

LEGISLATIVE ASSEMBLY OF SASKATCHEWAN
Fourth Session — Seventeenth Legislature
3rd Day

Monday, December 3, 1973.

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

On the Orders of the Day

WELCOME TO STUDENTS

MR. G.B. GRANT: (Regina Whitmore Park) — Mr. Speaker, through you and to the Members of this Assembly I should like to introduce 44 Grade Eight students from Athabasca School and they are under the direction of Doug Zaitz. I believe this school class is one of the first ones we have had in the Chamber this Session and I know all Members join with me in wishing them a sincere welcome and an interesting visit to the House.

HON. MEMBERS: Hear, hear!

MR. E.C. WHELAN: (Regina North West) — Mr. Speaker, through you I should like to introduce to the Legislature, 20 students from the adult up-grading class at the Wascana Institute of Applied Arts and Sciences, Vocational Education Division at the Saskatchewan House in Regina North West. They are located in the west gallery with their teacher, Mr. Hanson.

I am sure that all Members join me in welcoming them to the House and expressing the wish that their stay with us will be pleasant, informative and educational.

HON. MEMBERS: Hear, hear!

HON. W.E. SMISHEK: (Regina North East) — Mr. Speaker, if I may, I should like to also join with the Hon. Member from Whitmore Park in extending a welcome from the Government side of the House to the students from Athabasca School. It is normally the custom for the Member in the constituency where the school is located to extend a welcome to visitors, but regrettably at this time the Lakeview constituency is not represented in this House due to the death of the late Member, Mr. McPherson. So on behalf of the Government Members I should like to extend a warm welcome to the students from the Athabasca School and hope that their stay with us this afternoon will be enjoyable and educational. This is the first day of the Throne Speech Debate that is going to take place. The mover will be Mr. Kaeding and Mr. Cody as seconder.

I hope that your experience this afternoon will help you and will be useful to you in your social studies in school.

HON. MEMBERS: Hear, hear!

MR. C.P. MacDONALD: (Milestone) — Ted Malone will appreciate that.

SOME HON. MEMBERS: Hear, hear!

QUESTIONS

LARGE INDUSTRIAL GAS ACCOUNTS

MR. D.G. STEUART: (Leader of the Opposition) — Before the Orders of the Day, Mr. Speaker, I should like to direct a question to the Premier. I have a copy of a letter here from the Saskatchewan Power Corporation and it is to a company in Saskatchewan and the topic is large industrial gas accounts. The letter goes on to say, and it is dated May 30, 1973:

The supply of natural gas for all large industrial accounts, including yours, is covered by specific contract between us. One of its provisions enables us to increase the rate during the term without disturbing the force and the effect of the contract in any other way. Unfortunately we now find it is necessary to exercise the option. This will increase your annual bill by approximately 10 per cent. The new rate will be used to calculate bills rendered this August for gas taken in July. We still don't know the full implications of the gas pricing policy which the Alberta Government has adopted so it is likely this increase will be an interim measure.

It is signed, I think it is J. Catchuk, it looks like, District Superintendent.

I wonder if the Premier is aware that this has happened?

HON. A.E. BLAKENEY: (Premier) — Yes.

MR. STEUART: — I have a quotation from the Globe and Mail of November 14th, 1973.

MR. SPEAKER: — Order, order! I must remind Members at the start of this Session again that quoting from papers is definitely not permitted in Questions and I hope the Hon. Member will phrase his question without quoting from the paper.

MR. STEUART: — Mr. Speaker, I think that is rather a strange ruling but anyway I can say that the Premier was quoted in the Globe and Mail and I listened to him on the television the other night and I have heard him on the radio and what he said in effect was this. He didn't say it in effect, he said it:

We in Saskatchewan, through the Saskatchewan Power Corporation have avoided, we have not, in spite of increased cost, we have not raised gas rates.

And in his speech he went on to say:

Natural gas which is used by most of our manufacturing industries and to heat a great many of our homes . . .

And so on. The quote is right here and I have heard him on television:

We have resisted and we have not passed those rates on.

Now, in view of the letter which I have just read which he is aware of, why has he gone out to misinform the public when in fact gas rates have been raised to a tremendous number of users by over 10 per cent?

MR. BLAKENEY: — Mr. Speaker, am I allowed to make an equally facetious reply on the Orders of the Day? I say to him, as I have said any number of times, that the context of the question that I was referring to was household gas rates. I don't care what the Globe and Mail says. Order, Mr. Speaker! Am I to be allowed to answer the speech given by the Leader of the Opposition or is he to continue to interrupt me?

MR. SPEAKER: — Order! I think that the questions as I tried to point out previously and again today, should not be read from statements in the paper. The paper may or may not be correct. Members should ask their questions and if the question is lengthy the Minister concerned is going to take a lengthy answer. Therefore, it is better if questions are short and then answers are going to be short. But I believe in this case the Minister should have a right to answer because the question was lengthy.

MR. BLAKENEY: — Mr. Speaker, as I indicated the context in which I answered the question was with respect to retail gas rates and I say, again, that the people of Saskatchewan are going to enjoy the fruits of having a public natural gas corporation, they are going to enjoy the fact that they will not suffer increases in natural gas and fuel rates such as are happening in every province that has a Liberal Government. They are going to enjoy the fact that we have public ownership of this facility, whereas Liberal Governments all across Canada have resisted public ownership. If I had to defend in a forthcoming Federal election, the record of the Liberal Party federally and provincially with respect to fuel rates, I would be inclined to raise red herrings as is the Member from Prince Albert West (Mr. Steuart).

SOME HON. MEMBERS: Hear, hear!

MR. STEUART: — I wonder if you would ask the Premier if he would answer the question, why he deliberately misinformed the public when he said in this article, and said on the television and the radio and he lied to the public and said that he did not intend to raise rates, when in fact the rates have been raised. No amount of red herrings about Liberal Governments anywhere else will change the fact that you said this, you said it on the radio, you said it on the television . . .

MR. SPEAKER: — Order, order!

MR. STEUART: — . . . and now you get up here and you say you have not misinformed them.

MR. SPEAKER: — Order, order!

MR. BLAKENEY: — Mr. Speaker, may I have a ruling on his outburst which included the word 'lie'.

MR. SPEAKER: — I think Members should try to keep themselves in order by asking questions and not making statements on Orders of the Day this way because it leads to disruptions of the House and it doesn't lead to good procedures. Statements and words are used which shouldn't be used and I hope we don't start out the Session by getting out of order all the time. I should like to ask that the questions be distinct and to the point so that the answers may be the same. I hope that future questions will be brief and not quoted from newspaper articles.

MR. STEUART: — Mr. Speaker, I withdraw the word "lie". I meant, misinform and mislead the public by the Premier.

MR. KRAMER: — Is this little smudge pot going to be allowed to break the rules? He called the Premier a liar and I want a withdrawal.

MR. SPEAKER: — Order! The Hon. Member just rose and said if he used the word "lie" he wished to withdraw it. I think if Members would just be a little more patient with each other and not be so ready to take on verbal battle, we would get along a little better.

SCHOOL AT LA LOCHE

MR. C.P. MacDONALD: (Milestone) — Before the Orders of the Day I should like to ask Mr. Smudge Pot's seatmate, a question.

MR. SPEAKER: — I must ask that that remark be recalled, because I have been ruling him out of order and to rule one out of order and have another one repeat it, it doesn't help me in my capacity. I'll ask you to withdraw that.

MR. MacDONALD: — I would be most happy to withdraw if you ask him to withdraw.

MR. SPEAKER: — I ruled him out of order because the Member had risen. When we get a debate going like this where both sides are not trying to stay within parliamentary rules, it makes it difficult for all of us.

MR. MacDONALD: — Mr. Speaker, I should like to direct a question to the Minister of Northern Saskatchewan (Mr. Bowerman). Could he inform the House if those 450 children at La Loche and 22 teachers are now back in the classroom? I notice on his brilliant defence of the Department of Northern Saskatchewan he did not indicate whether or not the school in La Loche was open at this time.

HON. G.R. BOWERMAN: (Minister of Northern Saskatchewan) — The answer, Mr. Speaker, is yes. They are back in school and I suggest that an additional answer to this is that the Northern School Board is now in charge of affairs with respect to schools in Northern Saskatchewan and that question should be more properly asked of the Northern School Board.

SOME HON. MEMBERS: Hear, hear!

MR. MacDONALD: — As a supplementary question would the Minister from Northern Saskatchewan give my colleagues credit, Mr. Weatherald, Mr. Gardner and Mr. Coupland, for getting those 450 children back to school?

MR. BOWERMAN: — The answer to that question is no, I would not give them credit. Mr. Speaker, anybody who was born and raised on the Regina plains and goes into Northern Saskatchewan for 48 hours and comes out with an expert answer is a long way off course.

SOME HON. MEMBERS: Hear, hear!

AN HON. MEMBER: — It wouldn't take them 10 minutes to know more than the Member from Shellbrook (Mr. Bowerman).

MR. SPEAKER: — Order, order!

GLOBAL BUDGETING

MR. D.F. MacDONALD: (Moose Jaw North) — Mr. Speaker, I should like to direct a short question to the Minister of Public Health (Mr. Smishek). It seems that global budgeting last year forced doctors out of the Prince Albert Community Clinic and now the global budgeting has forced all of the doctors out of the Regent Park Community Clinic. My question is that in view of the complete collapse of the Regent Park Community Clinic, including the resignation of some of the Board Members and all of the staff and the fact that the doctors who were formerly employed by the Clinic, are now under a fee-for-service basis, will the Clinic still be collecting funds from the Government for operating the Clinic under a global budgeting basis?

HON. W.E. SMISHEK: (Minister of Public Health) — Mr. Speaker, obviously the Member knows something that nobody else does seem to know. I am not aware that there is a total collapse of the Regent Park Clinic, nor am I aware of any resignations of the staff or any medical group. Certainly that has not come to my attention. I know that there are differences between the Board and the medical group. I am aware that they have been meeting and negotiating their differences, the matter of whether or not they will be on a fee-for-service basis or on a global budget will be determined sometime in the future.

MR. MacDONALD: — Mr. Speaker, as a supplementary I will ask the same question again, will the Clinic still be collecting funds on a global budgeting basis at the present time or for the next month?

MR. SMISHEK: — Mr. Speaker, there is an agreement between the Medical Care Insurance Commission, the Minister and the Community Clinic on a global budget. That agreement has not been terminated by either party so far.

ADDRESS-IN-REPLY

MR. E. KAEDING (Saltcoats) moved, seconded by Mr. D.W. Cody, (Watrous):

That an humble Address be presented to His Honour the Lieutenant-Governor as follows:

TO HIS HONOUR THE HONOURABLE STEPHEN WOROBETZ Lieutenant-Governor of the Province of Saskatchewan.

MAY IT PLEASE YOUR HONOUR:

We, Her Majesty's dutiful and loyal subjects, the Legislative Assembly, of the Province of Saskatchewan in Session assembled, humbly thank Your Honour for the gracious Speech which Your Honour has been pleased to address to us at the opening of the present Session.

He said: Mr. Speaker, I am honored indeed this afternoon to have been chosen to move the Address-in-Reply. Both myself and the constituents of Saltcoats, which I have the pleasure to represent, are honored by this opportunity. It is probably ironic that just three years ago in the first session of this Legislature, in my maiden speech, I was somewhat critical of the procedures and methods of this institution. Many of the criticisms made then may still be valid, but I have learned in the intervening years that democratic decisions must of necessity be made slowly and accurately. It is not unusual that any group, political or otherwise, might become so bound up in their philosophy that they do not always see the other side of the street. On such occasions, sharp criticism from opposition and an informed public are a sobering counterbalance which can often lead to more responsive government.

Three years ago, Mr. Speaker, we entered this House full of enthusiasm at having gone to the people of this province with a platform and a working program which we called the New Deal for People, and at having received an overwhelming endorsement of that program. I can recall at that first session, the Leader of the Opposition (Mr. Steuart) waving a copy of the New Deal in his chubby little hands and telling us that he would keep it to make sure we would fulfil all of our commitments. I can assure you that neither his threats or his taunts have had anything to do with our performance up-to-date.

SOME HON. MEMBERS: Hear, hear!

MR. KAEDING: — I should like to take a minute or two to give a progress report on that program and I invite Members opposite to do their own analysis of it. In the New Deal, there was a total of 139 items listed. Since some of these items were covered in more than one department, the total number of commitments were probably somewhat less.

In the three years since this Government has been in office, 72 of these commitments could be said to have been completed in full.

SOME HON. MEMBERS: Hear, hear!

MR. KAEDING: — Another 60 or so are either already partially underway or in the final planning stage. Only six remain to be started and a number of these have become obsolete. In addition to these many commitments we have fulfilled, there are a host of other programs which have been developed and implemented in response to public demand.

The New Deal called for a removal of deterrent fees. They were immediately removed. It called for a hearing aid program. This year that became a reality. We promised to include chiropractic care under Medical Care Insurance and that is now an insured service.

The New Deal called for a reduction of mill rates on property taxes for school purposes and that has been done to the level of 25 mills. A new Trade Union Act was passed guaranteeing free collective bargaining, the repeal of Bill 2 and other benefits. The work week was reduced to 40 hours and minimum wages go to \$2 on December 1st.

