

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

**Wednesday, December 5, 1973.**

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

On the Orders of the Day

**WELCOME TO STUDENTS**

**MR. J.R. KOWALCHUK: (Melville)** — Mr. Speaker, I am very pleased to announce to you, Sir, and to this Assembly that we have in this Legislature today over 60 students from St. Henry's Separate School at Melville. They are all Grade Eight students accompanied by two of their teachers, Miss Linda Blaz and Mr. Bob Reid. They are seated to your left, Sir. The bus drivers who brought them safely to this place are Mr. Mike Halyk and Mr. Bunny Halyk. I sincerely hope and I am sure as do all other Members of this House that their visit will be educational and beneficial to them. I sincerely hope that Melville St. Henry's will continue to send students to Regina every year as they have done every other year up until now to see what goes on in this Legislature.

**HON. MEMBERS:** Hear, hear!

**QUESTIONS**

**RALPH SMITH — CLASSIFICATION OFFICER**

**MR. K.R. MacLEOD: (Regina Albert Park)** — Mr. Speaker, before the Orders of the Day I should like to ask the Premier a question. Is it true that Ralph Smith has taken time from his employment as Classification Officer dealing with job placement in the Public Service Commission to be campaign manager for the NDP candidate in Lakeview?

**HON. A.E. BLAKENEY: (Premier)** — Mr. Speaker, I understand there is a question on the Blues, approximately in that form, but so that the Member may not be held up for the answer my information is that Mr. Ralph Smith who is, I am told, an employee of the Public Service Commission has taken leave of absence and what he is doing during that period of time is not within the knowledge of the Government.

**SOME HON. MEMBERS:** Hear, hear!

**MR. MacLEOD:** — Mr. Speaker, I wonder if the Premier would tell us whether or not it is customary in the Government to allow leave of absence without any inquiry of any kind as to what the person intends to do during leave of absence and if he knows how long Mr. Smith is likely to be absent, and when he is going to return, and any other facts relating to his absence. It does appear to us, Mr. Speaker, that the Government is very lax if it gives indeterminate leave to anybody who happens to want it without knowing when, why, where or how soon he will be back.

**MR. BLAKENEY:** — I know the Hon. Member would not expect me to have at my finger tips in answer to an oral question the length of the leave of absence of one of some 10,000 employees that the Government has. May I advise the House that it is not only common but has been the custom of the Government of Saskatchewan under successive governments to grant leave of absence for personal reasons and I suspect that that would be the case with Mr. Smith. I have no idea at this time what the length of the leave of absence would be. If you would like we will attempt to expedite the question on the Blues and no doubt the appropriate Minister would be able to supply the information.

**MR. NED SHILLINGTON**

**MR. A.R. GUY: (Athabasca)** — Mr. Speaker, before the Orders of the Day I should like to direct a question to the Attorney General (Mr. Romanow). I wonder if he is aware and did he give permission for his executive assistant, Mr. Ned Shillington, to be the outside scrutineer in polls numbers 8, 9, 10 and 11 today in the Lakeview by-election.

**HON. R. ROMANOW: (Attorney General)** — I am not sure what Mr. Shillington is doing but I am sure that it is on proper leave, in any event.

**MR. GUY:** — A supplementary question, I wonder if he also is aware that he refused to turn in his scrutineer papers in a couple of the polls and this is in direct contravention of The Elections Act. And also is he aware that Mr. Coulter, the president of the Lakeview NDP Executive is not in attendance today and we wonder if he has been given leave of absence?

**MR. ROMANOW:** — I am sorry, Mr. Speaker, I am not familiar about Brian Coulter and I am not familiar about people turning in statements under The Elections Act or not. I am just not familiar.

**MR. MacLEOD:** — Mr. Speaker, I did have a supplementary if I may end I know that . . .

**MR. SPEAKER:** — Just one question and a supplementary, that is all I can permit.

**MR. MacLEOD:** — Is it not possible to allow another one having regard to the answer on this special day, Mr. Speaker.

**MR. SPEAKER:** — To me it's just another day.

**MR. MacLEOD:** — Mr. Speaker, would you not allow one because of the answer I got . . .

**MR. SPEAKER:** — No, I have had one question and a supplementary by you.

**MR. D.G. STEUART: (Leader of the Opposition)** — May I revert for one brief moment. Mr. Coulter works for you. Are you aware where Mr. Coulter is today? Has he been given time off?

**MR. ROMANOW:** — Mr. Speaker doesn't answer questions.

**MR. STEUART:** — Well, he might. You people don't, maybe he is a gentleman.

**SOME HON. MEMBERS:** Hear, hear!

**MR. STEUART:** — If you find out where he is will you let us know by word of — you know — letter.

### **ADJOURNED DEBATES**

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

The Assembly resumed the adjourned debate on the proposed motion by Mr. Kaeding (Saltcoats) and the amendment thereto by Mr. Steuart (Leader of the Opposition).

**HON. A.E. BLAKENEY: (Premier)** — Mr. Speaker, before I adjourned the debate yesterday afternoon I had addressed: come fairly lengthy remarks to the House on the matter of energy, the oil and gas policy of the Government of Saskatchewan. I want to add a few more words to those remarks.

You will recall that yesterday, Mr. Speaker, I talked about what I considered the absence of an effective Federal Government policy and I said that we in Canada had listened to the Minister of Energy, Mines and Resources and we were: still waiting and that we had listened to the Prime Minister and we were still waiting. I asked that we have a national oil corporation. Are we to have a national oil corporation? We are waiting for the answer. Are we to have a pipeline to Montreal and if so when? We are waiting for the answer. Mr. Speaker, this is by no means the first time that I or other New Democrats have called for a pipeline to Ottawa or for a national oil corporation. This has been part of our approach to solving these problems for many months, indeed, for years. In a press release which I issued in November I stated that clearly we should long ago have built; the Toronto-Montreal pipeline. It is late but not too late. Let's start building it now. Second, we should get on with a national petroleum corporation to get some measure of public control in the oil industry. That as I indicated has been our position for many months and it was reiterated again on November 2nd, I reiterated it again yesterday. Members over there are trying vainly to get out, front.

**SOME HON. MEMBERS:** Hear, hear!

**MR. BLAKENEY:** — I understand their feeble efforts in that regard.

We are very heartened today, Mr. Speaker, about rumors which are being heard that today we are to have an announcement in the House of Commons that a pipeline will be built to Montreal and that possibly there will be an establishment of an oil corporation of some kind. We can certainly hope that those rumors prove to be true. It is indeed very, very late for each of those but we are hopeful that even at this, late date something might be gained from the construction of an oil pipeline to Montreal and the establishment of an energy corporation.

Mr. Speaker, I want to say a word about the federal export tax on oil. We have tried on many occasions to make clear to the public our position with respect to this export tax. We believe that the export tax is a good tax and a proper tax under all the circumstances. We believe that the Federal Government, faced with the situation which they were faced with last September, acted wisely in imposing an oil export tax because we believe there is no reason why Canadian oil should be exported from this country at a price less than the going export price for oil, the going world market price for oil. And so we agree with the action of the Federal Government in this regard in the imposition of the tax and we, similarly, agree with the action of the Federal Government in raising the tax and that the situation required it. On each occasion I have indicated our agreement publicly. We do take the position that this return from resources in Saskatchewan belongs to the people in Saskatchewan and should be returned to the people of Saskatchewan. We take the position that the Federal Government is obligated to return all or substantially all of that tax to the people of Saskatchewan. We have pressed on many occasions the Federal Government to commit itself to returning the proceeds of the oil export tax. We have had some half-hearted suggestions that all or a major portion of the tax would be returned to Saskatchewan but we have had no commitment from the Federal Government. We, once again, call upon the Federal Government to return to this province the proceeds of the oil export tax which they have received in respect of the export from Canada of oil from Saskatchewan.

**SOME HON. MEMBERS:** Hear, hear!

**MR. BLAKENEY:** — Mr. Speaker, I said yesterday that we were going to establish a conservation board to guarantee to Saskatchewan people future supplies of oil and gas and I indicated that the conservation board might not be enough. I indicated that because of the attitude of the Federal Government a conservation board might not offer to the people of Saskatchewan sufficient protection of their resource. We are aware that action in addition to the conservation board may well be necessary. The Federal Government has set out to challenge the right of our province to control our natural resources. One potash company is trying to upset our potash conservation regulations and to recover damages in the tens of millions of dollars from the Provincial Government. In a move which so far as I am aware is almost unprecedented in Canadian legal history the Federal Minister of Justice has intervened on the side of this potash company and against the Government of Saskatchewan. The Federal Government acted to be added as a plaintiff, the prosecutor of this action, to overturn our conservation regulations and to recover many millions from the taxpayers of Saskatchewan. This move by the Hon. Mr. Lang is almost

unbelievable. He declared that there are ways in which a Federal Government can challenge the laws or regulations passed by a provincial government. It is always open to them and has been open to them for many, many months to commence an action for a declaration that these regulations were unconstitutional. This was not done. Instead they decided to intervene on the side of Central Canada Potash in a private legal action against the Government of Saskatchewan claiming not only that the regulations are invalid but also that damages are owed. It is one of the few times in Canadian history that the Federal Government has attempted to join with a private company to try to collect damages from provincial taxpayers. More important, much more important it's an attack on the right of this province to conserve and protect our own natural resources.

**SOME HON. MEMBERS:** Hear, hear!

**MR. BLAKENEY:** — It's a federal challenge to the right of this province and every other province to regulate the development of natural resources within the province. It is a politically partisan use of the position of Minister of Justice. These regulations stood for fifteen months when introduced by a Liberal Government under the late Premier Ross Thatcher. There was no challenge or no hint of challenge by the Federal Cabinet. The regulations are unchanged in their essentials. The facts are basically the same, the Federal Government is the same, the only thing that has changed is that this province now has an NDP Government not a Liberal Government.

**SOME HON. MEMBERS:** Hear, hear!

**MR. BLAKENEY:** — And I say that on this basis and on this basis alone the Federal Government and its Minister of Justice has decided to attack the conservation regulations. And I say that this is a cynical and partisan act. It is a misuse of the powers of the Federal Minister of Justice. It might be argued that somehow during the fifteen months of Liberal Government the fact that the existence of these regulations was somehow overlooked, but that's not true. The regulations were discussed by the then Liberal Government with the federal officials before they were passed during the Thatcher period. Since then, so far as I am aware, no single letter or other piece of correspondence has been sent by any Federal Minister to me or to any Member of our Government saying that these regulations were unconstitutional. So far as I am aware, our first knowledge of this federal assault on provincial powers was the filing by the lawyer acting for Mr. Lang of the Federal Government's support for the protesting potash company.

I want to say in the strongest possible terms that Saskatchewan protests this action of the Federal Government.

**SOME HON. MEMBERS:** Hear, hear!

**MR. BLAKENEY:** — I want to say that the Government of Saskatchewan will take all necessary steps to preserve the control for the people of Saskatchewan of our potash resources and I want to say that this lesson from the Federal Government will not be missed with respect to our oil resources. We know that the Federal Government says that conservation boards are not within

the power- of provincial. governments and I want to say that if they continue that position we must and will defend ourselves against this assault on our natural resources and if we need other measures besides conservation boards, we will take other measures.

**SOME HON. MEMBERS:** Hear, hear!

**MR. BLAKENEY:** — We are going to use all weapons open to us to defend the people of Saskatchewan against this assault by the Government of Canada on their resources.

**SOME HON. MEMBERS:** Hear, hear!

**SOME HON. MEMBER:** — And by the only Federal Cabinet Minister from Saskatchewan.

**MR. BLAKENEY:** — I need hardly add that the protesting potash company, the one that Mr. Lang has joined, is in Mr. Lang's constituency. but I know that that may be thought to be significant.

Mr. Speaker, I know that the Members opposite were asking a few questions earlier in the day and from their conversation it's reasonably clear that they are aware of some electoral activity in this city and I ah . . . many of my friends in the Lakeview constituency are similarly aware of some electoral activity. As a matter of fact one of my friends in Lakeview found a little book in his mailbox. It's a little green book. The person who left it didn't try to explain its contents, and small wonder

**SOME HON. MEMBERS:** Hear, hear!

**MR. BLAKENEY:** — The book reaches a new high of political cynicism. The book is really interesting. It says on the front 'Policies for Lakeview' and on the back you can see a lot of big print here. It talks about Ted Malone and the Ted Malone committee rooms and the next biggest print says 3261 South Railway and the next biggest print says telephone number and the next biggest print says Centax, that's the people who turned out the booklet and then in the smallest possible print you can find it says authorized by Lakeview Liberals. And on the front of the booklet and on the back of the booklet the only suggestion that there may be a party called Liberal around is in the tiniest possible print.

**SOME HON. MEMBERS:** Hear, hear!

**MR. BLAKENEY:** — I've even read the booklet and there is in all of the printing in this booklet no single suggestion that any policy in it is a policy of the Liberal party.

