the Welfare Committee. At the same time the Welfare Committee was having public hearings he was going around the province advertising at taxpayers' expense, travelling at taxpayers' expense, paid the halls at taxpayers' expense for nothing more than political meetings.

It is traditional, Mr. Speaker, that Cabinet Ministers may go and talk to local government, to talk with departmental officials, but to travel around the province on political meetings is a break in every democratic tradition.

Then, Mr. Speaker, we have the Premier's tours. Not only that, but about government advertising. For example, I have the Northland News. They advertise the Land Bank, the Foreign Ownership. You know what it would cost one man to get the Foreign Ownership Committee from Uranium City? First of all he would have to get an airplane to Prince Albert, then he would have to charter to Lloydminster, then he would have to charter back to Prince Albert, then he would have to go back to Uranium City. I say at least \$500. This was a political bribe during the Athabasca by-election. Mr. Speaker, the Land Bank from Uranium city is 500 miles from the nearest area of agriculture.

Mr. Speaker, then we have the Blakeney bus. That is the most blatant thing, but the most interesting part of it is — where is that other picture, here we are. Mr. Speaker, this is a picture of the NDP convention. Here is the picture of the

Blakeney bus. It says, "The day began with a small meeting of NDP supporters." This was the Blakeney bus. I would suggest, Mr. Speaker, we have Mr. Ostland — he was at both meetings; we have Mrs. Betty Schmalenberg at the NDP convention. We have her husband. Mr. Speaker, the Blakeney bus was nothing but a political tour at the taxpayers' expense.

Some Hon. Members: — Hear, hear!

Mr. MacDonald: — Now, Mr. Speaker, we talk about the Cabinet meetings in Athabasca. The Flying Circus. Since the Athabasca by-election this Government hasn't had any Cabinet meetings away from Regina, not one. But in one month during the Athabasca by-election they had 11 Cabinet meetings. At Athabasca, all of them but, Mr. Speaker, the latest Cabinet Minister. The Leader of the Opposition (Mr. Steuart) got a letter from the Government. What did that letter suggest? That we would use the television and radio services downstairs to send comments and clippings and tapes back to our home constituencies. Mr. Speaker, the Attorney General wants to manage the news, through press councils. But, Mr. Speaker, I don't like the fact that the NDP want to manage the news of this Legislative Assembly. If a man speaks, we have a Press gallery. That Press gallery is capable of reporting anything. How do we know what goes back to Lloydminster or what the Member from Cut Knife (Mr. Kwasnica) said or is relevant in this House. All it is is political propaganda. What they wanted to do, 138 clips for the Government and 33 for the Opposition.

I am going to tell you, Mr. Speaker, that you can tell the Premier to take these two clips that belong to Cy MacDonald as he will never use them, because in principle, I don't believe in that.

Now, Mr. Speaker, all I have seen is that this Government is spending hundreds of thousands of dollars of the taxpayers' money to perpetuate their own existence. I say it is time for a public inquiry. If you want us to support that Bill you better put some safeguards into the public treasury because I can hardly wait for that debate to arise.

Now, Mr. Speaker, I want to turn to the Minister of Agriculture (Mr. Messer). Here we have the Minister of Agriculture, he didn't bay like a rhinoceros, he whined like a donkey. He turned up and what was his thing? That anybody who opposed the agricultural policy of Commissar Jack Messer, was politically sabotaging it. And that the only people that were doing it were those terrible Liberals.

Mr. Speaker, I am going to tell you fellows something, that compulsion is not a laughing matter. I am going to tell you very clearly what our position is.

Mr. Messer: — Are you going to start with LIFT?

Mr. MacDonald: No, the Hog Marketing Board. First, we believe that the Minister has the responsibility to tell the farmers in Saskatchewan where they are going to deliver their hogs. Is this the first step to compulsory marketing? Mr. Speaker, tonight I have on my desk a Bill that justified the position of the Liberal

caucus. The worst Bill for compulsion and regimentation and regulation of the farm economy ever seen in the province of Saskatchewan.

Some Hon. Members: — Hear, hear!

Mr. MacDonald: — Let me read it. It is worse than the Foreign Ownership. To regulate the time and place and to designate the agency or through which any regulated product shall be marketed to regulate the manner of distribution, the quantity or the quality of grade and it goes on and on. Let me tell you if you think the hog producers were wild before, they will be a lot wilder when they see this Bill. The second thing, Mr. Speaker, we don't think compulsion is funny. We don't think that compulsion is a laughing matter. Let me tell you something.

An Hon. Member: — What was Bill 2?

Mr. MacDonald: — Bill 2 is not the point of the Hog Marketing Commission.