SOME HON. MEMBERS: Hear, hear!

MR. KAEDING: — In response to the New Deal commitment to assist small business, SEDCO regulations were drastically changed to make possible loans for a wide range of business financing. Regional business representatives have been appointed to help with technical advice and to assist businessmen in their dealings with Government departments and legal problems. New “Aid to Trade” programs will assist small manufacturers to promote and display their products on world markets. One could go on and on, Mr. Speaker, down the list of fulfilled commitments, and more are being introduced at this Session.

This record of performance, Mr. Speaker, will be well received by the people of this province. It is a record of promises made and promises kept. It is a record which will instil confidence in the people so that when we present the next edition of the New Deal that this Government will again have the courage and determination to do the will of the majority of the people.

SOME HON. MEMBERS: Hear, hear!

MR. KAEDING: — We invite all people of this province to join with us through policy seminars and forums in the next few months to help formulate that second edition of the New Deal with the full knowledge and confidence that this Government will again be responsive to their needs.

In the New Deal we committed ourselves to establish a Land Bank Commission. In response to the urgent need for a better and easier method of transferring farm land from one generation to get established in agriculture without committing all of their funds to the purchase of land., the Government introduced the Land Bank program in 1972. In spite of the bitter cries of the Members opposite that it wouldn't work; first the rent was too high, then it was too low, we paid too much, and then we paid too little, and all of the other predictions of doom and failure, in spite of this, Mr. Speaker, the Land Bank program has been a resounding success.

SOME HON. MEMBERS: Hear, hear!

MR. KAEDING: — Before this purchasing season is over the Land Bank will have purchased over \$21 million worth of land, and has leased it back to over 460 farmers, most of them young men, and many of them who would not otherwise have been able to obtain a start in agriculture.

In the New Deal we promised to provide low-cost credit with loan forgiveness features for young farmers to intensify their farm operation. Last year the Minister of Agriculture (Mr. Messer) introduced the FarmStart program to provide this low-cost credit and grants to young farmers who wished to intensify their farming operations by adding or expanding a livestock enterprise. Again this was an overwhelmingly popular program. Even in the few months, this program has been in operation, well over 200 farmers have had loans approved valued at close to \$6 million covering a wide range of agricultural enterprises. Many more are now being processed.

In addition, Mr. Speaker, legislation was passed to provide for a Farm Machinery Board to give farmers protection on parts and warranties. Veterinary services have been expanded tremendously; we now have 16 new clinics operating or in the process of construction. For the first time, Mr. Speaker, veterinary graduates are looking to Saskatchewan locations to start their practices because of improved facilities.

The Agricultural Representative Service has been increased and regional agricultural offices have been set up in six areas of the province to bring our extension service closer to farmers.

The Speech from the Throne indicates that legislation will be coming forward at this Session to establish a prairie agricultural machinery institute. Members will recall that in the 1950s the CCF Government established an agricultural machinery testing program which was of real value to farmers in selecting and assessing performance of farm equipment. It was a very popular and valuable service for farmers. However, it was not as popular with the larger machine companies who were forced to prove their machines. As a result when the Liberal Government came to power in 1964, these friends of large corporate enterprises, immediately bowed to the wishes of the companies and scuttled the program by relegating it to an insignificant role at the university. We are proud to re-establish this machinery testing service.

SOME HON. MEMBERS: Hear, hear!

MR. KAEDING: — The legislation will be prepared so that our sister provinces of Alberta and Manitoba can join with us. And we are hopeful that federal participation will be forthcoming, so that a real meaningful testing service will result. The institute will test, evaluate and appraise all kinds of machines under actual working conditions. It will work with manufacturers and innovators to develop new machines. It will publish reports on the results of tests and work to the standardization of parts. We are confident that this program will have wide acceptance among prairie farmers.

Further in response to the New Deal, we have established a Saskatchewan Hog Marketing Commission to promote orderly marketing of that product and to stabilize prices. Since its inception, the Marketing Commission has been extremely active in promoting and expanding export markets for hogs. It is interesting to note that prior to the establishment of the Marketing Commission, prices for slaughter hogs in Saskatchewan were consistently below Winnipeg prices, often by as much as \$2 or \$3 per hundred. Statistics compiled since the Commission started operating indicate that in that three-month period, the price spread has averaged just about 40 cents per hundred. This adjustment alone has been worth thousands of dollars to Saskatchewan producers.

SOME HON. MEMBERS: Hear, hear!

MR. KAEDING: — In addition, Mr. Speaker, the Throne Speech indicates a further move to expand and promote agricultural products through an Agricultural Products Development Act. This legislation will provide for financial and technical assistance to farm groups and individuals to improve their marketing techniques, and expand their markets.

This series of programs, developed in response to needs of rural Saskatchewan, are neither haphazard, nor unrelated. For too many years we have witnessed the gradual decline of farms and businesses in this province. Particularly in the late 1960s and early 1970s rural population dropped dramatically, nor yet has it been entirely stopped. With the advent of modernized equipment, farmers are able to farm larger acreages and subsequently as some retired or were unable to survive, others purchased their land and increased their holdings. Probably some consolidation was necessary in order to provide a viable farm operation under modern conditions. However, it is also obvious to most people that if this trend were to continue, the rural community would soon be depleted and in many areas community life as we know it would cease to exist.

It is for these reasons, Mr. Speaker, that this Government has made and continues to make a major thrust to provide the basis for an intensified livestock industry in this province. The alternatives are clear, if a continued consolidation takes place, many of our small communities will cease to exist. If we are to provide adequate incomes for a large farm population on existing acreages, this income must come from production of livestock or other intensified crops. We have determined to develop the latter course, not because it is easier, because it is not, but because it is the only course we feel that people in rural areas will willingly accept.

In order to provide the stability and security that is necessary to encourage young farmers to make a long-term investment in intensified agriculture, it then becomes necessary to provide some form of stability in the market place to ensure that when he has produced to his capacity, there are stable markets and prices which will warrant the risk. The need, therefore is for a well-planned grain and livestock stabilization program, developed on a federal-provincial-farmer basis, which will ensure the farmer a price for his produce which will guarantee him a reasonable return above his cost of production.

Last summer, at the Western Economic Opportunities Conference in Calgary, the Western provinces strongly endorsed such a

program and received assurances from the Federal Minister that serious consideration would be given to federal support for such programs. To date we have seen little evidence that such support is forthcoming at an early date, if indeed, it comes at all.

In fact, because of Federal Government activities and similar interference in the United States where these governments attempted to hold down the effects of inflation by apply-ing price freezes on meat products, a very serious imbalance has been created between the price of meat products and the cost of feed grains. This has resulted in a situation where Western farmers find themselves in the position of feeding out their livestock at severe losses to themselves or selling off their feeders to avoid such losses. It is not difficult to guess which alternative an alert farmer would choose. We are faced with attempting to encourage livestock production in the face of these artificial obstacles. This, of course, points out again the urgent need for a stabilization plan, not only for grain but for all livestock products as well. Events of the past few months are sufficient evidence that no one sector of the agricultural scene can be dealt with in isolation.

This Government will continue to press the Federal Government for a fully integrated stabilization program for agriculture which will not only guarantee security for the farmer on the land, but will guarantee to consumers of farm products a reliable supply of good food at more stable prices.

As a result of the sudden rise in input costs in the livestock feeding industry this summer many hog producers appeared to be seriously contemplating reducing their operations, in fact, some have done so. This Government acted quickly to provide a floor price of \$57 per 100, a price which would cover cost of production plus a fair margin. This quick action had the result of forestalling a major reduction in hog numbers, and has once again instilled confidence in that industry. We would very much have liked to institute a similar program for market cattle. However, the financial risks involved are too great to be carried on a provincial basis, which once again points up the need for an integrated federal-provincial program.

I should like to turn for a minute, Mr. Speaker, to the matter of orderly marketing. Farm organizations have from the early 1900s until the present day slowly and painstakingly struggled to ensure for themselves a method of marketing their grain crops in a way which would give them the maximum return with equal delivery opportunities and a pooled price which would reflect the average selling price of their crops throughout the year. Through their efforts the Canadian Wheat Board was established and has done a very creditable job for them over the years; it has won the confidence of most prairie farmers. So much so, in fact that they have persistently demanded that all grains including rye, flax and rapeseed be included under the orderly market system. The concept of orderly marketing under the Canadian Wheat Board has always been violently contested by the Winnipeg Commodity Exchange and by proponents of the open market system. It was not until this year, however, that they were able to obtain any support for their cause from governments. The Minister in charge of the Canadian Wheat Board, Otto Lang, has been under heavy political pressure from Eastern livestock interests and from his colleague, Mr. James Richardson, whose interest in the international grain trade is well known, to remove the sale of feed grain from the Canadian Wheat Board

and return it to the open speculative market. The feed grain proposals for 1974 and beyond as outlined by Mr. Lang are designed to do exactly that.

Under those proposals marketing of feed grains for domestic consumption would be removed from the Canadian Wheat Board leaving them responsible only for export sales. The Board would be required to give priority to domestic buyers by providing supplies when and where they are wanted. It would be responsible for the movement of all feed grains, but would have no pricing authority or selling function over feed grains in Canada. Feed dealers, brokers and speculators would be given freedom to by-pass the Board, and to buy grains on a direct basis in western Canada whenever it served their purpose and at whatever price they could negotiate. There would be no quota system on these purchases and no initial price guarantees for feed grains intended for domestic consumption. One can readily see that this would destroy the quota system for all grains and would lead to chaotic conditions in the grain-handling system since it would be required to give priority to these purchases.

The unholy alliance of Lang and Richardson would have us believe that because there would be many more buyers in western Canada for feed grains that this would result in higher prices to producers. What they fail to tell you is that there are over 100,000 individual farmers on the prairies to purchase from. If quotas are tight, as a result of transportation difficulties, slow export sales or for any other reason, farmers would find themselves in the same dog-eat-dog position they faced only two years ago. Surely, Mr. Speaker, we cannot accept such a proposal.

We are fortunate, indeed, Mr. Speaker, that we have a determined and articulate Minister of Agriculture who has led the way in opposing the imposition of this infamous proposal on prairie producers.

SOME HON. MEMBERS: Hear, hear!

MR. KAEDING: — His opponents have tried to discredit him by saying he is playing politics with Saskatchewan farmers, Mr. Speaker. If it is necessary to play politics with Mr. Lang to protect the interest of agricultural producers, then that's the name of the game. I am sure most thinking farmers will agree and support the Minister in that position.

SOME HON. MEMBERS: Hear, hear!

MR. KAEDING: — And he is not alone, Mr. Speaker. Every right minded farm organization which is concerned with the long-term welfare of Western agriculture has stood shoulder to shoulder with him in his opposition to this feed grain proposal. Nor has the opposition of the Minister of Agriculture or the farm organizations been a negative one. On the contrary they have worked together in putting forward alternative solutions which would combine the desired wishes of eastern feeders to obtain western grain at equitable prices and maintain the full jurisdiction of the Canadian Wheat Board in all aspects of the purchase, transportation and sale of these products. In spite of his blatant statements to the contrary, I sincerely hope that Mr. Lang will still see the error of his ways and listen to

the wishes of Western, farmers. Failure to do so will certainly lead him to the political destruction he so well deserves.

SOME HON. MEMBERS: Hear, hear!

MR. KAEDING: — We are now faced with the question of rapeseed marketing. The same powers who are so bitterly opposed to orderly marketing of feed grains are once again lined up in the rapeseed plebiscite. One wonders, after seeing the prices of rapeseed fluctuate from just over \$2 per bushel to highs of \$7 to \$8 and back down to \$4 in less than one year, how the open marketing system can have any creditability left among rapeseed growers; particularly when one considers that probably 90 per cent of the producers received prices on the low end of the scale.

Once again we are being bombarded by propaganda about freedom of choice and all of the other clichés that roll so glibly from the lips of the Commodity Exchange and its promoters. Freedom for whom, Mr. Speaker? Certainly not for the average producer who is often forced to sell to meet his financial obligations or is caught in a position of not being able to deliver because his elevator is congested when the prices are high. No, Mr. Speaker, let's not be fooled by that kind of propaganda. Now as never before in recent history, the whole structure of orderly marketing is being attacked, by commodity exchanges, grain export companies and international traders. Never before has it been more necessary for agricultural producers to stand together to defend their institutions for orderly marketing against these forces. I am proud to hear, Mr. Speaker, that there are even at this moment, large numbers of farmers visiting from farm to farm encouraging their neighbors to vote for orderly marketing of rapeseed. Because more than rapeseed is at stake in this issue. Should the plebiscite fail, and its designers have attempted to ensure that it does by requiring a 60 per cent vote and providing for an undecided vote, then the pressure will be or to degrade further the orderly marketing system. We must not let it fail. I call on all responsible farm organizations to get out and fight to ensure that the whole system of orderly marketing is confirmed by a positive vote between now and December 14th.

SOME HON. MEMBERS: Hear, hear!

MR. KAEDING: — I would even challenge the Members on the benches opposite particularly the rural Members, to stand up and be counted on this issue.

SOME HON. MEMBERS: Hear, hear!