**SOME HON. MEMBERS:** They're still waiting for the resolution results to come in.

**MR. BLAKENEY:** — There is another word that you won't find in this booklet and it's the word called Steuart.

**SOME HON. MEMBERS:** Hear, hear!

**MR. BLAKENEY:** — I invite anyone to find any mild suggestion that the Liberal party even has a leader.

**SOME HON. MEMBERS:** Hear, hear!

**MR. BLAKENEY:** — The people who prepared this booklet may have been fairly wise. Because as I say the name Liberal is; far from prominent and anyone who knows the Liberal party and the record of the Liberal party would probably compliment the advertising agency in keeping that word out of the booklet.

**SOME HON. MEMBERS:** Hear, hear!

**MR. BLAKENEY:** — Now the booklet is divided into sections and the first one talks about, and I'll read the first one. You'll appreciate this.

A society must, always be prepared to assist people in need, the old, the sick, the handicapped, the poor.

In need. This, Mr. Speaker, from a Liberal. And let's talk about the old for a moment. From the days of Walter Harris, back in the 1950s and his 'six buck boys', from that day on, every old person in this country knows that if you ever want to get anything for old people you have to get it from some other government but a Liberal Government.

**SOME HON. MEMBERS:** Hear, hear!

**MR. BLAKENEY:** — Or else you have to find a Liberal Government in an awfully vulnerable position. Because in 1972, just a year ago before the federal election, the Liberal Government refused to raise the Old Age Security Pension. Just a pittance they raised it. But after the 1972 election, when they were in a minority situation, the pension was raised and raised substantially. Now can you imagine, Mr. Speaker, any other reason, any other reason why a Liberal Government would refuse to raise the pension before an election and would agree to raise it after an election except that it was in a political jam because the NDP had power of control.

**SOME HON. MEMBERS:** Hear, hear!

**MR. BLAKENEY:** — Mr. Speaker, everybody knows that's what happened. Everybody knows that's why the old people got an increase in the old age pension. For the old, Liberal times are hard times and everybody in Canada knows it.

**SOME HON. MEMBERS:** Hear, hear!

**MR. BLAKENEY:** — Then the booklet goes on to tell us about the tender concern of the Liberal party, it doesn't mention the word Liberal of course, for the sick. Saskatchewan Liberals telling us of their concern for the sick.

**SOME HON. MEMBERS:** Hear, hear!

**MR. BLAKENEY:** — Saskatchewan Liberals whose record for seven years, for seven lean, gaunt years is one of relentless assault on the sick. In seven years they raised the Medicare premium from \$52 to \$72, they slapped on huge charges on the estates of mental patients leaving little or nothing for the widows. They closed small hospitals again and again, notwithstanding their solemn commitments not to do so. They chiselled and chopped on hospital budgets, leaving Regina General and other hospitals with deficits and debts and they imposed the odious deterrent fees, which taxed most heavily those who were sickest. And now they tell us, now they tell us about Liberal concern for the sick. The sick know only too well that Liberal times are hard times.

**SOME HON. MEMBERS:** Hear, hear!

**MR. BLAKENEY:** — Then the booklet goes on to talk about property tax relief. Now for Liberals talk about property tax relief takes a little bit of stamina. Because for seven years Liberal Governments with the present Leader of the Opposition who has now departed trying to go and get a vote or two. That Government off which he was the Treasurer kept school grants down and municipal grants down so that property taxes soared.

Between '65 and '71 mill rates in Regina rose by over 27 mills, 4 1/2 mills a year. In 1973, costs were going up much faster than they were in those times, but because of Provincial Government grants mill rates went up in this city this year, 1/2 mill. In two years, Mr. Speaker, school mill rates in this city have gone up less than 2 mills.

Added to this in seven years, the Liberals managed a grant to homeowners, mentioned by the Member for Albert Park (Mr. MacLeod), of \$70. In two years the NDP have raised that to \$144, more than doubled and given it to small businessmen too.

Can anyone doubt with that sort of a record, that for property taxpayers Liberal times are hard times?

**SOME HON. MEMBERS:** Hear, hear!

**MR. BLAKENEY:** — Then we have a section dealing with Albert Street. It offers no solution, which is hardly surprising. For in every year between 1964 and 1971 there was a Liberal Provincial Government and a Liberal dominated city council and no solution was found or even suggested for Albert Street congestion.

Now the next section deals with families. Now this one is touching. It says that the Provincial Government should help families to live within their monthly budgets. And it talks about removing the sales tax on children's clothing. This from a party which for seven years did nothing about the sales tax,



this from a party which only short months ago opposed raising the minimum wage and this from a party which only short months ago opposed the abolition of the Medicare and Hospital premium.

**SOME HON. MEMBERS:** Hear, hear!

**MR. BLAKENEY:** — This party which still opposes the abolition of the Medicare and Hospital premium. Now that abolition of that \$72 tax will give some real relief to families. To give similar relief from the removal of sales tax on children's clothing, a family would. need to spend on children's clothing, each year. \$1,440. Perhaps Liberals don't know it, perhaps the Liberal candidate doesn't know it, but most families don't spend and can't spend anything like \$1,400 a year on children's clothing. Most families aren't in that income tax bracket. Ordinary families will not be fooled by this sort of talk. Talk about what the Liberals are going to do, while opposing tax relief now. Ordinary people will want NDP action rather than Liberal promises about what they are going to do.

**SOME HON. MEMBERS:** Hear, hear!

**MR. BLAKENEY:** — Mr. Speaker, I go to the last section. Best argument in the book. It says that the Opposition needs strengthening.

**SOME HON. MEMBERS:** Hear, hear!

**MR. BLAKENEY:** — Certainly, Mr. Speaker, that's true enough. The trouble is it needs strengthening not in the back benches, but right up front. Indeed even now the real talent sits in the back row.

**SOME HON. MEMBERS:** Hear, hear!

**MR. BLAKENEY:** — Mr. Speaker, another backbencher, whether he be strong or weak, can do little or nothing for an Opposition whose leadership is carping and negative, which is bankrupt of new ideas and which month in and month out offers no alternatives to deal with the problems facing this province. The Opposition is certainly sick, it certainly needs some strength, but what it needs is members with new ideas, some fresh approaches to the challenges facing Regina and Saskatchewan and not another member who relies upon the slick publicity from the advertising agency of the Liberal party.

**SOME HON. MEMBERS:** Hear, hear!

**MR. BLAKENEY:** — And the interesting thing about the Liberal publicity is what it doesn't say. Whatever happened to the old Liberal stagnation line? They have laid that one aside and they've laid it aside for good reasons, because nobody but nobody would believe it.

Regina has boomed in the three years from 1971, '72 and '73. I must tell you what has happened in Regina in those years.

City budgets have gone from deficits to modest surpluses. Twenty-nine new industries, 300 new jobs, 54 business expansions, approximately 700 new jobs from business expansions, land assembly with the lowest cost building lots in Canada, tri-level government co-operation between the city and the province and the Federal Government the best ever.

**SOME HON. MEMBERS:** Hear, hear!

**MR. BLAKENEY:** — Population increase from 141,000 to 145,000. That what's happened to Regina. So says H.G.R. Walker, the Mayor of Regina and former Liberal candidate in this city. That's what he said. He says we have 29 new industries with 300 new jobs, he says we got 54 business expansions with 700 new jobs and it's not only Regina that has prospered. I'm delighted as I'm sure Members opposite are delighted at the economic progress that all Saskatchewan has enjoyed during the last year.

**SOME HON. MEMBERS:** Hear, hear!

**MR. BLAKENEY:** — When our Government came to office we said we would work to see that there were more jobs, more jobs in smaller industries, more jobs in manufacturing farm machinery, more jobs in processing our raw materials, our rapeseed, our dairy products, our forest products and all this has come to pass. It has happened and it's continuing to happen. Now it isn't happening with all the fanfare and the headlines of the old days. For example, last Saturday's Star-Phoenix carried a little ad, a little story about the opening in Saskatoon of a new garment factory, which now employs 120 people and more are expected to be employed. In the days when all we had were press releases this would have been a banner front page story, complete with the pictures of the then Premier, the whole bit. But this story the Star-Phoenix carried on page 42, between the ad for Eaton's and the ad for Inland Cement.

But never mind, never mind the approach of the Star-Phoenix to this, I think the public would sooner have jobs under the NDP than press releases under the Liberals.

**SOME HON. MEMBERS:** Hear, hear!

**MR. BLAKENEY:** — Month after month we have more jobs. Month after month we have more people working in this province than at any time since records were kept. Month after month, in spite of the mass of outflow of people during the latter years of the Liberal Government we have more people actually working than at any time in the history of Saskatchewan.

**SOME HON. MEMBERS:** Hear, hear!

**MR. BLAKENEY:** — And as a result unemployment rates are rock bottom. Let me tell you about some of these unemployment rates. In June, July, August, September and October they were 2 per cent, 1.9 per cent, 2.4 per cent, 1.9, 1.9, averaging just over 2 per cent. In Canada they averaged just over 4 1/2 per cent. Saskatchewan has had the lowest unemployment rate of any province in Canada for six straight months.

**SOME HON. MEMBERS:** Hear, hear!

**MR. BLAKENEY:** — Mr. Speaker, those aren't just figures, they are hard facts. Ask a contractor who needs a skilled man. He'll say he's short of good men. Pick up any newspaper, look at the want ad section. Page after page of job offers. Page after page of opportunities for people to get jobs.

The Member for Athabasca suggests that these were jobs with the Government of Saskatchewan. We too are finding it difficult to get good people. We too found that in 1971 we had inherited a civil service which had been stripped of its talent, much of its talent.

I know that in 1971, when I was on the election trail that dozens even hundreds of people who came to me talking about jobs would have been very happy if they had had a government which offered employment.

**SOME HON. MEMBERS:** Hear, hear!

**MR. BLAKENEY:** — As a matter of fact, let me repeat again what the Mayor of Regina has said, that Regina has 19 new industries with 300 new jobs and 54 business expansions with 700 new jobs.

Mr. Speaker, one of the things which is causing this province to hum is the activity in housing. After seven lean, gaunt Liberal years things are moving in housing.

**SOME HON. MEMBERS:** Hear, hear!

**MR. BLAKENEY:** — In the last few years of the Liberal administration housing starts had stagnated. The Liberals paid out a bonus to get people to build houses — \$500.

**MR. GUY:** — Were you against it?

**MR. BLAKENEY:** — I am against paying out a bonus of \$500 to a man with an income of \$70,000 a year, yes, I am.

**SOME HON. MEMBERS:** Hear, hear!

**MR. BLAKENEY:** — I am against paying bonuses to people who make \$50,000 a year so they can build a \$75,000 house, yes I am. We have raised the bonus from \$500 to \$800, and we have said that it is not going to people with \$50,000 incomes, but to people with incomes not exceeding \$9,000 per year.

**SOME HON. MEMBERS:** Hear, hear!

**MR. BLAKENEY:** — The turn-around in house-building has been dramatic. Let's look at a few of these figures. I have some in Regina. In Regina in 1970 we had 418 building starts and that was pretty high, look at the Saskatoon ones, they weren't half that. In 1972 that had more than tripled. More than tripled in two years. In 1970 apartment vacancies in this city were over 10 per cent, in Saskatoon they were nearer 20 per cent. Apartment vacancies

Now are 1.6 per cent. And that is in Regina and as the Member for Watrous (Mr. Cody) pointed out in his address in seconding the Speech from the Throne, housing starts in this whole province are more than 6,000 units this year.

**SOME HON. MEMBERS:** Hear, hear!

**MR. BLAKENEY:** — 6,000 units and that is more than four times the figure of 1970. Now I am not suggesting that we have all the houses that we need, by no means. We need more houses and we are going to have more houses. We are going to have more houses in La Ronge, we are going to have more houses in Saskatoon, we are going to have more houses in Regina and we are probably going to have more houses in Rosthern and . . .

**SOME HON. MEMBERS:** Hear, hear!

**MR. BLAKENEY:** — We are going to have some students' residences up there in Rosthern and they are going to be very much appreciated, I know.

**SOME HON. MEMBERS:** Hear, hear!

**MR. BLAKENEY:** — Well, in Regina housing starts have tripled, apartment vacancies are down 85 per cent and this is in very sharp contrast to the days of Steuart's stagnation, those gaunt, lean Liberal years.

**SOME HON. MEMBERS:** Hear, hear!

**MR. BLAKENEY:** — We haven't done enough in housing and I am not saying we have and we are going to do more. We have launched a major program of repairing and renovating existing houses and this is a program open to all people of restricted income, of whatever age. We have launched another program, a different program, of senior citizens' home repairs, a program which will help older people repair their own homes and continue to live in them. In this Senior Citizens' Home Repair Program we have had over 6,700 applications.

**SOME HON. MEMBERS:** Hear, hear!

**MR. BLAKENEY:** — Over 4,500 grants approved. And of the over 4,500 grants approved, more than 3,000 are in towns and villages and rural areas.