Some Hon. Members: — Hear, hear!

Mr. MacDonald: — Bill 2 was a public responsibility, a national emergency. The right to vote is denied by Jack Messer. He is saying that I know better than the hog producers what is good for them. I know better than the hog producers what their future should be. Mr. Speaker, let me tell you that the hog producers or nobody else will understand.

I am going to tell you something else, Mr. Messer. You are having a difficult time getting the message. First of all he went to the implement dealers and they almost ran him out. Then he went to the hog producers at the Livestock Association and 95 per cent of them nearly ran him out. Then he went to the Palliser Wheat Growers with his friends, a couple of the caucus Members and they nearly ran him out when they told him exactly what they thought of compulsory hog marketing boards. The third one, Mr. Speaker, which is very important, is producer control. Let me tell you, Mr. Speaker, that we believe that the producers are capable of controlling their own business. Then, Mr. Speaker, he stood up and he talked about the Land Bank. He said, "You know they have no principles. "Why," he said, "they had a five year lease." The Member for Cannington (Mr. Weatherald) told him this morning that the day we put that in most of the farmers that had a lease could buy it immediately. In order to treat them all fairly we did put a five year regulation.

Oh, yes, but what else happened? Why don't you tell the whole truth? Did you know that we also sold land by tender? A fellow didn't have to have a lease for a day, not a week or a month. He could get the title for that land immediately. Because we believed, Mr. Speaker, that the private man should own his agricultural soil.

Mr. Speaker, let me tell the Minister of Agriculture in very distinct terms. Why are we opposed to the Land Bank? First, it is designed to discourage purchase and to perpetuate the lease. First of all, Mr. Speaker, it does not give a clear-cut option. It says he may, it doesn't say he shall. You may

not even be the Minister of Agriculture, and at the rate you are going you will soon be kicked out. Second, five years from now, if the Land Bank continues to buy land at the rate it is, any young farmer's son or farmer with an unviable unit that doesn't qualify in the \$60,000 will have no land to buy or little land to buy. Not only that but the Land Bank Commission will be dictating exactly who farms in the Province of Saskatchewan. Thirdly, Mr. Speaker, they talk about the Small Farms Development Program. He said you know, if only they had some philosophy. Let me read:

On the contrary, the Government has tried to point out the difference in philosophy on the grounds that it is not economic for the farmer to tie up his capital in the ownership of land.

Let me tell you that is exactly why we oppose the NDP stand on the Small Farms Development Program.

Some Hon. Members: — Hear, hear!

Mr. MacDonald: — Why? Mr. Speaker, simply because they want the first right of a refusal. They want to destroy the very principle of the Small Farms Development Program which is trying to transfer land from one individual to another.

Mr. Speaker, don't ever kid yourself, there are a lot of farmers in the Province of Saskatchewan that feel exactly the same as we do.

Now, Mr. Speaker, there is one other subject, and I haven't got very much time. I want to talk about the DREE Grants.

I just want to hold up — “Blakeney repeats criticism of DREE.” “Says Quebec favored.” Mr. Speaker, I wouldn't talk about a federal issue in this House, except when the Premier stands up. You know he has a certain amount of credibility because he is the Premier, but that is the only credibility. Mr. Speaker, he stands up and gets headlines across this nation. The headlines are absolutely false.

Some Hon. Members: — Hear, hear!

Mr. MacDonald: — You know what he is trying to say, Mr. Speaker, is what he said isn't false. That his feud started with a speech Mr. Blakeney made while campaigning in Fredericton in which he accused the Federal Government of trying to buy votes in Quebec with DREE Grants. He said that wasn't divisive. He said that I say it is divisive, Mr. Speaker. I say the principles of the DREE Program were the same as those programs such as equalization payments, same as cost sharing with the Federal Government which had one idea and that was to turn around and equalize opportunity in Canada.

Let's examine his remarks. First of all he said, the first three months of 1972 on the way to the election, Quebec received 75 per cent of DREE grants, Maritimes 13 per cent and the West 7 per cent. I say, Mr. Speaker, that is false. I have in my hand a clipping, it says: “Statistics show Lewis charge to be false.” He was following like a parrot, the NDP leader. Recent statistics indicate the Federal Government was not using

Regional Economic Expansion Grants to buy votes in Quebec before the October 30th election. Mr. Lewis said 79 per cent of the grants in the first few months of 1972 went to Quebec. It turns out, Mr. Speaker, that it was 52 per cent. Almost, except the number of unemployed in the region of Quebec that is under the Regional Expansion program, in comparison to the rest of Canada.