MR. KAEDING: — I don't hear a sound. Mr. Speaker, you will recall at the last session the Agricultural Committee on the Ownership of Farm Land submitted its report to the Legislature. This report indicated that although control of farm lands by corporations and non-residents had not yet reached serious proportions in most areas, there was need for legislation to prevent further take-over and for gradual repatriation of those lands now held to active farmers. However, with higher grain prices and rapidly escalating land prices, there is evidence that a number of outside interests are again attempting to purchase blocks of our farm land for speculative purposes. We are

concerned that our rural population should not be depleted as it surely would be if such purchases continue. Therefore, as a result of the recommendations of the Committee, we shall be presenting legislation restricting the ownership of Saskatchewan farm land by corporations and non-residents. Safeguards will be written into the legislation to provide tenure in cases of estates, gifts, etc. and provision will be made for farmers farming across neighboring borders to safeguard their interests. Exemptions will also be provided for family farm corporations and co-operative farm operations. This legislation is further evidence of our determination to keep the ownership of our greatest resource in the hands of active farmers.

Mr. Speaker, I have dwelt at some length on agricultural issues and I do not apologize for that, since it is our most important and vulnerable industry.

Tied to agriculture is the whole fibre of rural life in this province. In the New Deal for People we said we would provide for rural people those kinds of conveniences and services which would make rural living attractive and rewarding. We have gone a long way toward that goal.

Through the Open Roads and Mainstreet programs, we have provided a dust-free access to highways into virtually every town and village in Saskatchewan. I look at my own constituency of Saltcoats. Oiling programs have been undertaken in all of the larger centres; Esterhazy, Langenburg, Churchbridge, Bredenbury, Stockholm, Dubuc, MacNutt and many others. Further oiling will be done in the coming year. I am sure, Mr. Speaker, the residents have appreciated this program.

New programs for improvement of parks and recreational areas have gone ahead under a number of grant programs. The Spy Hill area of my constituency negotiated a new regional park to serve its citizens.

Improved grants under The House Building Assistance Act and Home Repair Grants have assisted many people to build new homes or repair and renovate older buildings. The Senior Citizens Repair Grants particularly have been a real help to many senior citizens who were unable to make improvements out of their meagre incomes.

Through the restructuring of SEDCO, many small businesses are now for the first time eligible to receive assistance in financing a new business and in assisting transfers from one owner to another. To further strengthen rural life in Saskatchewan the Government is trying to promote industries that either process agricultural products or manufacture farm machinery. Through the new "Aid to Trade" Program these new small industries are able to obtain assistance to develop new markets and to advertise their products on the world market. In my own constituency of Saltcoats, a number of small businesses have become established because of this assistance and a number of others are under consideration.

Through the Winter Works and community betterment programs, large grants have been made available to local community centres to provide such things as recreational areas, swimming pools, curling rinks and other facilities.

The community college program has been instituted and many rural people are now attending courses which were heretofore available only in the larger centres.

All of these programs have done much to improve the quality of rural life in Saskatchewan and have brought a new feeling of well-being to these communities. These programs will be continued and expanded.

Much has been said in recent days and weeks with regard to the so-called energy crisis of this country. My colleague, the Member for Watrous (**MR. CODY**) will be dealing at some length with this topic. However, I should like to voice my extreme disappointment at recent statements made by our Prime Minister. After a great publicity build-up which indicated that he would be making some major announcements we were treated to a 15 minute monologue which meant virtually nothing and in which he ended by stating that his energy Minister would be making an announcement the following Monday.

On Monday, Mr. MacDonald, the Minister of Energy, spent 10 minutes, but the best he had to offer was a few tips on how to save energy, and a few vague promises of an energy board to control the use of oil products. Surely we had hoped that the Federal Government in this time of crisis — if there really is a crisis — would have come up with a strong national energy policy which would have had power to regulate the rates of production and export and which would have guaranteed that the unearned profits now being received by oil companies would be used to maintain reasonable prices for Canadian consumers.

The least one could have expected would have been that they would have made a commitment to maintain the \$1.90 tax on the windfall price increases, and pass substantial proportions of this revenue to the producing provinces to hold down fuel prices.

Should the expected price increases occur as a result of the promised removal of the export tax, the most serious repercussions would again fall on our farmers whose every operation depends on gasoline and diesel fuel. Increases of five or six cents per gallon on a private automobile would only result in an additional \$50 or so annually to the average motorist. To a farmer, however, this could add several hundred dollars to his cost of operation, a cost which he is powerless to pass on to the consumer. I would suggest that farmers take serious note of this situation and support any provincial action which could be taken to protect his interests.

Because of the tremendous increase in highway travel re-sulting from better roads and more leisure time, the tourist industry has been growing by leaps and bounds. As indicated by His Honour's Address, a new Department of Tourism and Renewable Resources will be structured to better cope with the development of this industry. Few people realize the importance of tourism to the provincial economy. Let me give you a few figures. In 1971, the last year statistics are available, the touring public spent over \$178 million on travel in Saskatchewan. Since that time both the numbers and the spending of tourists has increased dramatically.

The new Tourism Department will be responsible for such areas as: programs which will motivate travel within the province by Saskatchewan residents, Canadian residents and the

residents of the United States and other foreign countries. It will provide advice and information in all forms to persons wishing to travel. It will assist local communities through technical advice and grants for the development of tourist facilities and tourist attractions.

A new tourism advisory council has already been established, made up of representatives from any groups interested in the promotion of the tourist industry, to advise the Department on program development.

Although most tourist miles are travelled in the southern half of the province, there is a great, untapped potential in the North. This land of fresh water and forested areas, with its myriads of lakes and fishing grounds, could become a mecca of many concrete dwellers from our cities. The industry lends itself to development by native people whose experience in woodcraft, hunting and as guides would be invaluable in this field. It will be the responsibility of the Department of Tourism to promote this field, to be responsible to see that the environmental and aesthetic qualities are not ending.

Tied into the tourist program, must be a program of park development and a system of northern roads. These areas are receiving serious attention as well. We are hopeful that we can successfully negotiate an agreement with the Department of Regional Economic Expansion to help finance and expedite this development.

Mr. Speaker, Saskatchewan has long been known as the strong-hold of co-operative development in Canada. In the early years of the development of this province, farmers and consumers soon learned the value of joining together to provide for themselves the goods and services they needed. When they were being gouged by the oil companies, they built the Co-op Refinery. When grain companies attempted to exert unfair practices, they organized the Wheat Pools and United Grain Growers. When implement companies attempted to overcharge, they organized Co-op Implements. Through these organizations they have provided for themselves, at cost, many of the inputs needed in this province, such as fertilizers, feeds, petroleum products, lumber supplies, etc. When banking institutions and mortgage companies failed to meet their financial requirements they organized credit unions and provided their own source of capital. From humble beginnings these co-operatives have grown to where they exert a substantial influence in many aspects of our economy.

However, during the seven. lean years of Liberal Government from 1964 to 1971, the Department of Co-operation was continuously and persistently down-graded until in 1971 when this Government came to power, the Department was demoralized, understaffed and for the most part ineffective.

This Government, Mr. Speaker, believes in co-operation . . .

SOME HON. MEMBERS: Hear, hear!

MR. KAEDING: — . . . and in co-operative development. Since 1971 the Department has been completely reorganized. An active program of development is taking place. New programs are being promoted in the field of agriculture, housing, community

facilities, in fact in any area where people can band together to provide for their needs on a co-operative basis. A number of new co-op farms have been started, alfalfa cubing plants have been started on a co-op basis. A machinery co-op has been organized to reduce capital costs for farmers. A new and challenging field for co-op development lies with the native people of northern Saskatchewan to provide industries and facilities for themselves.

This Government will actively support all of these self-help programs.

Members of this House will know that in my constituency of Saltcoats we have the largest potash mine in Saskatchewan with two shafts and two mills. With the increase in the pro-rationing allowance to 68 per cent of capacity many new jobs have opened up at this plant as in others in Saskatchewan. The payroll now is probably near 700. Add to this the many satellite industries and services required by the plant, and you will recognize that this industry has had a tremendous impact on our rural communities.

However, this industry, as so many others which are foreign owned, often has a tendency to be more concerned about their dividend rate and corporate growth, than they are in the welfare and safety of the employees who work to provide those rewards. As a result, the employees formed a union last year, to give themselves some bargaining power with respect to wages and working conditions. Although there have been times of tension and even work stoppages, the company and the union appear to be gradually adjusting themselves to their new positions.

You will remember that in the 1972 session The Labour Act was re-written providing much greater security to employees when engaged in union activity. In the same session, The Occupational Health and Safety Act was passed, a real milestone in providing for safer and better working conditions for employees.

Unfortunately not all employers were willing to co-operate. Employees at the mine have had a difficult time in obtaining the necessary co-operation from management, and have had to resort to a walk-out to press their position. However, again with the co-operation of the officials of the Department of Labour, a working arrangement has been reached and union and management appear to be adjusting to the new regulations. Since many of the employees in the Safety and Health Committees are inexperienced and not fully aware of their rights, some time may elapse before these committees will work smoothly. However, I am convinced that with proper dialogue between union and management many of the difficulties will be resolved. Although some inadequacies may exist in the present Safety and Health Act, experience will soon uncover them and this Government will do what is necessary to adequately protect employees on the job.

Citizens in my constituency continue to be concerned about the environmental dangers present around the potash mines and satellite salt plant. Although these industries may be operating within limits set by the Department of the Environment, many are questioning the adequacy of these limitations.

Serious disruptions have occurred recently in power supplies in the Esterhazy area and SPC officials have indicated that even allowable salt emissions have a serious corrosive effect on their power lines. Salt build-ups on power lines become explosive conductors under humid atmospheric conditions, resulting

in serious power failures. I will be making my recommendations to the Department of Environment to improve this program.

We are pleased to note that substantial improvements are being made in the treatment of sewage from Regina and Moose Jaw. Since pollution from this source appears to be the major cause of algae accumulations in the Qu'Appelle system, my constituents will be looking to early improvement in our lakes and cleaner beaches for our citizens. We also look forward to early development of the Qu'Appelle Valley scenic highway as recommended by the Qu'Appelle Basin Study.

Mr. Speaker, at the Western Economic Opportunities Conference last July, the western provinces met with the Federal Government and presented a united stand with regard to many of the problems facing this region. All of us watched with eager expectations believing that here, at last, at this conference some of our grievances could finally be heard and corrected. We watched through successive days as the talks continued and much of our optimism turned to pessimism as the days wore on. One area, however, appeared to draw somewhat more response than most others. The case for a new national transportation policy was forcefully put by western delegates. Case after case of rank discrimination were produced as evidence to bolster our position. One province after another showed discriminatory freight rates mitigated against western Canada and forced our industries to sell at a freight disadvantage.

Some fairly substantive commitments were made by Federal spokesmen, promising that corrective action would be taken in some of the more glaring cases. However, little hope was held out for any new direction in policy or any willingness to use a national transportation policy as an instrument to provide the economic equity to our western industry which it so desperately needs to compete with the central provinces. To date we have heard little more from Ottawa and it would appear as though the whole conference was an exercise in futility.

However, this Government will continue to press with vigor every possible avenue to bring equity to the freight rate structure. Nor have we heard any assurance, Mr. Speaker, that the railway companies will not be allowed to carry out their rail line abandonment starting in 1975. Many of these branch lines continue to deteriorate and abandonment by default appears to be the strategy being employed. Since many of the lines do not have the steel to carry the new hopper cars and since the railways appear to have suddenly lost all the standard cars, some of these branch lines are getting little or no service. There is certainly a need for some direction to the companies to force them to provide the services to which they are obligated.

Rail line abandonment, in any case, except where duplication is evident, appears to be rather ridiculous particularly with the impending energy shortage. The amount of fuel required to move grain from the farm to distant elevators by trucks would surely greatly exceed the amount required to draw the same quantity on rail from branch lines.

Mr. Speaker, I have been kind to the Members of the Opposition during this three quarters of an hour. Their capability to destroy their own credibility in the country in recent months has been so clearly demonstrated that I . .

SOME HON. MEMBERS: Hear, hear!

MR. KAEDING: — . . . did not have the heart to add to their burden.

I chose rather to indicate the ability of the Government to provide stable and progressive government in response to the needs and demands of our average citizens. As long as we persist in that direction we have little to fear from the sniping and innuendoes which is the best we have heard from that side of the House.

Mr. Speaker, I believe all citizens of this province will recognize that this Government is an open government, which attempts in every way possible to communicate with its people. The Provincial Cabinet has gone to many centres outside of Regina to meet with groups to discuss their wants and aspirations. The Premier spent nine days on the road, talking to citizens and listening to problems. An executive office has been set up in Saskatoon to deal more quickly with problems in that major centre. We have de-centralized many of our Government departments into regional offices where citizens can go to meet Government officials without travelling to Regina. Cabinet Ministers have given unstintingly of their time to speak to local groups and organizations. We have sponsored forums and seminars on education, health, social services and environment to provide information and attempt to get local input into program development. We want these discussions to continue and result in the kinds of programs that Saskatchewan people want and deserve. This Government under the able guidance of our energetic Premier has proven itself to be courageous and reliable. The Legislative program it has introduced in the past three sessions has been well received and accepted. The new legislation outlined in the Speech from the Throne, will, I am sure, provide further evidence that this is a government by the people and for the people.

I am therefore pleased to move, seconded by my colleague from Watrous (**MR. CODY**) that a Humble Address be presented to His Honour the Lieutenant-Governor.