**SOME HON. MEMBERS:** Hear, hear!

**MR. BLAKENEY:** — That's another way that we can underpin life in rural Saskatchewan. This program provides jobs, it provides jobs in the winter time, it helps revitalize our smaller centres and most important, allows older people to live in their own homes in comfort and dignity. This program is one more step in giving the people of Saskatchewan the New Deal promised in 1971.

**SOME HON. MEMBERS:** Hear, hear!

**MR. BLAKENEY:** — Mr. Speaker, I want to a word about agriculture. I expect that my colleague the Minister of Agriculture (Mr. Messer) will be entering the debate and will be dealing with the new programs for farmers outlined in the Speech from the Throne. So I only want to touch on two topics, Canadian Western Agribition and the position of the Canadian Wheat Board.

One of the real agricultural success stories of recent has been the Canadian Western Agribition. The idea was well launched when our Government took office in 1971 and for that, people like Mr. Chris Sutter and others deserve full credit. We gave that project our full and unstinting support in the hope that it would prosper and give new impetus to our growing livestock industry.

Last year the Provincial Government gave in grants to Western Agribition, just about \$600,000. This year's show and sale was a tremendous success. Attendance was estimated at over 150,000. Sales of livestock soared from just over \$1 million dollars in 1972 to more than \$3 million in 1973. We had the largest sale of Simmental cattle in the history of that breed anywhere in the world ever. Sales of other breeds were also outstandingly successful. I am told that more people came to Regina because of the Canadian Western Agribition from Europe than came here from Europe because of the Silver Broom.

The success of Agribition means that the cattle industry of Saskatchewan has come of age. We stand among the world leaders as breeders of fine beef cattle.

**SOME HON. MEMBERS:** Hear, hear!

**MR. BLAKENEY:** — May I, Mr. Speaker, pay tribute to the many dozens of people who made this development possible and I include in that tribute the late Premier W. Ross Thatcher.

Mr. Speaker, I want to say a word about the Canadian Wheat Board. The Member for Prince Albert West (Mr. Steuart), the Leader of the Opposition, referred somewhat circumspectly to the Wheat Board, although he was fulsome in praise for the Minister in charge of the Wheat Board. If he would heap the same lavish praise on the Wheat Board as he would heap on the Minister in charge of the Wheat Board we'd find something to agree with him on.

**SOME HON. MEMBERS:** Hear, hear!

**MR. BLAKENEY:** — I compliment him on his circumspection, at least he didn't, attack the Wheat Board. I commend that, particular stance to the Member for Rosthern (Mr. Boldt) and some others across there.

I did a little research on the Wheat, Board and I want to tell some people about it, because when I was speaking here yesterday, some people were evidently laboring under the delusion that a Federal Liberal Government had introduced the Wheat Board. The Wheat Board was established by the Bennett government. It was authorized at that time to buy grain from farmers, to set floor prices, to operate elevators. But at that time it was still possible for farmers to sell through the Grain

Exchange. It was a dual system of marketing.

And then in the fall of 1935, the Liberals were elected and a couple of years went by. And during those couple of Liberal years a funny thing happened. Out of the woodwork came the friends of the Grain Exchange. They were in all sorts of disguises and they usually pretended to be friends of the farmers, but they began telling us what was wrong with the Wheat Board. It wasn't aggressive enough, it wasn't doing its job. And sure enough the Liberals passed an Act which curtailed the operations of the Wheat Board. The Liberals passed an Act which said that the Wheat Board could only buy 5,000 bushels from any producer. Everything other than that was on the open market. The Liberals said to the farmers, "back to the Grain Exchange". And then along came the war and not even the Liberals could stomach the inefficiency of the Grain Exchange during the war and so we had the compulsory Wheat Board which we now know. And the war was won and after the war there was an election. And in 1949 the Liberals had a substantial majority. A few years went by and a funny thing happened, a funny thing happened to the Wheat Board. Surpluses began to pile up and it couldn't sell the wheat. And out of the woodwork came the friends of the Grain Exchange in all sorts of disguises, usually pretending to be friends of the farmers, and saying what was wrong with the Wheat Board.

It wasn't aggressive enough, it wasn't doing its job. Fortunately before these people could do anything the Liberal were defeated at the polls.

**SOME HON. MEMBERS:** Hear, hear!

**MR. BLAKENEY:** — They were defeated in no small measure because Western farmers were determined to keep the Wheat Board.

Well, Mr. Speaker, in 1957 the Conservatives were elected and a funny thing happened. All of a sudden the Wheat Board could sell wheat. Hundreds of millions of bushels were sold to customers who the Liberals didn't even know existed. Now, this continued until 1963. The Liberals were elected in 1963 federally and in 1964 provincially. A couple years passed and a funny thing happened, a funny thing happened to the Wheat Board. Surpluses began to pile up and all of a sudden they couldn't sell the wheat. And once again out of the woodwork came the friends of the Grain Exchange, still disguised, still pretending to be friends of the farmers, telling us what was wrong with the Wheat Board. Oh, it wasn't aggressive enough, it wasn't doing its job, the officials were sitting in plush offices. You can read some of the speeches of the Member for Rosthern.

But in spite of the best efforts of these friends of the Grain Exchange a world-wide shortage of wheat developed and the Wheat Board sold our wheat. Farmers liked the Wheat Board and they wanted the Wheat Board to sell our feed grain everywhere in Canada and they wanted the Wheat Board to sell our flax. But once again, out of the woodwork came the friends of the Grain Exchange in all sorts of disguises, usually pretending to be friends of the farmers, protecting their freedom is their current slogan, telling us what is wrong with the Wheat Board. Oh, it is not doing its job, it is not aggressive enough.

Mr. Speaker, the farmers in this province know what is going on. They know there are things wrong with the Wheat Board, but they know there is nothing wrong with the Wheat Board that a clean-out of a few Liberal politicians wouldn't

**SOME HON. MEMBERS:** Hear, hear!

**MR. BLAKENEY:** — And when the next Federal election comes the farmers of this province will do their part to defend orderly marketing, to defend the Wheat Board, and they will do their part to clean out those Liberal politicians who are out to sabotage the Wheat Board.

**SOME HON. MEMBERS:** Hear, hear!

**MR. BLAKENEY:** — Mr. Speaker, the farmers know, they know that if you believe in orderly marketing, if you like the Wheat Board rather than the Grain Exchange, if you believe in these things, then Liberal times are hard times.

**SOME HON. MEMBERS:** Hear, hear!

**MR. BLAKENEY:** — And as Otto Lang and his fellow Liberals will find out, not only are Liberal times hard times but Liberal times are short times.

**SOME HON. MEMBERS:** Hear, hear!

**MR. BLAKENEY:** — As I said yesterday, for Members opposite who want to become senators, the time is very short, indeed. I know that they are busy saying that feed grains shouldn't be marketed through the Wheat Board and the rapeseed shouldn't be marketed through the Wheat Board, and the Wheat Board takes away your freedom, but when farmers have an opportunity to judge people who say that, it will be down the road for those opponents of the Wheat Board.

**SOME HON. MEMBERS:** Hear, hear!

**MR. BLAKENEY:** — The bell tolls for them!

Let me say a little bit about freight rates because the Leader of the Opposition has had a few words to say about freight rates. In the Speech from the Throne we said that freight rates have continued to climb and this seemed to surprise the Leader of the Opposition (Mr. Steuart). He was apparently taken in by the television announcement at the Western Economic Opportunities Conference that freight rates would be frozen. He has yet to learn that when dealing with a Federal Liberal Government you have got to watch for the fine print, even television. Because what they said was not that freight rates would be frozen, but across-the-board freight rates would be frozen. Other freight rates covering, perhaps, 25 or 30 per cent of our traffic can rise. I apologize to the House for giving it off the cuff the other day. And they have risen.

The Member for Prince Albert West asked what freight rates had increased. He asked me, off the cuff, what freight rates had increased. Well, let me give him a few.

Effective September 1st and that was well after the July WEOC, vehicles from the Chrysler plant at Windsor, Ontario to all points in western Canada up six per cent; effective September 4th grain and grain products from Moose Jaw and Saskatoon to Alberta and British Columbia up six per cent; September 4th, coal and briquettes from Bienfait to all points in Manitoba and Saskatchewan up six per cent; effective September 1st, lumber from Hudson Bay to all points in Ontario and Quebec up six per cent; effective September 1st, lumber from Big River, Carrot River, Meadow Lake, Prince Albert, Reserve to points in Ontario and Quebec up six per cent; September 14th, bottles and new glass from Medicine Hat and Redcliffe, Alberta, to all points in Saskatchewan up three per cent.

Now these charges affect the prices of cars, of trucks, of car parts, of bottles and glass and affect the cost of shipping lumber, coal, grain, flour. If these aren't freight rate increases, perhaps the Leader of the Opposition will explain to us just what they are.

Our position on freight rates was clear and is clear. We don't oppose all freight rate increases. Costs increase and so must some rates. But we do say this: freight rates should be based generally on the cost of providing the service, not on what the traffic will bear. We don't object to paying the fair cost of shipping our goods. We don't object to paying the same sort of costs of shipping our goods that other people pay, but that isn't the case. The philosophy of the National Transportation Act of 1968 is that rail companies may charge whatever competition permits. Well, that is fine, that is fine if you live in Ontario, because the competition is the Seaway, subsidized at public expense. But in parts of western Canada the railways have an effective monopoly and they charge monopoly rates for their services. And that is unjust.

**SOME HON. MEMBERS:** Hear, hear!

**MR. BLAKENEY:** — The Leader of the Opposition yesterday, was telling us about the commitments made by the Federal Government. Well, we asked them for a firm commitment to change this philosophy in the National Transportation Act, to make it cost-of-service oriented and not competition oriented, and that commitment was refused.

They say they still want to have eastern Canadians have low rates and western Canadians have high rates. They decline, too, to commit themselves to using transportation as a key part of regional development policy. No commitment there. They did undertake to look at individual freight rates. And in preparation for that they did say they would try to help provincial governments find out what costs really are. And that has been pursued diligently by all western governments and by the Federal Government, but, as indicated in the Speech from the Throne, to date little of a concrete nature has been accomplished.

I want to tell the Legislature and the public that we will continue to pursue this matter, actively and diligently, to see that we can make some constructive progress, not only in getting individual rates reviewed, but also much more fundamentally, to see if we can get a change, and a basic change, in the philosophy off the National Transportation Act.



Now the Leader of the Opposition was suggesting that somehow progress was not being made because of the New Democratic Government in Saskatchewan and because of the fact that we were taking a partisan approach to this. All I can say to the Leader of the Opposition (Mr. Steuart) is this; if he thinks that the NDP Government of Saskatchewan is somehow not co-operating with the Federal Government in getting freight rate analyses done and freight rates changed, let him ask the Conservative Government of Alberta, let him ask to see whether they are getting along any better with the Federal Government. I regret to tell the Leader of the Opposition that I can't refer him to any Liberal Government in Western Canada because there aren't any.

**SOME HON. MEMBERS:** Hear, hear!

**MR. BLAKENEY:** — I do say that our Government has done everything possible to work with the Federal Government, to see that an analysis is done, to see that we can make progress in getting lower freight rates.

Mr. Speaker, the Speech from the Throne referred to the fact that the Government has reached some conclusions concerning the recommendations of the Special Committee on Liquor Regulations. As you know these recommendations were many and far reaching. They reflect, I think it is fair to say, some division among authorities in the field concerning the appropriate course of action to take in reducing the abuse of alcohol and its effects. Although a number of recommendations of the Committee are still under review, let me give you a progress report on the Government's intentions. First of all we agree that there should be no relaxation of the present prohibition of commercial advertising of beverage alcohol in Saskatchewan. And accordingly there will be none.

**SOME HON. MEMBERS:** Hear, hear!

**MR. BLAKENEY:** — Second, the Government does not agree with those recommendations of the Committee which would have the effect of making alcohol beverages generally more accessible than they are now. There may be minor changes to remove instances of needless inconvenience. I am not suggesting this will not happen. But it is our judgment that the arguments for generally greater accessibility of alcohol are not persuasive and that to move in that direction would likely accelerate the consumption of alcohol. This is not to suggest we should try to make it deliberately inconvenient for people, it is to suggest that we should not go for any major step of making alcohol more generally accessible. We are further convinced that increased alcoholic consumption is likely to lead to increased abuse. I think it is fair to say that there is no general agreement in the public on this issue. Many of the public believe that there should be severe limitation of the public sale of alcoholic beverages because of the social evils that are evident. Many agree that alcoholic beverages should be freely available because as they say their freedom should not be restricted because of social problems being experienced by others and not by them. And somehow governments must find a balance between these two positions. We believe that it is the current consensus of the people of Saskatchewan that generally speaking they are not now in favor of any substantial lessening of the

degree of regulation and control of the sale of alcoholic beverages in Saskatchewan. So on that basis there will be no change to make alcohol generally more accessible.

