

LEGISLATIVE ASSEMBLY OF SASKATCHEWAN
Fourth Session — Seventeenth Legislature
6th Day

Thursday, December 6, 1973.

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

On the Orders of the Day

WELCOME TO STUDENTS

MR. E.C. WHELAN: (Regina North West) — Mr. Speaker, through you I am pleased to introduce to this Assembly, 14 adult students from the Up-grading Class at Wascana Institute of Applied Arts and Sciences at Saskatchewan House in Regina North West.

They are in the west gallery with their teacher Stan Metcalf. I am sure Members join me in commending the students and their teacher for including this visit in their studies and expressing the wish that their visit here will be pleasant and informative.

SOME HON. MEMBERS: Hear, hear!

MR. SPEAKER: I believe there is also another group of students who came in from Touchwood which the Member (Mr. Meakes) is not aware of. They came without knowledge ahead of time and they are a group of Grade Eight students from Lipton. I'm sure that the House would like to recognize them also.

SOME HON. MEMBERS: Hear, hear!

ANNOUNCEMENT

CONGRATULATIONS TO TED MALONE

MR. D.G. STEUART: (Leader of the Opposition) — Mr. Speaker, before the Orders of the Day, I should just like to take a moment to thank first the Premier for giving notice that he will introduce a Bill to facilitate the seating of Mr. Ted Malone and I want to congratulate Ted Malone and the people of Lakeview for making the wise decision to elect him.

SOME HON. MEMBERS: Hear, hear!

MR. STEUART: — Since the Premier said, "I believe that the New Deal for People is the issue," and we accepted that issue, and the issue has been voted on so overwhelmingly, I wonder if they will be prepared to take another look at the Land Bank and the Hog Marketing Commission which were big issues. I would think that a wise government would go back and take a look at some of that legislation they have been putting on the books lately and I am just trying to help them in face of the next election. I wouldn't want to see this happen again on their behalf, but since I know that they won't learn anything and they'll not likely take the lesson, I welcome the fact that they will continue on in the same downward course.

However, I should like to thank the Premier and join with

the Members on this side and I'm sure the Members on the other side in congratulating both Don Keith, who put up an excellent and a very clean campaign and Ted Malone who was the victor and we look forward to having him seated on this side of the House by Monday or Tuesday.

SOME HON. MEMBERS: Hear, hear!

QUESTIONS

RUMORED HEAD OF SASKATCHEWAN DEVELOPMENT CORPORATION

MR. D.F. MacDONALD: (Moose Jaw North) — Mr. Speaker, I should like to ask the Premier a question today.

It is often thought that there is no prize for coming in second in an election and usually you just have one winner. We all know that Ted Malone won the by-election yesterday. It has come to my attention that there possibly is a second prize in last night's by-election and that second prize was possibly a \$20,000 plus job for Mr. Keith with the Government. I should like to ask the Premier if it is true, as people say, that Don Keith could not afford to win last night's by-election and secondly could the Premier tell us if Mr. Keith, as has been rumored, is to be employed as the head of the new Saskatchewan Development Corporation?

HON. A.E. BLAKENEY (Premier) — Well, Mr. Speaker, I can answer part of that. I don't know whether it is true that Mr. Keith couldn't afford to win the election, but if that is the case it offers a better explanation than I have been able to come up with yet.

SOME HON. MEMBERS: Hear, hear!

MR. BLAKENEY: — With respect to the other part of the question, arrangements had been made with Mr. Keith before the death of the late Member from Lakeview (Mr. McPherson) to accept employment with the Government of Saskatchewan and Mr. Keith has, in fact, given notice of his termination from employment with the Saskatchewan Teachers Federation. When this by-election came along we persuaded Mr. Keith to delay his appointment. This was only after the constituency had decided that he was certainly the best of a good number of candidates. Be that as it may, the answer is that arrangements have been made with Mr. Keith to accept employment with the Department of Finance and I'm not precisely clear what Mr. Keith's duties will be but they will be associated with the Saskatchewan Development Fund, as I understand it.

ABSENCE OF MR. RALPH SMITH

MR. K.R. MacLEOD: (Regina Albert Park) — Mr. Speaker, before the Orders of the Day I should like to ask of the Premier, who is rather incurious about the absence of Ralph Smith from work, to do something other than employment with the Government of Saskatchewan for a period of time, which I assume ended last night. I wonder if the Premier would consider investigating the reason for Mr. Ralph Smith's

absence and if he should discover that Mr. Ralph Smith, the placement officer, (the classification officer dealing with job placement in the Public Service Commission) did in fact work as a full-time organizer in the Lakeview by-election and if he discovers that as a result thereof he has used his position with the Public Service Commission to apply firm but gentle persuasion to people who are otherwise employed by the Government in the by-election on behalf of the NDP — if he discovers that he has in fact done this — would he not regard this position as a conflict of interest and remove him from that position and place him elsewhere in the Government?

SOME HON. MEMBERS: Hear, hear!

MR. BLAKENEY: — Mr. Speaker, it is certainly a lengthy question. I believe there is a question on the Order Paper or an Order for Return which deals in part with that, but as suggested by the Hon. Member, if on looking into this matter we find that Mr. Smith has misused any authority which he may have as an employee of the Government of Saskatchewan, we will certainly take appropriate action.

MR. BRIAN COULTER & NED SHILLINGTON

MR. J.G. LANE: (Lumsden) — Mr. Speaker, before the Orders of the Day, we on the Opposition would like to welcome back to the House the Assistant Clerk. We wonder why, Mr. Speaker, on your assurance that he was not needed yesterday, why he's needed today, and indeed why he is needed at all?

We would like to ask a question of the Hon. the Attorney General (Mr. Romanow). Could he tell us whether Mr. Ned Shillington is back at work today?

MR. ROMANOW: — Yes. Ned Shillington is back at work today and doing his usual tremendous job on behalf of the Department of the Attorney General.

SOME HON. MEMBERS: — Hear, hear!

ADJOURNED DEBATES

ADDRESS-IN-REPLY

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

HON. G. SNYDER: (Minister of Labour) — Mr. Speaker, before I adjourned debate yesterday I had taken just a moment to offer words of congratulations to the mover and the seconder of the Address-in-Reply and I had expressed on behalf of Members on this side of the House our very great satisfaction in the performance of these two Members from Saltcoats (Mr. Kaeding) and Watrous (Mr. Cody). I believe they have done their constituencies proud and we have good and sufficient reason, Mr. Speaker, to be exceedingly pleased with the performance of these Members in the very able manner in which they performed their time-honored duties.

I expect also, Mr. Speaker, it would be appropriate for me at this time to offer words of congratulation to yesterday's winner in the Lakeview by-election.

SOME HON. MEMBERS: Hear, hear!

MR. SNYDER: — I think it can be said, Mr. Speaker, that this was not entirely unexpected in light of the fact that Lakeview gave the Liberals their third highest plurality in the election of 1971. It must be admitted, Mr. Speaker, that the Liberals had a fairly good argument going for them in that by-election campaign. They campaigned consistently on the point that they were badly in need of reinforcements.

SOME HON. MEMBERS: Hear, hear!

MR. SNYDER: — I say to you today, Mr. Speaker, that if the performance of the Member for Prince Albert West (Mr. Steuart) and the performance of the Member for Rosthern (Mr. Boldt) yesterday, are examples of the residue of talent remaining on Liberal Benches opposite, then by all means we on this side of the House are prepared to admit that their need is greater than ours and we hope with the addition of Mr. Malone to the ranks of the Opposition, will very greatly enhance their intellectual stature.

Mr. Speaker, the Throne Speech which is the topic of debate is a document which I believe all Members should be able to support with real zeal and enthusiasm because it is a further indication of this Government's willingness, its desire to see the Province of Saskatchewan prosper. It's a further indication, Mr. Speaker, of the Government's determination to ensure that Saskatchewan people will enjoy a fuller share of the good things that a prosperous economy can provide to the people of Saskatchewan.

In the last two years, Mr. Speaker, our province has passed through a recovery period. Our people have passed through a convalescent stage, a recuperative era, Mr. Speaker, following one of the most disastrous eras ever experienced in Saskatchewan's history.

Retail sales in the Province of Saskatchewan have reached record heights in the last two years, Mr. Speaker. Personal income in the agricultural, as well as the non-farm sector has reached record levels. In my own community the City of Moose Jaw we have seen more new housing starts in 1972 and in 1973 than in any two consecutive years within living memory. The Provincial Government's housing program has contributed in a very major way to this particular development. New construction in the City of Moose Jaw, Mr. Speaker, involves senior citizen's housing, apartment dwellings, a new YM-YWCA, a new shopping centre, all of these having served to stimulate the construction industry in our city. The prospects for 1974, Mr. Speaker, appear to be equally bright with construction slated to commence on the new provincial office building, which I can recall was halted in 1964 when the Thatcher Liberals took office. Moose Jaw has been chosen as the site for the new Western Development Museum which will appropriately feature the transportation theme. Construction will commence in 1974 and will cost in excess of \$1 million with respect to this particular

program. Additionally Canada Packers Plant which is to be constructed on the western outskirts will cost between \$3.5 million and \$4 million.

The location of the City of Moose Jaw in the shadow of Regina, has in the past, I believe, inhibited Moose Jaw's growth to a very marked degree. I am not naive enough to believe, Mr. Speaker, that Moose Jaw will suddenly become overrun with giant industrial plants. We are, Mr. Speaker, however, very encouraged by a number of operations and in particular the introduction of the new Canisphere Austrian Glass Bead industry and the prospect of a number of other secondary industries in the immediate future. Frankly, Mr. Speaker, there is more spirit and there is more enthusiasm, there is more optimism in the City of Moose jaw today than I have seen in excess of two decades.

SOME HON. MEMBERS: Hear, hear!

MR. SNYDER: — Across the province generally Mr. Speaker, the unemployment rate in Saskatchewan has been the lowest of any of the provinces in Canada for a total of six months, and our unemployment stood at 1.9 per cent in October, compared to a high in Newfoundland, at 10.1 per cent, with the national average being a figure of 4.6 per cent. Additionally, Mr. Speaker, our non-agriculture labor force has increased from 355,000 in October of 1972 by 4,000 to 359,000 in 1973, and there are 5,000 less people looking for jobs than was the case just one year ago.

SOME HON. MEMBERS: Hear, hear!

MR. SNYDER: — Well, Mr. Speaker, Liberals inside this Chamber and outside the Chamber are quick to suggest Saskatchewan's new-found found prosperity is a direct result of improved circumstances in agriculture.

SOME HON. MEMBERS: Hear, hear!

MR. SNYDER: — Now this, Mr. Speaker, I expect at least in part, is true. And it is also a well-known fact that the major thrust of this Government since assuming office has been in the development and the promotion of agricultural programs which will come to the rescue of agriculture in the Province of Saskatchewan.

SOME HON. MEMBERS: Hear, hear!

MR. SNYDER: — Liberal agricultural policies, Mr. Speaker, both Federal and Provincial had Saskatchewan's agriculture industry in a state of absolute shock. The Federal Government's LIFT program designed to take land out of production blackmailed farmers into accepting the principle of reducing production of food stuffs in a hungry world. And that is a principle, Mr. Speaker, that is alien to Saskatchewan farmers.

SOME HON. MEMBERS: Hear, hear!

MR. SNYDER: — The Federal Task Force

on Agriculture offered no solution to Saskatchewan farmers except to suggest that the smaller farmer had to disappear from the scene. He had to die from slow strangulation and be absorbed by the larger farmers.

Liberals, Mr. Speaker, federal and provincial, were reconciled to seeing an accelerated exodus from rural to urban areas with the smaller farmer continuing to represent the victim in this Liberal free enterprise program. Well, Mr. Speaker, when we assumed office in 1971, it was our firm conviction that this kind of Liberal defeatist attitude had to be reversed if agriculture in Saskatchewan was to survive as a way of life. Accordingly, Saskatchewan's agricultural programs have been changed in a number of fundamental ways and new innovations to stabilize and to protect the industry have been developed.

My desk mate, Agriculture Minister John Messer, has been responsible for more forward looking, new, innovative programs in the first 29 months that this Government has been in office than was brought about during those entire seven disastrous years under the anaemic leadership of agriculture ministers, Hammy MacDonald and Doug MacFarlane. Liberals, Mr. Speaker, have a consistent record of opposition to progressive farm legislation. It is historic with them. Liberals have opposed the Land Bank on every conceivable grounds. Not because it was a bad program, they opposed it because it was a good program and because it will be another nail in their coffin when they next face the electorate in 1975.

FarmStart, Mr. Speaker, is one of the answers to the need to encourage and expand the livestock industry, aimed particularly at young farmers by providing grants and loans to them. This is another area where Liberals talked for seven long years concerning the need to diversify and then left office having delivered many fine speeches about the subject but having initiated no programs to give an indication of their convictions.

Now, Mr. Speaker, just as it became necessary to provide for the orderly marketing of wheat in the early days when the farmer was at the mercy of the Winnipeg Grain Exchange, it is necessary today to provide for the orderly marketing of hogs in order to provide for long-range production goals and to assure that markets will be available in the future. Predictably, Mr. Speaker, Liberals have opposed the Hog Marketing Commission in the same way that their counterparts have opposed other orderly marketing systems that they have been confronted with. They oppose it, Mr. Speaker, because they are Liberals. They oppose it because the Hog Marketing Commission points out again how totally and how hopelessly deficient they were when they were the Government of Saskatchewan for seven, long, lean years.

SOME HON. MEMBERS: Hear, hear!

MR. SNYDER: — Well, Mr. Speaker, these programs that I have just alluded to in the company of many others have played a very large part in the economic recovery of our province and have renewed the confidence of Saskatchewan citizens. Every corner of our province, Mr. Speaker, has been touched with this feeling of optimism and new found prosperity. Saskatchewan's wage earners presently enjoy a more adequate measure of minimum wage and they will be provided during this Session of the Legislature with extended vacation benefits in keeping with

current trends. Other amendments to the Labour Standards Act will also provide additional protection for Saskatchewan wage earners.

I want to say just a few words, Mr. Speaker, with respect to the department for which I have some responsibility. I want to say that since July of 1971, Mr. Speaker, the Department of Labour has developed from an undernourished and sickly orphan of the previous Liberal administration to a department which has been able to attract a high calibre of dedicated civil servants, capable of providing services properly expected of a progressive and forward looking government.

SOME HON. MEMBERS: Hear, hear!

MR. SNYDER: — New staff, Mr. Speaker, supplementing a nucleus of fine and dedicated employees have helped to transform the Department of Labour from the role of a reluctant caretaker to that of an enthusiastic and innovative department. For example, Mr. Speaker, our research department or division is now able more properly to respond to the needs of the public, to labor and to management, more properly to provide them with the kind of statistical information and to provide to the parties to a collective bargaining agreement comparisons and pertinent data in order that the parties to that collective bargaining agreement can more properly come to decisions in an intelligent and orderly way. Through an expanded and improved Industrial Relations Branch we are now able to provide conciliation services in the cases of industrial disputes. This is a vital area, Mr. Speaker, in which the previous Liberal administration was so sadly deficient that they were satisfied to have one single industrial relations officer running madly about the province in a vain attempt to put out brush fires with no help, no assistance from within the department. Our efforts in this connection, Mr. Speaker, I believe are paying off and paying off in a very decided way.

During 1973, Mr. Speaker, we have experienced less than half the number of man days lost as a result of strikes and lockouts as was the case in a similar period during 1972. We are satisfied, Mr. Speaker, that we can yet improve upon that record. We are satisfied that we can, with the expanding efforts of departmental staff and the continuing co-operation of management and labor, improve on the record to a very marked degree.

We would like to think, Mr. Speaker, that we in the department have been able to gain the confidence and the respect of both of the parties to the collective bargaining agreement.

For a few minutes today I want to take a little time to discuss one of the functions of my department that is particularly close to my heart and one which I think over the years will touch an increasing number of Saskatchewan's working men and women. When we formed the Government in 1971, Mr. Speaker, we were concerned about the apparent lack of attention to the health and the safety of Saskatchewan's working people. We realized that despite advances in industrial health, Saskatchewan people, like employees everywhere, face a continuing and an alarming growth in work related maladies. One of the by-products of the technological revolution seems to be the creation of the potential for more and different accidents and

the emergence of new categories of diseases and disorders. The hectic pace of modern life, the use of more sophisticated industrial apparatus, the growing diversification of the economy, have all combined to cause attention to be focused on such questions as noise and atmospheric pollution, perpetual fatigue, the rising incidence of chronic bronchitis, the persistence of a number of allergies and the increase in nervous tension which seems to stem from the progressive complexity of our social system.

In addition to this, Mr. Speaker, a whole new set of ailments are manifesting themselves, including neuro-muscular weakness which is caused by vibration, deafness caused by the noise of machines, beryllium poisoning, poisoning by new chemical products and so on. While the application of pneumatic tools and mechanized equipment may be cutting down on injuries formerly caused by the use of hand tools, an increasing amount of damage to bones, to joints and muscles has been noticed. Where physical fatigue is reduced by the takeover of a productive process by machines, mental fatigue and its related problems are intensifying because of the faster rate and the more complex nature of the work involved.

Mr. Speaker, in 1972 this Legislature passed the Occupational Health Act. I suggest to you that it represents the most progressive piece of legislation in the field of industrial health and safety ever introduced by any government on this entire continent. That Act, Mr. Speaker, became law in October of 1972 and during the past 13 months the Department of Labour has given the utmost priority to the implementation of its provisions. The implementation of this Act has not been easy, Mr. Speaker, but we didn't expect that it would be. Unlike many other Government programs it has not been a simple matter of training a superstructure of civil servants to run another government department. Instead of a staff of professional and technical experts the program, Mr. Speaker, has as its basis the joint co-operative labor-management health and safety committees which are required to be established in all places of employment where ten or more people are employed. The formation of these committees was the initial step towards the implementation of the program.