SOME HON. MEMBERS: Hear, hear!

MR. D.W. CODY: (Watrous) — Mr. Speaker, as I rise to speak in this debate, I want to say how deeply honored and gratified I am to have been given this opportunity to second the Address-in-Reply to the Speech from the Throne. It is indeed a great honor for the people of the Watrous constituency to have their Member given this opportunity. I especially want to thank our Premier on behalf of my constituents for having seen fit to give me this opportunity.

Before getting into my main remarks on the many items of this Throne Speech, I should like to say a few words about the constituency I represent.

Mr. Speaker, the Watrous constituency is a representative rural constituency and is also fortunate to have industry in its midst. We have a potash mine near Colonsay. We have a feed manufacturing plant at Bruno; we have a flour mill at Viscount and a manufacturing industry in Watrous. The people of this constituency can be justifiably proud of their area.

Mr. Speaker, the Watrous constituency has one of the most unique recreational facilities and health spas in Canada, if not on the North American continent. Of course, I speak of none

other than Manitou Beach. This body of water has attracted people from all over the world for its therapeutic value. I recommend to the Government today that this area be expanded and publicized for the benefit of all people of Saskatchewan and all Canadians.

SOME HON. MEMBERS: Hear, hear!

MR. CODY: — Mr. Speaker, this Government recognizes the rural way of life in this province and has designed its programs to better meet that way of life. This is evidenced by some of the benefits my constituency has received over the past two and one half years. Just let me outline a few of them:

1. Grants to hospitals and nursing homes \$800,000
2. Construction of a 14-bed addition to
Manitou Lodge \$ 56,000
3. Municipal Road Assistance Programs \$388,000
4. Recreational Grants \$6,500
5. Youth Employment \$12,0000
6. School Grants \$4.7 million
7. Your new FarmStart Loans \$63,100
8. Incentive grants through the Department
of Industry and Commerce \$61,400

One could go on and on, such as:

9. Property Improvement Grant \$700,000
10. Winter Works Grants \$ 27,000

Only to mention things such as Open Roads and Mainstreet, seven communities in my area have received.

Another area of concern that the people have had for some time is Highway No. 2. This highway, Mr. Speaker, was staked for seven years consecutively under the Members opposite. This Government has now seen fit to construct this road at another \$1.65 million. The new senior citizens low rental complex in Colonsay and a new low rental project at Cudworth are in the works. Mr. Speaker, this is the kind of record the New Democrats have.

SOME HON. MEMBERS: Hear, hear!

MR. CODY: — This is what I call performance. This is a New Deal for People.

SOME HON. MEMBERS: Hear, hear!

MR. CODY: — Mr. Speaker, I should like to turn for just ore moment to agriculture. I should like to say that the Member from Saltcoats (Mr. Kaeding) has done a tremendous job in his address explaining the programs that this Government has introduced, and for giving you an indication of the direction in which we will be going in the years ahead.

There is, however, one item which I think bears mentioning and repeating over and over again, and that being the erosion of the Canadian Wheat Board by the Minister of Justice, the Hon. Otto Lang.

Mr. Speaker, in all of the years since the Wheat Board been in existence, I have never witnessed such pressure being placed upon it and the National Feed Grains Policy, is probably the most vicious of all.

Mr. Speaker, the farmers of this province know who their friends are and I am sure they not saying it is James Richardson from Portage and Main; I am sure they are not saying it is Alvin Hamilton and Jim Balfour who are afraid to speak out; and I am sure they are not saying it is Otto Lang, the professor from Saskatoon, but I know what they are saying; they are saying it is the Saskatchewan Wheat Pool. They are saying it is the National Farmers' Union and they are saying it is the Saskatchewan Department of Agriculture, under their able leader Jack Messer.

SOME HON. MEMBERS: Hear, hear!

MR. CODY: — Mr. Speaker, what do those organizations say? Well, they have constantly been telling Mr. Lang that his Feed Grains policy will only serve to wreck and ruin the Board. Did he consult the farmers? No, he didn't. He didn't consult the farmers. But, now a strange turn of events, Mr. Speaker. Now he has decided to consult the farmers and he is going to give them a vote on the rapeseed question. All he is doing, Mr. Sneaker, is he is trying to confuse the farmers. That's all he is trying to do. Let me just quote one line from a release from the National Farmers' Union. The NF U said:

The Minister had thrown the whole question into confusion by stating; on CBC radio noon broadcast over CBK radio, Saskatchewan, on November 16 that the undecided category on the ballot was not, in fact, a second place to vote against the Wheat Board marketing of rapeseed.

MR. GUY: — Who said that?

MR. CODY: — If you had been listening you'd know who said it. Mr. Speaker, does this mean that the undecided vote then will not be taken into account? If this is the case, why have it there at all? I feel that the question should be decided also on a simple majority. But Mr. Lang says 'no', 60 per cent. Well, let me tell you, if Mr. Lang had needed 60 per cent to be elected, he wouldn't be the head of the Wheat Board. He would be back teaching school in Saskatoon.

What has the Saskatchewan Wheat Pool said? Mr. Speaker, I have a release here dated October 31, 1973, where they say and I quote:

There would be numerous advantages to producers of rapeseed by orderly marketing through the Wheat Board, the Pool Director said. They include (1) a guaranteed initial price; (2) annual pooling of returns; (5) a fair quota system; (4) more efficient use of the handling and transportation system; (5) and the Wheat Board's program of market analysis, promotion and development.

Well, that certainly speaks very highly, in my mind, of marketing rapeseed under the Wheat Board.

Mr. Speaker, this release does, in fact, speak very well for the case of having rapeseed placed under the Wheat Board. Mr. Speaker, I urge all farmers to think back, think back to the days of the Winnipeg Grain Exchange. Think back to when wheat was selling for 20 cents a bushel and oats was being given away. Don't be fooled by Otto Lang and James Richardson. My suggestion to you would be to vote in favor of marketing of rapeseed under the Wheat Board.

SOME HON. MEMBERS: Hear, hear!

MR. CODY: — Mr. Speaker, turning to labor for a moment. When we came to office in 1971, there was virtually no harmony between labor and management. No harmony between labor and farmer. All segments of society had been put against each other by the old Liberal Government. That Government, the fragments of which you see across the way, took a stance to repress any progressive elements in our society and I point out, the labor movement was not spared in this regard. What did this Liberal Government do? They invoked the insidious Bill 2, a Bill, Mr. Speaker, which deprived every working man and woman in this province of a decent and adequate wage. A Bill which denied good working conditions; a Bill which denied the right to withhold their labors. And, above all, what did that Government do? They failed and failed miserably to produce any jobs. As a result, thousands and thousands of our working people, our tradesmen and our professional workers, left the province to seek employment in other areas of Canada. That is the track record of the Liberal Government, Mr. Speaker. I am proud to lay before this House the record of this Government. We abolished Bill 2; we restored the rights of working people; the right to be on the same level as other people in this province. We introduced a new Labour Standards Act; we increased the minimum wage twice and we have created thousands and thousands of new jobs. We can now proudly boast, Mr. Speaker, of having the lowest unemployment rate in Canada.

SOME HON. MEMBERS: Hear, hear!

MR. CODY: — Mr. Speaker, I am proud to see that the Throne Speech indicates employees will enjoy three weeks vacation after one year's service.

The Throne Speech, Mr. Speaker, makes reference to a development fund which I feel is long overdue. It is long overdue that average citizens of this province have an opportunity to invest in a safe investment with a guaranteed return and the privilege of redeeming the investment within a reasonable period of time. This fund will give the investor a measure of protection against inflation. This fund, Mr. Speaker, will serve as new capital which could be made available to help new industries and to expand existing industries in the province. I would hope the Minister of Finance (Mr. Cowley) would see fit and give careful consideration to the co-operatives, such as Co-op Insurance and the credit unions, when it comes to market outlets.

Mr. Speaker, in the area of co-operatives, the Department of Co-operation, in the past year, has made tremendous strides forward. New co-operatives of all types are springing up and people are once again learning to work with each other. The

old Liberal Government stands condemned in this area. It was a department which was bankrupt of ideas and near death. It was a department, Mr. Speaker, where there was practically not a soul working in it. The New Democratic Party revitalized this department and we have shown some of the greatest growth and expansion of this business that we have seen in the past ten years. Credit unions, Mr. Speaker, have reached a record high, with assets amounting to \$508 million. In 1972 assets increased by 27 per cent and memberships stood at 358,000. I am grateful, very grateful, Mr. Speaker, to the Ministers of the Crown, who saw fit to adhere to some of the motions I made in Crown Corporations committee and moved accounts from banks to credit unions.

SOME HON. MEMBERS: Hear, hear!

MR. CODY: — I would hope that we continue doing this and I would also hope that we could continue to expand and develop new co-operatives and more credit unions which will work for the average citizen of this province.

Mr. Speaker, in the area of housing and urban development, I think this Government will take a back seat to no one in the Dominion of Canada. We have more housing starts in Saskatchewan this year than any other year on record, in excess of 6,000 housing starts for the current year.

SOME HON. MEMBERS: Hear, hear!

MR. CODY: — Mr. Speaker, that's a new deal. That's a New Deal for People. I am pleased to see there will be increased grants to urban centres. I would strongly urge this Government to allow some of these grants to be unconditional. However, other grants should be specifically earmarked for important services such as recreation and transportation, which are becoming a very integral part of our life style today and deserve every bit of consideration that is possible.

Mr. Speaker, I live in the east end of Regina, what is now known as the Qu'Appelle constituency, where our recreation facilities are virtually non-existent. And I, together with the Glencairn Community Club, will be pressing the city of Regina and the Government for a complete sporting complex, better streets, more adequate transportation, and above all, proper access to that subdivision.

AN HON. MEMBER: — What about the mayor?

MR. CODY: — No mayor at all. Mr. Speaker, I should like to say a few words about the Qu'Appelle Basin Study.

This precedent-setting study is recognized as a milestone among water basin studies on this continent. It illustrated how many agencies of government, committed to identifying problems and developing solutions can co-operate and complete a complex task. This province is not resting on its laurels. This Government recognizes the study is only the beginning. Recommendations only chart the course. What counts is action in implementation. Over the past eight months we have taken action on several points. The Department of the Environment has invited public review and comment. I am pleased to see the wide-spread public acceptance

of the majority of the reports and 64 recommendations are being accepted. This, Mr. Speaker, is a testimony to this Government and this Government's belief that Saskatchewan citizens want environmental problems in this beautiful area to be squarely faced and resolved.

SOME HON. MEMBERS: Hear, hear!

MR. CODY: — Individual agencies of this province have already initiated many recommendations of a strictly provincial nature. Flood control measures at Lumsden have been undertaken; cottages in the basin have been surveyed as a prelude to development of regulations to control cottage wastes. Plans for a road transportation network to meet traffic demand without destroying the character of this valley are proceeding. It is my understanding the report and its recommendations have been reviewed by all provincial agencies, and an implementation package covering new programs and new priorities, I am hopeful, will be forthcoming during this Session. I am pleased with the position taken by the cities of Regina and Moose Jaw. Regina has committed itself to tertiary treatment and the first phase is now under way. Moose Jaw is investigating the feasibility of effluent regulation. The residents of these communities have recognized their responsibilities and are ready to pay their share for re-medial measures.

But, Mr. Speaker, my optimism is tempered when I review a lack of progress at the federal-provincial level. Many of the major recommendations require a significant federal contribution. Trying to negotiate a federal-provincial agreement, officials of the Government have been stymied at every turn of the road. They have been bounced around like a rubber ball, Mr. Speaker, from one federal agency to another. This is a classic example of federal buck-passing and provincial Liberals patting them on the back for doing it. When it comes to meeting the costs of pollution control, the Federal Government is all talk and no action. Nevertheless, Mr. Speaker, the Provincial Government will continue to press for an agreement. But at the same time, we will move ahead in line with our continuing commitments to restore and maintain the environmental quality of the most beautiful area in this province, the basin, and I hope to see more things done.

Mr. Speaker, I want to deal for a moment with energy. This is one of the most talked about and controversial items in the news today. This is what I term 'a so-called energy crisis'. I think basically four questions must be asked.

1. Why is there an energy crisis?
2. Who brought on the crisis?
3. What is the role of the Federal Government?
4. What avenues are open to the Provincial Government?

I will try to deal with these questions in the following order.

The crisis, as I see it, is that eastern Canada imports its crude oil mainly from two sources — Venezuela and the Middle East; 44 per cent from Venezuela and 30 per cent from the Middle East. In barrels, this means something like 900,000 barrels of crude oil per day. The decision to import this crude was not made because there was no available supply in western Canada, but because it was cheaper for the short term. I think it is

absolutely incredible, Mr. Speaker, to see a Canadian energy crisis when Saskatchewan and Alberta, alone in 1972 exported 350,000,000 barrels of crude oil. The consequences of that policy resulted in them being tied into contracts with multi-national corporations. These contracts provide that in time of shortage or other external factors, the supplying companies are allowed to reduce normal deliveries to some buyers and divert oil to other customers, in spite of what Mr. MacDonald is now trying to peddle to you.

Mr. Speaker, you see the dangerous position this places Canadians in. The Federal Government has virtually lost control of this resource and it is in the hands of the multinational corporations to tell us as Canadians how much crude oil we can have.