Third, in the year ahead the Government will begin an extensive alcohol social health education program using the mass media and other resources. We will be ear-marking a significant sum from liquor profits for this purpose. Our objective will be to raise the level of public awareness of harmful drinking patterns; to reinforce social attitudes which rich will help to change those drinking patterns.

Frankly this program will be breaking new ground. It may fail, it may be only a partial success. There are no real models to follow. We have broken ground before. We are prepared to try again. I will have more to say about this program after the Budget is brought down. But let me say this. The program will be experimental, it will be innovative, it will involve extensive use of radio, other media advertising and when fully operational we expect that it will involve an expenditure of probably a \$1 per capita per year to a continuing program to counter alcohol abuse.

Mr. Speaker, let me turn to one other subject. It has been the subject of a good deal of comment in this House and elsewhere in the last short while. I refer to the Department of Northern Saskatchewan and the work being done there to transform the social structure of that part of Saskatchewan. The Department of Northern Saskatchewan is potentially one of the greatest social experiments ever undertaken by the people of Saskatchewan.

**SOME HON. MEMBERS:** Hear, hear!

**MR. BLAKENEY:** — For a century, Mr. Speaker, that area has been treated a white colony. It has been ruled by whites sent in from Ottawa and from Regina. The resources have been largely exploited by whites. The business and professional services have largely been provided by whites. This colonial type of government is becoming increasingly unacceptable to the native people of the North. The aim of the Department of Northern Saskatchewan is to end that colonial regime step by step as rapidly as reasonably possible. And to replace it with a form of administration where local people would govern themselves. They would govern themselves in respect of the same sort of things that local people govern themselves in the South and other matters in the North which in the South are dealt with by federal and provincial governments would in the North be dealt with by federal and provincial governments. Now that is the concept. We don't clearly know now all of the things which might be the subject of local government in the North. Whether they would include all of the things that are true in the South or more or less. But we don't have to make that decision now. There is still a long, long way to go to establishing northern Saskatchewan local self-government to the extent and to anything like the extent that we who live in the South now enjoy. When we speak of local control we mean control by the people who live in the North, with all participating to the extent that they want to participate, whether they be registered Indian or Métis or whether they be white.

Speaking to a conference in December of 1972 about the Department of Northern Saskatchewan, I said this:

We look to the new Department of Northern Saskatchewan to provide a new focus for building government services in the North with the involvement of people living in northern communities. This means an involvement in not only an advisory capacity but also in a developing capacity. A developing capacity of self-government and local decision making. It will require readiness to abandon the safe standardized approaches to the delivery of government services. And it will take an equal dedication on the part of the people living in northern communities to develop their interest in self-government and their skills in decision making.

That was our design for the Department a year ago and under the excellent leadership of Ted Bowerman that is still the desire of our Department.

**SOME HON. MEMBERS:** Hear, hear!

**MR. BLAKENEY:** — This path is not an easy one. The path of rapid but measured social change is never easy. There will always be those on-lookers who will say faster, go faster, and these other on-lookers who will say stop, halt, whoa. Department of Northern Saskatchewan doesn't lack for these grandstand quarterbacks. We have got a whole bench full of grandstand quarterbacks, some of them who have come off the field in total defeat only a few months ago but are now experts in the field.

**SOME HON. MEMBERS:** Hear, hear!

**MR. BLAKENEY:** — Particularly we don't lack advice from those who have had the opportunity to put their ideas into effect for seven years, and for seven long years did nothing in Northern Saskatchewan but keep the iron grip of white colonialism clamped on the North, give away its resources to American corporations and allow its acute social problems to fester and compound. That is their record.

But we have charted a new course. Faint hearts in the Liberal Party are already decrying that course. They complain about the changes. They said in effect these terrible things wouldn't happen if people who had been running things for the past 15 years were still in control. I am quoting the very words of the Member, over there. But the whole idea of the Department of Northern Saskatchewan is to move control from the hands of those people who have exercised it during the last 15 years. The people who have lived in the North and who have controlled the North, and many of them were public servants, for the last 15 and yes, last 50 years have simply got to learn to share power with the people living in the North. That is what it is all about.

The Liberals oppose this. They have always opposed this. Many of them don't have the courage to say so but when they go in there and see the consequences of those changes they come out and say the changes are terrible. It is terrible because the people have been in control are having to share their power.

And of course, the native people complain. What do they complain about? They complain that change is not fast enough. And that is understandable. We didn't promise to make changes over night and we don't promise to make changes over night. We do promise steady measured progress to sharing the decision making power in the North among all the people in the North. And we are doing that and we will continue to do that. There have been changes and there have been dramatic changes for the better. There's new life in La Ronge. And Members opposite are saying, "Oh, oh, look at all these civil servants in La Ronge." Well, I say that we have decided to move the headquarters of the Department of Northern Saskatchewan to La Ronge. We have decided to attempt to decentralize the Government of Saskatchewan and live make no apology for that.

**SOME HON. MEMBERS:** Hear, hear!

**MR. BLAKENEY:** — If Members opposite think that all the civil servants in this province should live in Regina, they should say so. We for our part think that they should be spread across this province and we are going to put public servants in La Ronge whatever they say.

**AN HON. MEMBER:** — And Guy in Rosthern.

**MR. BLAKENEY:** The Member for Rosthern says he has been bitterly critical about these civil servants in La Ronge. I guess he wants them in Rosthern. All I can say is that their task of bringing about social change in Rosthern would be difficult because they would have to overcome the almost insuperable intransigence of the Member for Rosthern (Mr. Boldt) who opposes all change.

**SOME HON. MEMBERS:** Hear, hear!

**MR. BLAKENEY:** — Consider some of the solid improvements that have come in the North. Lower power rates for all northerners. Rates comparable to those in the South for the first time in history. An elected municipal council, another first. There were no complaints from the elected municipal council when the Liberals were in power because there was not an elected municipal council. New local community councils. A community college at La Ronge, another first. Six new sawmills in operation as the Member for Watrous has said, providing jobs for 115 people, sawing ten times as much lumber as used to be sawed in the Liberal era. And may I point out providing more jobs for native people than the Prince Albert Pulp Mill provides in the woods and in the mills.

**SOME HON. MEMBERS:** Hear, hear!

**MR. BLAKENEY:** — A highly successful post cutting operation at Beauval which has brought a new spirit and a new esprit de corps to that community.

A northern housing program which is more than double the annual housing in the Liberal years. A '73 house construction program which by northern standards, it's gigantic. Ten houses at La Loche, 10 at Pine House, 10 at Patuanak, 10 at Green Lake.

Buffalo Narrows, 9, Ile-a-la-Crosse, 9, Cumberland House, 9, Beauval, 8, Stanley Mission, 7, Sandy Bay, 5, Camsell Portage, and Weyakwin, 33.

During all the seven lean years, the seven years when the Member for Athabasca (Mr. Guy) was the king of the North, the years when the Member for Meadow Lake (Mr. Coupland) was supposedly doing something for his people up there, when did the Liberal Government ever build houses in those numbers? Just name the year. Roads are being built as never before, hundreds of miles. We have already completed the road to Rabbit Lake, months and months ahead of schedule. This year we proceed with paving the road from Waskesiu junction to La Ronge.

**SOME HON. MEMBERS:** Hear, hear!

**MR. BLAKENEY:** — I could go on. The Department of Northern Saskatchewan offers more hope for the people in the North than any other government initiative in the history of this province. There will be criticism, much of it from people with ulterior motives. From Liberals who see no prospect of re-election and therefore are moving, very wisely to other, they think, greener pastures. I think perhaps the sound of public opinion may make some of them pretty unhappy by the time election time comes.

**SOME HON. MEMBERS:** Hear, hear!

**MR. BLAKENEY:** — Members of the white governing group, some public servants, some business people think that things are going too fast, native leaders think things are going too slow, but that is healthy. It tells us that the Department of Northern Saskatchewan is at the cutting edge where we want it to be. It tells us that the Department of Northern Saskatchewan is bringing change. It is bringing progress and bringing hope to the North. We will not be deterred by the critics, we won't be deterred by the faint hearts of Members opposite. We intend to press on with this great experiment. And we know that the North and all Saskatchewan has a brighter future because of those pioneers who are taking this new philosophy to northern Saskatchewan, this new and bold approach to northern Saskatchewan. And when 10 years are over, I know it will be a success and I will be proud we have done it.

**SOME HON. MEMBERS:** Hear, hear!

**MR. BLAKENEY:** — Mr. Speaker, the Throne Speech proposes three major measures of electoral reform. First, we propose to introduce in legislative form the report of the Electoral Boundaries Commission headed by Judge McGuire. I think we all remember the background of that legislation. In April 1972, in the first full session of our new Government, we introduced legislation to establish the Independent Boundaries Commission. That Bill's debate two years after the worst political gerrymander in the history; of Saskatchewan, provided, as some will recall, a dramatic moment in this House. The Liberal Leader sputtered a bit but he and his colleagues did a flip-flop which has been characteristic of the Saskatchewan Liberals. In 1970, these Members, I might even say these guys, voted down our proposal to refer redistribution to an independent commission. They voted this down with arrogance and they went on to create their

'Daveymander'. In 1972 faced with the same proposition in the same House, they neatly supported the Bill. Flexibility of Liberal principles, a wonder to behold.

**MR. GRANT:** — . . . in a rut.

**MR. BLAKENEY:** — It's a gutter, that's what I call it.

**SOME HON. MEMBERS:** Hear, hear!

**MR. BLAKENEY:** — When we took over the electoral office we discovered a few interesting documents. We discovered a working paper called a report of the Liberal committee which had engineered this 'Daveymander' in 1970. These papers showed that the Liberal Party expected to win 40 seats in 1971 without getting a single extra vote. Dozens of seats they were supposed to win. Dozens of seats New Democrats weren't supposed to win. In Nutana Centre for example the plan was to elect Mr. Estey. The margin was to be 1,300 votes. Of course Nutana South was so safe that the 'Daveymander' draftsman took a little block of votes out from Nutana South and moved it over to make Hanley safe. This was still to leave Dr. Forsyth in Nutana South a comfortable margin of 1,700 votes. All of these calculations are neatly worked out, but fortunately the Liberal scheme left out one factor in the calculations, the people of Saskatchewan.

**SOME HON. MEMBERS:** Hear, hear!

**MR. BLAKENEY:** — Their plans were wrecked by an angry electorate unable to stomach this attack on the basic principle of democracy, representation by population.

**SOME HON. MEMBERS:** Hear, hear!

**MR. BLAKENEY:** — Very soon we are going to find out where Members opposite stand on this issue, we are going to find out whether they believe now as they did not two years ago in representation by population. No doubt we will find that they have done another conversion worthy of St. Paul. I think this next one is even going to be more interesting. We are going to see too where the Liberals stand on the second proposal for election reform, our proposal for a fair election campaign.

**SOME HON. MEMBERS:** Hear, hear!

**MR. BLAKENEY:** — Our proposal for limiting election expenses for disclosing where political parties get their money. I think it is going to be very interesting if we get the facts, and I underline 'if'. If we get the facts on what the Liberals are spending on publicity in the Lakeview by-election.

**SOME HON. MEMBERS:** — Hear, hear!

**MR. BLAKENEY:** — Our calculations of what the media coverage costs, just the radio and the television and the billboards, approaches \$30,000.

In 1971 certainly the Liberal Party spent hundreds of thousands of dollars on television and radio and it still wasn't enough. They have not told the public where their funds came from and I suspect that they don't want to tell the public where their funds come from. I believe the public is entitled to know where the money comes from that finances political parties.

**SOME NON. MEMBERS:** Hear, hear!

**MR. BLAKENEY:** — I think the public wants an end to these saturation campaigns of radio and television coverage. I think they want an end to these constant bombardments by television spots about what a great party the Liberal Party is. I think the public have got every right to know who is paying for this, they have got every right to be suspicious of where campaign contributions are coming from . . .

**MR. STEUART:** — Like the Brewery!

**MR. BLAKENEY:** — The NDP is willing to say where we get our election funds from.

**SOME HON. MEMBERS:** Hear, hear!

**MR. BLAKENEY:** — We certainly propose to have this in legislation. We are willing to say how we spend our election funds and the Liberal Party will have an opportunity to stand up and be counted on this issue. Will they dare to tell the public how much they spend? I suspect they won't. Will they dare to tell the public where they get their money? I suspect they won't. I suspect they will vote to keep their corporate contributions under the table and their hidden financial backers a back room secret. If they oppose this measure for fair and honest elections the public will know once and for all what the Liberal Party is, who finances it, and whom it stands for.

**SOME HON. MEMBERS:** Hear, hear!

**MR. BLAKENEY:** — Mr. Speaker, there will also be legislation presented in a draft form, as a White Paper dealing with conflict of interest situations. We believe that legislation of this nature is necessary, not to deal with known abuse, but rather to give further assurance to the public that there are no abuses.