It has not been an automatic process. Occupation Health and Safety officers have travelled the length and the breadth of this province providing assistance to those involved in the organization of these health and safety committees. They did meet some resistance in the early stages, Mr. Speaker, particularly from employers who believed that health and the safety of employees was a managerial prerogative and also from some employers who could not conceive of themselves actually sitting down and discussing anything of mutual concern with their employees, and even, Mr. Speaker, from some employers who could see no need for concern regarding employees occupational health and safety at all. I am pleased to say, Mr. Speaker, that these obstacles on the whole have been overcome after a concerted effort by the occupational health and safety staff of my department along with a considerable degree of co-operation on the part of both employees and employers. Today most of these committees are in existence, in fact in little more than a year some 2900 committees made up of 10,000 workers and representing more than 100,000 employees have been formed. That was a mammoth task, Mr. Speaker, and the overwhelming success that we have had is no doubt due to the recognizable

merits of the program and the farsightedness and the concern for the health and safety of working people, acknowledged by the vast majority of the employers and endorsed heartily by the trade union movement in the Province of Saskatchewan.

I had the good fortune, Mr. Speaker, during the month of October to address the National Safety Council in Chicago. This meeting of labor, of industry, of manufacturers of a variety of protective equipment for employees, was a meeting which is held annually and I think provided a forum for the discussion of matters of similarity and dissimilarity between different jurisdictions. Recently enacted legislation in the United States rests and depends upon a virtual army of high-paid civil servants to inspect and to enforce the Federal Health and Safety Statutes. The Occupational Health Act as we see it in Saskatchewan by comparison has as its base the Occupational Health and Safety Committees at the plant level who are charged with the responsibility of identifying health and safety hazards and resolving these problems on a co-operative basis with management, Mr. Speaker. In the vast majority of cases, Mr. Speaker, problems are resolved at the plant level without any reference to the Department of Labour at all. However, Mr. Speaker, in those difficult instances where labor and management are unable to agree mutually on a satisfactory solution, we intend to use the authority provided in the Occupational Health Act to ensure that appropriate action is taken in order to provide a safe and healthy working environment in the place of work.

American delegates to the National Safety Council in Chicago, Mr. Speaker, expressed a special interest in our approach to the problem through joint labor-management committees at the plant level. We provided numerous groups and we provided numerous individuals with copies of our legislation and our code of practice and I sincerely believe, Mr. Speaker, that our occupational health program in future years will be recognized as the best, the most economic and the most effective of any such program in North America and will be providing a pattern for similar programs across the entire country.

SOME HON. MEMBERS: Hear, hear!

MR. SNYDER: — Unfortunately, Mr. Speaker, Saskatchewan Liberals as usual find themselves again on the wrong side of all progressive measures and we have seen another indication of it today. It will be remembered, Mr. Speaker, that this legislation received the support of Members opposite when it was first introduced into the House. The Member for Moose Jaw North (Mr. MacDonald), says they were duped into supporting it. It is obvious, Mr. Speaker, that since that time Members opposite have wilted under the pressure of a reactionary minority in industry and the political dinosaurs in their own political party. That Liberal spokesman for Saskatchewan working people, the Member for Moose Jaw North, made reference in the Moose Jaw Times Herald on October 31st, Hallowe'en night, a very appropriate occasion, to our occupational health program in this way and I quote him:

The objectives are to provide a tool for organizing new unions and strengthening existing ones.

And I say, what foolishness. Mr. Speaker. What absolute stupidity.

The Member can't point to a single instance where the Occupational Health Committees have been used as a device to forward the objectives of any trade union in any particular quarter of the province. Mr. MacDonald in his release on October 31st in the Times Herald concluded by saying and I quote him again:

This is clearly a betrayal to the working people of Saskatchewan.

Now surely, Mr. Speaker, this kind of frivolous and unfounded supposition strikes a discordant note with rational people of a variety of political faiths. That Liberal Member for Moose Jaw would be well advised to make himself acquainted with Saskatchewan workers whose productive years have been cut short by accident or industrial illness, and ask them whether they believe that our Occupational Health Act is a betrayal of their best interests.

I think particularly of a young widow, of a young worker who was killed in an industrial accident, an unnecessary industrial accident just about a year ago leaving a young family behind. I wonder if she feels that she has been betrayed by an Act which is designed to stop the unnecessary maiming and killing of Saskatchewan's working people. If there is any betrayal of our workers, Mr. Speaker, it is because this Act was not introduced nearly soon enough.

SOME HON. MEMBERS: Hear, hear!

MR. SNYDER: — Mr. Speaker, the imaginative and the ill-considered statements of Liberal Members opposite and particularly the Liberal Member for Moose Jaw North do a disservice to a program which was designed for one purpose and for one purpose only and that was to identify, to evaluate and to rectify health and safety hazards in the work place. Time has long since passed, Mr. Speaker, when in a civilized society employees could be expected to give life and limb for their employers. Although the occupational health program will not in itself be a panacea, it will go long way towards eliminating dangerous and unhealthy working conditions which will in turn minimize working time lost as a result of occupational accidents and disease and thus help maximize the economic efficiency of the Saskatchewan labor force and safeguard the welfare of the employees on the job.

SOME HON. MEMBERS: Hear, hear!

MR. SNYDER: — Mr. Speaker, we are convinced that this on-going co-operative approach to occupational health and safety by management and labor with the full support of Government will muster the concentrated effort needed to combat the multiplying health and safety risks of our industrial society. I am sure that during the months and years to follow the success and the accomplishments of this program will become readily apparent even to Members opposite.

Well, Mr. Speaker, we on this side of the House will continue to provide a role of leadership. We believe that our policies and our legislative programs since we resumed office in 1971 point in the direction in which Saskatchewan people

wish to travel.

Because this Throne Speech offers a great hope for economic justice and equality of opportunity I'm pleased to add my voice in support of the main motion and I will be opposing the amendment.

SOME HON. MEMBERS: Hear, hear!

MR. G.B. GRANT: (Regina Whitmore Park) — First of all I'd like to extend my congratulations to the new Member for Lakeview (Mr. Malone). I think each candidate staged a good campaign and did well on their remarks last night on TV.

But first of all I want to point out, Mr. Speaker, that we have a Premier in this Province, and I'm sorry he's not present in the House this afternoon, he should be here I think because I'm going to address some remarks to him and I would suggest that the House Leader on the other side call him in because I think he should account to the people.

SOME HON. MEMBERS: Hear, hear!

MR. GRANT: — He's not only a loser, he's a ten time loser. First of all he lost the Roumanians, he never really found them. He lost the pulp mill, he lost Burns and Company, he lost the iron mine. Mr. Snyder just admitted that they've lost 5,000 people, actually it's over 6,300 people in the past year.

SOME HON. MEMBERS: Hear, hear!

MR. GRANT: — They've lost John Richards, they almost lost Don Faris, they should lose Mr. Bowerman, the Minister of the Department of Northern Saskatchewan.

SOME HON. MEMBERS: Hear, hear!

MR. GRANT: — And the eighth, ninth and tenth are Morse, Athabasca and now Lakeview. There's a ten time loser who predicted that Lakeview would be won by a small margin. How can a man of that ability to forecast be the Leader of this Province when he lost by a margin of 1,749. He's a real loser. I suggest you drop him, call a leadership convention . . .

SOME HON. MEMBERS: Hear, hear!

MR. GRANT: — No, I wouldn't suggest the Attorney General. The Minister of Labour (Mr. Snyder) suggested that Mr. Malone ran on the basis of the fact that we needed some more Members on this side. Well, apparently he didn't see the policies for Lakeview. I'll send this over to him. 1. Welfare. 2. Recreation. 3. Property tax relief. 4. Albert Street. 5. Families. Not a single mention made of shortage of numbers.

What did Mr. Keith run on? Well he ran on the record of the NDP and apparently it's not a very good record, because he lost. He is a nice person. I know Don Keith and I have no

complaint about him. He's a good fellow and I think he did his best, but I'm absolutely amazed at how blatantly the Premier admitted that Mr. Keith had been offered, we will say a \$20,000 job in the field of finance before the election was even called. How big a hypocrite can the Premier be? He points the fingers at others while his halo is so large and slipping so readily over his ears that sooner or later it's going to choke him.

SOME HON. MEMBERS: Hear, hear!

MR. GRANT: — On the same subject, but on a different person, one of our members asked about the activities of certain government people and here we have an assistant Legislative Clerk who is supposed to be independent and where was he yesterday? You admitted where he was. If we didn't need him yesterday, we certainly don't need him today in this House and I see he's missing again. I don't know what he's doing campaigning this afternoon, but apparently he's not needed this afternoon. I was just wondering why we need him at all.

The Attorney General admitted that his Assistant was back working hard and I'm sure he must have looked up in the gallery and his assistant was sitting behind us here. He wasn't working . . .

SOME HON. MEMBERS: Hear, hear!

MR. GRANT: — He was not working very hard today. He was working hard yesterday, campaigning for Mr. Keith. I've never seen in my ten years in the Legislature such arrogance, when the Premier and the Attorney General stand up in this House and admit these things with no apology whatsoever.

Mr. Speaker, I'm sorely disappointed in the Premier because I think he's got quite a bit of ability, but he's not demonstrating it this Session.

SOME HON. MEMBERS: Hear, hear!

MR. GRANT: — His remarks were uninteresting, and dull, given with no enthusiasm and 17 Members of the Government side missing; while the Premier was speaking. In fact, at one point there were 23 and today when the Hon. Minister of Labour was speaking, 17 of you were not in your seats. That's how seriously you take the Government of this Province.

SOME HON. MEMBERS: Hear, hear!

MR. GRANT: — There is very little applause . . . We're not the Government Mr. Attorney General, you're the Government. There is little applause, but not surprising because he is playing the same old record, harping about Ottawa, federal problems. It's like the Throne Speech, two pages out of eight taken up harping about things that pertain to Ottawa, over which he has little or no control, but he likes to make a lot of noise about.

SOME HON. MEMBERS: Hear, hear!

MR. GRANT: — His defense of the Department of Northern Saskatchewan was pitiful, lame and ineffective.

SOME HON. MEMBERS: Hear, hear!

MR. GRANT: — In fact, it was so lame that he had to follow his notes very closely in case he made a mistake and said something wrong about Mr. Bowerman. At one stage he was snarly. Now when the Premier gets snarly, which he does quite often, I don't know why he does it, because it's not very effective, but it shows that he's trying to get his point over. I hope that Mr. Bowerman is not one of those great pioneers of the North whom he referred to. If he is, he's a bungling pioneer.

SOME HON. MEMBERS: Hear, hear!

MR. GRANT: — I was going to remark about election reform but boy, oh boy, after yesterday, I don't think the Premier has to continue that holier-than-thou attitude which he has been laying down in this House.

Mr. Speaker, today in Saskatchewan the Blakeney Government, Premier, Cabinet and Caucus have adopted the slogan, "The King can do no wrong." They have assumed that they, the socialists, have the cure-all for all of mankind's ills, whether they are residents of Saskatchewan or Canadians in general.

I for one and I'm positive many agree with me, feel that he is wrong. I say that their heads are buried in a sand pile of socialism and the people of Saskatchewan are paying a terrible price for this socialistic experimentation. The sad part of the whole thing is that it's so easy for the governments and particularly the Blakeney Government to get into business, into the lives of people and yet it is so difficult, prolonged and agonizing to withdraw when the action proves unwise, uneconomic or no business of government and believe me they are getting into a lot of areas that is no business of government. Thirty million dollars worth of land purchased, it's only taken them two years. I dare say it will take 20 or 30 years to get out of it. Ten million dollars for a slice of a meat packing business, much easier to buy than to sell. What's it done? Well, it hasn't created any new jobs, in fact, fewer jobs. The price of meat hasn't gone down. All it's done is create confusion and suspicion. Six million dollars for a plywood plant that should be run by private interest. Let the Government set the rules, its stumpage rates, protect the public interest, but there is no earthly reason why they have to get in there and produce plywood, other than their hunger for control of production.

If this wasn't such an expensive ski jump that the Government is on and which they are pushing the province down, I'd say keep socializing. The voters are bound to wake up and realize where you're leading them. Lakeview results should help to convince you, but I'm sure it won't, because socialists have pretty tight fitting blinders and they won't take them off, it won't strike them until the people say, we've had a belly full of the NDP.

SOME HON. MEMBERS: Hear, hear!

MR. GRANT: — And I think this was indicated in Lakeview. I think Mr. Keith was quoted as saying that the reason he lost was that his supporters just couldn't be bothered. Well, he came pretty close to the truth. I think it was demonstrated in Denmark, that sooner or later the people see the light and I feel that the pendulum has started to swing back here in Saskatchewan.

SOME HON. MEMBERS: Hear, hear!

MR. GRANT: — I'm not surprised at the direction the Blakeney Government is heading, dominated by too many school teachers and theorists, embroiled in fuzzy brained schemes leading to Government control and an erosion of private initiative.

MR. GRANT: — They've got to the point now, they've got the people of this province to the point where a good many are saying, what's the use of demonstrating private initiative or get up and go. The Government, the great brother will look after us.

While there has been the odd case of private business expanding or establishing new work opportunities, the Minister of Labour explained, probably as well as I can, why this happened. It happened because of the general prosperity of Saskatchewan farmers and the NDP had nothing whatsoever to do with this. They can thank Mr. Lang in Ottawa and the Federal Government and the world wheat shortage. This is a situation that could change very readily and this Government opposite, Mr. Speaker, is doing little to prepare for it.

The Government's job making activity had been restricted solely to expanding the civil service and the Crown corporations. A very poor substitute for private jobs and jobs in co-ops. The Leader of the Opposition has suggested a thousand more civil servants. A statement not denied by the Members opposite, it would seem to be accurate. We have 60,000 fewer people in the province, yet we need a thousand more civil servants to manage our lives and pry into our business.

Check with the old time, the long time civil servants. They are fed up to the teeth with the NDP, shoehorning their friends and the people of the Party into key positions.

SOME HON. MEMBERS: Hear, hear!

MR. GRANT: — Seniority in the higher levels is completely ignored. I was talking to a Power Corporation official at noon and he is in this category. A Department of Labour individual expressed the same deal yesterday, I was driving him to vote actually. Believe it or not there are some people in the Department of Labour who are not supporters of the present Minister.

AN HON. MEMBER: — They'll be looking for them this afternoon.

MR. GRANT: — Mr. Speaker, the Blakeney Government has no desire to be thrifty. Ten million dollars extra Government payroll, sixty million dollars social aid, air travel far in excess of

what we used to do. The Members opposite are the ones who used to criticize the Thatcher Government for the acquisition of some aircraft, but I don't notice . . . they've had a fire sale on 52" brassieres, but they haven't had any fire sale yet on aircraft.

SOME HON. MEMBERS: Hear, hear!

MR. GRANT: — In addition, they have handed out projects to Party people, they have built employees' houses, far in excess of the need of quality and number. A New Deal for People! Yes, the Cabinet, the caucus and their friends. It's a poor deal for the remaining people of the province. All these at the expense of the hard pressed Saskatchewan taxpayer, paying more than any other taxpayer in Canada.

I notice the Member from Regina North West admitted that he wasn't a member of the rightist group and I admire him for standing up and being counted. I just hope the Minister of Education (Mr. MacMurchy) has the intestinal fortitude to indicate that he doesn't belong to that group. He has been classed with Mr. Whelan. But I have a feeling he won't because I believe they are all leftists over there, Mr. Speaker, with the possible exception of the Minister of Agriculture (Mr. Messer). He's one that I'm not convinced is a real out and out socialist. I think he is an opportunist, because he can't possibly be blind to what he is advocating.

SOME HON. MEMBERS: Hear, hear!

MR. GRANT: — And Mr. Messer, I would suggest you get your head out of the sand pile of socialism and see the light, because believe me you're in the wrong camp. The philosophy of the Members opposite is that you can't go wrong politically if you hammer Ottawa, business, the professions and big industry.

The Throne Speech pretty well confines itself to this approach. Blame Ottawa for all our ills. Accuse them of wrong decisions, even as the federal NDP keeps the Government in power. If so much is wrong why doesn't the Premier and the rest of you Members over there, convince Mr. Lewis to pull the plug.

AN HON. MEMBER: — Yeah, pull the plug, have an election.

MR. GRANT: — Why don't you pull the plug before those bad federal people can do wrong and I'm willing to bet the Attorney General \$10 right now, that next week Mr. Lewis will not pull the plug.

SOME HON. MEMBERS: Hear, hear!

HON. R. ROMANOW: (Attorney General) — Mr. Speaker, if it's legal, he has the bet.

MR. GRANT: — Okay, very good. We'll let the Speaker, he's impartial, hold the money.

If it's not Ottawa it's big business. The banks, oil

companies and industry in general. Why is Blakeney and Company so wishy-washy. Why can't they be honest with business, like the Member from Saskatoon University (Mr. Richards). If you hate the big boys why not take them over. Why didn't you take over 100 per cent of Intercontinental Packers instead of 49 per cent or whatever you did. It's quite evident that many opposite would love to do that, but they are just a little bit realistic and recognize that they need the Lewis 'welfare bums.' They need industry's job making expertise. The Premier has admitted to this as far as Saskoil is concerned. They need their dollars and their tax paying ability. Even though they reluctantly admit this, nevertheless, they continue day in and day out to keep that old guillotine swinging over the heads of business, large and small.