One may be quick to say that the complete problem is the embargo placed by the Arabs, but this is only one part of the explanation. The real problem, Mr. Speaker, is that the world oil reserves are owned by multinational corporations. These corporations, Mr. Speaker, tell us how much we can have, when we can have it and how much we pay for it.

Let me show you just one example. Exxon Corporation through its Venezuelan subsidiary Creole Petroleum which is the largest single supplier of Canada's import crude is at the present time not living up to its contracts to supply crude to eastern Canada.

Mr. Speaker, what is the role of the Federal Government in all of this? First of all I want to make it abundantly clear that the absence of any federal energy policy is the direct cause of the energy crisis. The lack of this policy led eastern Canada to be exclusively dependent on imported oil. The lack of this policy resulted in no transportation of western crude beyond the Ottawa Valley and worst of all, the lack of this policy placed Canadians in the hands of multinational corporations. Mr. Speaker, to show you the lack of this policy let me just quote from the Leader-Post of November 27th, I quote:

Mr. MacDonald said the Government learned only a week or ten days ago that these contract clauses might be used.

Of course, Mr. Speaker, the contracts which he is talking about are those held by corporations like Exxon. How can we expect to find an energy policy when the Minister himself didn't know until 10 days ago that oil companies could, in fact, gouge the Canadian people by increasing prices and withholding oil.

Mr. Speaker, last week the Prime Minister was on television telling us all to tighten our belts and saying his Minister would announce a policy on Monday. On Monday, Mr. MacDonald was on national television and had no policy. Mr. Speaker, things are getting so bad because of a lack of policy that even the Leader-Post agrees that something should be done. Let me quote from Wednesday's edition, Wednesday, November 28th.

Statements made last Thursday by Prime Minister Trudeau and Monday by Energy Minister MacDonald show absolutely clearly that far from not having an integrated comprehensive national energy policy in force, Ottawa doesn't seem to understand what an integrated comprehensive national policy is. Ad hoc crisis intervention is the name of the only energy game currently being played in the national capital.

It seems to me, Mr. Speaker, that if the Federal Government isn't prepared to make energy policies, the Provincial Government will have to take over and make them. And I am sure that this Government guided by Premier Blakeney is prepared to do just that.

SOME HON. MEMBERS: Hear, hear!

MR. CODY: — We haven't been afraid of the giants before and we won't be afraid of them now. Mr. Speaker, I would strongly urge this Government to forge ahead with a new, bold, imaginative and socialist energy policy.

SOME HON. MEMBERS: Hear, hear!

MR. CODY: — Mr. Speaker, as of January 30th the price freeze on increases will be taken off and the oil companies stand to make \$300 million in Saskatchewan alone. I don't think this Government can stand idly by, I think the citizens of this province want us to act and think they want us to act now.

SOME HON. MEMBERS: Hear, hear!

MR. CODY: — They don't want to see \$300 million put into the United States, they would rather be spending this money on exploration of new oil reserves and to hold the price at a reasonable level for consumers.

Mr. Speaker, if we allow the multinational corporations to sneak off with this price increase for gasoline, heating fuels and farm fuels, we will have the worst price increase that this country has ever seen. I, for one, am prepared to stop them and stop them now.

SOME HON. MEMBERS: Hear, hear!

MR. CODY: — I am pleased to see that the Throne Speech indicates there will be measures to control the oil resources, to control the oil resources for the Saskatchewan people and not for the multinational corporations.

Mr. Speaker, our Government's accomplishments also extend into northern Saskatchewan where this new department continues to earn the respect and support of northern residents.

SOME HON. MEMBERS: Hear, hear!

MR. CODY: — It is no secret that our friends in the Opposition are against the Department of Northern Saskatchewan. In fact their leader has said publicly that should he live long enough to see the day when he forms the next government, one of the first things a Liberal Government will do is to abolish DNS.

SOME HON. MEMBERS: Hear, hear!

MR. STEUART: — . . . number one!

MR. CODY: — There you are, Mr. Speaker,

he just proved it again. Mr. Speaker, his politicking certainly has the shades of the criticisms the party raised in 1962 when Medicare was brought to the people in this province by a Social Democrat Government.

When our Government brought into being we recognized the immense challenge which was before us. Certainly we recognized there were going to be problems, there have been problems and there will be more problems in the future. However, it is important to recognize that it was this Government which met the northern problem head on, rolled its sleeves up and went to work to do whatever possible to improve the social and economic well-being of northern residents.

SOME HON. MEMBERS: Hear, hear!

MR. CODY: — Now, why didn't the Liberals do something for northern people when they occupied these benches for seven years? All we got out of them was a promise of a pulp mill, which would have created more problems than it would have solved. But yet they should be reminded that the single agency concept was at their fingertips when they were the Government. However, when they took a look at the consultants' report which was basically the recommendation of a single principle, they chose not only to ignore its recommendations but the report conveniently disappeared and it wasn't until after the 1971 election that we found the report in the government archives. In the government archives, Mr. Speaker! So, Mr. Speaker, the stage was set, the Liberals attempted to hide the fact they weren't prepared to undertake a comprehensive social and economic program in the North. The New Democratic Party was willing to accept this responsibility and went ahead with its major commitment, which left the Liberals in a bind. When they had the chance to do something they didn't, but we did, so the only avenue they had left is to criticize. I tell you they can certainly do that. Yet despite their deliberate attempts to discredit the department and the civil servants working within that department, progress is being recorded and I predict that in the years ahead the Department of Northern Saskatchewan will occupy an elevated respect on a par with hospitalization and Medicare.

SOME HON. MEMBERS: Hear, hear!

MR. CODY: — I have watched the Liberal Opposition very closely on this issue and their reaction is about: -that one could expect from a party which is pre-occupied with matters far removed from the social goals which this Party aspires to. I remember vividly the arguments of the Leader of the Opposition (Mr. Steuart) who tried to peddle the argument that all we were doing was transplanting a bunch of white civil servants into La Ronge, whose responsibility it was to dictate to northern people. He attempted to create the illusion that there was not going to be any consultation. He said the local people would have no input into the types of programs and policies which were followed in the North.

I wonder then why this Government made it possible that such bodies as the Northern Municipal Council, the Northern Development Advisory Council, local community authorities, northern school unit boards, adult education committees, welfare committees and the like be set up to give local people a say in

the decision making process. Mr. Speaker, half of them are elected, not appointed. Somehow this doesn't look like a dictatorial approach to me, but yet our Liberal friends like to generate suspicion and untruths at the expense, Mr. Speaker, of the very people who are benefiting from this new department.

Then they say that DNS has done nothing to promote economic development. One aspect of economic development, Mr. Speaker, which is very important in the North centres on the sawmilling industry, something you hear little about. Let us look at the record for a minute. In 1964-71 under a Liberal Government two sawmills were in operation intermittently, 40 jobs producing 190,000 board feet. At the present time, 1973, under the cap-able leadership of Ted Bowerman

SOME HON. MEMBERS: Hear, hear!

MR. CODY: — . . . not two sawmills in operation, six sawmills in operation at full time. Mr. Speaker, not 40 jobs, 200 jobs.

SOME HON. MEMBERS: Hear, hear!

MR. CODY: — Mr. Speaker, not 190,000 board feet, 2 million board feet, that's the kind of record we have in the North. Our approach to economic development has a marked contrast to our friends on the left, who did little to encourage small businesses. Close to 100 project applications have been forwarded and many have already been approved. Time does not permit me to list all of them. As an example, government assistance to establish such projects as wood cutting, tourist outfitting, boat building, commercial trucking, trapping and fishing are but a few industries which we have already been setting up, with more to come in the future. We recognize the need to improve educational opportunities as well for northern people and the presence of five mobile training units to offer instruction in such things as plumbing and electrical work have been met with overflow success.

The La Ronge Community College is established and operating. Regional adult education offices have been opened in Uranium City, Buffalo Narrows and La Ronge and a bursary program for post-secondary education is currently under study. Mr. Speaker, for a department that isn't doing anything, a lot is being done.

SOME HON. MEMBERS: Hear, hear!

MR. CODY: — Somehow, our Liberal friends thought they could convince the people of this province that our housing program was no good either. Well, let's go back to the record again. Agreements have been reached with Central Mortgage and Housing Corporation for 625 homes over the next five years on a subsidized ownership basis for northern residents. It's not Ad Fab Building, that's a cinch!

So far this year, 99 homes are under construction and 40 per cent of these units are complete, Mr. Leader of the Opposition, and an additional 40 houses will be built to maintain the 125 per year commitment which we made and will keep.

SOME HON. MEMBERS: Hear, hear!

MR. CODY: — Somehow our friend from Athabasca (Mr. Guy) doesn't think this record is very impressive. We recognize the current program as a very significant beginning which will certainly alleviate the housing problems which have built up because of a shoddy housing program during the Liberal years.

Mr. Speaker, our average 125 houses per year; under the Liberal Government 35 per year. Mr. Speaker, worst of all, not one home built in 1971. Now I wonder why there would be no homes built that year. Well in the months prior to the election the Liberal Government instructed the Housing Branch of the Department of Natural Resources to go to the invitational bid system and the Branch was instructed to approach Ad Fab Industries of Prince Albert. However, this procedure was shunned by the CMHC, so the northern residents didn't get one single new home in 1971. That's the record of the Liberal Government. So you see, Mr. Speaker, it is very evident that the reason the Liberals are in opposition to DNS is because it contrasts their terrible track record in the North and they don't like to be reminded.

I have just mentioned a few of the accomplishments in a short period of time. Let me mention a few more. Well, additional medical staff has and is being hired. A dental care program for west side communities was recently finalized. A Child Care Centre is under construction at Sandy Bay. Planning and design systems for the first four water and sewer programs are now being completed with construction to begin next year. La Ronge received a \$220,000 provincial grant for a sewer and water system. New wells have been completed at four northern communities. DNS funding is involved in the installation of electrical generators at several communities. Saskatchewan Power rates have been reduced to compare with residential rates in the South.

SOME HON. MEMBERS: Hear, hear!

MR. CODY: — Eight road construction projects are either completed or under way, with six communities involved in street construction programs. Portable classrooms have been provided for four communities, new gymnasiums provided for two communities, a new school is being built in Weyakwin, a major school addition is planned for Ile-a-la-Crosse, and school superintendents and support staff are now resident in the North.

Mr. Speaker, I have listed a number of programs which have been undertaken by this Government and I have done so in order that there will be no doubt in people's minds about the insincerity and loose comments which continue to emanate from the benches of the Opposition.

SOME HON. MEMBERS: Hear, hear!

MR. CODY: — Mr. Speaker, the Department of Northern Saskatchewan does have support and confidence of the majority of northern residents.

It was interesting to listen to a radio program the other day, the Hon. Leader of the Opposition (Mr. Steuart) on radio told a few supporters at Duck Lake that he personally was going to lead a charge of MLAs into the North.

SOME HON. MEMBERS: Hear, hear!

MR. CODY: — They were going to use force if necessary to what he called ‘get to the bottom of DNS.’ Well, I guess he realized that as soon as he said it, he shouldn’t have, because what happened? Did Mr. Steuart, who admits, Mr. Speaker, that he hasn’t been to La Ronge in 18 months, did he go north with his colleagues? And those colleagues of his that did go, did they carry out an intensive investigation? Not only did the Leader of the Opposition choose to stay home, but those who did go North made a 48-hour whirlwind tour.

SOME HON. MEMBERS: Hear, hear!

MR. CODY: — Convinced themselves they had all the problems identified, ran home to their leader, who in turn called a press conference to call for a judicial inquiry into the North.

Once again, it is crystal clear that the professed concern of the Liberal Party is nothing more than window-dressing. And obviously there isn’t much concern from the Member from Athabasca (Mr. Guy). He is sneaking out on his northern people now.

SOME HON. MEMBERS: Hear, hear!

MR. CODY: — They tell me that the Member from Meadow Lake (Mr. Coupland) is sneaking out. The professed champions from the North are now leaving their people behind.

Their past performance in the North shows they don’t care and their present stance shows clearly that all they are attempting to do is tear something down before it is built because they realize that once DNS realizes its full potential, nobody will listen to them, and is it any wonder?

It was also very interesting the other day, Mr. Speaker, to watch the Member from Athabasca when he returned from the North, which includes part of the constituency he is supposed to represent. He appeared on an open line show just last Wednesday and I am sure he thought he was going to be able to score some political points, because surely no one in the North would call in and the people in the South would take his accusations as being true.

Well during that hour I must admit I started to feel sorry for him because he was receiving blast after blast from listeners who were well aware of DNS. First he said it was just terrible that the school at LaLoche was closed because DNS hadn’t provided adequate sewer and water facilities. But a resident from that community called up and clarified that situation, which in turn severely jeopardized Mr. Guy’s credibility.

SOME HON. MEMBERS: Hear, hear!

MR. CODY: — Then he switched to Ile-a-La-Crosse and said it was terrible DNS had flubbed again because they had not moved to replace a school which had burned down.

Well, a local resident phoned in and corrected him again by saying that the children were in class and DNS have provided for portable classrooms.

SOME HON. MEMBERS: Hear, hear!

MR. CODY: — By now, Mr. Guy was getting a bit flustered so he took on the Northern School Board only to be chastised by another northern resident who works in Education.

SOME HON. MEMBERS: Hear, hear!