It is not easy to note just what form this legislation should take. We have formulated proposals, we will put them forward and ask for comments from all interested parties inside and outside this House. We hope that we can come to consensus which is fair. Legislation must be fair to people who are standing for public office, and I'll ask them to go to greater lengths, particularly than people in other walks of life go to. On the other hand it must be fair to the public and its right to know that its elected servants in making decisions have no undisclosed personal interests in those decisions. That's the balance which must be struck, we will put our proposals and we will welcome comment from all parties.

**SOME HON. MEMBERS:** Hear, hear!

**MR. BLAKENEY:** — Mr. Speaker, these three measures together — independent boundaries, disclosure and limitation of election expenses, disclosure in dealing with conflict of interest — represent major forward steps in making our democratic system fairer.

**SOME HON. MEMBERS:** Hear, hear!

**MR. BLAKENEY:** — Liberals have traditionally played fast and loose with the election machinery in their scramble to seize or retain power. But the public is fed up with this sort of activity, they want honest elections and I challenge the Liberal Party to stand for democracy, to support the progressive measures announced in the Speech from the Throne and to join with us in giving to the people of Saskatchewan a new deal in election reform.

**SOME HON. MEMBERS:** Hear, hear!

**MR. BLAKENEY:** — Mr. Speaker, I have spoken at length about the Speech from the Throne, I have spoken at length . . .

**MR. STEUART:** — . . . in Lakeview . . .

**MR. BLAKENEY:** — . . . The Member for Prince Albert West (Mr. Steuart) wants to make another speech, and if I had made that first one, I would want another chance, too.

**SOME HON. MEMBERS:** Hear, hear!

**MR. BLAKENEY:** — I want to say that this Throne Speech involves imaginative and farsighted policies, imaginative and farsighted policies on energy, on agriculture and its problems, policies to stimulate and develop the rich multi-cultural heritage of this province, policies to reform and remodel the democratic structure of our government, policies on the many other proposals outlined in the Speech. It is a good Speech from the Throne, it is a progressive Speech from the Throne, it heralds a further new day for Saskatchewan and accordingly, Mr. Speaker, I will oppose the amendment and support the motion.

**SOME HON. MEMBERS:** Hear, hear!

**MR. D. BOLDT: (Rosthern)** — Mr. Deputy Speaker, for the last two hours we have heard the Premier of the Province try to tell us what will happen in the next year or two. Usually when the Premier speaks he has his forces up in the Speaker's Gallery and in the west and east galleries, but today they are all out in Lakeview, even our civil servant that should be sitting in this chair here, he's out campaigning. Then he has the gall to tell us and give us a sanctimonious speech on how we are to divulge to the public our election expenses. Well, aren't these election expenses out here, is he going to admit that these civil servants are out there campaigning on behalf of the NDP. The Liberals haven't got that avenue. Are they going to be put on



the pages of your election expense accounts. No, you are the most hypocritical sanctimonious Premier that I have ever seen in this province.

**SOME HON. MEMBERS:** Hear, hear!

**MR. BOLDT:** — Then he had a few things to say about what the Hon. Leader of the Opposition had to say about the Wheat Board. He said he had done some research, on the Wheat Board. Well he doesn't know wheat — I should say he doesn't know wheat from Mae West . . .

**MR. BLAKENEY:** — I know Mae West.

**MR. BOLDT:** — Well, he made some research and I remember the time when Alvin Hamilton sold all that wheat for the Wheat Board and he made headlines across the province. I asked the Wheat Board if they would send me the sales of the previous ten years prior to the Diefenbaker Government. I have the results of these sales and during the Diefenbaker Government there are only a few years where they surpassed a sale previous to the ten years of Liberal Government. In 1952-53 under a Liberal Government the Wheat Board sold 535 million bushels of wheat and the highest number in bushels of wheat sold by Alvin Hamilton when he was in charge of the Wheat Board was 396 million. Why didn't the Premier make some research. Immediately after the Liberals took power in 1963, in the year 1961-62 Alvin Hamilton was able to sell 305 million bushels of wheat while the Liberals the following year sold 474 million, and the next year, 568 million.

**SOME HON. MEMBERS:** Hear, hear!

**MR. BOLDT:** — That is the record of the Liberals and the Premier states the Liberals are going to do away with the Wheat Board.

More wheat has been sold while the Liberals were in power by the Wheat Board than any other government . . . Well the NDP haven't even had a government, never even had a chance to sell a bushel of wheat.

Oh, then the Premier goes on and says, we have the greatest housing building program that ever existed in Saskatchewan. Well, I am going to tell you this Government would be absolutely broke if it wasn't for the farm economy for which they have absolutely no claim to credit.

**SOME HON. MEMBERS:** Hear, hear!

**MR. BOLDT:** — Well, today for the first time, under a Liberal Government, and I have farmed for 30 years and I never sold wheat yet for \$5 a bushel, this time I hope I'll be doing it. It has nothing to do with the Provincial Government. If wheat wasn't selling the way it was, this Government would be absolutely bankrupt, and you know it.

Then he talks about the homeowner bonuses. He doesn't want to give the bonuses to the \$50,000 a year income, he doesn't want: to give the bonuses to the \$75,000 income. I agree with him. Why should he give me \$72 on the Medicare

premium, I don't need it. Why? The old people and the poor people, those on welfare, they had the \$72 erased from them several years ago. So today he gives to Allan Blakeney, gives it to Mr. Romanow, he gives it to me, and I don't need that \$72. I could very well pay for it myself. It doesn't make sense what the Premier says.

Mr. Deputy Speaker, I want to say a few words about the opening of the House on Friday. I want to make a few comments on the resolution that came from the Hon. Minister of Agriculture. I believe the Star-Phoenix came out with the proper headlines. What did it say?

Session under Way, Grandstand Play, First Failure.

**SOME HON. MEMBERS:** Hear, hear!

**MR. BOLDT:** — The only disagreement I have with this first failure was that the Throne Speech was a failure the day before.

Mr. Deputy Speaker, I am confident that the Speaker had absolutely nothing to inform the Government before the House convened on that day that the motion would be ruled out of order. However, when one observed the Members of the Government, their reaction to the Speaker's ruling, they accepted it without argument or debate. An independent observer could easily have formed the conclusion that this political episode was cooked and dried long before the House convened.

I would suggest, Mr. Attorney General, that next time you bring in such kind of resolution you don't embarrass the Speaker. I think this was real cheap politics.

**SOME HON. MEMBERS:** Hear, hear!

**MR. BOLDT:** — Usually when the Minister of Agriculture (Mr. Messer) enters the debate he comes in with a group of Statute books, places them up high, so that he has a podium, armed with a bunch of material. On Friday afternoon, when he came in he didn't have a piece of paper in his hand, he knew that this was going to be ruled out of order.

The motion dealt with the rapeseed vote. This Government of course would not give rapeseed growers a vote at all. This is clearly spelled out in the New Deal for People, they would place oil seeds and all grains including feed grains under the Canadian Wheat Board without a vote. Their big argument is that the United Farmers of Saskatchewan, the Wheat Pool are in favor of rapeseed being brought under the jurisdiction of the Wheat Board. Well it is obvious to the Saskatchewan farmers that the United Farmers of Canada have no influence on Otto Lang, and I appreciate the fact that he wouldn't even go and attend their convention. Otto Lang has come to the conclusion that they are just a small group of NDP communist agitators.

The Saskatchewan Wheat Pool has every right and privilege to promote the handling of rapeseed under the Wheat Board. However, the Saskatchewan Government should not take the Wheat Pool's thinking as gospel. Several years ago we had a plebiscite on the two-price system and the vote was for the

payment to be made on wheat or on the acreage payment. The Saskatchewan Wheat Pool, rightfully so, strongly campaigned for the payment to be made on wheat. That was one of the few times I agreed with the Wheat Pool. However, the farmers voted overwhelmingly against the wishes of the Wheat Pool, about 85 per cent of those voting voted for acreage payments against the Wheat Pool's advice. This is also possible and hopeful as far as I am concerned, likely with the rapeseed issue.

Mr. Speaker, I should like to direct my remarks at the Throne Speech itself. The first page is just straight political NDP propaganda. It strongly criticizes the Federal Government regarding the Western Economic Opportunities Conference and it condemns the Federal Government for inaction in the field of agriculture. I think it is a disgrace for the Premier of the Province to write a political speech criticizing other governments and then have His Honour the Lieutenant-Governor, who is politically independent, forced to read 'My Government is angered and disillusioned at the Feds.' It is a disgrace.

Let's just take a look at the foolishness of the statements on the first page directed towards the Federal Government. The Throne Speech states that the Government urged the Federal Government to do the following:

1. Assure that livestock producers in the West reaped the benefit of their natural advantage in livestock production.
2. Assure grain producers the best price for their products.
3. Assure grain and livestock producers of minimum prices.

Well, Mr. Deputy Speaker, the Speech states the Federal Government either has not acted or either acted directly contrary to those joint proposals. But whoever wrote the agricultural section and I imagine it was Messrs. Messer and company, did not know nor were they informed of the preamble of the speech written by the Premier, for on the second page, Mr. Messer writes on agriculture and rural life, and I quote:

Events have moved swiftly in the marketing and pricing of agricultural products during the past nine months. Prospects for grain producers have never been brighter, (and yet on the first page they condemn the Federal Government.) And, although short-term uncertainties are troubling livestock producers, the demand for meat is strong and future prospects are encouraging.

This is what it says on the second page. I think for once Mr. Messer told the truth, but as yet he has not informed the Premier, or perhaps the Premier was too busy patching up the love affair which ended up in a divorce with John Richards and the Waffle group, which has kept him from enjoying the prosperity of the Saskatchewan farmer. Talking about other love affairs, we hear that the Premier of British Columbia is wooing Rene Levesque, the one who wants to opt out from this country.

The Agriculture Report states that FarmStart has approved 205 loans and will be continued and expanded.

**MR. MESSER:** — That's right.

**MR. BOLDT:** — Well, the Throne Speech deliberately omitted the fact that 10,000 rural people have left the province in the last year. It also omitted the fact that school boards are faced with a 20 to 40 per cent reduction in student enrolment in the next two years. Nothing said about that and yet the Premier said today that the rural and urban centres are becoming stronger, when we are told by your people that rural school population is to be down between 20 and 40 per cent in the next two years. Nothing has been mentioned in the Throne Speech on the much publicized Roumanian Tractor Plant. That love affair also ended in divorce.

Where are all the new packing houses that were promised by this Government? Only Intercon is expanding — to a degree. A small degree. And I am confident it would not expand if it weren't for the Saskatchewan tax dollar which is footing the bill.

**SOME HON. MEMBERS:** Hear, hear!

**MR. BOLDT:** — I want to say a word about energy and resources which has some mention in the Throne Speech. The Premier went on at length about it yesterday. The things I have to say about energy in Saskatchewan occurred before there were any energy problems in the world. I agree with some of the recommendations this Government wants to act on and particularly I agree with the recommendation No. 6 on Page 4 and I quote:

Oil explorations in Saskatchewan should be stepped up over the last exploration levels of the past several years.

Finally, the socialists have realized that low exploration has taken place since their election.

In reference to Recommendation No. 2 that future supplies of petroleum for Saskatchewan farmers must be assured is just another piece of NDP propaganda to get farm support on an issue that doesn't exist, that has never existed. At no time ever, even through World War II, was farm fuel for production of foods rationed and to my knowledge at no time has the Federal Government as much as hinted that farmers might have fuel rationing imposed upon them. This has not even been suggested in the United States where fuel shortages are much more pronounced.

**SOME HON. MEMBERS:** Hear, hear!

**MR. MESSER:** — How much are the prices?

**MR. BOLDT:** — Oh! I'll get to those prices. However, I want to deal with another aspect of our Natural Resources, particularly to that of oil. And it has to do with a propaganda letter written by the Premier to all householders in the province. I am referring to the letter which dealt with the

medical-hospital card.

The Premier, in his letter, has given me a free card. That, of course, is socialist thinking. In the first two paragraphs the Premier makes note of all the things in health care that are now absolutely free. They are all free. He thinks they are, but I don't, but I will not quarrel with his socialistic arithmetic. However, in the next two paragraphs — the third and fourth paragraphs, the Premier has tried to deliberately misinform the public and I want to quote these two paragraphs for the records of this House. The Premier writes:

These changes in the health field alone have reduced direct payments by users of health services by over \$25 million each year. This Government has been able to pay for these extra services without cutting back on the other health programs and without equivalent increases in personal tax rates.

The Fourth paragraph:

Part of the reason for this has been the Government's policy of insisting that the people of the province get a greater share of the profits from the extraction of our natural resources. For example, revenue from oil and potash next fiscal year will be about \$29 million more than it was in the 1970-71 fiscal year.

Now this must be the understatement of the year and it couldn't come from a more unqualified Premier.