If this attitude is continued, and I hope it is continued because it's sure going to rebound to our benefit. It's inevitable that Saskatchewan will be less attractive to investment by the private sector. Mr. LaBerge of Imperial Oil certainly made that clear on television last night. He indicated that you've done a pretty good job of chasing the private industry, the oil industry out of business.

I am very pleased the Premier has joined us this afternoon.

SOME HON. MEMBERS: Hear, hear!

MR. GRANT: — I'm sorry that he wasn't here to hear my remarks, but I'm sure he can listen in, if he's plugged in, if not he can read it in Hansard.

I think it's encouraging to see more emphasis on the Pacific rim. I commend the Minister of Industry (Mr. Thorson) for his budget success. I hope he has obtained the funds for this, but one thing I can't understand is why he let his colleagues and particularly the Attorney General, talk him in to appointing Mr. Ching to head up that operation. Not exactly a career diplomat, not exactly a business promoter or even an expert.

It's difficult properly to assess the proposed Saskatchewan Development Fund. If this is an open ended investment fund and is to be guaranteed by the Government, it would seem that its potential return to those who buy shares would be on the conservative side and in all likelihood could not be counted on as a real money maker for the individual shareholder. And if Mr. Keith is going to be appointed to a responsible position with that fund, this raises some other doubts because I do not think that a school teacher is one who is qualified to be Provincial Treasurer or the head of a Development Fund. It is suggested in the Throne Speech that this would give Saskatchewan residents an opportunity to invest in western development. The West could include Manitoba, Saskatchewan, Alberta and British Columbia. So I suppose we'll have a bit of BC Forest and Chemical Company, Manitoba Canneries and I believe Homco, we now own \$50,000 worth of Homco shares, which is a prefabricated building company. But why not throw successful monopolies in, like the Saskatchewan Power Corporation, the Liquor Board, SaskTel and a few more.

Mr. Speaker, I doubt very much whether this open ended investment fund is going to be successful. There is really no

need for it. Through the Crown corporations and SEDCO's participation in shares in companies it's not required. It's purely and simply a gimmick of the socialists.

While it is gratifying to see something being promised by way of preservation and restoration of the Territorial Government building or Dewdney Avenue, I am sure that Regina people were disappointed to find no mention of plans for Saskatchewan House, the former residence of Lieutenant-Governors. This is a good building of historical value, portions should be restored and space provided for preservation of items of historical pioneer interest and as the Premier and the Cabinet know there are some 15,000 of these items in storage in Regina at the present time. To me this would be a tourist attraction and would do more than the establishment of another Department of Tourism and Renewable Resources whatever that is.

Mr. Speaker, the Government opposite has ignored the right of 300,000 of our citizens to vote on the ward system and I am not going to dwell on that, but to say that this was the most undemocratic action that one could imagine.

Under the direction of chief plumber, Mr. Smishek, they have flushed 26 hearing aid dealers down the drain, the Government that says they want to help the small businessman. Well they did a wonderful job as far as the hearing aid dealers are concerned.

Mr. Speaker, I commend you for your decision on the matter of urgency the other day, it was purely and simply a case of the Government opposite wanting to blame Ottawa for more ills that they are responsible for and keep on, crying the lack of democracy when they themselves are the most guilty. Mr. Speaker, the Government opposite are the greatest window dressers, the best whitewashes of misdeeds, the biggest of the big spenders, 472 people entertained at a party at the auditorium the other night for the cornerstone laying of the Base Hospital (Plains Hospital) which I believe attracted about 70 people at the function itself but 470 at the party.

The Throne Speech demonstrates the continuation of the takeover and control by the NDP, a complete disregard by the Blakeney Government of the desire of the taxpayer for relief and for a reduction of growth in the civil service. It completely ignores the rights and needs of the citizens of Regina. Mr. Speaker, I cannot possibly support the motion, but I will support the amendment.

SOME HON. MEMBERS: Hear, hear!

MR. J.A. PEPPER: (Weyburn) — Mr. Speaker, it is indeed a pleasure for me to have the opportunity this afternoon to participate in this debate.

I wish to begin by offering my sincere congratulations to the mover and the seconder for a job well done, and I must say I wholeheartedly agree with the sentiments contained in their individual addresses.

I should like also to congratulate Members opposite in their by-election victory yesterday. I must say to them. Mr. Speaker, that I am not surprised, I am disappointed, but am certainly not disillusioned. This was their day. I can

assure the people of Saskatchewan that there are better days to come.

SOME HON. MEMBERS: Hear, hear!

MR. PEPPER: — Our Government's legislative program for this Session represents another reflection that this Government is indeed delivering on the New Deal for People platform which was presented to the public in June of 1971. I am sure that we all vividly recall the skeptical observations of our friends opposite when our party laid before the public a concise list of platform promises. However, their skepticism appears to have diminished somewhat, Mr. Speaker, and when you consider the record of this Government the reasons become crystal clear. This New Democratic Government has completely fulfilled or is in the process of fulfilling 133 of the 139 election pledges made to the people of Saskatchewan.

I am proud to be a member of a government with a record like that, however, I quickly add that we will not rest on our laurels. We will continue to develop the types of programs and policies which are needed to improve the economic and social well-being of the people of Saskatchewan. Almost daily, Mr. Speaker, new programs and policies are being developed, and I have full confidence that by 1975 if this is the time when this Government goes to the people for another mandate, the results will be equally gratifying to those recorded on the evening of June 23, 1971.

SOME HON. MEMBERS: Hear, hear!

MR. PEPPER: — Mr. Speaker, before offering some views on the Throne Speech I should like to take a moment to say a few words with respect to the Weyburn constituency. On behalf of my constituents I should like to thank this Government for the considerations which have been afforded to the residents of that riding. I can assure this Assembly that the people of Weyburn constituency are pleased with the assistance which has been given to them to date.

Since the report of the Independent Electoral Boundaries Commission the proposed boundaries of my riding have been changed quite dramatically. I would have to say that I am saddened somewhat at the fact that if this proposed boundary is carried through that I will not have the opportunity to serve many people whom I have had the opportunity to know and work with over the years. However, I also welcome the new Weyburn constituents if and when the final report of the proposed boundaries becomes legislation, I pledge to do whatever possible to assist them in any way I can. I would also add that the mere changing of boundaries will in no way detract from the lasting friendships I have had the opportunity to make over the past number of years.

A moment ago, Mr. Speaker, I mentioned that the people of my constituency were pleased with the assistance which has come forward from this Government in the past year. The city of Weyburn has benefited from many of our Government's programs and as an example the recent \$6,000 youth and culture grant was greatly appreciated. The Department of Municipal Affairs announced a provincial works incentive grant recently of

approximately \$16,200 which will be made available to the city of Weyburn to assist it in the development of various community projects.

Then as we go to the rural area, Highway No. 18 is oil surfaced, Oungre to Lake Alma, Highway No. 28 has been rebuilt from Radville to Lake Alma and is now ready for surfacing. Our Open Road program, Operation MainStreet is very popular in the Weyburn constituency with the communities of Gladmar, Lake Alma, Beaubier, Minton, Bromhead and Colgate participating.

The Provincial Government provided a substantial grant for the construction of a new auditorium for the Lyndale school, provided funding for the enclosing of the Oungre Regional Park Swimming Pool, along with the construction of a cairn at the regional park commemorating the 100th birthday of the Royal Canadian Mounted Police.

Perhaps, Mr. Speaker, one of the greatest benefits not only to the Weyburn constituency, but to south eastern Saskatchewan was the decision of the Government to locate in Weyburn a Southeastern Regional Headquarters for the Department of Agriculture.

These are but a few of the specific programs which have been undertaken as a result of provincial assistance. It does not include the benefits that all citizens receive as a result of such programs as the elimination of Medicare premiums, Land Bank, Property Improvement Grants. I would say that much has been accomplished in a very short period of time. I am confident that in the months ahead much more will be accomplished to the benefit of the people of Saskatchewan.

The state of the provincial economy as noted from the Speech from the Throne is a reflection of this Government's legislative programming in 30 months. The agricultural sector has experienced a very favorable upswing, especially within the grain industry. A marked improvement within secondary and industrial development is noted as well with manufacturing up 10 per cent, 2,000 additional jobs coupled with a 40 per cent increase in investment.

In addition, the employment picture continues to brighten. As you know, Mr. Speaker, October marks the sixth consecutive month in which Saskatchewan had the lowest unemployment rate in Canada.

But there are other encouraging indicators as well, indicators that reflect success of programs and policies of this New Democratic Government. It is a well accepted fact, Mr. Speaker, that agriculture continues to form the basis of our number one industry. The spin-off of a healthy agriculture sector is reflected in the healthy business atmosphere which is highly dependent on the financial well-being of our farmers. The recent upswing in grain prices has significantly contributed to this improved economy. However, let me remind you it has been programs such as the Land Bank, FarmStart, programs like that that have made it possible for our farmers to be in a position to benefit from the increased demand for our agricultural produce.

The success of the Land Bank is well known and I am pleased that our friends in Opposition have finally recognized the

futility of attempting to criticize this much needed and well accepted program. I was particularly pleased to note the success of the FarmStart program. In less than two short months over 205 loans have been approved for a value of \$5 million. I hope this Legislature gives unanimous approval to the Government's proposed expansion of this program.

The decision to provide grants and loans to encourage the development of new outside markets for agricultural produce is another indication of foresight and concern. To ensure that the people of Saskatchewan realize maximum profit for their labors it is essential that our Government takes the initiative to promote the marketing of these products.

I have no doubt in my mind that this Throne Speech truly reflects the priorities of the New Democratic Party. Throughout the Speech there are references to new programs and the expansion of existing programs which will enhance the social well-being for all citizens. Introduction of the Saskatchewan Dental Care Act which will lead to free dental care for our children, grants for kindergartens under the direction of school boards, an improved minimum wage, three weeks annual vacation after one year employment, a new legal aid plan, increased relief for taxpayers, improved economic opportunities for the people of northern Saskatchewan are but a few of the programs which immediately come to mind.

In addition to the many new programs which this Government has forwarded, this Speech indicates the need for us to undo or offset the effects of action, or may I say inaction of past and present Liberal Governments. I wholeheartedly back our Government's move to re-establish agricultural machinery testing in Saskatchewan. Unfortunately the former government bent under pressure from the giant machinery companies and abandoned this much needed program. I know I speak for farmers all across the country when I say the re-establishment of testing is overdue and will be very much welcomed.

SOME HON. MEMBERS: Hear, hear!

MR. PEPPER: — This Government's commitment to ensure that Saskatchewan residents reap the benefits of a new provincial oil policy is also a very welcome announcement. Already, Mr. Speaker, we are viewing the adverse effects of not having a national policy. This Government's commitment is to meet this situation head on. This is indicative of where this Government stands when it comes to the welfare of citizens.

I viewed with regret the announced intention of the Federal Government to lift the ceiling on oil prices the end of January. This can have nothing but adverse effects on the people of this nation and in Saskatchewan alone multinational oil companies stand to reap an additional \$300 million. I am proud, Mr. Speaker, to support a government which questions this move and is prepared to do something about it before it is too late.

Mr. Speaker, as I talked with farmers, businessmen, students, housewives and senior citizens, I find that there is a new confidence in our province. I am not in any way giving our Provincial Government full credit for this new pride in Saskatchewan. However, it is very obvious to me that because

of the many new programs and policies which our Government has put into effect, more and more people are finding it much easier to attain the goals which they have set for themselves. Young farmers are staying on the farm, thanks to the Land Bank, FarmStart, plus other grant and loan programs.

Small communities are again growing, due in part to an improved agricultural economy, yes, but also due to assistance to small business and financial assistance in providing these communities with improved services such as sewer and water, schools, street improvements, winter works projects and the like. Saskatchewan, Mr. Speaker, has always been in the forefront in education and the opportunities are never better than now for young people to receive their level of post secondary education.

Our record in the field of health care is second to none on the North American continent and our 'people first' philosophy is reflected in many of the other programs which this Government has brought to the people over the years. Because of the fact that this Throne Speech is consistent with that philosophy and reflects the positive ideals which will improve the economic and social well-being of our people, I wholeheartedly give my support to it and hope that all Members of this Assembly will do likewise. You, no doubt, Mr. Speaker, will gather from my remarks that I will support the motion and I oppose the amendment.

SOME HON. MEMBERS: Hear, hear!

MR. G. LANE: (Lumsden) — Mr. Speaker, it is very disheartening to speak in the Saskatchewan Legislature when outside 150 to 200 Métis are demanding justice and fairness in northern Saskatchewan, demanding the resignation of the Minister of Northern Saskatchewan. The people who are outside demanding redress for the wrongs that have been done by the NDP Government in northern Saskatchewan are a living illustration of the failure of the Blakeney Government in northern Saskatchewan, and I say that it is about time that the Government of Saskatchewan decide to listen to the people of northern Saskatchewan and not send civil servant after civil servant into northern Saskatchewan to tell the people what is best for them.

SOME HON. MEMBERS: Hear, hear!

MR. LANE: — Mr. Speaker, I have had the honor to represent the constituency of Lumsden. I have argued many, many times — well it really hasn't been an argument, it is a statement — I say that the constituency of Lumsden is a most sophisticated rural constituency. It was the first constituency to be served by both television networks, it is served by two daily newspapers. Many prominent leaders of all farm organizations come from that constituency and it has been a great pleasure for me to serve the people of that particular constituency.

MR. ENGEL: — Why don't you run there again?

MR. LANE: — Well, you have kind of done

away with that seat and that's why I won't run there again. It is very disheartening, as I have said, that the Government would not take into account the fact that there is a tradition in Lumsden that has now been ignored by doing away with that particular constituency.

There are some concerns in that particular constituency:

The heavy snowfall that we have had so far this year has the people in the town of Lumsden concerned about a heavy spring runoff. I urge the Government to place a very high priority on flood control and flood control assistance to the particular town of Lumsden. And, in particular, I urge the Government to place a priority on a new bridge for the town of Lumsden which will be much needed . . .

SOME HON. MEMBERS: Hear, hear!

MR. LANE: — . . . and much desired by the people in that community.

We are concerned in the constituency that the so-called commuter villages and towns that surround Regina are being weighed down by a demand for services which they cannot financially cope with. I am referring to a list of them: Lumsden, of course is one; Pense, Balgonie, White City, MacLean, Pilot Butte, Grand Coulee. They all find themselves in a position, not of their own making whereby they are growing, growing as fast as people wish to move out of the city of Regina and live in the surrounding rural areas. And through no faults of the local governments in those particular communities, they are being heavily weighed down by tax loads, by a demand for services which they find it impossible to meet. The demand for services is such that I urge that the Government take into account and give special recognition to these commuter centres so they can supply the services and encourage community development, something they have been unable to do under the present system.

As I have said, as was made mention by the Members opposite, under the new Electoral Boundaries Commission there will be no Lumsden constituency in the future. Part of, and most of, Lumsden constituency will go into a new constituency called Qu'Appelle, but those problems which I have raised will still have to be solved and as I have said, I urge the Government to put a great priority on solving these special problems.

I urge, also, in the new constituency of Qu'Appelle, that the town of Qu'Appelle be given a priority. I also urge the Government to do what they can to get included in the federal-provincial agricultural service centres agreement, the towns of Fort Qu'Appelle and of Lumsden. They are deserving and the Federal assistance which would go to these communities for water supply facilities is much needed and, again, a priority should be placed on this particular action.

We have the results of a very important by-election yesterday, Mr. Speaker. The constituency of Lakeview elected a Member to the Liberal side of the House and elected a Liberal Member, Mr. Ted Malone . . .

SOME HON. MEMBERS: Hear, hear!

MR. LANE: — Mr. Speaker, it was a sweep for the Liberal Party and it was a victory for the Liberal Party and no matter how you slice it, it was a defeat for the Blakeney Government, the Blakeney team and the NDP in Saskatchewan.

SOME HON. MEMBERS: Hear, hear!

MR. LANE: — I should like to congratulate Mr. Ted Malone. I should also like to congratulate Mr. Don Keith whom I know personally. It was a clean campaign. They were both good candidates and both qualified candidates.

Mr. Blakeney has said that Lakeview was a safe Liberal seat and, yet, a few days before he thought that he would win it “by a slight majority”, I believe, were the exact words. But the NDP vote was down drastically in that election, Mr. Speaker. I think an analysis is proper at this particular time.

The vote in the Lakeview by-election yesterday made it quite clear that the people in Saskatchewan are concerned about the direction the Blakeney Government has taken.

SOME HON. MEMBERS: Hear, hear!

MR. LANE: — The people of Saskatchewan are beginning to learn that the NDP that they elected so heavily in 1971 is not the CCF Government that governed this province for 20 years. It is certainly not the CCF Government of Tommy Douglas and the traditions that he started, because the CCF and Tommy Douglas would not be into a program which means government ownership of farm land and \$30 million of prime farm land being bought by the Government with no intention to sell. No CCF would have brought in the infamous Foreign Ownership Bill which meant that Saskatchewan citizens could not sell their own farm land to their own sons and daughters if they lived outside the Province of Saskatchewan.

No CCF Government would have brought in a Hog Marketing Commission without a vote and the only time the CCF Government brought in a marketing board there was a vote of the producers.

SOME HON. MEMBERS: Hear, hear!

MR. LANE: — The CCF would not have brought in, nor did they bring in, a ward system in the cities of Regina and Saskatoon without a vote and without a plebiscite. The CCF certainly did not favor, did not go on record as favoring the Guaranteed Annual Income program that the Blakeney Government has done.

The people are concerned about the direction and the power that the Blakeney Government, the NDP, are taking. It is no longer a Blakeney team that we are talking about, it is a Blakeney machine, and that is what scares the people.

SOME HON. MEMBERS: Hear, hear!