MR. CODY: — Things were getting bad by now so he turned right on the Minister by saying he didn't believe Mr. Bowerman had the confidence of the northern people and he pointed to the Métis Society. Well, the Métis Society phoned in . . .

SOME HON. MEMBERS: Hear, hear!

MR. CODY: — . . . and they blasted him for refusing to attend one of their functions despite repeated invitations.

SOME HON. MEMBERS: Hear, hear!

MR. CODY: — And they went on to say, Mr. Speaker, while there were problems the situation would be unbearable had DNS been under a Liberal Government.

SOME HON. MEMBERS: Hear, hear!

MR. CODY: — Well by now the situation was critical, so he decided to use the bogeyman argument of compulsion, only to be confronted by another caller who reminded him that this was the same Liberal tactics used during hospitalization and Medicare, which today are the most successful programs despite Liberal criticism and condemnation.

SOME HON. MEMBERS: Hear, hear!

MR. CODY. — Mr. Speaker, call after call came in and not one caller sided with the views of the Member from Athabasca. And yet, they call for an investigation. I agree there might be need for an investigation, however, it is the credibility and sincerity of the Liberal Party which should be investigated.

SOME HON. MEMBERS: Hear, hear!

MR. CODY: — Mr. Speaker, before I conclude my remarks I want to remind this House, once again, that they should question very seriously the motives of the Liberal Opposition. They say there should be consultation; they say we should give northerners more opportunities to participate in decision-making. I agree with that. But we should all remember one thing, remember that it was the two northern MLAs, the Member from Athabasca (Mr. Guy) and the Member from Meadow Lake (Mr. Coupland) who stood alone in this House, to see that the North wouldn't get

two representatives in this Legislature.

SOME HON. MEMBERS: Hear, hear!

MR. CODY: — That is the kind of thing that they did.

Mr. Speaker, the Throne Speech shows clearly that this Government is going to do much more for the North in the months ahead. I agree wholeheartedly with what has been done up to the present and what will be done and accomplished in the future, I congratulate my colleague, the Hon. Mr. Bowerman, for his dedication.

SOME HON. MEMBERS: Hear, hear!

MR. CODY: — Mr. Speaker, for his dedication for looking into the future and not be drawn down to the level of some of those people who are committed to a campaign designed to use any ploy possible for their narrow political interests.

Mr. Speaker, this Government was elected on a program, a New Deal for People. This Throne Speech is one more of the steps towards fulfilling this New Deal. I am sure the people of Saskatchewan will endorse these programs. I challenge the Opposition to stand up and be counted and come up big for a change and vote for this Speech, vote for progress.

Mr. Speaker, I am pleased to second the Address-in-Reply to the Speech from the Throne.

SOME HON. MEMBERS: Hear, hear!

MR. D.G. STEUART: (Leader of the Opposition) — Mr. Speaker, I should first like to congratulate the addresses on the Speech from the Throne.

AN HON. MEMBER: — Why?

MR. STEUART: — Because it is traditional, that's why. No, they did a fine job. They had a great deal of difficulty but they did a fine job.

I should like to start in with a few remarks that were made by the Member for Saltcoats (Mr. Kaeding). I wonder why they picked this particular individual or that particular individual to move and second the Speech from the Throne. I think I know why Mr. Kaeding was picked. He is a very fine gentleman and I think they wanted to make sure that he made one major speech in this House before Bill Peasley replaces him after the next provincial election.

SOME HON. MEMBERS: Hear, hear!

MR. STEUART: — He will soon have the nomination I am sure but I should just like to say Thank You, congratulations and farewell. It will be an open convention but he is so popular out there I am sure that he will just sweep in. He will have no

problem. We will have our usual 800 or 900 out fighting for the nominations as in Lakeview.

AN HON. MEMBER: — 800 or 900?

MR. STEUART: — Yes, 800 or 900 as you will find out when the Lakeview votes are counted in a couple of days.

I might say that he mentioned FarmStart and I will have something more to say about FarmStart tomorrow, but I should just like to say one thing. He said in his remarks that FarmStart has done a great job and it has helped a great many farmers. As a matter of fact in the Speech from the Throne it says, "FarmStart has helped exactly 205 farmers."

Well now, 205 farmers — I suppose you could consider it to be a good start if you are on that side of the House. I should like to point out there are about 80,000 farmers in Saskatchewan. So if there are about 40,000 who could use some help then I calculate at the rate you are going — 205 per year — it should be about 200 years before you get around to look after the rest of them. He talked about the Hog Commission and, again, I will have more to say on that tomorrow.

I should just like to point out that since the Hog Commission was forced on the farmers and the people of Saskatchewan that hog deliveries since then are down in this province, lower in percentage than in any other province in Canada, and actually down from anywhere from 20 to 25 per cent.

MR. MESSER: — Do you get your figures . . .

MR. STEUART: — No, I get my figures from the proper source. I get them from Statistics Canada and then I even check them, once in awhile, with the Department of Agriculture. In this particular case oddly enough both figures check. The Department of Agriculture of the Government of Saskatchewan had exactly the same figure. They are not the ones that you use, I don't think, most of the time but they certainly are the same figures used by your Department and by people in Ottawa.

I shall now deal, for a minute or two, with the Member for Watrous (Mr. Cody). I want him to know that we checked those phone calls that came in for Mr. Guy who was on the open line show — four were from Watrous; two from Shellbrook.

SOME HON. MEMBERS: Hear, hear!

MR. STEUART: — All I want to say is that I hope you haven't used up all your phone allowance for the full year. You know when you listen to Mr. Cody you must remember where it comes from. I have a press clipping that I think says much about Mr. Cody and the speech he just made and all the wild charges he made. I want to read it. It came out of the last session from the Star-Phoenix, March 28, 1973. Fittingly enough it is in red ink. The title is: "Striking Absurdity". It goes on to say:

One of the more striking examples of absurdity to come out of the current Legislative Session was Don Cody's recent rationalization for 34 per cent increase in

traffic accidents in Saskatchewan in 1972.

The New Democratic Member from Watrous said, with as far as we know the utmost seriousness, prosperity brought about by his Party was responsible for more people driving and thus, more accidents.

SOME HON. MEMBERS: Hear, hear!

MR. STEUART: — It goes on to say:

Residents of Saskatchewan could not afford to drive during the seven years of Liberal power. Following Mr. Cody's reasoning for the sake of argument, only, the residents of this province may not be able to cope with prosperity of the scale promised by the New Democrats. We will kill each other off on the roads and highways as our income increases leaving the spoils of economic achievement to the invaders of less fortunate provinces. Before that takes place, the people may turn the New Democratic Party out of office and put the Liberal party back in, in the simple interests of improving traffic safety, of course.

SOME HON. MEMBERS: Hear, hear!

MR. STEUART: — Mr. Cody said that the first thing I would do if I be-came Premier, or when I become Premier, is to end the DNS. It will be the second thing as the first thing we will do is restore that drugstore back to Bruno. I can tell you that.

SOME HON. MEMBERS: Hear, hear!

MR. STEUART: — But there is something interesting about Mr. Cody. I don't know if he realizes the greatness that he has had thrust upon him. I am told that everyone — Mr. Tchorzewski and Mr. Taylor — who had been asked by the Premier to second the Speech from the Throne, were shortly after brought into the Cabinet. I understand there is a new Cabinet position coming up — the Minister of Tourism and something else. It can't be Industry as we already have a Minister of Industry .and it is bad enough that we are getting few enough industries with one Minister and we don't need another one.

I should also like to congratulate him for coming -up from the oil filter King to being in charge of their energy program or their energy spokesman. But, seriously, I want to deal with some of the more nonsensical things he said about the energy crisis and I will deal, again, in more detail. tomorrow with the energy crisis.

This was started off by Mr. Thorson, the Minister of Industry, when he talked about and came out publicly to say — I don't know whether he was misquoted or not;-and I certainly hope he was, because it; ass without a doubt the silliest statement I have ever heard. When Mr. Macdonald asked the people of Canada, he was talking more to the people in eastern Canada, I presume, but it was to all the people of Canada too that in a time when it looks as if we have in some parts of Canada a serious shortage of oil and possibly there will be a more serious shortage, that they might take some steps to conserve energy — turn down the heat a little and slow down our driving,

Mr. Thorson immediately spoke out and said, "We, in Saskatchewan, we won't do it, we won't lower our standard of living."

Exactly what turning down thermostats three or four degrees and slowing down your car to 50 miles per hour has to do with the standard of living I don't know. But I do want to say this: He keeps saying that the Federal Government has no energy policy, no oil policy. They have had one and whether it has been sufficient or it hasn't been sufficient is open for debate. I just want to point out that this Government, the NDP, have been in power for two and a half years and in those two and one-half years what has happened to oil in this province? Production is down; the discovery of new oil reserves is down; we have less proven oil reserves than we had two and one-half years ago when they came into power. The price of gasoline, diesel oil and heating oil are all up anywhere from 17 to 30 per cent. So all that we have had so far is the threat to do something. Oh, we have had the whining to Ottawa as usual. We have had the usual pointing to the large corporations and saying that they are the villains. We have been threatened with something called Saskoil. I don't know where it is. The latest we heard was when the Premier was apologizing to the NDP convention and said, "Don't rush us, ladies and gentlemen, we can't find any experts to run Saskoil". So that is what has passed for a government policy. How they have the nerve to say anything to any government, including the Federal Government, about an oil policy or a lack of an oil policy, I don't know.

Mr. Cody dealt with the DNS at some length with an apology for the Minister, who has left to rewrite the script, I guess. I am not going to deal with that plate of worms today, I shall deal with it tomorrow. When he was quoting the statement that I had not been in the North for 18 months, it was the Minister of Northern Saskatchewan who said that I haven't been in the North for 18 months. I have been in the North since that time. I was up there 12 months ago along with Mr. Guy and several others. We came in just after the flying circus, led by the Premier. We came out of there very successfully. I can tell Mr. Cody and the Members opposite that our record in the North as judged by the people who live in the North, is pretty good. It is much better than the old CCF or much better than the NDP.

SOME HON. MEMBERS: Hear, hear!

MR. STEUART: — We have consistently won those seats. And when Mr. Guy and Mr. Coupland stood up in this House to talk about northern representation, what they said was this, and we agreed with them. If you are going to set up a Boundaries Commission allow them to draw the boundaries for all the area in this province. And don't say to the people in far northern Saskatchewan, you will have this many seats and no more. It was the NDP Government that said to that part of the province, just one more example . . .

MR. MESSER: — You better check . . .

MR. STEUART: — Oh, granted you said to the rest of the province, we will give you a so-called independent Boundaries Commission, but again, what you said to the people in the North, 'we know better than you what is better for you than any Commission or anyone else.' You, the NDP, never gave them a chance to be

heard, never gave the people in the far North of this province a chance to come before that commission and say, this is how we want to be represented. This is where we want the line, this is where we want the boundaries to be. No, sir, you did that to every other part of the province. And that is what you can't get through your heads is wrong with the DNS, is what is wrong with your policy in the North. It is why they in the North turn to us every chance they get and why I predict they will continue to turn you out of the North. When we have asked Allan Guy and Hal Coupland not to run in the far North, again we are recognizing the facts.

SOME HON. MEMBERS: Hear, hear!

MR. STEUART: — Oh, they can get re-elected. Don't worry about that. They can get re-elected. Mr. Coupland was the only Member on this side who increased his majority, so don't worry about that. Mr. Guy in spite of everything you threw at him, in spite of lowering the electrical rates just before the election, in spite of flooding — I think maybe because of flooding it with Cabinet Ministers and the Premier — we have no problem winning the North, no problem at all. We are saying to the native people whom you people turned your back on, we are saying those seats are open. If you want to go and win the nominations we will support you. Not like you people did before the Athabasca by-election. When a native person had your nomination he had it sewed up, he had it won. What did the NDP do, the hierarchy, the Party? They got together in a kangaroo court and they kicked him out. They said to you very clearly that's another reason you lost and you will continue to lose in the North, we are not interested in you. You said, oh, he went out and he bought people memberships. Well, Henry Baker can tell you a few stories about one time he tried to get a nomination here. It was Mr. Clarence Fines who decided the present Premier would be handed a nice seat in Regina and they turned their back on Henry Baker. There were a few memberships bought in those days. And if Henry wanted to get up and tell the story he could tell a pretty good story in that case too. So don't let anybody say that the NDP throughout their history have never gone out and hustled memberships when they were trying to win a nomination. Of course they have.

MR. MESSER: — Who did that?

MR. STEUART: — Mr. Ray Jones did it, the Indian member. It was a different thing. They kicked him out. As a result you know what the Indian population did to you.

Mr. Speaker, I want to talk for a few minutes about the question of the rapeseed vote by the farmers of this province who grow rapeseed. About how they want their product sent to market. I want to deal in a little detail with the grandstand play that was put on by the Minister of Agriculture (Mr. Messer) but failed so badly.

Let's go back and take a look at the marketing of rapeseed. It was about three years ago when people began to discuss seriously the question of marketing rapeseed. Up until that time there had been no question. It was a relatively small cash crop and it was sold on the open market. As it grew in importance, serious people, responsible farmers and farm leaders

began to discuss, 'should it stay under the open market or should it go under the Wheat Board'? The Federal Government under Otto Lang began studies two years ago. He has made those studies available.