Since June, 1971, this socialistic government has twice raised the personal income tax and also the corporate tax.

**SOME HON. MEMBERS:** Hear, hear!

**MR. BOLDT:** — The personal income tax increased three per cent in 1972 and three per cent in 1973 of the Federal tax payment. This is an increase in the provincial income tax of 17.6 per cent, but yet the Premier writes in this letter, you have had no increase in taxes.

I do not deny that this Government is getting more from the oil companies than the Liberal Government of two and one-half years ago. But, Mr. Speaker, this \$29 million and more is all first charged to the Saskatchewan citizen before these companies pay the tax. The Premier says he has not taxed the taxpayer directly for this additional revenue. No — he hasn't, he doesn't have to do it, but the oil companies do it for him so that they can pay the Government.

I have some invoices that I would be willing to show to the Members opposite, or I could get some photostatic copies made and table them; I have some invoices made out to me from the bulk dealer at Osler which I am prepared to lay on the Table if anyone suggests so.

Let's first look at stove oil, or heater fuel, the most common fuel used where natural gas is not available. On April 17, 1971, we then had the Liberal Government, I was billed 19 cents a gallon. On November 3, 1973, my son-in-law,

who now uses oil for heating — I have changed over to propane — who lives on my yard and was supplied by the same dealer, paid 25 cents per gallon for stove oil. An increase of six cents per gallon to every householder using stove oil. This has happened in the last two years under socialism, which promised to keep the prices to the consumer down.

**SOME HON. MEMBERS:** Hear, hear!

**MR. BOLDT:** — Mr. Speaker, that is an increase of over 30 per cent. And we weren't talking about an oil crisis at that time. A direct tax to the consumer. This six cent increase per gallon is charged by the oil companies so that they can pay the royalties and taxes levied by the Government. Does that medical card look so free now?

**AN HON. MEMBER:** — No. It sure doesn't.

**MR. BOLDT:** — Let's look at the cost of propane which is also widely used for heating homes. As I stated earlier, I changed over to propane in 1971 and my tank was filled by Gulf Service Centre in Saskatoon on October 5, 1971 and I was charged 18.5 cents per gallon.

If the Minister of Finance (Mr. Cowley) would shut his mouth and listen he might get a little smarter.

**SOME HON. MEMBERS:** Hear, hear!

**MR. BOLDT:** — On November 14, like in 1971, I was charged 18.5 cents for propane per gallon. On November 14 this year, 1973, I was billed for 23.5 cents per gallon and was told by the deliveryman that he came around on that day because propane was going up 2 cents per gallon within a few days. I phoned Gulf Service Centre on Saturday and I was informed that bulk propane had gone up two cents and is now selling for 25.5 cents per gallon, under an NDP Government or an increase of seven cents per gallon in less than two years under socialism. And you were going to hold the prices down. You had a concern for the people.

Again, Mr. Speaker, propane for home heating two years ago was 18.5 cents per gallon, today it is 25.5 cents per gallon. I just wish the Premier would stop taxing the oil companies so that I wouldn't have to pay that extra seven cents. This card is not free.

Let's take a look at car gas. I use the red or premium gas. Now Premier Blakeney has not raised the tax on car gas. But on July 19, 1971 I paid 47.8 cents per gallon; on November 3, 1973 I paid 53 cents per gallon. That is another increase of 5.2 cents per gallon for every gallon you put in your car. The oil companies are collecting this from the Saskatchewan consumer in order to pay for the taxes this Government has levied upon them. And then they say the hospital card is free.

Mr. Speaker, the worst is yet to come and I want to inform this House how benevolent this Government is to the farmer. Diesel purple fuel is the most used fuel on our farms today. On July 9, 1971, shortly after the election, I paid 20.8 cents

per gallon; on September 17 before we had the oil crisis in 1973, I paid 27 cents a gallon for diesel fuel. That is an increase of 6.2 cents per gallon. I have all the invoices here. You don't have to question them. That is an increase of 6.2 cents per gallon within two years under socialism. That is an increase of over 30 per cent on farm fuel alone. This Government wants to make sure that the farmer will have ample fuel to produce food. Well, I can tell the farmers of Saskatchewan that if this Government is going to let the prices go up they will have to conserve fuel, there is no need to ration it.

Premier Blakeney, in the Throne Speech, and in his letter is rather blunt in stating that the oil companies will be forced to pay their share. Before they pay, I have to pay them, in order to get my free medical card. These oil increases have all occurred before the present oil crisis and the Liberal Party on this side will welcome the day when you will tell the farmer there will be no more increases in farm fuel or home heater fuel.

**SOME HON. MEMBERS:** Hear, hear!

**MR. BOLDT:** — You do that and you will get our support.

Mr. Blakeney also says that he will force taxes out of the potash industry. He has already done it. They will be forced to pay a fair share. Well, Saskatchewan does not need much potash, thank goodness. But the same thing applies in Alberta. We do use a lot of phosphate, which is commonly known amongst our farm members as 11-48-0 manufactured in Calgary.

On November 26, 1971 I paid \$98 per ton for fertilizer. I gave an order a few weeks ago to the same company and will now be billed \$118 or an increase of 20 per cent over a two year period. And some companies are charging the farmers \$125 a ton for 11-48-0. Again, the farmer pays the tax for the corporation so that they can in turn pay the Government. Then you say, all these things are free. Nonsense. That's the way the socialists' arithmetic comes out. It always comes out the hard way to the taxpayer.

What about the implement companies? This Government promised in their 'New Deal for People' and I think it's on page 2, item 9; this Government promised to keep prices in line, but what has happened. We don't need to look at Massey-Ferguson, John Deere or Case, the multi-corporations for price increases. No — let's just look at Morris Rod Weeder in Yorkton, a Saskatchewan implement manufacturer. I have one of their Morris Rod weeders and a deep tillage cultivator and I know what I am talking about. The cost of some of these repairs and I know more than the school teacher from Saskatoon does about implements, you wouldn't know a pigsty from a combine. The cost of some repairs from a dealer in Saskatoon, jumped thirty per cent last spring. In one year thirty per cent and we can thank this Government for interfering with the unions at Yorkton at the Morris plant.

I have been informed by dealers across the province, particularly in Saskatoon, practically every dealer, that tractors will go up 15 per cent before spring seeding. You promised to keep implements in line. You were going to control

prices. Most of these increases are because of direct big taxation and labor demands.

I hope, Mr. Speaker, that I might have been able to convince the Premier — who isn't here today — that in June, 1974, when he mails out the Medical and Hospital card to me, at least to me, that he might at least tell me a bit of truth as to why the Medical and Hospital cards are free. I don't care what he writes to the socialists, but I would like it written to me, because I know better than that.

Yes, the oil companies and the potash people will perhaps pay \$29 million more in taxes, but the consumer, including the farmer, homeowner and car operator will have paid them at least twice that amount. I am sure that the Premier will not deny that oil companies and potash mines in Saskatchewan had perhaps made more profit in the last two years than in the previous two, and yet he wants me to believe his Government will tax their profits away. I am pleased that they are making a profit and if they were taxed less, I would be getting my fuel, oil and gas 30 per cent cheaper than I'm getting it now.

Mr. Speaker, I would now like to turn to the DNS and I am sorry that the Minister, as usual, is out of his seat.

**AN HON. MEMBER:** — I'll go and get him.

**MR. BOLDT:** — Members are aware that my colleague from Athabasca and I visited La Ronge about two weeks ago.

After investigating for two days, I came to the conclusion that Don McNeil, CBC correspondent in Washington on Watergate, should be transferred to La Ronge and report on the corruption and waste of the DNS. In terms of corruption and value of items stolen in the Watergate affair, it is but a drop in the ocean compared to money being robbed by this Government through taxation and wasted in the North by the DNS.

We met with a group of citizens at La Ronge on our arrival and we received one message during the two days, which came out loud and clear. It was repeated over and over, as if these messages had become proverbs in the North. We were told and I quote:

The deal out here is so ridiculous that if we told you the whole story, nobody would believe half of it.

One individual put it this way:

We have no industries, no mining, no drilling rigs, no fishing, but business is terrific. Those that are not on social aid are on the government payroll.

One gentleman told us:

Tell the South, tell the farmers of the South, you bought this Government, and we in the North, who elected two Liberal Members, we in the North as business people, just love it.

Another quote went as follows:



Blakeney said no longer will we allow the South to rape the North, now the North is raping the South and we just love it.

One gentleman told me when we left La Ronge:

Dave, tell the farmers to raise more wheat and pay more taxes so that more money can be spent in the North. We just love it, so that we can continue to flourish.

Delta Holdings, the housing contractor, came under repeated attack. It was rumored that CMHC had cut off its funds and it appeared that all building for the housing projects, at the time when we were there, was halted. The formation of this company, and how it got the contract, is only known by Mr. Bowerman and the officials of the company. These questions, we hope, will be answered honestly by the Minister when he rises in this debate although I doubt it very much. We can only guess at the mess this contractor and Mr. Bowerman are in at this time.

We were also made very much aware that the DNS was not successful in getting jobs for the local natives. Just a handful are employed and it is really sad to hear from natives and whites that the majority are on welfare and spend most of their time in the beer parlor. The Government operated liquor store and beer parlors were reported to have flourishing businesses and liquor consumption and alcoholism is the concern of almost everyone in the area. I am sad to say that this concern does not appear to be the concern of the Minister, nor the Government.

Apparently the Department of Northern Saskatchewan have a kind of training program designed to keep some people off welfare, but not to train them for a specific job. These were some of the complaints. Examples were given where an individual was trained as a taxi driver. When this course was finished, they suddenly became aware that there were not enough taxis around, so they trained him as a cat driver, then they found out there were no caterpillars, so they trained him as a carpenter and then for something else, all at taxpayers' expense and the individuals are still being trained with no job in sight. This is also welfare in my humble opinion and another indication of the corruption that goes on in the North.

A good deal was heard from business people who complained about accounts payable by DNS. Only as late as two weeks ago we were informed that one businessman in La Ronge had outstanding accounts dating six months back. Some administration. They have an administration building that can house 200 people and they can't pay a bill. And I can readily see why this is so. Apparently the civil servants in DNS and the NDP executive assistants have more leeway in making expenditures than the other sector of the Civil Service. We were told by the business people that DNS employees would check in at the hotel or motel and stay there for a week and when they left they just simply said, "Charge it to DNS."

There is definitely a departure from Government policy of previous years. Civil servants could not make expenditures unless authorized by the Department. Advance accounts were issued and expense accounts had to be submitted before approval

could be given. The DNS and Mr. Bowerman apparently do not believe in this kind of a procedure, so I can imagine that the accountants in Treasury have a very difficult time in processing all the bills and expenses where no authority has been authorized to make such expenditures.

Before leaving the DNS I want to say a few words about the officials and the personnel in the Administration Building at La Ronge. We found them to be very friendly and I am convinced that most are sincere, competent individuals. I did not expect them to tell us what was wrong with DNS but I also did not hear many, if any, compliments. There is no doubt that working in the North has always been a frustrating experience, but I felt that the frustration in the North with the Civil Service personnel and the business sector at La Ronge is with Messrs. Bowerman and Churchman and the NDP executive assistants who are calling the shots, and I don't think that anyone in the North would wipe away a tear if these two men were released from their responsibilities today.

**SOME HON. MEMBERS:** Hear, hear!

**MR. BOLDT:** — I want to say a word about the elected Board for the North. I am surprised that the Government with DNS in control, did not set down some guidelines in particular in the area of compensation for these Board members which has been criticized by the Minister and perhaps rightfully so. Municipal Acts have, from time to time, spelled out the rates of pay and number of days a councillor could charge for his services. But this was left wide open to this Board. I have been told, Mr. Speaker, that the reasoning of the Board for voting themselves \$33,000 in salaries and expenses was justified on the basis of comparison as to what the Minister was worth.

**AN HON. MEMBER:** — Oh, they wouldn't have paid him that if they had.

**MR. BOLDT:** — So they looked at his qualifications, Mr. Speaker, he was a man of the North, he was a bush fire jumper, no experience in business administration, who receives roughly \$30,000 in salary as a Cabinet Minister and MLA, plus a Government car, all expenses paid if on a trip, all airplane tickets paid for by the Treasury, which could amount to an overall total of about \$35,000 to \$40,000. They considered his work load, mainly that of politicking for the NDP. If he is worth \$40,000 then nobody would discount the Board members if they voted themselves 25 per cent less than the Minister. And if they do a good job, travel the vast North, get the people to work and off welfare rolls, maybe \$33,000 is better justified than the \$40,000 received by the unqualified Minister.

However, the Opposition can criticize and this is what the Minister expects, but the most damaging criticism has come from the NDP supporters themselves at their last convention held recently in Saskatoon. This is what really worries the Premier. I don't think the Government has to be concerned so much with what the Liberals say on this side of the House but what did the NDP delegates say at the convention, that's what concerns them most.