MR. LANE: — The NDP members stayed at home because they know that what they elected in 1971 is totally different from what they

had through the 20 years from 1944 to 1964. We know, in the Liberal Party, that we have not yet set ourselves as the alternative, but we will under the leadership of Dave Steuart . . .

SOME HON. MEMBERS: Hear, hear!

MR. LANE: — We will have common sense policies that will solve problems in the Province of Saskatchewan and not merely be the cosmetic approach of spending money and not solving any problems, of merely taking over control for control's sake. We will have common sense programs, common sense policies and we ask the people of Saskatchewan — and we are sure and we are confident after the results of the by-election yesterday — that they will give us a chance to present our policies and when our policies are made known to the people, there is no doubt that we will have a Liberal Government in 1974 or 1975.

SOME HON. MEMBERS: Hear, hear!

MR. LANE: — It is very unfortunate, Mr. Speaker, that the Throne Speech was made into, I say, an unfair political document, because the first part of the Throne Speech was nothing but an unfortunate, and I say cheap, attack on the Federal Government.

They start out by attacking, under the heading of 'Western Economic Opportunities Conference' that very conference. And they say nothing was done. I am going, for the interest of the Members opposite, to list some of the things that did happen at that conference that you seem to want to sweep under the table and hide, things that are good for the people of Western Canada and are good for the people of Saskatchewan.

First of all the Federal Government made the offer to Alberta, Saskatchewan and Manitoba to share a 50/50 cost of upgrading their primary highway network to the same capacity as presently operates in British Columbia. There was a commitment from the Federal Government to establish a new industrial bank and development agency to make federal financial and business, advisory and training services more accessible to businesses throughout the various regions of Canada.

There was a commitment to decentralize the Department of Regional Economic Expansion to place about 70 per cent of its personnel in regional provincial offices. And, already we have seen the concrete result of that action with the new regional office being opened in the city of Saskatoon.

SOME HON. MEMBERS: Hear, hear:

MR. LANE: — There was a commitment made by the Federal Government to establish a new crop development fund, to stimulate development and adaptation of new crops, new varieties and new protein services.

SOME HON. MEMBERS: Hear, hear:

MR. LANE: — There was a commitment by the Federal Government to revise present Prairie Grain Stabilization Programs and to consider stabilization measures for other commodities. There was

an offer to provide funds to the provinces and universities for testing and evaluation of agricultural machinery and related information programs, and I think that we can rest assured that the promise made in the Throne Speech of an agricultural testing institute will be funded, if not totally, in large part by funds which will come from the Government in Ottawa and not from the Government of Saskatchewan.

There was a commitment to increase financial assistance to young farmers from the Federal Government. There was an offer to contribute to the creation of additional and expanded veterinary training facilities. And the list can go on and on. That conference was not a waste of time, that was a constructive conference and good was done for Western Canada, and I don't think that we should lose sight of that fact. The Throne Speech tries to hide it but it is not correct.

We note, referring to the by-election, that the Blakeney Government — and they use the words the Blakeney Government and the Blakeney team — has promised \$200 pensions for old age pensioners. It is very interesting to note for the interest of the people of Saskatchewan that the present pension including income supplements will be \$179 as of October 1st from the Federal Government, not the Provincial Government.

SOME HON. MEMBERS: Hear, hear!

MR. LANE: — The only contribution that the Provincial Government can make to bring it to that \$200 figure, is a measly \$21. The Federal Government will supply \$179. I think that is another reason why the people of Lakeview voted so overwhelmingly against the NDP Government because they knew, the pensioners knew, exactly what the Government was up to.

SOME HON. MEMBERS: Hear, hear!

MR. LANE: — It is very interesting that in the Throne Speech the Blakeney Government would spend so much of its time criticizing Ottawa and does not tell the people that over 50 per cent of Medicare is paid by the Liberal Government at Ottawa. That over 50 per cent of our welfare payments come from a Liberal Government at Ottawa. And over one-third of all the income to the Government opposite comes from the Federal Treasury, not from the people of Saskatchewan.

Let's take a minute to take a look at the specific things in the by-election. We have now understood, after the results were announced and the devastating . . .

ADJOURNMENT OF HOUSE REQUESTED RE MÉTIS DEMONSTRATION

MR. J.G. RICHARDS: (Saskatoon University) — Mr. Deputy Speaker, I should like to make a motion that we adjourn the House at this moment, renewing the debate on the Speech from the Throne this evening, with the understanding that we would remain in our chairs and invite a representative of the 100 people who have come from the North to discuss the question with us of northern forest developments. These people could make a presentation and Mr. Bowerman could also enter into such a debate. We owe the 100 people here the respect of listening

to the issues. The issue of northern forest development and the Department of Northern Saskatchewan are crucial issues. There is a precedent, Mr. Deputy Speaker, inasmuch as we, in the last session, adjourned to allow the Silver Broom curlers to enter the House.

MR. DEPUTY SPEAKER: — I would ask the Member to submit to the Speaker's Chair the written motion.

MR. ROMANOW: — How do you get such a motion before the House?

MR. DEPUTY SPEAKER: — Well, I am asking the Member to provide the Speaker with a written motion and then we will rule on it.

MR. RICHARDS: — Mr. Speaker, I understand that the motion to adjourn is always in order, and my Point of Privilege was to be able to make the motion. Mr. Speaker, I repeat what I previously stated to the Deputy Speaker. I requested on a Point of Privilege, to rise and move to adjourn, that we might invite a representative of the people who have come down from Prince Albert to discuss the situation with respect to northern forest development. I used as a precedent the adjournment that we had during the previous session, to invite the curlers on to the floor of the House during the Silver Broom celebration.

HON. R. ROMANOW: (Attorney General) — Mr. Speaker, I wonder if I just might be heard on this very briefly. I, unfortunately, wasn't here at the time the motion was made. I wonder, Mr. Speaker, whether the motion really is in order. My understanding is that the Member from Lumsden (Mr. Lane) is the Member who has the floor. On a Point of Privilege the Member from University (Mr. Richards) raises, he can state a privilege as I understand under a Point of Privilege, but surely he cannot make a motion because he does not have the floor. The person who has the floor is the Hon. Member from Lumsden. The Member from Lumsden is in the process of making his speech and the Point of Privilege is merely to draw to your attention on something about the privilege of the Member's speech or one of the Members in the House involved.

So I would respectfully suggest, Mr. Speaker, that this matter is out of order.

MR. LANE: — Mr. Speaker, having had the floor before the Point of Order . . .

MR. SPEAKER: — Are you speaking to the Point of Order or the Point of Procedure?

MR. LANE: — Point of Procedure or Point of Privilege, I think the technicality that we are concerned about, that the Attorney General is concerned about, is not important. I think we know what the Hon. Member has proposed and I am prepared to wait a ruling in that particular regard.

MR. SPEAKER: — I think that I would have to rule that while a Member can rise to move adjournment of the House, that motion in itself is not debatable. But to make a motion with instructions, then attached to the motion to adjourn is also a motion of instructions, which would take notice or unanimous consent. When another Member had the floor, I would say that it was out of order for another Member to rise at this time, and ask leave to adjourn the House with instructions. So I would so rule.

MR. RICHARDS: — Mr. Speaker, there was no definite explicit instruction that I was making and Members are quite free, should the House adjourn, to attend to their private business. I was merely trying to elaborate upon my reasons for such an extraordinary move in requesting at this time an adjournment of the House. If it facilitates making the motion in order I am certainly glad to remove any explicit or implied instructions from the motion.

MR. SPEAKER: — The Hon. Member from Lumsden (Mr. Lane) had the floor. He was speaking in the debate and I think it highly out of order for someone else to rise to ask the House to adjourn because that in itself cuts another Member off. I think that is out of order. And furthermore, if the House is going to adjourn for a specific reason, — your example was the time we met the curlers in this Legislature, — that was a predesigned notice and it was done ahead of time so that when the notice came in, the House was aware of it. I would have to rule that you were out of order and the Member for Lumsden (Mr. Lane) may continue.

The Assembly resumed the interrupted debate on the Address-in-Reply.

MR. LANE: — Mr. Speaker, I was quite prepared to allow the representative in the House. If that is the ruling of the Chair we will of course bow to your ruling.

I had raised before the Motion was introduced the matter of the Lakeview by-election. We understand as a result of the sweeping Liberal victory yesterday that there will be new amendments to the Elections Act to allow a candidate to deduct his deposit if he so losses the election.

SOME HON. MEMBERS: Hear, hear!

MR. LANE: — I had the privilege of working yesterday in a poll called poll 10 which is in the northern part of the Lakeview seat . . .

MR. MICHAYLUK: — You should have been here.

MR. LANE: — . . . he says I should have been here. It gave the people of poll 10 a chance to express their feelings about the Government. I was glad to be of assistance to them in that regard. It was very interesting in that particular poll which had been very solidly NDP prior to yesterday's fiasco of the Government that the heavyweights were brought in. The Premier

was traipsing around through the cold and the wind and the snow and the hail and the sleet, going door to door talking to the people in poll 10. Probably that was because that poll may be in a constituency where the Premier will seek the nomination in the next election. It is very interesting they also had one of the Federal heavyweights in, going door to door, talking to the people, again through the hail, the sleet, the snow and the rain. Mr. Benjamin was going around.

MR. STEUART: — Lightweights.

MR. LANE: — Oh, I thought they were heavyweights. I am sorry. But we can get a very interesting comparison of what happened when they brought the Premier into this particular campaign in this particular poll. Because in 1971, the Liberals lost poll 10 by approximately 30 votes. But, lo and behold, what happened yesterday? After the Premier went door to door and talked to all the people in poll 10, what happened? The Liberals won it by 10 votes for the first time in the history of the poll.

SOME HON. MEMBERS: Hear, hear!

MR. LANE: — The Premier has a very, very interesting record when it comes to campaigning. Who was it that went from reservation to reservation, from lake to lake, from outpost to outpost when talking to the people in Athabasca, leading the flying circus? We all know who that was, we all know what happened. We all know the results of the Premier's action in the Athabasca by-election.

SOME HON. MEMBERS: Hear, hear!

MR. LANE: — And he worked just as hard in the by-election in Morse. As a matter of fact I don't think anybody other than the winning candidate worked harder than the Premier in Morse. And what happened in the Morse by-election? Lo and behold the Liberals won the Morse by-election. The only one he stayed out of was the one in Estevan. Very interesting that the only by-election that the NDP have won since 1971 is the one where they made a prior commitment to give the candidate a Cabinet post if he was lucky and they used that throughout the campaign. And the people of course in Estevan have approached that with mixed feelings as they look back and see what happened ever since that particular date. Very interesting with all the whining and crying and carping about what the Liberals are doing to the poor old pensioners.

I should like to take a typical poll, one that is certainly representative of how the people in Lakeview felt and it is one in a nursing home that I have just taken by chance, it is the Santa Maria Nursing Home.

AN HON. MEMBER: — All Roman Catholics.

MR. LANE: — It is very interesting that that particular poll as I said was a nursing home. A lot of people were old in that particular poll. They were on pensions, all but seven. There are seven union organizers in there voting because the vote

was 80 to 7 in favor of the Liberal Party.

We had a lot of talk yesterday I understand from the Premier about a little green book. He prefaced his remarks that nowhere in the book is the word Liberal mentioned. I should like to refer to the second page, Ted Malone, Liberal. The ballot, Ted Malone, Liberal. Authorized by the Lakeview Liberals. The word was used over and over again because Ted Malone was proud to run as a Liberal and proud to win as a Liberal yesterday afternoon.

SOME HON. MEMBERS: Hear, hear!

MR. LANE: — If you ever want to see an avoidance of the name NDP, all you had to do was drive around Lakeview the last month and look at all the bus stop benches. Not one word of NDP. Constantly throughout the Government opposite's campaign material they referred to the Blakeney team, a Blakeney Government. If you wanted to look for a NDP you had to get the N out of Blakeney, the D out of Don and the P out of pension. That is the only way you could get NDP.

We were very interested to note that there were 45 polls in the by-election, one for each NDP Member. They were all responsible and we all know the success they had. But they did win a particular poll. Out of the North they brought the heavyweights, they had to save face, they knew they were in deep trouble so they brought in the 'biggies'. They brought in the hard-nosed politicals, the bosses, the toughies, the no nonsense politicians from the North. The big guns. Mr. Big in the NDP. The Godfather of the NDP to come in and bring them a poll and we would like to congratulate Mike Feduniak.

SOME HON. MEMBERS: Hear, hear!

MR. LANE: — Very interesting that nobody worked harder on the opposite side of the House than the Hon. Member and we expect him to be named the next Minister of Tourism. We know he likes to travel and we are sure the new job will do that for him.

We were disappointed, knowing the candidate for Lakeview, at some of the untruths in the campaign material. Very unfortunate that the Government would consider even doing such a thing. We were surprised by your untrue allegations as to jobs and new industries in the Province of Saskatchewan because you haven't got any. We were surprised by your comments about what you are going to do for the pensioners when you knew it wasn't true. We were shocked that the Government opposite would pull these types of tricks when we should have had an election on the issues, two issues that were raised by the Premier, one issue was the New Deal for People and the people have spoken; the other issue, who can do the best in the Legislature for Lakeview and the people have spoken again. There is no way you can slice that election but as I say, except it is a defeat for the NDP, it is a defeat for the Blakeney team and it is a defeat for the Blakeney Government. As I said it was a victory for the Liberal Party, a victory for the leadership of Dave Steuart and the first battle in the fight for 1975.

SOME HON. MEMBERS: Hear, hear!

MR. LANE: — It is very interesting to note the Government opposite's actions over the last couple of years. You know they have opposed so much I think they have a Freudian desire to get back into the Opposition. Their programs all depend on huge grants from the Liberal Government in Ottawa. I reiterate what I said, that over 50 per cent of Medicare and 50 per cent of welfare and over a third of the income comes from the Government in Ottawa. But it is so used to being in opposition that all it does is oppose everything that the Federal Government has brought in. The Blakeney Government has opposed the best income stabilization program ever proposed to the Saskatchewan farmers.

SOME HON. MEMBERS: Hear, hear!

MR. LANE: — The first time the farmers have had a chance to get a higher income in bad years, the Blakeney Government has opposed it and the Blakeney Government has thrown away over \$150 million of the farmers' money because it was a good idea, a good program, a good principle. And now they turn around and they flip-flop around and they now want an income stabilization program. But the farmers of Saskatchewan know that if Otto Lang and the Federal Liberals propose an income stabilization program, the NDP of Saskatchewan will oppose it no matter what form it takes, because they have proved time and time again that they don't care about the farmer and his serious problems and only wish to offer cosmetic solutions to the problems of the farmer.

SOME HON. MEMBERS: Hear, hear!

MR. LANE: — The Government, the NDP, does not want a far, income stabilization. If they really wanted one, they could have had one. The Government of British Columbia, the NDP in British Columbia did it. Why doesn't the Government opposite do it? Because they don't want one.

The Blakeney Government has opposed the Feed Grains Policy, not because it weakens the Canadian Wheat Board, they already did that themselves with their Feed Grains Commission. They oppose it simply because it has got a floor plan to give some security to the farmer. The NDP don't want security for the farmers especially if it comes from Ottawa.

The Blakeney Government took cheap shots at Ottawa in the Throne Speech and yet the statements in the Throne Speech do not hold up to be true when looked at.

I have given some examples of what the truth is on the Western Economic Opportunities Conference. I have given some examples of what the truth is when it comes to pensions and yet the Blakeney Government in the Throne Speech says little has been accomplished. Freight rates have continued to climb. Sure they have continued to climb. Not rail freight rates in the Province of Saskatchewan, but freight rates under provincial jurisdiction. Truck freight rates are up in Saskatchewan. STC, the people's bus line, has just raised freight rates. Why did the Government opposite not absorb the freight rate increase that STC proposed? Because I say the Government opposite is purposely raising freight rates in the Province of Saskatchewan to make a cheap political issue. And I say they are wrong and

the people know that they are wrong.

The STC announced its freight increase, bread and buns in containers to go up. Newspaper rates to be increased. But what does the Government opposite do? It holds the price on beer. No beer increases, no beer freight rate increases, just bread and butter and newspaper rate increases. The beer increase of course is most interesting after the promise that the Premier has made to the hotel men of Saskatchewan, there would be no liquor increases until after the next provincial election. Thanks to the Opposition the public became aware as to what the Government is really doing.

I think the Government opposite has a schizophrenic approach to government. The Federal Liberal Government reduces taxes, the Provincial Government raises personal taxes. The Federal Government increases exemptions and gives more tax benefits to those in lower incomes, but the Blakeney Government raises motor vehicle licences two years in a row to the highest in the history of the province. The Blakeney Government brings in a Land Bank which means Government ownership of farm land. And as I have said \$30 million in the last two years to buy up prime farm land in the Province of Saskatchewan.

But when a free enterprise plan is offered by the Government in Ottawa, the Blakeney Government takes over so it can control a plan totally different in principle and in concept to theirs. They want to make sure that the Federal Small Farms Development Act fails and they will work and make every effort to make sure it does fail.

The Blakeney Government closed down the Athabasca Pulp Mill. They continued their assistance to the millionaires' retirement benevolent fund by giving \$6 million to Karl Landegger. And that is better than Fred Mendel did, but Fred is only a Canadian and a Saskatchewan resident.

We can assume, I think, from the statements made that the Government opposite opposes a second pulp mill in the Province of Saskatchewan. I am going to refer to a study by the Department of Regional Economic Expansion which says that the Province of Saskatchewan can support a second pulp mill.

"Saskatchewan Timber Resources" (and I am quoting from page 33 of the Department of Regional Economic Study):

are probably sufficient to sustain an additional pulp mill using poplar, spruce and pine chip from sawmills, plywood and veneer plants. Such a development would represent investment of about \$100 million and generate about 450 plant jobs.