MR. MESSER: — It is confusing to talk about it.

MR. STEUART: — Just listen for a minute and you will find out if it is confusing to talk about. He went out across this country and they talked to every farm organization and as a matter of fact they talked to every one of the Prairie governments. He went further than that. He asked the Rapeseed Associations, all the Rapeseed Associations to get together, make up a pamphlet, put the case for the open market as far as rapeseed is concerned. He asked the Wheat Pools of Manitoba, of Saskatchewan and of Alberta to do the same thing and put the case for marketing rapeseed through the Canadian Wheat Board. Then at the expense of the Federal Government they had these two booklets, sent them out to over 37,000 farmers who have been concerned with growing rapeseed, sent them out to farm organizations, sent them out to anybody who was interested.

They went farther than that. On June 13th they appointed Mr. George Turner, he has been involved with the Manitoba Wheat Pools for about 40 years. He is a well known knowledgeable and respected man in the farm community. They asked him to carry out a study of how a vote should be taken to allow those farmers who grow rapeseed to decide themselves, very openly and democratically how they wanted their product marketed. He went to all farm organizations, to all Prairie governments. What did he do? First, they talked about who could vote. It was decided only after he consulted with all the groups concerned, farm groups, with the wheat pools, with the rapeseed associations, with Unifarm, Palliser and with the governments of the three Prairie Provinces.

MR. MESSER: — Who did that?

MR. STEUART: — I'll tell you who did it. You just listen. You don't know, that is the point. I'll make that point in a minute.

SOME HON. MEMBERS: Hear, hear!

MR. STEUART: — He came back and he said, "We will let all those people who have grown rapeseed in any two out of the last three years vote. On top of that all new farmers who have grown rapeseed either this year or last year, we will let them vote." There were 37,000 people in all. The decision was made then that if 60 per cent of these people who grow the rapeseed voted for a change, voted in favor of marketing their product through the Wheat Board that the necessary changes in the legislation would be brought in as soon as possible before the next crop year. That would change the way the rapeseed crop in Western Canada would be marketed.

Why 60 per cent? What did Mr. Turner do? First, he went to the Wheat Pools, Manitoba, Alberta and Saskatchewan. They said if you have a vote we would like the vote to be 50 per cent plus one. He went to the Rapeseed Association of Canada.

He went to the Rapeseed Associations of Manitoba, Saskatchewan and Alberta. They said, if you want to change the system, and it would be a change, then we would ask that you demand at least 66 and two-thirds per cent. That two-thirds of the rapeseed growers must vote in favor of the Wheat Board if it is to be used as a marketing agent. Sixty-six and two-thirds per cent from those organizations who are concerned solely with the growers of rapeseed in the three Prairie Provinces. He went to the United Grain Growers and they said 66 and two-thirds. He went to Unifarm, the largest farm organization in Canada and they said 60 per cent. He talked to the three Prairie governments. Now what about Saskatchewan? He phoned the Deputy Minister, Mr. McArthur and he talked to him. I said, surely Mr. Messer got in touch with Mr. Turner and said come out and have a meeting with us. The answer was no. The Government of Alberta asked for a meeting with Mr. Turner. He went out there and he spent half a day. I am informed that your Government, the NDP Government, outside of the talk that he had before the poll. was made, before it was decided how the vote will be taken, that you never even asked for a meeting. He contacted your Government somewhere between June 13th and July 11th, over five months ago. You were aware or should have been aware through the Press or your own Deputy Minister that they were then making studies and deciding on how the vote would be taken. Who would be eligible to vote and exactly which way the vote would be counted, what would be on the ballot. All those people who are concerned with the growing of rapeseed said 66 and two-thirds. Most other farm organizations said 60. The Wheat Pool did say 50 per cent plus one. A compromise was recommended by Mr. Turner. It was accepted by the Federal Government and by Otto Lang. So the decision was made 60 per cent. If 60 per cent of the farmers voting said they wanted their rapeseed marketed through the Wheat Board the law will be changed and that is the way it will be done.

The ballots for the vote say:

1. Do you want your rapeseed marketed through the Wheat Board?
2. Do you want your rapeseed marketed on the open market as it is today or,
3. Undecided.

Now why undecided? I find it pretty hypocritical that anyone of that side would even talk about anything that was on any kind of a democratic ballot when you think of their record.

SOME HON. MEMBERS: Hear, hear!

MR. STEUART — Let's keep in mind that what we are asking is a very serious question. We are asking the people who grow the rapeseed, who started that crop, who through their own associations, free associations developed, managed, run and organized by themselves have said, we like the open market. That is surely their business. It has been a pretty good open market for them. They have been able to sell all the rapeseed they have grown and by and large they have had good prices. But anyway they said there are people who can't make up their minds. Now there might not be many of them. But if you just say, Wheat Board vote, open market vote, you are, in effect, saying to those people who really are undecided in spite of the fact that the Federal Government has given them both sides of the

question, in spite of the fact that the Government of Alberta went out and held meetings to listen to both sides of the question, something you didn't do Mr. Messer or Mr. Blakeney's Government didn't do on behalf of our farmers, never gave them a chance to talk on both sides of the question. In spite of that there are farmers who are undecided, and that is legitimate. It is their rapeseed, it is their product by the sweat of their brows. So if you deny them a vote, you are saying either you are forced to vote "yes" or "no," or you are forced to stay home. That is why they decided to put "undecided." If the vote comes up with a very large undecided, then I think it is incumbent upon farm leaders and Prairie governments and the Federal Government to go back out and do a better job of explaining. This isn't the end of the world if a vote goes with the Wheat Board or against the Wheat Board. There can always be another vote taken next year or the year after. That is why the undecided vote is on that ballot.

MR. MESSER: — How do they count the ballots?

MR. STEUART: — How are they going to count the ballots? The day the rapeseed is marketed on the open market and there are four rapeseed organizations, voluntary, open, free organizations, every-one of them have said, we like the present system. Now if you want to change the present system, the Federal Government is giving through this vote to the farmers the opportunity of saying, yes, we want to change the system. If a man is undecided that means he doesn't know if he wants to change the system. Maybe there is another way. There might be a third way. As a matter of fact, I think it is very interesting when you compare this democratic type of vote to the way the NDP have acted.

Let's take a look at the Hog Commission. What did the Hog Commission do? Did they get an undecided vote or a yes vote or a no vote? They got a slap in the face by the Blakeney NIP Government. No vote. Mr. Messer, Mr. Blakeney, the rest of you, what did you say? Oh, you say we were given a mandate by the people of Saskatchewan. That gives us the right to do any-thing we want. If we decide the city of Regina and Saskatoon should have the ward system, do we have to ask them how they will elect their own local democratic government? No, we don't have to ask them that we will just force it on them. If they dare to say anything we will have a little secret meeting in the building, we will send our fellows out and threaten them and phone them and give them a few instructions. Here is what you do, you say the Trade Union won't vote for members of council, they have the guts to stand up for their own rights and freedom, we will defeat them at the polls and I think you did a pretty good job on some of those people the way it turned out. And somebody claps his hands, it turned out pretty well.

Let's see what it says in your New Deal for People. You ought to see what you say yourselves about your own democratic vote. Item 12 on page 2 of the New Deal for People says, if you are elected to government you would establish a provincial producer controlled hog marketing board. You have broken that promise. You have got a Hog Marketing Commission, not a board, and it is no more producer controlled than it is controlled by us or by anyone else. It is controlled by the NDP Government of Saskatchewan. That is the comparison. And they have the

nerve to stand up and talk about how the vote goes.

I want to make it very clear an undecided vote is a vote evidently to leave things the way they are. If a man is undecided surely he has got that right. You wouldn't even give them a vote at all. So I don't know how you have the gall to stand up and talk about any vote.

Let's take a look at the record of Otto Lang compared to the record of the NDP. Otto Lang has guaranteed the farmers a fair and democratic vote. Not only that, he said if you want to maintain the open system, he has taken a neutral stand. If that is your decision, Otto Lang said in Edmonton recently, that he would do two things. He said he would put in a government paid and hired supervisor over the commodity exchange. Many farmers, some for good reasons, have been very suspicious over the years of the commodity exchange. The commodity exchange themselves have said, fine we will welcome a supervisor. So that is number one. Mr. Lang has also said there might be a third way if there are a great many people undecided. You might not have to go the Wheat Board way or you might not have to stay the way you are because there are a great many farmers who like the open market but they would like a pooling arrangement. They are all aware that if they go and sell their rapeseed at the wrong time they might get \$2.50 or \$3 and if they held it for a week they could get \$5. If they sell it for \$5 their neighbor goes down the next week, and it has gone down to \$4. So they say we would like a pooling arrangement. And you can have a pooling arrangement without going through the Wheat Board. Otto Lang has promised them that if that is their decision, if that is their desire, he will change the legislation and he will make it possible for the farmers who grow rapeseed, if they want it, to have a voluntary pooling arrangement. This is the same man who gave the farmers a free vote on how they wanted the two-price system distributed.

SOME HON. MEMBERS: Hear, hear!

MR. STEUART: — But look what has happened to our Minister of Agriculture. He got up and he called this phoney emergency debate. He said this is an emergency. He knew from June 13th to July 10th, if he talks to his Deputy Minister of Agriculture, that they were already studying how that vote would be taken and when it would be taken. Why did he wait? Why did the Premier allow him to wait? We know it was a grandstand play and it backfired. We know that this is a small time operator with a big head who is jealous, almost paranoiac about Otto Lang. Because he knows that Otto has been decent, fair, and he is one man that has really helped the farmers.

SOME HON. MEMBERS: Hear, hear!

MR. STEUART: — It must give him some peculiar kick, I guess, to think that maybe he can get up and get some publicity about a national figure like Otto Lang. That is understandable. But why would the Premier let him? This is a little more difficult to understand. To begin with why that grandstand play on the second day? If it was such an emergency and the ballots were going to go out as of today, the Premier could have called the Session a week or two weeks earlier. He could have had a special session. He could have got up in the House and said

we are going to read the Speech from the Throne and then because we think this matter is so serious we are going to set aside a day or two to debate the whole question of the rapeseed vote, how it will take place, who will get the ballots and so on. He didn't do that. He didn't say a word about it. If the Premier of the province had come to us and said we want to debate this, we would have given him permission. We would have agreed.

SOME HON. MEMBERS: Hear, hear!

MR. STEUART: — What did Mr. Messer do? Sneaked in here at 8:30 in the morning to the Speaker's office and put that on the desk. I was very pleased and very proud of the Speaker when he rightfully turned it down and labelled it for exactly what it was, a cheap grandstand play.

The Premier knows better. Why does he allow it? Well, I think I know why he does. I think his record shows why he allowed it to happen. I think Mr. Messer or his Deputy Minister or some of those brain trusters he has got there decided this would be a cute play. We will get a little publicity before this vote. I don't think Mr. Blakeney really thought that but he can't stand up under the pressure. You just have to go from the day you became the Government, Mr. Blakeney made a decision to leave the Member from North Battleford (Mr. Kramer) out of the Cabinet. And subsequent events have proven it was a very wise decision.

SOME HON. MEMBERS: Hear, hear!

MR. STEUART: — Not only is he a bull in the china shop, he is the only bull I know who takes his own china shop around the country with him. The Bowerman mess, and it is a mess. Everything he has touched whether it is hunter safety regulations, the Department of Northern Saskatchewan, whatever. What is this sign they've got out here? You talk about the Métis, the Métis are happy. Here's the New Breed, that's their official paper. What has it got on the back?

Missing Ted Bowerman, Alias Ted Bowerman. People in northern Saskatchewan would like to know the whereabouts of this man Ted Bowerman, alias Ted Bowerman, last seen in the Shellbrook area during the election of June, 1971 when he was appointed the Minister of Northern Saskatchewan. According to rumors next probable sighting will be in Shellbrook area in 1975.

SOME HON. MEMBERS: Hear, hear!

MR. STEUART: — I predict that if he is sighted at that time he will be sunk on the same day.

SOME HON. MEMBERS: Hear, hear!

MR. STEUART: — Where is the record? Any time anybody stands up to the Premier of Saskatchewan, Mr. Blakeney, he backs off. They brought in a bill to do something about the foreign ownership and control of land. I didn't like the bill and many other people didn't like it. They withdrew it. Oh, Mr. Blakeney

said it was just a White Paper. Well, it was on white paper all right, but there was no White Paper brought in by his Minister of Agriculture (Mr. Messer). Great storm rose up, he backed away. Then they brought in the bill where they were going to change the University of Saskatchewan. They were going to keep their word, their promise to some of the people here in Regina or somewhere else. They were going to totally change the structure of the University of Saskatchewan. Again, there was an outcry. Again, what happened? Within a day or two days when the president of the University had the intestinal fortitude to stand up against that bill, they backed off.