The DNS was violently debated in the panels, according to the newspaper reports, and it was then brought to the main convention floor where Premier Blakeney tried to have the resolution withdrawn or defeated or tossed out. All his Cabinet voted against the resolution which called for an investigation into Delta Holdings. The NDP convention went on resort to have DNS activities in the North investigated. We say it too, but your NDP delegates at your convention told the Premier, "Now you go and investigate that mess in the North." That alone convinces me that the activities of the DNS in the North are very questionable.

Before closing, I should like to comment on the press release of November 26th, 1973 by the Minister of Social Services (Mr. Taylor). And again our Ministers are out campaigning.

**AN HON. MEMBER:** — Yes, they are out campaigning.

**MR. BOLDT:** — Well, you will have more notes to take and I hope you take them correctly. The press release begins as follows:

I am very pleased to report to you today some facts regarding the number of people receiving public assistance in Saskatchewan.

In other words the Minister is saying that he is very pleased to state that 46,000 people are on social aid in Saskatchewan. When asked about this figure on Friday last by the Member for Meadow Lake, if this figure included the people on welfare on reserves, the Minister answered that they were not the responsibility of the Provincial Government.

We have checked these figures with the Federal department and find that there are about 16,000 natives on welfare in Saskatchewan. That brings the total on welfare to 62,000 people in Saskatchewan. In a press release of November 14th, 1973 from the Premier's office, he states that there are 7,000 people unemployed in Saskatchewan. That brings the net total of welfare and unemployed people in Saskatchewan to almost 70,000 individuals. These figures do not include the 10,000 people that have left the province in the last year or so. The Minister of Social Services is pleased to report that, according to the press release, that 7 1/2 per cent of our population is on welfare and unemployed. This I say is a disgrace and things will get a lot worse.

The natives on or off the reserves are not happy with this situation. I have talked with them personally. Many of us have heard the native say, when he was interviewed by the CBC, that 70 per cent of the adults on his reserve were alcoholics. The Minister of Social Services states it is not his responsibility and I don't believe he is seriously concerned what happens to them. But let me assure him that many native people and whites are concerned.

But what has this Government done in a positive way to correct this terrible mess some of citizens find themselves in? Well, the Government certainly can't say that they have provided jobs for them, in fact, they paid \$6 million to the Athabasca Pulp Company to pull out of the province when, in fact, they

were going to locate amongst some native people. No, the only recommendation made thus far for our natives is incorporated in the final report of the Special Committee on Liquor Regulations in Saskatchewan. I was glad to hear some of the comments made by the Premier today, on liquor. But that committee felt that northern areas and reserves should have more outlets so that alcohol could be consumed in a more systematic manner. That's the solution that you people have over there.

The farm industry in the Rosthern constituency is very diversified, and farmers repeatedly have visited me and informed me how difficult it is to get hired help. Yet we have 7,000 people unemployed and 62,000 people on welfare. Everyone knows of some individuals able to work, but they are on welfare and refusing to go to work and why should they.

Let me relate a story about a prominent dairy farmer in the Saskatoon area. I am sure the Saskatoon Members know him very well. Vic Sommerfeld, Reeve of Corman Park, a third generation dairy farmer, had a complete disposal sale of his dairy herd this summer. Bill Story, farm news broadcaster on CFQC radio and television, advertised this sale on radio one morning and I happened to listen in, and these are approximately the words he used:

Mr. Sommerfeld is selling out a well established, third generation dairy farm because he just can't get any farm help. Vic says the unemployed prefer drawing unemployment insurance or welfare cheques to working on a dairy farm. Well, that's just too bad, says Mr. Story, but one good thing about dairy products is that even the unemployed and those on welfare have to buy dairy products, that is if they have something left after they come out of the beer parlor.

This is not what I say, but what a well known, respected farm news broadcaster had to say about the welfare system in Saskatchewan and to the best of my knowledge Mr. Story has never been challenged about this comment by the press or by the MLAs in Saskatoon.

**AN HON. MEMBER:** — The beer has been subsidized but the milk isn't.

**MR. BOLDT:** — But I agree with the statement that in many instances this Government is creating a society that produces a good number of permanent welfare bums. I call them 'bums'. We, on this side of the House, support the principle of welfare to those in need and it has never been questioned. There has never been any argument about that. You talk about old age pensions — the NDP have never given out any old age pensions, it was always done by the Liberals or the Conservatives. You have no record. But today farmers are going out of the hog business, not just because of high grain prices, but also because it is difficult to get help. If you would look at the ads in the Western Producer of this fall — dairy dispersal sales — you could easily find 20 in my area, in the Qu'Appelle Valley, in Saskatoon, in the Rosthern area. Dairyman after dairyman is going out of the business — complete dairy dispersal sales. hog producers, poultry producers in my area are getting out of the business just because they can't get help.

Yet we have able bodied people on welfare.

Potash mines are advertising daily for laborers. Saskatchewan and Canada is experiencing a tremendous growth and prosperity. I say this in all sincerity, that no welfare of any kind should be given to able bodied and able minded people among the labor forces. Let them do something for Canada and for Saskatchewan if we believe and have faith in this good land and home of ours.

On a recent CBC film "Thy Kingdom Come", I noticed with interest as I watched this film. I watched intently and I hope some of you Members saw it. The narrator of the program introduced to the viewing audience the key leaders of the socialist reform party better known as the CCF or the NDP. Well, this was a very interesting film. J.S. Woodsworth, the founder of the CCF Party was introduced as a man who was born and raised in a Christian home. His father was also a minister. He trained in the ministry and preached on the prairies. He ended his ministry in the church in Winnipeg after having served them for seven years. He was reported as saying he gave up the church ministry because he found it difficult to preach something he could not believe in himself, namely the virgin birth, the crucifixion and the resurrection. He saw the poor on the streets in Winnipeg, barely existing, living on relief and indulging in alcohol. That was his prime concern. So he decided to go and do more in government and politics than in the church. And I don't argue with that. Men like Stanley Knowles and Tommy Douglas, both ministers, joined in the crusade as depicted in the film. To do what? To make a heaven on earth. There is no doubt that many of the social reforms suggested and implemented by these men have been very beneficial.

**AN HON. MEMBER:** — Then along came Blakeney and blew it up.

**MR. BOLDT:** — But what has been accomplished by a so-called society under socialism?

Have we no alcohol problem today? Today the poor, particularly on the reserves, are indulging in alcohol as never before in our history even after this socialistic crusade to help these people. That's our problem, number one. Prostitution is running wild and completely out of control. There were 425,000 V.D. cases in Canada in 1972 and a 20 per cent increase forecast for 1973. Some doctors and technicians killing off thousands of unborn children through the act of abortion, all in the name of social reform. Drunkenness and carnage on our highways is at an all time high. Divorces and separations made easier by our governments, with the public purse forced to pay for the consequences. Bank hold-ups, riots, demonstrations, police beatings, murders and suicides is an everyday occurrence. Yet socialism was supposed to correct all of this. Our morality is at an all time low. Films shown in our movies, the greater percentage, are rated category X and our governments have absolutely not the courage nor the conviction that this must be cleaned up and cleaned up quickly if we are to survive.

Let's forget about the Government's so-called social reform program and let each citizen take upon himself some responsibility as a citizen without Government support. We should tell

the Christian Church to rise and to rise quickly and preach the Christian gospel and not socialism, and I can assure this Assembly that if we can change the hearts and minds, particularly those on your side . . .

**SOME HON. MEMBERS:** Hear, hear!

**MR. BOLDT:** — . . . of our people from a permissive government sponsored society to a decent, clean-living, hard-working, nation, 95 per cent of our social problems will fall by the wayside. But I want to give you one example, I mentioned V.D. In closing, I want to show you this ad in the Saskatoon Star-Phoenix, almost a full page, a venereal disease ad. Yet in the same paper a clipping “V.D. cases up 20 per cent”. Now how are you going to do away with venereal disease by an ad like this. All you say — the Minister of Labour must have a problem —

**SOME HON. MEMBERS:** Hear, hear!

**MR. BOLDT:** — I want to tell the Minister of Labour (Mr. Snyder) what to do. This Government says, if you’ve got venereal disease you go to the doctor and he can cure you. Well, that’s a fine way of telling the people how to stay away from V.D. so the young people and the children are all going to be told, don’t worry if you’ve got V.D. just go to the doctor and get fixed up. The trouble and the problem is — stay away from the prostitutes.

**MR. MICHAYLUK:** — What would you tell them?

**MR. BOLDT:** — Well, Mr. Michayluk, if you stay true to your wife, which I am sure you do, you will not have any problems and you know what I refer to. All I am telling you, Mr. Speaker, is that under socialism as seen in Stockholm, Sweden or wherever you have socialism a permissive society exists. The morals of the individual go down and down and down. We see it here in Saskatchewan. I can see a little ray of hope — I see that hair has got a little shorter, I can see just a little bit more brain and I hope it’s going to work a little better. Socialism is not the answer. We have got to have every individual living in Saskatchewan that is able bodied and able minded, working. The Liberal Party believes that they should work and if we want to make this country one of the finest countries in the world, we expect that every able bodied man is going to do his share.

Mr. Speaker, I cannot support the main motion. I will support the amendment.

**SOME HON. MEMBERS:** Hear, hear!

**MR. P.P. MOSTOWAY: (Hanley)** — Mr. Speaker, it is with extreme pleasure that I am replying to this Throne Speech. I say extreme pleasure because it shows that this Government, as in the past, is concerned with tackling real problems — real problems which only an NDP Government has the vision and boldness to tackle and, of course, this is so because this Government represents people and not giant corporations which we all know are represented by the Members opposite, with one exception.

Mr. Speaker, before I go on, I should like to congratulate the mover and the seconder to the Throne Speech. They spoke well and they well deserved the honor. But before I go on I wish to reply to the previous speaker's comments and in this regard I will be very brief. Mr. Speaker, it was like going back into history to about the 18th century, and I am sure that even his seatmates felt embarrassed by his remarks.

If I were to give a brief resume of Hanley constituency this past year, Mr. Speaker, I must in all sincerity say that it has experienced a reasonably good year, thanks to good crops and, generally speaking, an upswing in the economy. I should also mention various projects which have either been begun or carried out this past year. Projects such as a program to ensure telephone service in the area around Saskatoon; the work going on on Highway No. 15; the alfalfa pellet plant at Broderick; the acquisition of the Extenda-Care Nursing Home in Hanley constituency in Saskatoon, to provide more Level IV beds for the ill; river water for many communities in the constituency; expansion of the two provincial parks in the area, and many others too numerous to mention.

I want also to mention two other things in regard to Hanley constituency this past year. The first is the excellent showing made by Miss Barbara Boricki of Kenaston in the Miss Canada pageant held recently. The second is in regard to the young Voyageurs who visited Allan for ten days last summer. Being from Quebec, they found Saskatchewan fascinating, and Allan and district thoroughly enjoyed being host to them and their two accompanying chaperones.

Mr. Speaker, I want to spend a little time in praise of this Government for its removal of Medicare premiums. By the cruel comments made by some Liberal Members of this House, it is plainly evident they were not in favor of the removal of this tax. I suppose they think the elderly, the handicapped, the poor, the unemployed, should not be given a break. Mr. Speaker, I can assure you that I have had numerous compliments given me and directed to this Government in regard to this removal.

Another area I want to touch on is the excellent work I think is being done by the Department of Consumer Affairs in helping people with consumer complaints. I know of many cases where this Department has helped people in regard to such a variety of things as farm storage buildings, water softeners, tractors and kitchen equipment. I am also sure that without this help these people would never have received justice, because these shysters who would try to pull a fast one on consumers, know the ropes and the ways and the means to make a consumer give up. So I say, Mr. Speaker, the good work of this Department should not go unrecognized.

Mr. Speaker, I also want to touch on the activities of the Hon. Member of Parliament for Saskatoon-Humboldt. This Hon. Member I would liken to a magician because with him it is a case of 'now you see the Wheat Board, but pretty soon you won't be able to see it at all'.

Now, far be it from me to suggest that he is beholden to the Winnipeg Grain Exchange boys. And far be it from me to suggest that he wishes to destroy the agency which farmers worked hard for to get for many years. Far be it from me to

suggest that the Richardson Winnipeg Grain Exchange boys and certain American companies are making huge profits at the expense of our Saskatchewan farmers. Far be it from me to suggest that these boys have persuaded this hon. gentleman to ask farmers to vote in such a manner that one side has a huge initial advantage.

Mr. Speaker, are we to believe that this lawyer knows better than the Commissioner of the Wheat Board, the Wheat Fool, the National Farmers' Union and the Federation of Agriculture? Well, I don't believe that he does but I believe that he does know which side his bread is buttered on.

Now, I know that the Hon. Leader of the Opposition (Mr. Steuart) in this House is in favor of this chipping away at the authority of the Wheat Board. If he is against orderly marketing, he is against farmers and for this he will be remembered along with his seatmates at the next election.