The Blakeney Government closed the Choiceland Iron Mine. And because of that action as I have said in this House in the past, the Province of Alberta is considering setting up its own steel industry using iron ore from the Province of Saskatchewan. And yet the DREE study says that Saskatchewan can support, be the basis for the prairie steel industry and they can get iron ore from one of three locations; Choiceland, Saskatchewan; Dillon, Montana or Steep Rock, Ontario. Only one from Saskatchewan. It would mean another 200 to 300 jobs.

As a result of developing Choiceland, IPSCO could then

expand into cold roll, bar and plate and could supply steel for a possible foundry which could perhaps be located in Saskatoon to serve the pulp, potash and oil and gas industries. Because of that development of Choiceland particular opportunities would now appear possible in machine shops, sheet metal products and wire and wire products and heating equipment. All of these new developments might be closely tied to the urban centres of Regina, Saskatoon, Moose Jaw and Prince Albert.

And yet the Blakeney Government cancelled the Choiceland Iron Mine development. They said it was a bad deal. And they said there would be no deal. So they cancelled it shortly after they took office. As I have said they have opposed and they have fought and cancelled the second pulp mill in the Province of Saskatchewan.

Are we to assume from the statements made that the Government opposite opposes a pulp mill and a Choiceland Iron Mine? Yes, of course we assume it and they've told the people that they oppose them. But what does the Premier say about the DREE study that I have just referred to which says the province can support a second pulp mill, that the province should go ahead with the Choiceland Iron Mine. The Premier says he agrees with the views in that study. He agrees with it. Does that now mean that the Government opposite favors a second pulp mill? Favors a Choiceland Iron Mine? Let's make no mistake the people of Saskatchewan will be reminded if you go ahead with the second pulp mill of what your party supporters said throughout the last campaign about pollution and about how uneconomic the present one was. Let's also make no mistake that a Blakeney pulp mill will be just as polluting as the claims they made about a Landegger pulp mill and I say the Government opposite made bad decisions and made a bad deal for the Province of Saskatchewan.

I think now we should take a quick look at energy. It's a topic of interest although as has been made clear there is no energy crisis in the Province of Saskatchewan. The Blakeney Government favors the export tax. They say so in the Throne Speech. But they have made no commitment to return their share of that tax, whatever it may be, to the consumer, but instead intend to tax the consumer indirectly through the proposal set out in the Throne Speech. And yet they complain about a lack of Federal energy policy. They bring in Saskoil and what happens — gas prices go up, oil prices go up, crude oil prices go up, heating oil prices go up — all because the Government opposite brought in its Saskoil policy and its Saskoil Crown corporation. All that the Blakeney Government does is expend its energy and all of its energy whining, crying and complaining to Ottawa and really has no plan to deal with the energy crisis in Saskatchewan and just does not want to admit it and tries to cover it up in the Throne Speech. I say there is no energy crisis in Saskatchewan, there is a crisis in Government but the proper antidote will be applied in the next provincial election.

The Blakeney Government then introduced Human Rights legislation and an Ombudsman, but when things got hot and embarrassing the Blakeney Government forgot principle and a much ballyhooed tradition and kicked out the independent Member from Saskatoon University (Mr. Richards). The myth perpetrated by the Premier, the Independent Member himself and a gullible press was that the Waffles voluntarily left the NDP. Let's make

no mistake, they were out-manoeuvred, out-hustled and kicked right out of the NDP.

Thanks to Ottawa the economy of Saskatchewan is in good shape but NDP memberships were still down drastically, so drastically that the Commonwealth quit publishing the membership numbers. Why were memberships down — because the Waffle were an embarrassment to Allan Blakeney and his Government. But the Waffle knew full well that they would have no political clout if they left the NDP. They saw what happened to the washed out Waffle of Ontario. They knew that they would cease to be a political force if they left the NDP. So the question arises, why did they leave? They left because they were kicked out. But they were only kicked out temporarily and I say that they will be back in after the next provincial election. The Waffle made their own deal. They agreed to help out the NDP by not running candidates in the next provincial election. If the Waffle were really concerned and really serious that consideration could not have arisen. They would not have made that decision. I say the Waffle are not serious. They made a deal to get out for now and they will get back in after the next election. The Waffle are play politicians who are out-manoeuvred by the Premier and the big boys of the NDP.

I say that the Member for Saskatoon University (Mr. Richards) is now playing with his constituents by not resigning from his seat. They elected an NDP Member, not the particular individual, not a Waffler and certainly not an Independent. They elected an NDP and I have got here campaign material which indicates John Richards NDP, New Democratic Party. He refers constantly throughout to the New Democratic Party and he was and the people of that constituency elected an NDP Member. I say the Member for Saskatoon University should resign and allow his constituents to vote on whether they want his group or if they want a serious political party. I say he is doing a disservice to his constituents by using their trust as a forum and a platform for his political views. I have urged my colleagues not to second any of the Waffle motions, unsuccessfully I might add. I say that that is the duty of the Government Members. They denied him the right to speak, they denied him the right to freedom of speech within his own party. I say that the Waffle only have one outlet in the Province of Saskatchewan and one vehicle to implement their political views and that is the NDP and I say that they should get back on side. As I say if they were serious in their position they would not hesitate to run candidates but they have refused to do so. Obviously I am not speaking personally about the Member who is one of the most articulate Members in this House, but I urge him as a matter of principle to either serve as he was elected or resign his seat and let his constituents decide on what type of representation they want. But with the track record of the Government opposite of backing off under the Kramer tantrum for a Cabinet post, the backing off on the attack of the University, the backing from the foreign ownership Bill, there is no doubt but that the Waffle expulsion was a nice agreement to get out for a while.

The NDP have talked paranoically about corruption and yet have made one of the greatest sweetheart deals with one of their own supporters and I refer to the Delta Holdings deal. A corrupt deal that even the party supporters insisted on an investigation. There was the illegal payment to Service Printers and might makes right under the Government opposite when the Legislature was forced to condone such an act. An action as I

have said in the past improperly blamed the Minister of Industry and Commerce who had only been in office for one month and the previous Minister of Industry and Commerce authorized the agreement with Service Printers. There is no doubt that unfair and partisan land deals have been made by the Land Bank. Principals have been appointed to Community Colleges only if they have an NDP membership card. That's an example not of a Blakeney team, that's a Blakeney machine. As I say sweetheart deals to party supporters, that's the sign of the Government opposite.

A Government that attacks Ottawa not because it's a good program but because it's good politics. A Blakeney Government that tries to hide its failures and ignores the problem of inflation in the Throne Speech. A problem that was so great two and one-half months ago the Premier had to pre-empt network programs and I say abuse the air waves of the province to make a political announcement. But where is inflation mentioned in the Throne Speech? It is not, because the Economic Council of Canada has condemned the Government opposite in its approach to government, saying that their type of irresponsible spending is the type of thing that causes inflation. Ever since that report the Government has tried to come up with other issues and forget about inflation.

We in the Liberal Opposition have started to move and we have moved with winning three out of four by-elections with a tremendous victory yesterday to put the Blakeney Government right back where it belongs, and that is in opposition. We will do it by selling the land to the farmers without holding on to it, we will do it with programs that are designed effectively to solve problems and not merely get votes like the hearing aid plan that ignores children with hearing problems. We will put the Blakeney machine back in opposition by moving that unnecessary sledge hammer, the seize and desist power presently held over the heads of the businessmen of Saskatchewan. We will end the policy of appointing Wafflers as business reps to stop them from being an embarrassment in constituencies. We will end the financially irresponsible program, the welfare program, that the Government opposite has proposed. We will commit ourselves to giving the people a voice in the type of government or control agency that they have. We will not bring in new types of government without a vote. We will give the farmers a vote on their future. We are very interested to note the grandstand play of the Minister of Agriculture (Mr. Messer) of last Friday. He brought in a proposed emergency debate, a debate on bringing rapeseed under the Wheat Board.

We know that, based on the track record the Government opposite is merely grandstanding. They have refused the vote to the cities, they refused the vote to the farmers on the Hog Marketing Commission and they don't want a vote on the matter whether to bring rapeseed under the Canadian Wheat Board or not. That was the real intent of that motion. The Government stands clearly condemned for failing and refusing to give the farmers a fair vote and that is really what they are opposed to, not the idea that it is going to weaken the Canadian Wheat Board as they so sanctimoniously say.

SOME HON. MEMBERS: Hear, hear!

MR. LANE: — The real issue is the NDP do not want the farmers to have a vote and I say that I wish that debate had have gone on

because we would have made it clear to the people that that is the issue.

As I say, we will give, we in the Liberal Party will give the farmers a voice and a vote. The people have made it clear in Lakeview that they feel that the Blakeney machine is too big and too powerful. That it does not solve basic problems, that it merely puts dollars and cents before common sense. If this Government can't spend money it is lost and confused and if it does spend money it is lost and confused. I say that the Throne Speech is an unfair document because it does not tell the truth about the Western Economic Opportunities Conference. I say that the Throne Speech is a misleading document in that it tries to cover up the Government opposite's failure to fight inflation. I say that the Throne Speech is a document which asks us to support a Government which has already run out of ideas and for these reasons I cannot support the motion but will support the amendment.

SOME HON. MEMBERS: Hear, hear!

MR. J.G. RICHARDS: (Saskatoon University) — Mr. Speaker, before I launch into my prepared statement I should like to make a few preliminary statements with respect to the situation of the northern forests. I should also like to assure the Member for Lumsden (Mr. Lane) that I will in due course in my speech discuss the question of whether he is right, that I should have resigned my seat or whether I have taken the appropriate, principled action.

Mr. Speaker, the delegation which came down from Prince Albert is primarily concerned that there will be sufficient wood allotment for various producers, co-ops, fence post operations etc., available to them. The Minister has tried to assure them in the rotunda outside and I tried to adjourn the House earlier. I don't think it appropriate to renew this request right now and to get into more procedural wrangling but let me make a couple of very elementary points. One of the best pieces of legislation that was passed in the previous session, Mr. Speaker, to wit an Act to amend The Forest Act, Chapter 41 of the 1973 session earlier in the year. Section 3 reads as follows:

The Lieutenant-Governor-in-Council may make regulations and orders not inconsistent with this Act as the Lieutenant-Governor-in-Council may consider necessary or advisable for the care, development, management, protection, utilization and conservation of Crown timber, of forest lands, provincial forests and Crown timber on provincial lands and for the purpose of carrying out the provisions of this Act according to the obvious intent or to meet cases that may arise in which no express provision is made in this Act.

In other words very broad, sweeping powers, the Provincial Government may, the Lieutenant-Governor-in-Council may enact changes and may enact regulations to assure appropriate forests to these producers, co-ops.

Then in Section 5 there are amendments to say that:

Notwithstanding anything in this or any other Act or

in any management licence, timber permit, timber sale or timber agreement, the Minister may by order amend any forest management plan.

And also carrying on in Section 6:

Subject to subsection (2) but otherwise notwithstanding anything in this or any other Act or any management licence, timber permit, timber sale, or timber agreement, the Lieutenant-Governor-in-Council may in respect of any management licence, timber permit, timber sale or timber agreement except (a) any portion of the licensed area together with the trees and timber thereon, etc., etc.

In other words in this Act, which was passed by us in the previous session there exists full statutory provisions to assure adequate wood supplies to all wood producing co-ops which would like to establish themselves hereinafter.

Mr. Speaker, there exist a number of questions about northern forest development which I think the people of northern Saskatchewan and southern Saskatchewan have not yet had answers to their satisfaction. There are rumors galore with respect to intensive forest developments to be planned for Prince Albert, Meadow Lake and Hudson Bay. But there are many, many questions, Mr. Speaker, about these kinds of developments. Will these developments depend upon subsidies equivalent to those which were involved in making the Prince Albert Pulp Corporation a success? What kind of jobs will be created by these projects? To what extent will they be solely in these three centres; to what extent in the bush and further North? To what extent will there be employment in the bush relative to employment in the plant? To what extent will there be skilled versus unskilled employment created? There are questions of environmental importance. To what extent are the total available cut estimates being used in the planning of these intensive developments adequate? To what extent are they allowed sufficient leeway that there can be new plans developed further down the pipe line as may seem necessary or are we by these series of projects going to totally commit the available cut in northern Saskatchewan allowing no flexibility if one, two, three years hence there are new projects which northern people would like to undertake.

I admit that I don't have the answers to these questions, Mr. Speaker, and certainly the remaining Members on this side of the House don't have the answers because they are merely calling to return to the conditions in 1970 and 71, with the boondoggle over the Meadow Lake pulp mill. If there is a policy for northern Saskatchewan which is inappropriate it is that policy of that Meadow Lake pulp mill. I should have thought that the remnants which are left on this side of the House would have understood that that was not the appropriate policy for northern Saskatchewan.

SOME HON. MEMBERS: Hear, hear!

MR. RICHARDS: — I think that the total irrelevancy of Liberal policies with respect to northern Saskatchewan is hardly worth my debate. It is for that reason that I emphasize these questions which I pose in all seriousness to the Government opposite and to the Minister in charge. I don't think the Saskatchewan

people and in particular the people of northern Saskatchewan are satisfied that they have had the answers to these questions. It is because of that dissatisfaction that you have camped on the doorsteps of the Legislature 100 people from Prince Albert who want to meet with the Cabinet and trust that the Cabinet will see fit to so meet with them.

Mr. Speaker, let me return to my original address as prepared. Mr. Speaker, it is with real regret that I find myself on this side of the House. It was a decision obviously that I made in full knowledge of impending consequences for good and for bad. A decision I made in some difficulty and some anguish over a number of months. I have a great deal of respect for many of the people within the NDP, from Cabinet Ministers, party members and a great deal of respect for the members of my constituency executive and my constituency organization in the old Saskatoon University constituency, for those who have decided to stay within the New Democratic Party for this juncture, because they represented in my opinion the New Democratic Party at its best, humane, tolerant and progressive. It is with real regret that I find myself for the time being separated from them. I feel, however, that the decision made by 300 people in attendance at the Moose Jaw Waffle conference in October, is a symbolic and important decision. A decision that is in some sense tragic, it is something which symbolizes, in my opinion, the end of a valuable and important tradition which has gone on within the New Democratic Party, of it being the party which was the part of the politics of movement, the politics of progress, the politics of socialism. I'll return to this general theme, I'll have a good deal more to say about it.

Mr. Speaker, this is the third successive Throne Speech in which I will have made extensive reference to the question of energy. I almost feel that I am establishing a political tradition. I found that the majority of the Premier's remarks on energy demonstrated the same rational socialism and I can wholeheartedly endorse them. I feel, however, that the Government opposite has suffered from what I shall call the energy schizophrenia. It is an interesting ailment which has afflicted that Government I am afraid and which on the one hand you get the Government sounding like sane, rational socialists and the next breath they are indistinguishable from the Liberal babblings on this side of the House. I hope that this ailment this energy schizophrenia as I have called it has come to an end with the Premier's comments two days ago. Let me review a bit of the case history of this particular ailment and how it has affected the Government opposite. I go back to 1971 when the New Democratic Party in convention passed the following resolution. I shouldn't be too disingenuous about this, Mr. Speaker, I had a fair amount to do in drawing it up:

Be it resolved that the Provincial Government enter the oil industry by establishing an integrated oil company run as a Crown corporation. To that end the Government should: (1) recover direct ownership of proven and unproven oil deposits; (2) create adequate refining capacity; (3) assure an adequate retail outlet network.

In other words, Mr. Speaker, the New Democratic Party in 1971 in Saskatchewan committed itself to nationalize the provincial oil industry from well-head to gas pump.

Now, Mr. Speaker, in March of 1972 elaborating on that

resolution which had been passed the previous December, I made my first pitch in the Throne Speech of that year for the nationalization of the industry. What was the response? Well, there came to me shortly afterwards a memo from a certain civil servant in the Department of Mineral Resources who shall remain unnamed for his own credibility. In my speech I, for example, discussed the inadequate receipts of governments from resource industries. Hardly a particularly controversial theme I would have argued and one which the Premier in some length dealt with in his remarks. This civil servant, however, said:

If a complete study could be carried out on the total oil industry in Canada the revenue to Government would likely equal or exceed revenues accruing to Middle East countries on a per-barrel oil produced basis. .

Now what utter drivel, Mr. Speaker. If that was the quality of input which the Government was receiving from its departmental advisors, and the date of this is April 26, 1972. I went on to talk about profits in the oil industry something which the Premier also discussed at great lengths in his remarks. This was the kind of gibberish which came back from the Department of Mineral Resources:

Imperial realizes about 6 cents on each \$1 of annual sales revenue as earnings or returns of 12 cents on each \$1 of net investment. Perhaps it is an oversimplification on my part in assuming that an investor should expect 6 1/2 per cent return on investments and the Imperial profits are therefore in the order of 5 1/2 per cent on net capital investment.

Assuming, which I don't, that the rate of return on Imperial Oil is only 12 per cent, it's a very naive person who takes these accounting figures as put out by Imperial Oil at face value. But assuming that figure you then have to divide it in half — half of it 6 1/2 per cent goes off to the shareholders and that fictitious entity, Imperial Oil. That fictitious corporate entity is only left with some measly 5 1/2 per cent rate of return. What horribly confused economics was going on in the Department of Mineral Resources, Mr. Speaker. A prime example of this problem of energy schizophrenia which I have raised.

Now, Mr. Speaker, simultaneously as I was making that address, in that Throne Speech Debate in 1972, the relevant Minister was addressing the Saskatchewan Association of the Canadian Petroleum Association and I quote:

I hope you will feel my door is always open and you are always welcome to present your views to me and you will feel I will be a strong and effective voice for you in government.