We got the most recent, rather unpleasant sight of the Premier sneaking a little \$100,000, 10 cents per gallon subsidy for the breweries. He announced it, he got up on the television and radio and said, "Oh, it's not a subsidy. No, no, a subsidy isn't when you give the breweries money out of the Treasury," he says, "that's not Treasury money, it's money from the liquor profits." Where do the liquor profits go? I'll tell you where they go, if this is a normal government. They keep more in the corner right where they got most of them right now. When they need them they bring them into general revenue. Liquor profits are the same as taxes. They belong to the people of Saskatchewan and they eventually end up, if they are not siphoned off, to some of their friends somewhere, they eventually end up in general revenue. So when the Premier said to the breweries, I'll give you 10 cents a gallon which works out to about \$100,000 a month, he was giving them a subsidy. What else was it? He said here it is, we won't raise the price of beer until when? He said I think I'll do it after the first of the year. When we raised the subject they happened to be having a caucus, one of his Members there — I don't know if he will ever be a Minister now or not, but he should be because he's got some character to him — he's not afraid to stand up and be counted. He said he thought it was a dreadful thing.

The Premier had a caucus. I should have liked to have heard that caucus, because I have a funny feeling a lot of the other Members stood up behind those closed doors. The didn't have the nerve of the Member from Arm River (Mr. Faris) and said we don't like it, you are in trouble. Everybody around the country said, what are you playing with the breweries for? We didn't know you were friendly with the breweries, we thought those were the Liberals. You're out of character, Mr. Blakeney. You've got the wrong team, we are friendly with the trade unions, that's where we get our money. We get ours from the trade unions. It's the Liberals that do the other kind of tricks. What did he do, did he wait until January? Did he wait until December? He ran for cover, you could hardly see him going. So I am pleased because any man who couldn't find a little money to subsidize the price of bread or the price of milk or any of the kind of necessities of life, I think was a bit surprising he was a little out of character and a bit surprising. As to the Premier, friends say all these things are really kind of low profile. I am not sure if they are a low profile or no backbone or low backbone or what they are, but I say this, that it's time the Premier had a talk with the Minister of Agriculture. It is time that he recognize the antics, the irresponsible antics of the Minister of Agriculture, that are hurting the farmers.

SOME HON. MEMBERS: Hear, hear!

MR. STEUART: — Mr. Minister of Agriculture begin thinking of the farmers first and your own little image in the New Democratic Party second or third.

Let's talk about the feed grains. Let's talk about the feed grains and take a look at the record of the NDP Government opposite in connection with the feed grains. To begin with for some time for many years, responsible and I use the word responsible, farm leaders all over this country have said, we've got to do something about feed grains. Don't try and tell anybody that for years there was an orderly marketing of feed grains. There was not. Don't try to say that feed grains situation accrued to the benefit of either the producer or the cattleman in western Canada. It didn't. Most of the time it accrued to the benefit of some of those people who were buying three bushels of barley for \$1. As far as the producer was concerned, he never knew from one year to the next if he could sell his barley. Let's not downgrade the fact that some of our best customers, over the years, have been the farmers of eastern Canada. They have bought hundreds and hundreds of millions of bushels of our feed grain. Let's not forget that they are not captive customers, that they can buy American corn, and there have been years when the control of feed grain was under the control of the Wheat Board and that one year alone over 30 million bushels of American corn were brought into Ontario at the same time we had barley rotting in the elevators here in the Province of Saskatchewan.

So let no one try to kid anyone that the handling of our feed grains over the years has always been in the best interests of our own people.

There have been disadvantages. We haven't been able to take advantage of our own natural position. With the freight rate structure it has been more advantageous over the years, to ship cattle and finished beef East and ship feeders East and ship the feed grains East and not stay here in the West where we could finish our cattle and finalize the production through our packing houses. Those things are facts, and again, one man in this country has had the nerve to tackle it — Otto Lang. And he said let's get into this and see if we can straighten it out.

SOME HON. MEMBERS: Hear, hear!

MR. STEUART: — Let's say something else. I don't care how you do it, you are not going to please everybody when it comes to a policy for feed grains. No question about that. Let's take a look at what he has done and what he asked.

What kind of feed policy should we have? We need one where there's equity across this country. We need a feed policy where we, in the West, will be able to keep and take advantage of our natural position. We should get the highest price possible for producers and we should be able to encourage a situation so that many of our cattle as possible are finished here in the West that the packing houses can flourish here in the West, so that we can process our animals from the farmer right through to the finished product. That's what we want to try to develop in a feed grain policy.

Mr. Lang has called on responsible people in the farming industry all across this country to give him their ideas. We've got an interim year, we are going to start a new long range policy August 1, 1974. What has he received from solid farm organizations, farm leaders? He has received a great variety of very good advice. What has he received from Mr. Blakeney and Mr. Messer and the NDP opposite? He has received political slogans, he has received half-truths, he has received smears, in fact, he has received everything but sound solid advice. We hear this all the time. "Under this new plan the East is leading the West. Otto Lang is the greatest enemy of the Wheat Board. He will do away with the Wheat Board." That is not only nonsense, not even a half-truth, that is an outright lie. There has been no man in Canada, now or in the last 10 or 20 years, who has done more to strengthen the position of the Canadian Wheat Board and make it once again, and it was not for the last few years, make it once again a very respected institution here in Western Canada.

SOME HON. MEMBERS: Hear, hear!

MR. STEUART: — Okay, what about the East bleeding the West? Let's take look. The last prices that are available show eastern farmers were paying the highest prices in history for western barley. To land western barley in central Ontario and southern Ontario was costing them about \$2.45 a bushel. Feeders in the West were paying a little over \$2.03 a bushel.

You know it is very interesting to hear the Members opposite talk about orderly marketing and making sure that the farmers are not set one against the other. A very interesting little item appeared in a Watrous paper a little while ago. What did it say?

Call for tender. Tenders will be accepted until 4:00 p.m. Monday, October 1, 1973 to supply approximately 2,000 bushels number one feed oats, 1,000 bushels feed barley delivered to the Matador Community Pasture, headquarters located southwest 18-21-13 west of the third. Tenders to be enclosed in unsealed envelope and marked Matador feed grain, on the outside of the envelop. The Department reserves the right to reject any or all tenders. Further information can be obtained by contacting the Lands Branch, Saskatchewan Department of Agriculture, Administrative Building, Regina.

SOME HON. MEMBERS: Hear, hear!

MR. STEUART: — Orderly marketing. What did Mr. Messer do? His own Department, when they want feed grain themselves, they don't go through the Wheat Board. They didn't go to the Agricultural Products Board. They set farmer against farmer. Oh, yes, we checked up on that. You know what they told us, they didn't buy any. You know why they didn't buy any, because they didn't get it cheap enough, that's why they didn't buy any. The farmers were too smart for them.

You know when it comes to the NDP attitude about the feed grain situation there is an editorial in the Winnipeg Free Press of September, and I want to read it into the records because I want to tell you something and I hope you fellows

over there listen to it because it tells you exactly what your Minister of Agriculture is doing, what your Premier is allowing him to do and I say it's to the detriment of the farmers of this province. It's called "Saskatchewan Copies."

Apparently not content to follow Manitoba's lead in smaller tactical errors related to the proposed federal feed grains policy, Saskatchewan has now copied this province by establishing its own feed grains marketing commission. Mr. Messer, when announcing establishment of the Saskatchewan Commission, indicated that he intends to follow a pricing policy similar to that of Manitoba. A policy that has caused total confusion in Manitoba and is unlikely to do anything else in Saskatchewan. It would appear that in its timing and attitude the Saskatchewan Commission is to be used as a political lever to try to force Otto Lang to the bargaining table. Such action can only create further havoc in the western grains industry, already plagued by uncertainty and concern over the state of feed grains and pricing on the prairies. Mr. Messer has said that he hopes the setting up of this Commission will encourage an orderly marketing system and bolster what he claims would be an undermined Canadian Wheat Board, under the new federal policy. But a Saskatchewan Commission, if organized along the lines of the Manitoba Commission will create such confusion about prices that no potential buyer will be willing to purchase local grain at the price demanded and the Saskatchewan Minister's beliefs that the wheat board will be strengthened by his move is clearly unfounded. Mr. Lang has already stated that prices set by the Agricultural Products Board, the board which the province claims is undermining the wheat board will not, I repeat, not take into account feed grain prices set the Provincial. Commissions. The only loser in this political manoeuvring will be the farmer. Nor should Mr. Messer be deluded into thinking that by following Manitoba's example he will force the Federal Government to play the ball game his way. Ottawa has already clearly indicated that it will not.

I just say this, that it is time that the NDP led by their Premier and the Minister of Agriculture, put forward a, concrete, positive plan for the feed grains if they have one and stop whining and complaining and confusing the issue and playing politics with the future of the province.

SOME HON. MEMBERS: Hear, hear!

MR. STEUART: — What has been suggested? Let's take a look at what they are attacking. Here are some of the things that Otto Lang has suggested he would like to see in the feed grains policy, every one of which have been attacked by the NDP Government opposite. A floor price that will be a absolute basic requirement of any long range feed policy. A sensible sound floor price. That's something the farmers have fought for for years More cash advances. That's something they have fought for for years. To pay farmers storage for storing feed grains and other grains on the farm. Another thing they have fought for for years.

SOME HON. MEMBERS: Hear, hear!

AN. HON. MEMBER: — . . . recommended that.

MR. STEUART: — Ah, recommended that!

SOME HON. MEMBERS: Hear, hear!

MR. STEUART: — You didn't even know about the vote. You didn't even know about the vote until Monday morning. The other, and I think one of the most basic important principles that will be in if Otto Lang has his way and if we on this side of the House have our way, will be equity in freight rates so that there will be no favoritism in the shipping of feed grain to any part of Canada, no favoritism in shipping finished cattle and live cattle over feed grains to any part of the country.

Now, those are basics of any sound, long range feed grains policy. Why haven't the NDP spoken out on that? Why have they just taken the cheap political route and said they are ruining the Wheat Board, they are handing things over to eastern Canada.

We, in the West, have fought for years, regardless of our political stripe, for a more equitable deal on a whole variety of fronts from Ottawa and central Canada. We have a right to this kind of a deal. For the first time in Calgary, in July, we had a Federal Government and a Prime Minister who said, "We agree, there has been inequity, there has been unfairness and we are prepared to change it." And I am going to point out tomorrow that they have done a great many things. I am going to point out just two today to show you the kind of a ball game we are playing and to show you what we can accomplish if we can get the rules of the game changed.

AN HON. MEMBER: — You didn't do anything in seven years.

MR. STEUART: — We did lots in seven years. The Federal Government intervened with the Canadian Transport Commission, and there was a change made in the shipment of rape meal from Western Canada to the East Coast and the West Coast. A change that Premier Blakeney pooh-poohed the other day and said we'd never go that route again. That one change alone saved the producers of rape meal. Wheat Pool is one of them, Agro in Nipawin is another. It saved them \$400,000 a year. Recently Otto Lang, just before the Western Opportunities Conference, announced that he would change the stopover charges on flour milled in western Canada. That is saving flour mills in western Canada \$500,000 a year and one of them is the Wheat Fool. Those two savings alone, and they are just the beginning, they indicate what is possible in saving producers in western Canada \$900,000 a year.

AN HON. MEMBER: — You are a mile off

MR. STEUART: — Well, then, you phone the Wheat Pool like I did yesterday and you talk to them and ask them how much they save. They say this saving alone to us is \$170,000 a year. I wrote Agro. I am a way off eh! In Nipawin they said it saved them nearly a \$100,000 a year and there are three others. All right the total saving was printed in the paper and was backed up by the statements I got from them, the people in the business, Mr. Attorney General, the saving is \$400,000 a year and I know

the saving on changing the stopover deal is going to cost the Federal Government half a million. I am just trying to point out to you that what we are trying to achieve and you are trying to achieve it as much as we are in regard to equity and freight rates, in regard to changes in tariffs, in regard to other things we fought for for years, can do more to benefit everyone in western Canada, farmers of Saskatchewan, working people of Saskatchewan, investors in Saskatchewan.

But I want to tell you this, if we now say to Ontario, to the farmers of Ontario, the farmers of Quebec, "Look we've got you over a barrel the next year or so on things like feed grains and things like oil and we are going to take advantage of you for every nickel we can get," then I say to you we can't go to them on one hand and say, look, we think we haven't had fair treatment for years, you are beginning to listen to us. They haven't made very much progress. But it has only been four months since the meeting in Calgary and there has been a great deal of progress made in that four months. Thanks more to the Federal Government than the actions of you people. How can we go to the people of eastern Canada and say we want a fair deal from you but the first time we get a chance to stick it into you, man we are going to take it. That is exactly what you people are doing. In this particular feed grains issue you are taking a narrow, negative, short range view. You are doing it because, as usual, you think it will help you politically. You think you are going to get a little bit of political credit from some people who can't see past their noses. Well, you might, but I say to you and the people of Saskatchewan, when we develop our long range feed grain policy, of course, we should look after ourselves, but we should remember just as when we develop our long range oil and energy policy that we are Canadians and that we can't very well go to eastern Canada on one hand and demand as we have been doing with some success lately, a fair and equitable deal and then turn on the other hand and say, but when it comes to us, when it is something we have the advantage we are going to balkanize this country and we are going to say to people in the rest of Canada, "We are not interested, we will gouge you for everything we've got."

Mr. Speaker, I want to get into the mess in the Department of Northern Saskatchewan. I want to talk about energy in a serious way. Since I have a great deal to say and you couldn't even begin to touch the plate of worms called the Department of Northern Saskatchewan unless you wanted to stay here until 10:00 or 11:00 o'clock tonight, I beg leave to adjourn the debate.

Debate adjourned.

The Assembly adjourned at 5:05 o'clock p.m.