Then he went on to talk about the last three months. He goes on and says, Quebec's share for September was 25.4 per cent. For August 50.4 per cent. For September it went up because of one grant, the average was 56 per cent. What those statistics show, Mr. Speaker, was not that Quebec was unfairly treated or overly treated. Not that the Maritimes, not that the rest of Canada or Ontario or western Canada, what it showed was that Quebec got exactly what they deserved.

The only province that suffered was Saskatchewan. I should like to tell you why. Mr. Speaker, he started off his second argument. The per capita figures used by the Prime Minister included all programs of the department. He said I was only talking about those for Union Carbide. I was only talking about those for Procter and Gamble. I went to the DREE office and I got a copy of the \$36.51 per capita grant for DREE in the Province of Quebec, and of \$55.16 for the Province of Saskatchewan. It is a rather interesting story. Because Quebec under RDIA which the Premier mentioned so often only got \$3.46 per capita. Saskatchewan \$3.15 for the RDIA \$6.59 to \$5.07. Infrastructure in Quebec, \$16.34 to \$2.36 for Saskatchewan. FRED program \$8.07 in Quebec, nil for Saskatchewan. ARDA \$1.40 in Quebec, \$7.63 in Saskatchewan. I want to tell you about that ARDA program. That is down at the Crooked Lake region in the Province of Saskatchewan where the native people are developing a complex. It is eventually going to cost \$33 million. A golf course, a summer resort, lakes. If that isn't economic development and expansion, I don't know what is.

Mr. Speaker, what I am saying is that if they had not cancelled the Choiceland iron mine or the Athabasca pulp mill the Province of Saskatchewan would have received more per capita even in industrial grants than the Province of Quebec.

Some Hon. Members: — Hear, hear!

Mr. MacDonald: — Mr. Speaker, the most blatant charge was that the program was changed to benefit the Quebec region predominantly. That is an exact quote. This is false, Mr. Speaker, I see it as a deliberate divisive statement for the Dominion of Canada. DREE does not initiate grants they only have an officer here. They don't have people running around the province doing it. They can only respond to applications. The Premier said there was no shortage of applications. I happen to have the number of applications. Mr. Speaker, for example, there are only two reasons it could be divisive or discriminatory. One, not enough applications or bad treatment of those applications. The Maritimes got 29.8 per cent of their applications approved. The Province of Quebec 28.4; western Canada 26.9 or almost 27 per cent.

How did Saskatchewan make out? I should like to tell you — 198 applications have been received since inception of the program. Manitoba was almost 500. 113 withdrawn or rejected. 64 offers made, 47 accepted — 26 pending.

Mr. Speaker, if the offers made are accepted by the companies in Saskatchewan; if applications outstanding are in the same percentage, Saskatchewan will be better treated than any other area in Canada. The real problem, Mr. Speaker, is the fact that the business community does not have confidence in the NDP Government and it is a real economic indicator.

The second reason, Mr. Speaker, is that the Minister of Industry (Mr. Thorson) has done a terrible job. It is his responsibility in his department to go out and encourage industry. To go ahead and project. Mr. Speaker, let me tell you for example about the three months he referred to. The Province of Quebec had 861 applications to Saskatchewan's 35. If they had approved every single one since the inception they wouldn't have been in the percentage of the Province of Quebec. It is an admission by the Premier of the failure of his economic policy. That is all that's the matter with DREE, and if he had not accused the Province of Quebec of getting favoritism, if he had come to the Opposition we would have supported him because I believe that DREE has to be made more available because we have too much land in Saskatchewan that is not a potential industrial area, because of high freight rates, because of transportation costs. But surely the Premier of the Province has no right to stand up in this Legislature and accuse the Province of Quebec and the Federal Government of buying votes in Quebec when it is a deliberate falsehood.

Some Hon. Members: — Hear, hear!

Motion agreed to on the following recorded division:

YEAS — 41

Blakeney	Brockelbank	Taylor
Dyck	MacMurchy	Matsalla
Meakes	Pepper	Cody
Wood	Michayluk	Gross
Smishek	Byers	Feduniak
Romanow	Thorson	Comer
Messer	Whelan	Rolfes
Snyder	Kwasnica	Lange
Bowerman	Carlson	Hanson
Kramer	Engel	Oliver
Thibault	Owens	Feschuk
Larson	Robbins	Kaeding
Kowalchuk	Tchorzewski	Flasch
Baker	Cowley	

NAYS — 14

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

Hon. R. Romanow (Attorney General): — Mr. Speaker, I move seconded by the Hon. the Premier (Mr. Blakeney):

That the said Address be engrossed and presented to His

February 6, 1973

Honour the Lieutenant-Governor by such Members of the Assembly as are of the Executive Council.

Motion agreed to.

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