The new Minister addressed close to 200 industry executives at the meeting. Another case of energy schizophrenia surely, Mr. Speaker. The Minister is, in effect, setting himself up to be the representative within government of the Canadian Petroleum Association. The last thing we need within government is another representative of the Petroleum Association, we have got 15 of them on this side of the House, we don't need any more.

SOME HON. MEMBERS: Hear, hear!

MR. RICHARDS: — In November, 1972, began the first of our recent price increases in oil — 10 cents per barrel. It was a little beginning, it didn't look like anything particularly serious. However, the Department of Mineral Resources, its response: "It will mean an extra one-half million dollars to the provincial revenues annually." The Department of Mineral Resources in talking about these price increases, doesn't talk about what this means in terms of corporate profit and what this means as it is passed along through to the gas pump and higher energy prices. It talks about it in terms of increased royalties to the Provincial Government of one-half million.

Mr. Speaker, in January of 1973, however, the patient showed progress. I am glad to say there were real rays of hope that there was going to be some solution and that there was going to be a cure. At that time in January the Premier spoke to the Canadian Petroleum Association himself and unlike the Minister the previous year he said that he was really displeased with the high profits of the industry, he was displeased with refinery closures. For that I give the Premier credit. That is the kind of message which should be taken to the Canadian Petroleum Association. And also in that month there came mention that there was to be Saskoil legislation coming up in the forthcoming session. In February, 1973, I spoke again on the energy issue. Then in April of 1973 came this piece of legislation. It was an excellent piece of legislation. The Saskatchewan Oil and Gas Corporation Act I salute. In Clause 6 we laid down the powers of this corporation. The corporation may explore for, develop, produce, process, refine, manage, utilize, conserve, store, transport, purchase, sell or otherwise dispose of petroleum, natural gas or any products thereof. In other words Saskoil has the power to fulfil the policy resolutions stated by the New Democratic Party in its 1971 convention to nationalize the provincial industry. Furthermore, the Minister when he was speaking in the debate with respect to that Bill concluded his remarks by saying:

I want to say, Mr. Speaker, the corporation will be created as quickly as enabling legislation is passed.

We had a Bill with wide powers, we had a Bill in which the Minister stated that he was going to act quickly. Things really looked to be shaping up. But what happened? The Minister had also been speaking again I'm afraid to the Southwest Oil Fields Technical Society and the energy schizophrenia took hold again. Mr. Thorson said the Crown corporation should operate in the same manner as other companies. He was going to operate it in the same manner as other companies but it never did act in the same manner as other companies. Because if there is one thing that characterizes the private oil companies it is that they are ruthless, they are ruthless in pursuing profits, in pursuing their control, private corporate control over the energy resources of Saskatchewan, Canada and other places of the world which have energy resources.

But what was happening? Instead of being ruthless in attempting to secure for the people of Saskatchewan new oil and gas discoveries in March 16th, 1973, a press release from the Department of Mineral Resources talking about leaseholds and of sales in that month. It said there were the most leaseholds bought since August of 1965. In other words, Mr. Speaker, while the Government was preparing its legislation with respect to

Saskoil, the Department of Mineral Resources was continuing to lease out promising oil and gas fields to private corporations at a time when they knew oil and gas prices would be increasing. The same occurred in September of this year, Mr. Speaker. On September 11th the Western Oil Industry paid the Department of Mineral Resources \$1.4 million in bonus bids for Crown oil and gas rights, the second highest yield since April, 1967. Again, what we have had, I'm afraid is happening again, Mr. Speaker.

Now in August of 1973 occurred the final of these four major price increases. We had a ten cent increase in November, a 20 cent increase per barrel in January of 1973, a 25 cent per barrel in May and finally a 40 cent per barrel increase in August of that year. And what was the comment for the Department of Mineral Resources and its Minister and I quote:

The Hon. Kim Thorson, Minister of Mineral Resources, commenting on the latest price increase for Saskatchewan crude said: 'The latest increase of 40 cents per barrel will mean an extra \$2 million in provincial revenues from royalties on Crown oil produced in the next eight months of this fiscal year. But further benefit will accrue to the Treasury next year from mineral taxes on free hold oil production which will be based on the increased value of '73 crude.'

Again, Mr. Speaker, the schizophrenia at work. Faced with a situation of blatant oil profiteering the Minister is blathering on about increased provincial royalties. The Government can be bought for \$2 million increases in royalties so what confidence can one have that it is seriously interested in tackling the problems posed by the oil corporations to the people of Saskatchewan.

Mr. Speaker, let me make one other quick observation at this point which may have escaped some of the Members. It is ironic that because of the extent of foreign ownership of Canadian petroleum every increase in oil prices results in a net loss to Canadians. Given any price increase the amount which leaves the country in the form of dividends to foreign shareholders exceeds the increases in provincial and federal income taxes and provincial royalty revenues. This was an estimate made by Messrs. Rosen and Wilkinson in an article which appeared in the Canadian Forum in June-July of this year.

Unfortunately, Mr. Speaker, it appears that to conclude this unhappy chapter that the Saskoil Corporation, as the Leader of the Opposition stated, seems only to exist on the bumper stickers of Waffle cars travelling around the province. As of this date, December 6, 1973, it has yet to appoint an executive director, and that, Mr. Speaker, I consider to be an unfortunate situation. But again, just when times are worst come rays of hope. I should like to extend congratulations to Mr. Ron Duncan for the work that he did on an NDP committee in trying to get to the bottom and discuss and propagandize about the nature of the oil industry. An excellent insert in the Commonwealth appeared, "Saskatchewan Energy", which has also been widely distributed at the NDP convention and the Federation of Labour convention. Again rays of hope.

However, back at the NDP convention we had a perfectly good resolution, for example No. 39:

Be it resolved that Saskatchewan should develop its own resources through assistance of public ownership that will benefit the people of Saskatchewan; that all future development of these resources should be by and through Crown corporations when the province undertakes to nationalize all Saskatchewan resource industries for the good of our citizens.

An excellent, clear stating, hard cutting resolution which was amended by the Hon. Minister to read as follows:

Be it resolved that Saskatchewan should develop its own resources through a system of a mixed economy of public co-operatives and private ownerships but where it appears that the concentration of resource industries and private ownerships has or is likely to result in the less than full benefits to the people of Saskatchewan then the provincial government should take such steps as are necessary to gain public control and ownership to ensure that there is no undue exploitation of our resources.

What that means, Mr. Speaker, God only knows. It is the kind of mishmash and rubbish which is not befitting of a party which claims socialism.

Mr. Speaker, hopefully this schizophrenia is at an end. I should like now to attempt to diagnose the Liberal Opposition. If the Government suffers from an energy schizophrenia which I hope is curable, I'm afraid that the disease of the Liberals is far more serious. I'm afraid that they suffer from the disease that afflicted the Hon. Dr. Pangloss in Voltaire's "Candide" and I hope this isn't too bad a reference for them. Dr. Pangloss suffered from this disease in which he believed that everything was the best of all possible worlds. Any time that anybody did anything to try and change it they could only make it worse. I make one exception. I think that the Hon. Dave Boldt has no illusions about this being the best of all possible worlds, he thinks it is the worst of all possible worlds although he also agrees with the Members on this side that any change made to improve it will doubtless make it worse.

Now, Mr. Speaker, the Liberals — I gave them a certain credit in earlier times for what I called honest colonialism. Faced with the announced closure of the Imperial Refinery in Regina, the Liberals stated surely the Government's approach to the Imperial Oil affair — this was after the closure — should be to sit down with the company like reasonable men, try to negotiate terms whereby Imperial Oil will stay in Regina and guarantee the employment of the 160 men employed. This was at a time when the refinery was being closed. The Liberals' attitude was, we have no power in the Provincial Government, we are powerless to do anything so let's politely go and sit down with Imperial Oil and hope that they will give us a few crumbs and maybe, perhaps with sufficient subsidies, maybe perhaps they will keep open their refinery, maybe perhaps, please. Now that had a certain truth to it. It did at least recognize the power of the oil corporation.

We come now — and I think this is quite illuminating — to the performance of the Dr. Pangloss syndrome when it came to the consideration of that Saskoil legislation last spring. Mr. Guy: "It is a complete sell-out to the Wafflers." Now if

that is a complete sell-out to the Wafflers, a corporation which is yet to appoint an executive director, we too can be bought for a pretty low price. Then Mr. Guy goes on to say:

There is absolutely no justification for the Government of Saskatchewan entering this high-risk and competitive industry at this time on the basis that the industry is not pulling its own weight in our province.

Does the Hon. Member from Athabasca still believe, faced with the evidence presented by the Premier opposite, faced with the corporate pricing, faced with the inadequate planning of the private oil corporations that the oil industry isn't pulling its own weight? Is the Pangloss syndrome so severe that even faced with the energy crisis that we now have, he still believes this is the best of all possible worlds and that any intervention by Government is bound to make it worse?

Mr. Speaker, we can proceed to what the Hon. Leader of the Opposition (Mr. Steuart) had to say in that debate. I think this is quite illuminating as well. This is the Hon. Mr. Steuart:

It has been pointed out before by speakers from this side and people in the oil industry that taking into consideration normal interest on the money invested, that while there has been a profit it hasn't been huge, it hasn't been extraordinary, it hasn't been anything that could be criticized by fair-minded people.

Does the Hon. Leader of the Opposition really believe the profit figures as they have been accruing to the oil industry aren't exorbitant. I should like if the Member hasn't read it and if he would consider the source sufficiently respectable, I would go back to Oil Week, the trade journal of the oil industry from which I have repeatedly quoted and it's not known for its Waffle sympathy. In fact, it probably thinks that Donald Macdonald is a communist. I give their figures for the profits earned on western Canadian oil and gas, the crude oil.

MR. STEUART: — It doesn't include Saskatchewan.

MR. RICHARDS: — It includes Saskatchewan, Dave. We'll come back and we'll talk about that too some more. I thought you might want to have a broader perspective but given the obvious ignorance displayed by that remark to the Legislature you need a bit of broadening. In 1969, \$75 million; 1970 — \$214 million; 1971 — \$296 million; 1972 — \$476 million and the estimate for 1973 an incredible \$988 million. We have had a 13 fold increase since 1969 in profits earned by the western Canadian oil and gas industry.

Mr. Speaker, what about the federal level? I think we have to give first credit to Federal Liberals for having seen fit to publish an energy policy for Canada, even if there is no policy in it. It is a statement in 500 long, lengthy pages about the problem and once one has seen the problem one can hopefully begin to see the solution. I think we have to give them credit that they began, albeit hesitatingly, to take into consideration the problem of the profits which are being created by these windfall increases in prices. The oil people did increase prices and the Canadian Government did impose the export tax

of \$1.90.

I think also Mr. Macdonald deserves credit that he managed to state in the House, a short while ago that a part of the crisis was due to the clauses in contracts which would allow the oil corporations to divert imports to Canada to places where it might be more profitable. In other words, the Minister hinted at the fact that this energy crisis is not only caused by the Arabs in their cutbacks in the Middle East War, it is also caused by the incompetence of the long-range planning of the multinational oil corporations and the various devices which they have at their command to hold to ransom the public. For all of these things, Mr. Macdonald deserves credit. Of course one can't go too far for the export taxes are all going to come off on January 30. The Government as the Premier said has no real policy, the Conservatives have no real policy and quite frankly I am not even sure what the NDP's policy is.

The federal NDP convention's original draft on the energy resolution was drawn at the last minute, it was brought back in at the last minute and it talks a great deal about control, but it never seriously gets down to what I think Members opposite will agree with me, that the only rational solution to the crisis of energy which we face in Canada is the complete nationalization of the energy industry. Here in Saskatchewan if we took our job seriously we would be establishing a precedent by provincializing the oil industry, an appropriate precedent for the later nationalization of the industry across the country.

I make again the parallel with Medicare — we introduced Medicare, it was fought by the Members here, it was fought by the medical profession, kicking and screaming, but the rest of the country followed suit within the following decade. If we could succeed in nationalizing the provincial oil industry, kicking and screaming, the rest of the country would certainly follow suit and that would be the kind of precedent which would influence far more heavily the rest of the country than a thousand speeches for Saskoil that I could possibly make.

Mr. Speaker, is it so far away, is it something which is so radical which cannot be done, which the Canadian people will not understand?

Let me refer to a Gallup poll in May of 1973. The question asked of the people was: The US is currently facing a shortage of energy resources such as heating oil and gas, do you think in view of this the Canadian Government should nationalize our energy resources such as oil and gas — that is own and operate them — or do you think private enterprise should still control them as at present? That was the question. Overall 48 per cent of those polled said they were in favor of nationalizing the energy industry in Canada, against only 36 per cent who were in favor of leaving it in the hands of private enterprise. It might be interesting to the Members here to note what the results were among the Liberal voters — 47 per cent of Liberal voters were in favor of nationalizing the industry and only 38 per cent of the Liberal voters were against. As for the NDP, 69 per cent in favor, 22 per cent against.

Mr. Speaker, let me finally now come to the Throne Speech and what it explicitly states with respect to energy. The measures which the Government proposes are to incorporate the following principles:

1. Control of the oil resources as with other basic resources must be firmly vested in the people of Saskatchewan.
2. Future supplies of petroleum for Saskatchewan farmers and other Saskatchewan users must be assured.
3. Increases in Saskatchewan wholesale prices for petroleum products which do not reflect increases in the cost of operations must be limited.
4. Future unearned increments in crude oil prices over and above the level of prices which have prevailed during the immediate past period must be retained for the people of Saskatchewan.
5. The returns from producing lands owned by farmers and other small holders of freehold acreages should not be disturbed.
6. Oil exploration in Saskatchewan should be stepped up over the low exploration levels of the past several years.

I want to home in on numbers 3 and 4, Mr. Speaker. The Premier elaborated on them. If — the Premier elaborated on them and I don't think I need to go into any further discussion about the state of profitability in the industry — there were no Federal export tax, if there were no price freeze, if the price of Saskatchewan crude were allowed to float up to world levels, it would be something in the order of \$6.50 per barrel. If we can take as accurate the cost estimates used by Oil Week which includes exploration, development drilling, land acquisition, producing facilities, producing costs, provincial royalties, taxes and others, and if we allow for a 13-14 per cent escalation over the figures they gave last year we might say that the cost per barrel was in the order of \$1.70 which would leave a clear profit of \$4.80 a barrel, a total profit of \$412 million on the current 86 million barrels per year of Saskatchewan production. But, of course, the price has been frozen at \$3.40 very roughly, which is 95 cents higher than it was a year ago. Even at this level the estimate using this \$1.70 cost, the estimates of profits from the Saskatchewan oil industry is \$146 million.

Mr. Speaker, if we prevent any future price increases, we are allowing the corporation a level of \$146 million profits which are something in the order of 50 per cent higher than they were a year ago, prior to their \$82 million increase resulting from the 95 cent per barrel increase in prices which they have been allowed.

I think I should like to quote again as I have quoted before a most eloquent passage from David Cass-Beggs, a passage referring to the question of when will we get publicly owned energy industry in Canada:

It is logical to suppose that as the need arises the concept of public ownership will be extended into other aspects of the energy industry and that this will apply to the major gas systems, the major pipe lines and the major oil, gas, coal and nuclear reserves. I suggest the only open question is when will the need arise. Perhaps the answer is at such time as the pressure to establish

and conform to a national energy plan that will meet the needs of the environment and solve the problems of achieving an energy balance exceeds the ability of the energy industry in its several parts to co-operate, to plan and to conform without the imposition of intolerable control. The time scale may extend over a few decades or may be much shorter than one thinks. Public concern is increasing at an astonishing rate, governments will be forced to achieve by one means or another the planned energy use in conformity with energy environmental demands. The simple solution will be the integration of the energy industry under unified public control and an instruction to the industry to work out its destiny within certain basic terms of reference. The hard way will be to persuade the segmented industry and its foreign owners to accept an overall plan that is in the public interest and survive under a complexity of controls such as those which are developing today in the United States.

I am not raising this issue with any doctrinaire ideological approach but from experience with a practical situation, observation of current developments. The trends that one sees today do not allay the fears that industry-based plans will not be for the benefit of the consuming public. Among the alarming aspects are the facts that the oil and gas industry is largely controlled outside Canada, that the control is centred in very few multinational companies which have a history of political coercion. These companies are extending their operations into other energy fields such as coal, not to facilitate planning in the interests of the public but to eliminate competition.

Mr. Speaker, the point which David Cass-Beggs is making is that to try and achieve rational national energy policies by a hodgepodge of regulations has got to be 'bloody' difficult. I think that is precisely where we are heading. The Provincial Government has stated that it is prepared to stop future increases by expanding the powers of an oil and gas conservation board. The Federal Government has got a \$1.90 export tax and controls on exports. We have got various alternate and countervailing legislation to be implemented in Alberta. We have got precisely the situation which Cass-Beggs says is going to be the most difficult in order to bring about a rational solution.

At times before, I have discussed the desirability of nationalizing the industry, I think it is the only way to stop the profiteering; to get the regional development for Saskatchewan in terms of secondary processing of oil here with a location of refineries in Saskatchewan; to make sure that there is adequate consideration of long-run ecological concerns and fourthly, in order to set precedents for public Canadian ownership of the key industry of this country.