But, Mr. Speaker, I am not finished on this topic. I want to just mention the Hon. Member for Saskatoon-Humboldt's Western tour whereby he supposedly spoke to farmers. You know the tour, that is the one where he told farmers not to sell to his newly created Agricultural Products Board. At any rate, what I should really like to know is why so many non-farmer Liberal Party hacks attended the meetings on this tour. Was it a precautionary measure? And since when does a chairman have to ask for a standing ovation four times before a partial one is given?

Mr. Speaker, about one month ago I had the pleasure of visiting certain people in Saskatoon who were having so-called low-cost houses built. Well, Mr. Speaker, I was shocked beyond words because what I saw were houses that were absolutely ridiculous and out of this world. In a few the floors were as crooked as a dog's hind leg, the workmanship was of inferior quality and in some there is no doubt that inferior products were used. Why, just the other day one of these owners told me that the front door of the newly-constructed house, in which he now lives — fell off when the first breeze fluttered by and water in a tumbler left overnight on the floor of the living room easily freezes.

Well, I made a statement about this situation particularly as it affects low-income people. I pointed out that most construction companies are reputable but that a few are unscrupulous. What I tried to point out was that these few unscrupulous construction companies zero in on low-income people who have houses constructed. They overwhelm, they talk these people into product substitution; they make verbal deals that don't stand up later. In short, they take advantage of these people. They do this because they can get away with it because as a rule, Central Mortgage and Housing isn't overly concerned with this. Central Mortgage and Housing seems to be more concerned with a few rough inspections but doesn't consider the despicable practices I just mentioned.

At any rate, I was criticized as being ridiculous by a gentleman who represents some sort of an association of house builders in Canada. Well, Mr. Speaker, I didn't really expect him, a house builder, to agree with me, but many other people did because since that time I have received many letters and telephone calls saying that what I said is really very true.



Mr. Speaker, I have another area I now want to say a few words on. That is the safety of workers in general in our province. I know that the concept of Occupational Health Committees is a good one and that these committees are functioning reasonably well at most places of employment. However, I know that some establishments are bucking these committees and in this regard I want to ask the Minister of Labour to crack down on these establishments before more people are hurt or killed. I think that it is too easy for buck-passing when it comes to safety — and here I am referring specifically to our potash mines. I refer to such things as the danger of roof collapse while men are working. The heat and fumes to which some men are subjected, also, to other work on the surface, just to mention a few. I urge the Minister to have a good, hard look at the whole situation with the view of making employment establishments safer places in which to work, even if it means enacting codes of practice into legislation.

I say, Mr. Speaker, these outfits should be hit hard because there have been far too many deaths in this province. Also, in that regard I should just like to mention that the other day I had occasion to look over a coroner's report relative to the death of one of our miners in Saskatchewan just recently. I would say that insofar as safety is concerned it left a lot to be desired.

Mr. Speaker, I have another concern. It is in regard to urban and rural municipalities in some degree of financial trouble. As you are probably aware, this province has a Local Government Board that assumes varying degrees of control over such municipalities, but this Board only involves itself in a purely cold financial sort of way. What I am really saying, Mr. Speaker, is that this Board — the Local Government Board — often lacks true understanding of relevant situations as they often affect rural or small urban communities. Why should this Board deny a municipality the opportunity to borrow money at an excellent rate of interest in order to pay off debts?

With this in mind, I should like to ask the Minister of Municipal Affairs or others to consider a thorough study of the functioning of this Board. Or should there be a newly created board with added functions and possible power to involve itself in a different manner and at other points in time relative to specific situations?

Mr. Speaker, Members opposite have suddenly become experts on northern Saskatchewan. We all know what their strategy is. It is to stir up our northern people when they visit that area. However, when they are down here it is a different story because when they are down here, they try to stir up people against our northern brothers. The Hon. Member for Rosthern (Mr. Boldt) just pulled that off just a little while ago and then went around talking about Bibles, prostitution, etc. a slight contradiction Sir, if you don't mind me mentioning it. It is the same kind of practice they are now engaging in in their desire to retain the constituency of Regina Lakeview. And I say that because I had occasion to look at a despicable ad in The Regina Leader-Post last night. It is a smelly practice and I urge Members opposite to stop trying to pick up a few votes by using your usual tactics of pitting people against people.

Mr. Speaker, let me inform this House that when I had the pleasure of visiting many northern centres last year, almost all told me how happy they were when the Liberals met their Waterloo at the last election. They were happy because under the Liberal regime, they had no say whatsoever in things affecting them. This, they admitted was as if a bad dream had finally come to an end. Members opposite, I urge you to stop using our northern natives as pawns in your cheap desire to win power at all costs.

Mr. Speaker, I should now like to spend a few minutes on the urgent need for better gun control legislation and education, particularly in this province, and I would imagine, in the country as a whole. I say this because I find that far too often we have young and old alike engaging in the use of guns without any real appreciation of the potential dangers involved. There are too many deaths each year in this province due to a lack of gun knowledge. Perhaps the Provincial Government should involve itself more fully than it has in the past in making people more knowledgeable in this regard. Perhaps this could become a function of our schools.

Mr. Speaker, I think this Government's plan to establish a Department of Tourism and Renewable Resources is a good one. I say so because I think Saskatchewan has tremendous potential, particularly in regard to tourism which benefits a host of people in this province.

While I am on the topic of tourism, may I make a suggestion in regard to tourists entering our major cities. I know that in some cases, tourists may stop at a tourist booth and these are serving tourists well. However, I often wonder if larger buildings situated on the outskirts of our cities, manned by people who provide information and materials and containing washroom facilities, might not provide services to tourists that would induce more to return to our province. If you like, Mr. Speaker, something like a comfort station.

Mr. Speaker, representing a portion of Saskatoon, I am pleased to note that this Government will be paying increased attention to urban affairs particularly as they affect our cities. In this regard I would hope that some sort of a grant system might be arrived at in order to provide relief to our urban people. I mention this because for many urban people, particularly those on low incomes, taxes are extremely high and cut deeply into their opportunity to take advantage of many things which many would consider essential in this day and age.

Mr. Speaker, last summer I made a statement concerning the recent sale of the CNR Hotel in Saskatchewan, that famous landmark the Bessborough Hotel. I questioned the CNR's selling of the hotel at a time when it was finally beginning to make a profit while at the same time that same company was making plans to abandon railway stations because they are or were not making money.

Mr. Speaker, to me there seems to be a contradiction in policy, particularly when one considers that just recently reliable information was given which indicates that this hotel was practically given away for nothing and in this regard I should like to ask a certain gentleman if this is his idea of free enterprise competition in the buying of this hotel. If it is, all that I ask is that the people of this province, take note.

Mr. Speaker, Hanley constituency is mainly rural. In it are many grid roads, gravelled and serving a very useful function. By now, there is no doubt that certain of these roads are used very much and will continue to be so used for a long, time in the future. Therefore I should like to suggest that this Government formulate a policy whereby rural municipalities will find it to their advantage to oil these roads, to provide a better service to rural people. As I just mentioned, this policy should induce rural municipalities to readily take advantage of such a program keeping future maintenance costs very much in mind. I know many municipalities are waiting for such a program.

Mr. Speaker, there has recently been much talk about the possibility of a series of hydro-electric projects in the Churchill River Basin of Northern Saskatchewan. Yes, I know a study of the whole situation will be made. However, I want go on record as saying I hope these projects will not materialize, at least not in the immediate future. I say this because I see such a series of projects as being detrimental to the natural, unspoiled environment of that area, as it now exists. I say this because I saw what can happen when I visited certain northern communities last summer. I saw communities of idle people, idle not by choice, Mr. Speaker, but I know it was because of pollution and manipulation of the environment. Mr. Speaker, if such a project is allowed to materialize we will partially destroy a people and their culture once again just as has been done over and over in the past.

Mr. Speaker, once again I wish to bring to this Government's attention the urgent need for some sort of relief in regard to the tax on children's clothing. I consider this tax nearly on a par with the infamous Liberal tax on the sick and the crippled. Mr. Minister of Finance (Mr. Cowley) can relief from this tax be expected soon? Many are waiting.

Mr. Speaker, I should like to say a few words on the Liberal policy of social assistance. And in this regard, I presume that the Hon. Member from Rosthern speaks for all Members opposite. In fact, I know he does. I ask Members opposite, do you really think that most people on social assistance are abusers? Do you really want to see the aged, the ill, the handicapped suffer more? Do you really deep down in those small hearts of yours wish to see these people put down further? Gentlemen opposite, why not come clean and admit that you've been wrong right along?

You may be wondering why I mention this Liberal attitude to the downtrodden. Well, I'll tell you. It's because I know of a man who was involved in a serious accident about one year before the Liberals attained power in 1964. Shortly after, while the CCF Government was in power, he began a course in radio and TV to kind of put him on his feet again. Then came the election of 1964. Doomsday. Well, Mr. Speaker, do you know what the Liberals did when he had only a few more months to go on his course? Did they allow him to finish the course so he could once again become a productive member of society? Oh, no, they didn't. The Liberal Government told him he had to quit the course. In other words, Mr. Speaker, they doomed him to a life of social assistance and I'm sure the Hon. Member for Rosthern, because he had something to do with it, remembers the case, nightmares and all.

Mr. Speaker, I am pleased that this Government anticipates taking strong action in regard to the oil industry and petroleum in this province. I think it's obvious that control of this resource by the people of this province is absolutely necessary if we are to give our people the benefits to which they are rightfully entitled. Benefits which Members opposite would deny the people. I think that leaving control of this resource in the hands of the giant octopus corporations will see our people bled white, what with the artificial shortage created by these corporations for their own greedy ends, and in this regard I certainly hope this Government acts, I know it will.

Mr. Speaker, I tell you in all sincerity that I know of many people who are now very concerned over the petroleum situation in this province and in the country as a whole. They have asked me to relay to our Government their desire to see these corporations finally put in line, a place they should have been put in years ago, because of the hundreds of millions of dollars they have sucked out of the province in the past.

**AN HON. MEMBER:** — You gave it to him.

**MR. MOSTOWAY:** — I can't hear you. Mr. Speaker.

**AN HON. MEMBER:** — Well, you don't miss nothing.

**MR. MOSTOWAY:** — Well, the hon. Gentleman said I didn't miss anything, that's why I can't hear him, because I know I'm not going to miss anything.

Mr. Speaker, as in the past I should like to stress the urgent need in our schools for a course of studies for our students. A course of studies that will equip our students to better stand up against the various pressures of modern day living, even eighteenth century pressures I suppose. On this I feel. very strongly because without such a course of instruction, who can withstand the subtle advertising of our various chain stores? Who can resist the temptation to take out a loan at exorbitant rates of interest?

**AN HON. MEMBER:** — I can.

**MR. MOSTOWAY:** — Well, that's because you don't need a loan in the first place. When you're loaded you don't go for a loan. I realize that there are various meanings to that word.

Who can withstand some of the subtle shysterisms as practised by certain insurance companies or certain salesmen? Mr. Speaker, a course, such as I advocate must be implemented soon and the sooner the better.

**SOME HON. MEMBERS:** Hear, hear!

**MR. MOSTOWAY:** — Well, you've had a lot of trouble and I can well understand why. You go out and talk to the people and you'll be in more trouble yet.

**SOME HON. MEMBERS:** Hear, hear!

**MR. MOSTOWAY:** — I am also pleased to see that this Government will take action to preserve historic sites in Saskatchewan, a move that might even be a little late because I believe we already have lost many a site of historic significance.

**SOME HON. MEMBERS:** Hear, hear!

**MR. MOSTOWAY:** — Well, I suppose we should preserve it and show it to the future generations, show them what life was, at one time in Saskatchewan, under the Liberals. With that in mind they certainly would be better able to appreciate the future. Such a move I know will be welcomed by many communities in their desire to preserve the heritage of this province.

Mr. Speaker, from my remarks it is obvious that I will be supporting the motion. I will be supporting it because unlike Members opposite, I see this Throne Speech as an indication that the people of this province come first. I see it as a statement of confidence in this province and its people, and because of this, I fully oppose the amendment and I fully support the motion.

**HON. G. SNYDER: (Minister of Labour)** — Mr. Speaker, the hour grows late and it's not my intention to speak at any length because I seem to detect, across the way, a certain urgency for the House to adjourn, I suppose depending in large measure upon the certain events of the day. I do want to take this opportunity however, Mr. Speaker, to express on behalf of Members on this side of the House our very sincere congratulations to the mover and seconder of the Address-in-Reply for what I believe was one of the best performances that I have seen in this House in a good many years and I think we want to take this opportunity to congratulate those two Members thoroughly and suggest to them that their constituents have every reason to be proud of the contribution that they have made in this House and the manner in which they have represented their constituency and brought honor to it.

The hour grows late as I suggested earlier, Mr. Speaker, and I would accordingly beg leave to adjourn the debate.

Debate adjourned.

The Assembly adjourned at 5:15 o'clock p.m.