Can it be done? This is the question which is always posed by Members on this side. I would argue that it can. I could go through legal discussion, and I am sure they have had legal opinion prepared on it. I should like to summarize from a 60 page paper entitled Constitutional Aspects of the Nationalization of the Saskatchewan Oil Industry, prepared in the Law College in Saskatoon this spring. Their concluding remarks are:

It is submitted that as proprietor of the vast majority

of oil and natural gas interests in Saskatchewan the Provincial Government can appropriate to itself as owner the remaining oil and gas reserves of the province. In so doing the province would have to face several constitutional problems, the necessity to make it express in the legislation that private property rights were being expropriated, the fiasco created by the British Columbia Power case, the fragmentation of some interests by the historical anachronisms of the rights accorded to the Hudson's Bay Company and railroads, compensation of private interests, the possibility of federal intervention by making use of its powers under Section 92(10) of the British North America Act in taking over at the well-head as works for the general advantage of the Dominion in the midst of a continental energy crisis.

There are certainly constitutional problems, Mr. Speaker, far be it for me to deny them.

I think, however, it is worth pointing out again a point made by Eric Kierans, an upstanding Member of the Liberal Party. Eric Kierans emphasized in his report for Manitoba that in the vast majority of cases the provincial governments are already phenomenal owners of the resources lying within their province, that given the amendments to the BNA Act in 1930 with provincial jurisdiction over these resources the Crown and the provinces became their owners. Take Saskatchewan, for example, approximately 71 per cent of oil is under Crown lease, 29 per cent free hold. Nominally the Saskatchewan people own 70 per cent of the provincial oil, nominally that is, obviously the private corporations at present consider these leases to be as good as complete private ownership.

Technical problems I don't think are insurmountable. We can go back and refer to the example of the co-op refinery in the mid 1930s which got going during the time of depression, with the opposition of the oil companies, with minimal capital raised of \$32,000 raised during the summer of 1934. They managed to make a go of it, and incidentally that is the only sizeable Canadian owned refinery in the country. It is not legal problems, I would submit, Mr. Speaker, it is not technical problems, it is political problems which are going to determine whether or not Saskatchewan people are going to have their oil industry nationalized. It is a political question of whether or not the issue of nationalizing the industry is taken before the people in a credible and comprehensive manner, such that it becomes — I would submit — the major issue of the 1975 provincial election. I submit there is no issue more pressing before Saskatchewan and the people of Canada. If the New Democratic Party had about it a commitment to reform and a commitment to the traditions of the CCF it would be prepared to make that issue the issue of the 1975 election.

Mr. Speaker, let me come from the high plane of discussing nationalizing the industry to something which I consider equally important, but something at a more local level. On November 14th the city council in Saskatoon passed a resolution that:

Whereas there have been expressions of concern from all segments of the economy including the Government since the energy and fuel shortage, and whereas a broader use of public transportation could substantially alleviate the problems, therefor be it resolved the council urge the

Government of Canada and the Government of the Province of Saskatchewan to initiate and financially support such programs which would encourage the use of public transportation facilities.

I think that resolution is something which we ought to act upon in this Legislature. Here is one minor reform which we could undertake easily with all the revenues that we are going to get when we stop the oil corporations from increasing their prices any further. I submit that we should negotiate with the local governments of Saskatchewan, perhaps on a 50-50 sharing basis the complete elimination of all fares on transit systems in the province. The total revenues which were taken in, estimated from 1973 of the Saskatoon Transit System for example are to be 2.4 million. Ignoring the obvious problem about increased utilization should we proceed to make the transportation free, a 50-50 sharing basis means a provincial expenditure of 1.2 million in Saskatoon. Given the \$40 million or \$50 million which we annually expend as capital for highway construction, this sum fades into insignificance and obviously the highway construction amounts to a basic subsidy to the private automobile, why can't we extend an analogous subsidy to the public transport. This is obviously a reform which would be based upon helping the poor. It tends to be the poor who don't have private vehicles. I don't see why it shouldn't be extended to the provincial bus system. I might propose that we reduce by 50 per cent the fares on the Saskatchewan Transportation Corporation. That corporation earned an outrageous profit last year; \$500,000 on a capital of \$1.5 million, 30 per cent profit. Why don't we reduce the . . . yes, they did, they increased the freight rates, so I'm going to have to ask the Minister one day why he managed to do that, if he wasn't satisfied with 30 per cent rate of return.

Now, Mr. Speaker, why couldn't we reduce by 50 per cent the rates of Saskatchewan Transportation Corporation. Total revenue was in the order of \$3.6 million. That would mean 1.8 million would have to be expended, that 1.8 million would be lost, given their profits of \$500,000, 1.3 million would have to be taken from the Treasury to show that the corporation wasn't running in the red. Obviously then we would have certain advantages here because surely they have given the elasticities which doubtless would get more people travelling on the buses if we lower the rate and having travelled back and forth between Saskatoon and Regina extensively, Mr. Speaker, on the bus system I am a great advocate of that use of means of public transport.

Here I am suggesting two very simple reforms that we might undertake if the total measure of nationalizing the provincial oil industry escapes the Members opposite as something too ambitious.

Let me turn to another troubling and vexing aspect of resources in Saskatchewan, the potash industry. I have discussed this issue before and I shall doubtless be discussing it again. I think the best introduction to the issue can only be that of the late Hon. Ross Thatcher who in 1969 stated and I quote:

Seldom in the economic annals of Canada have we seen such responsible companies get into such an economic mess.

AN HON. MEMBER: — Where are you quoting from?

MR. RICHARDS: — Oh, I quote the Premier extensively in here. One of our best sources in Next Year Country.

Now I think that obviously in 1973 the silver lining on the cloud of world hunger has been the increased prices and increased demands on fertilizer which has resulted in increased quotas of Saskatchewan mines from the stagnation levels in which they remained in the late 1960s and early 1970s. However, the economic mess is hardly over and the Premier made reference to it when he discussed that Otto Lang had entered into the case before the courts of Canada versus the Government of Saskatchewan, challenging the constitutionality of the whole conservation board regulations.

Mr. Speaker, I find that the history of the potash conservation board staggers the imagination. It was a cartel arrangement, no denying it, introduced by the provincial Liberal Government in 1969 which increased the floor of the price of potash by 70 per cent, curtailed Saskatchewan production to prevent invading the American market. We vigorously denounced it at the time in the New Democratic Party and I think Woodrow Lloyd's comment summed this up quite adequately. Woodrow Lloyd stated at the time:

It is not the responsibility of the Saskatchewan Government to make the world safe for US potash.

In the 1971 New Deal for People the Saskatchewan NDP committed itself to end this cartel. But, obviously this was not a cartel which had just been introduced by the provincial Liberals. This had been at the initiation of Duval and International Minerals and Chemicals. When the NDP came to power, however, far from taking seriously the question of breaking down that cartel arrangement within six months of coming to office the Hon. Ted Bowerman was saying things such as the following:

The Saskatchewan Government believes in the spirit, intent and purpose of the potash conservation regulations.

Within six months of having come to office the Government had seemingly abandoned all attempts to arrive at an alternative potash policy.

Furthermore, the situation was aggravated by the demands of Sylvite and Kalium to the effect that the prorationing scheme should be made a flat quota according to the capacity of the mine. The Liberals had allowed that there would be allowances made for captive markets. On that basis Central Canada which consists of 51 per cent Noranda and 49 per cent ownership by CF Industries and American Farm Co-op, said that they had gone into business in order to break the American cartel control. Given this alleged reform of flat-rate quotas which resulted in a third reduction of the quota for Central Canada in 1973-74 relative to 1972-73, they went to court, first, asking for a mandamus to try and get it changed, then asking for damages based on the unconstitutionality of regulations involved. We have got ourselves in a pretty pickle, Mr. Speaker. We have now got a situation in which a Canadian company is challenging the constitutionality of a cartel arrangement imposed by a

provincial Liberal Government defending that cartel arrangement which the provincial NDP criticized vehemently when in opposition and is now the NDP Government. We've got the Federal Liberal Government entering in on this case in order to challenge the policy introduced by a previous Liberal Government, which, of course, the provincial NDP is now defending.

I admit that the problems are hugely complex. I admit that the designing of an alternate policy will require many man-hours of work in thinking, etc., but I submit that because the Government failed to do this we've arrived at this unhappy situation which, as the Premier has noted in his remarks, could well result in the setting of constitutional precedents in the courts making it impossible for the Provincial Government to regulate adequately the oil industry and thus the ramifications extend out in all directions. Because of the failure to tackle the resource question head-on the Provincial Government now finds itself in this embarrassing situation of defending a potash cartel and hoping against hope that there won't be unfortunate precedents established making it impossible to use an oil and gas conservation board.

I should like to say, however, how pleased I am to see that there is going to be a doubling of the prorationing fee from 60 cents to \$1.20 for potash. That will result in \$10 million approximately in provincial revenue according to the Minister. That should be compared, of course, with the fact that potash revenue will have increased since 1972 when it was \$146 to the level of \$180 to \$200 million. There has been a \$40 to \$50 million increase in revenue earned by the potash industry and let us recall what were the profits earned by the potash industry at the old level.

In 1971 on sales of \$44.6 million, International Minerals and Chemicals Corporation declared profits, before taxes, of \$17.6 million; they had income taxes of \$6.2 million, all of which except a nominal \$1,000 they deferred. If IMC could earn a rate of profit of 40 per cent on sales, \$17 million on sales of \$44.6 million in 1971, what is IMC earning now? What are the other companies earning now, now that quotas have been substantially increased?

The Minister has declared that he is going to force disclosure of this corporate income to the Provincial Government, and I would trust that he would also see fit to disclose this information to the Saskatchewan people.

Mr. Speaker, I should like to turn briefly to a few other issues before I conclude. I should like to discuss the question of the Department of Northern Saskatchewan. I should like to discuss a few questions with respect to agriculture and I beg leave to call it 5:30 and resume after at 7:00 o'clock.

Mr. Speaker, before we called it 5:30 I was just finished my discussion, at some length I must admit, about the question of resource policy in the province. Maybe it would be useful, before I proceed any further to summarize it in five points:

- (i) I am pleased that the Government is belatedly facing up to the disastrous state of the oil and gas industry under private planning and the existence of a vacuum of public policy;

(ii) I think that regulation is unlikely to work for reasons that I stated previously and I think that public ownership is desperately needed;

(iii) I can approve the curtailment in production in order to ensure future use and future production later on;

(iv) The Premier stated in his remarks and I quote:

We will have a baseline of the prices which have prevailed over the immediate past period and over and above that baseline we will act to recapture for the people of Saskatchewan the great bulk of the unearned profits.

I am pleased that the Government will step in if the Federal Government has quite likely abandoned the field of regulation, but the question remains, what about the \$150 million profits which the corporations are earning right now in Saskatchewan given their 95 cents per barrel increases since 1972?

(v) I feel that the failure to develop alternate potash policies, in part responsible for the legal mess in which the province finds itself with respect to Central Canada challenging the constitutionality of regulations under the Potash Conservation Board.

If the Government intends to use such regulations and such boards in order to protect the interests of the people of Saskatchewan, they are hardly setting a good case for it if they continue to defend the use of these regulations strictly in the corporate interest, which is basically what the Potash Conservation Board has been all about, and so faced with a choice of the lesser of two evils, one might well find oneself supporting the federal position on the case of the constitutionality of the Potash Conservation Board regulations knowing how the use has been made to date of them.

Mr. Speaker, turning from the question of resources, I should like briefly to mention the Department of Northern Saskatchewan.

I felt very saddened by the exchange which occurred the other day in which the Liberals claimed that the Métis Society hated the NDP and the NDP response was to say that the Métis Society hates the Liberals more. If we've got to a situation in which it is merely a question of who is the lesser of the two evils, we haven't got a great deal of progress in northern Saskatchewan. I think, however, that that's a grossly simplified and unworthy debate to get into — who's more hated in the North. I think the Department of Northern Saskatchewan has to its credit that it has begun to break the feeling of fatalism among people in the North, both the white overlord and native underling, but it is inevitable that there will be a continuing system of colonial rule. The Department of Northern Saskatchewan brought in a small number of conscientious civil servants and initiated some programs which have allowed for some native participation, and consequently to its credit there is a great deal of wakening going on of which the delegation from Prince Albert is but one example, the delegation which is here today, which unfortunately we have not been able to hear in the Legislature.

However, if the Government is seriously intent upon the removal of the northern Saskatchewan area from its colonial status why, I ask, has it given the Deputy Ministership to the man who is responsible, as much as any, in the old Department of Natural Resources for creating that colonial empire in Mr. Wilf Churchman? The old DNR which sat over the sell-out of the forest resources under the Liberals in the 1960s, which kept check on the wildlife and the game, and thirdly, ran the northern colony, in approximately that order of priority.

It seems that the Department of Northern Saskatchewan has been unable to eradicate the rampant and endemic corruption which has unfortunately characterized northern Saskatchewan. As a sad little symbol of that when for example Next Year Country discussed the problem, by illustration, the incident of a certain senior civil servant using the DNS heavy equipment shop in Prince Albert in order to undertake repairs on his own boat — on his own boat, the response was a big sign over the DNS shop “Employees Only” so that no one is going to find out the next time that the boat is in there. That’s not hardly a sufficient response.

I discussed briefly at the beginning the question of forest developments in the North and I repeat again there remain these very serious questions about the advisability of the maximum sustainable cut estimates being used and whether there is sufficient flexibility being allowed to accommodate the kind of producer co-ops which the people down from Prince Albert are talking about today.

Another area about which I am going to have more to say concerns a very significant issue which has become known as ‘women’s issues’ and that is day care centres. There is a Motion, in fact the first Motion on the Order Paper, concerns a program of universal day care and I advise Members that there will be another delegation down here that day with a petition and a good number of young children. Probably they will be equally as obstreperous as the people who came from Prince Albert today. So, I don’t want to, at this time, talk about the obvious need for universal day care programs, but it is something which I was saddened to see non-existent in the Throne Speech.

And another question which I could sort of level with the Minister with whom I worked closely as Legislative Secretary, I hope very soon there is going to be a director of The Family Planning Program, which is obviously a program of some importance and which I had some involvement in while I was serving in that capacity.

Mr. Speaker, I was admittedly quite critical of the Government with respect to resource policies and I trust that it will be taken in the appropriate vein, my accusation of energy schizophrenia. However, there are some other areas where I think the Government deserves considerable credit.

I think that the community Legal Aid Clinic program is admirable in concept and I trust that it will receive the unambiguous and universal support by Members of this Legislature.

Secondly, the Department of Agriculture talked about introducing machinery testing and the Bill was tabled for first

reading today. Another excellent program, in my view. In fact, the entire Department of Agriculture has earned my respect in the two years that I have been in this Legislature.

SOME HON. MEMBERS: Hear, hear!

MR. RICHARDS: — The people who have led that Department have seemed to me to manifest a level of concern about getting to the bottom of what we politicians are all too often prone to talk about merely in rhetorical terms, namely, rural development. Politicians are great about talking about returning people to the land, about stopping the out migration, about bemoaning the problems of declining rural communities.

The Department of Agriculture has seen fit to try and investigate the possibilities of labor intensive agricultural industries, FarmStart emphasizing the use of livestock production, the Land Bank being particularly concerned about the transfer from one generation to another to try to provide alternate means which would not really result in consolidation at the time of transfer into larger and larger holdings.

Both of these programs, I think, are admirable programs and the Department does deserve credit for having kept foremost in its mind the needs of labor intensive alternatives. However, I would argue that although the Department has begun the process and the Department has indicated the right direction, there is a need for much broader scope and that any government policies should conceive of total programs which in some sense at the most at this time must seem far-fetched because of their scope. I would argue, for example, that we should try and get the hundreds of millions which are involved in profits from the resource industry and we should consciously conceive of that as a means to buy back the most important resource of the province, namely the province's land, which is conservatively estimated at a good \$4 billion in value. That is a program of such scope and magnitude that maybe it seems irrelevant to be posing it at this time, but I think it is precisely with programs of such magnitude that the government gains significance.

Secondly, if we did have a program which did result in massive repurchase for the public of land, obviously this raises all the questions of public land ownership and the Members here on this side will be quick to talk about stifling individual initiative. However, I would submit that it's only ultimately going to be through a publicly owned land scheme that we are going to be able to preserve a combination of private farming and/or co-op farming and stock corporate farming in this province. As these are the major decisions, which people have to make in this province in this decade, and we must not turn back dismayed by small amounts of opposition which I can see to such programs as the foreign ownership of land, resulting in the withdrawal of that Bill. I would argue furthermore that if we are concerned about drastic rural reorganization we would have drastically to overhaul rural organization. Scrap rural municipalities which are obviously inefficient units of rural government. We have to have some form of county government with 5,000 to 10,000 people I would argue in a unit, sufficiently large that it could effectively administer land transfers in its regions, administer the Land Bank locally, undertake integrated health services in its region, set up various forms of farm co-ops, etc., machinery co-ops.

In conclusion, Mr. Speaker, I want to return to the theme which I made at the very beginning in which I stated that I was saddened to find myself on this side of the House and why in general terms I felt that it was the only decision to make on principle.

I should like, in introducing this subject, to point to a speech from the Premier, a speech which has gone really unnoticed and does deserve an analysis. It was an address which the Premier made to the Institute of the Public Administration of Canada, 7th September, 1971 — the relationship between provincial ministers and their deputy ministers. In that speech the Premier defined the appropriate role of the Minister as:

- (i) to interpret and explain policies of the department to the public;
- (ii) to interpret to his departmental officials public reactions to the department's policy.

The clear implication of the Premier's remarks are that it not the Minister himself who is the initiator of policy within his department. And the Premier goes on further;

For better or worse, our system of government is a democracy, not a technocracy. Accordingly, an elected government is involved with providing leadership in developing policies which are in the range of public acceptability.

In my view of democracy we do not impose policies which go outside this range. This is true, even though from a technical point of view and in the eyes of the officials who design them, the policies which the public reject happen to be superior.

Now, at one level I couldn't agree more. I agree that policies have to be public to be acceptable. But the clear implication again is that the people who are at the cutting edge of progress are the officials, the advisors, the bureaucrats within the government whose ideas must be mediated by wise politicians who know the limit, the range of public acceptability. I refer back to that speech I made back in 1972, my first Throne Speech contribution, in which I talked about nationalizing the oil industry. Response of the bureaucrats to that was certainly not progress and not being held back by a politician and I could refer to the Gallup poll which says that 48 per cent of Canadians are in favor of nationalizing the energy industry in Canada. Surely the case is not hard and fast, that it is the bureaucrat and the professional who has the bright ideas, who wants to go forward and who is constrained by some irrational web of public opposition which the politician can understand only.

Surely the role of a political party is what's missing in the Premier's statement. I'm not trying to quote him out of context, I'm not trying to belittle the Premier, I greatly respect his intellect and respect the work that he is trying to do. But, I think the Premier fails to understand the importance of a party to lead, to be an advocate of change that has not yet achieved consensus support and to view its job as a countervailing force to corporate power. I have some

support for that opinion. I would refer to the ad which appeared in the Commonwealth in September. An ad which was signed by a fair number of prominent people in the New Democratic Party, which talked about the nature of the party as it existed now and which I quote:

Only a narrow viewpoint within our party gains expression, other points of view are effectively stifled. Little effort is put into educational and policy development. The young and others with radical ideas become frustrated and disillusioned, the party stagnates because necessary internal debate is discouraged.

I feel that's true and it's in the context of that that I made my own decision, my decision to cross the floor and sit as an Independent.

At this time it might be appropriate to say a few words in response to the Member from Lumsden, Mr. Lane, who has called on me to resign.

He accused me of play politics. He accused the Waffle of play politics. That we weren't serious about the issues we talked about, that I wasn't serious about politics myself. I submit, Mr. Speaker, that's a cheap attack. I made the decision to cross the floor with full knowledge of the probable implications and a full realization that it will be a great deal more difficult for me to be re-elected as an independent, as a socialist and as a member of the New Democratic Party, if indeed I seek re-election. I can assure the Member from Lumsden that the Waffle is not abandoning electoral politics and that the Waffle is most seriously considering the fielding of a dozen or so candidates in the 1975 election. I assure the Member that there was a great deal of serious consideration as to what was involved in trying to launch a new socialist movement at this time. A full realization that the New Democratic Party has much to recommend it, that there are a great number of reforms which we value which the party instituted and that it was a very delicate balance of the pros and cons.

Let me perhaps try and review in our perspective what went on in the New Democratic Party since the emergence of the Waffle in 1969. In our opinion the periods from 1969 to '71 was a period of revitalization within the party. It was a period characterized by the Waffle Manifesto and it parallels to the Regina Manifesto. It was a period in which Don Mitchell put forward an excellent campaign for the provincial leadership of the New Democratic Party, it was a period in which James Laxer presented himself for the federal leadership and won in the final ballot, 37 per cent of the vote. It was a time in which the New Democratic Party was in ferment, was discussing seriously to an extent that I don't think could happen for many decades, women's rights, the questions of Canadian economic independence, the question of public ownership of resource industries, and the issues which characterize socialism in the 1970s.

Since 1971, however, Mr. Speaker, there's been a debilitating polarization. That's the word I used before and I think it describes the situation accurately. A debilitating polarization which as the Member from Watrous (Mr. Cody) points out, the Waffle was in part responsible for. It was a polarization in which the issues were no longer being seriously debated but increasingly the debate was a question of whether Waffler one

did something evil to non-Waffler two and non-Waffler three did something evil to Waffler four, in which the dynamic of polarization and a personal confrontation replaced the serious debate about issues. A good example of that was the controversy over the Regina Community Clinic this spring.

It was a situation in which Stephen Lewis and several heads of the American Labour organization such as the United Auto Workers and McDermot purged the Waffle in Ontario. And in that context 300 people assembled in Moose Jaw in October of this year and determined reluctantly that their job had to be outside the New Democratic Party for this time. Whether it is possible to achieve within one organization the advocacy of change and the administration of government, I don't know. Maybe it is impossible, maybe it was inevitable, the break-up which occurred in October of this year. I'd hoped when I was elected in 1971 that it would not be impossible. I viewed entering into politics as in some sense enlarging the classroom. My profession is as a teacher, and I was entering politics and I viewed my job in much the same way, once I entered politics. Unfortunately, things did not evolve that way. I wish that the healthy tension which existed in 1971 had been able to persist and were I convinced that things had changed within the New Democratic Party I would argue that it would be appropriate for Waffle members to return. But with the Federal NDP committed in some sense to junior partnership in a coalition with Trudeau, perhaps something which will fall apart next year, with the provincial NDP in Manitoba and Saskatchewan fairly set upon the centre of the political stage, is that a serious possibility? In its day on its issues the CCF led the reforms which resulted in the creation of the welfare state in Canada. Hospitalization, unemployment insurance, old age pension, Medicare. These were programs which were originally championed by the CCF and its predecessors such as Woodsworth in the Federal House of Commons. But I feel that in 1973 the NDP is not playing the analogous role upon the issues which characterize the 1970s. And despite, Mr. Speaker, that his document is forty years old, despite its being dated, I think that some of the passages from the Regina Manifesto are an appropriate manifesto for me.

The Manifesto begins with the following:

Aim to replace the present capitalist system with its inherent injustice of humanity by a social order from which the domination and exploitation of one class by another will be eliminated, in which economic planning will supersede unregulated private enterprise and competition, in which genuine democratic self-government based upon economic equality will be possible. The present order is marked by glaring inequalities of wealth and opportunity, chaotic waste and instability.

It closes:

No CCF government will rest content until it has eradicated capitalism and put into operation the full program of socialized planning which will lead to the establishment in Canada of the Co-operative Commonwealth.

Mr. Speaker, those words are forty years old. There are many issues in the Regina Manifesto which are not dealt with. It is not a blueprint of definitive socialist politics for the 1970s, but I feel that the NDP has abandoned, in a sense,

that document. I ask the Members opposite to consider seriously whether they think those passages I quoted seriously characterize their Government, their party now and maybe, Mr. Speaker, the time has come that the socialists have to go into the wilderness and start the very serious job of trying in Saskatchewan, Ontario and across the country to build a new socialist party.

Mr. Speaker, in conclusion, I should like to move an amendment and seconded by Mr. H.E. Coupland (Meadow Lake), a sub-amendment to the amendment which was moved by the Hon. Mr. Steuart (Prince Albert West). Before I read it, I might state the following. I express my thanks to the Liberal Party that they see fit, although they obviously disagree with the intent, the substance of this motion, to second it in order that it could be debated.

I move that all the words after the word “Assembly” be deleted from the amendment and the following substituted therefor:

Congratulate the Government of Saskatchewan for recognizing the problems posed to the people of Saskatchewan by the excessive profiteering and inadequate planning of the multinational oil corporations and is in favor of measures being taken to stop further oil price increases; however this Assembly regrets that the Provincial Government has allowed oil corporations to profit from unjustified price increases since November, 1972, and urges the Government to implement the policy, adopted in 1971 by the Saskatchewan New Democratic Party convention, calling for the nationalization of the provincial oil industry.

The debate continues on the motion, the amendment and the sub-amendment.

SOME HON. MEMBERS: Hear, hear!

MR. F. MEAKES: (Touchwood): — Mr. Speaker, in rising to take part in this traditional debate, the Speech from the Throne, before I get into my prepared text, I should like to say a few words to my young friend, the Member for Saskatoon University (Mr. Richards.)

He said in his speech when he first started out that he regretted very much leaving the NDP. Now I want to say that personally, I said I wanted to say personally that I regret it too. I said it to him before, I say it again to him publicly. I look on that Member as one of the most able young Members that has ever come into this House and I’ve been around for a while.

SOME HON. MEMBERS: Hear, hear!

MR. MEAKES: — I look at him and if I may say in his youth in comparison to my age, and I see him very much of what I was myself. A young, impatient man. I look, I remember my youth in growing up in a society that was very different to the society that we live in now and yet very similar. I reached the age of 18 in 1935 and I saw all the ills of the society that was facing me at that time and there are many of those ills still facing me. There’s no secret, I think, to the Members across the way or to

my party or to the people whom I represented in Touchwood since I was first elected, that I've always been on the left side of the spectrum of our political party and I am proud of that position. Certainly I make no apologies to it.

When I was young, I was one of those people to whom everything was black or white. One of the things I've learned in life is that there is a lot of grey in between the black and white yet we shouldn't get lost in the grey while it's there. One of the things it seems I have learned through my years in public life, both in this House and before I came to it, was that governments can only move as fast as society will allow it. The Hon. Member was talking about a survey that was made recently in which 48 per cent of the people of Canada were of the opinion that the energy of this country should be nationalized. If that survey had been taken three years ago or when we came to power I'm sure he'll agree that it would not have been that kind of a percentage at that time.

Really, I think what I'm saying is that I have learned to be patient. I think that my goals are not very much different to his goals. We both might dream of a socialist utopia, but it's how we get there. I know when I was his age, and I presume he is this way too, that he dreams of waking up some morning and having been able to establish a socialist utopia. I look at it in a different way, that it's as though we're hoping to take one step to get that long mile. I am prepared to take the 1,760 steps that I might have to take to achieve that mile or if necessary 5,000 steps to achieve that mile. Really what I'm saying is that it's a question of speed and I say again before I go on to my prepared notes, I regret that the Hon. Member has seen fit to leave the NDP. I admire him for his courage, I know that he was aware of the implications that he just spelled out a few minutes ago and I say that this takes courage to do these kinds of things and I give him credit for it.

If I may now turn, Mr. Speaker, to the debate that we're on and the amendments. I want to first congratulate the mover and the seconder. I think they did honor to themselves and to their constituencies and of course they had a very easy document to talk about.

I want also to congratulate the Premier and his Cabinet for what has gone on in the last year, in the last twelve months since we left this Legislature. FarmStart Program has now started, we've had property improvement grants increased. I am sorry that the Minister of Education (Mr. MacMurchy) isn't here but we had that very thorny problem a year ago when we couldn't get trustees and teachers of this province to talk to one another and now they not only have talked together, they have not only started to communicate together but they have come to agreements together. I want to compliment the Minister for his patience in achieving this fact. I know this, that talking to many trustees they are happy. When my hon. friends quit chatting, I'll go on: I'd like them to learn, to have some wisdom, get some wisdom from my words.

SOME HON. MEMBERS: Hear, hear!

MR. MEAKES: — I want also, before I turn to the Speech from the Throne, to thank — I'm sorry he's just left his seat in the last few minutes — to give my personal thanks to the Minister of Health,

(Mr. Smishek) from myself and for the people of Touchwood and in particular the community of Lestock, in the fact that Lestock is going to get a new hospital. This has been a thorn in the side of that community and the Sisters who run that hospital for many, many years. They were assured of great improvement in 1963 and they would have started in 1965 if there hadn't been a change of government. At that time the Member for Touchwood must have, for some reason or other, put his thumbs down on it and that hospital wasn't proceeded with.

MR. MacDONALD: (Milestone) — . . . closing. . .

MR. MEAKES: — We were not going to close them at all but you fellows started off by closing quite a few. So I want to register my appreciation for the fact that the hospital is now going to be built. The plans are going ahead and I believe that they will be issuing tenders very shortly.

I also want to thank the Minister of Social Services (Mr. Taylor) for the fact that the Cupar Nursing Home was brought into service last June, I believe it was, and now we are going to have another nursing home in Ituna. I know that the people of Touchwood are thankful that there is action on these three programs.

Mr. Speaker, this is another good Speech from the Throne following up the last earlier two Speeches. We see ourselves as a political party in the process of having nearly completed the New Deal for People of 1971. It is now for us, as Members of the party and also MLAs, to prepare a program for the next term of office that will be a worthy successor of the New Deal.

I intend in a sense, to break my address into three parts. First of all as to what is happening in Touchwood. Second, to deal with the Speech from the Throne, and, I should like to say a few words on federal policies — Liberal Federal policies.

We all know that within a few weeks, from the Speech from the Throne, that there will be an Act brought in in regard to new boundaries of the constituencies that will come after the next election. In that Act, I notice, that there is going to be no constituency, Mr. Speaker, by the name of Touchwood. I cannot really argue with that. Some of the Members across the way might remember that when we were in Opposition every year we moved a motion for an independent boundaries commission and we argued for representation by population. I know that I spoke of this and I believe that it was the Hon. Member for Athabasca (Mr. Guy) who interrupted me to say on one of those times that I spoke on it. He said what happens if Touchwood vanishes in an independent boundaries commission. My answer was, well if it does at least we will have representation by population. So I bow to this, I think it is a good Act, even though Touchwood is vanishing.

MR. BOLDT: — Let's you and I retire together.

MR. MEAKES: — Oh, I haven't said that I am not running in some other place. Mr. Speaker, I am thinking about running down in that seat in which the present Hon. Member for Milestone (Mr. MacDonald) is nominated in.

MR. MacDONALD: (Milestone) — Good!

MR. MEAKES: — I'll have a little more to say about that in a little while.

Every session that I have sat in in this Legislature, I have always reviewed the happenings of Touchwood, both good and bad, for the previous year and so I should like to spend just a few minutes again tonight.

1973 has been a good year for the people of Touchwood. For the first time in many years farmers are getting a better break. Prices of grain are at an all time record. Cattle prices are reasonably good. Let no one say, in this House or out of this House, that things are too good for the farming community. I am troubled at the continuing spiral of inflation and the drastic upsurge in the costs of production of every farmer in this province. When you look and see combines selling anywhere from \$25,000 and more and tractors from \$15,000 and up — \$5 wheat is not going to go very far.

For many years, Mr. Speaker, I have talked in this House about farmers being forced to leave the land, the size of landholdings increasing, the gradual decline of our villages and towns, and that the average age of our farmers was rising until now the average age is over 57 years. And that, Mr. Speaker, at long last we have a government in this province which is trying to stop these trends and indeed I believe beginning to reverse them.

As the CCF Government back in the '40s and '50s acted to bring rural electrification and grid roads and Medicare to the rural people and in so doing improved rural life, so are the programs like the Land Bank and FarmStart, dust free roads and streets having the same effect on rural people today.

The grand old man, Toby Nollet, in this House once said, in referring to rural electrification, that it not only lit up the farmsteads in Saskatchewan, but it lit up the hearts and the minds of the rural people of this province. And this is true. I prophesy that ten years from now that the same things will be able to be said of these new programs. It does my heart good to see older farmers now able to retire in dignity, because they are able to sell their holdings at a good price and yet they are also able and happy to see that their neighbors or sons are able to take over the home place.

There is a movement of young people back to the farms. All the time that this is going on as it was in the '40s and '50s, the Liberal Party poured gloom and doom over the land. And, I personally, Mr. Speaker, am glad they did. Now people, again, are beginning to see the Liberal Party for what it really is, a political party loaded with barnacles, ready to sink. I suggest that it may well do so after the next election and you will find that the Liberal Party will be like a dodo bird, even after the by-election of yesterday.

I think the thing that I am really happiest about, was that the Liberal Party in the last two or three years has supported some of our good programs and said, me too. I think this is very fortunate for us.

The FarmStart program got going this fall and already young farmers are coming to me and thanking us for it. Here is a program where a farmer will be able to intensify and enlarge his business venture without buying more land. In turn the meat industry will be stabilized, more employment for our young people in the cities — and the Liberals talk of us doing nothing.

Let me turn to the Open Roads program — dust free streets. One year ago, in this House, the Hon. Member from Milestone (Mr. MacDonald) said that this was a Liberal program. Well, I don't know whether they had it in as a program or not, but if so it was like most other Liberal programs, a program on paper but no action taken on them. The women of our villages and the businessmen of our villages, they know and they appreciate the program that has been brought in by the New Democratic Government and our Department of Highways. This program is banishing dust from their homes and their wash lines and they appreciate it. I suggest that they are going to show their appreciation by voting NDP next time.

Let me turn, Mr. Speaker, to another problem facing many farmers of Touchwood. This is the price of rapeseed and the vote on rapeseed and the sabotage by Otto Lang, the Minister in charge of the Wheat Board, to try to make certain that the selling of rapeseed remains in the hands of the Grain Exchange, or as they would like to call it now, a commodity exchange.

The Leader of the Opposition (Mr. Steuart) proved the other day when he was speaking, proved in his defence of Otto Lang that that is what the Liberal Party is all about. Those of us who are old enough to remember when all grain was sold through the Grain Exchange and the disastrous consequences . . .

MR. STEUART: — John has been . . .

MR. MEAKES: — I wish my hon. friend the Leader of the Opposition would keep his mouth shut once in a while and his ears open as he might learn something from me.

MR. STEUART: — Not from you, Frank!

MR. MEAKES: — Those of us who remember when all grain was sold through the Grain Exchange and the disastrous consequences to the farmers. We will fight to our outmost to never see that happen again.

I remember when I was at home with my parents we had to sell wheat in the fall because of a shortage of dollars. I remember us hauling wheat to town eight miles for 26 cents and oats for nine cents. I also remember those farmers who were well enough off to afford to hold their grain until March when the price went up, and I remember that same figure, they got \$1.40 per bushel. It was a criminal act.

Now let us look at what Otto Lang does to make sure that the rapeseed remains under the Grain Exchange. You know, Mr. Speaker, only a Dean of Law could have drawn up such a ballot for the farmer to mark. Only Otto Lang could dream up a ballot like that.

First he says there must be 60 per cent of all the rapeseed

growers voting or he won't count the ballots. Then, if they are going to count the votes there is going to be 60 per cent . . . You know I can't help but wonder, Mr. Speaker, whether Otto Lang or the Leader of the Opposition would like to have that kind of a ballot at election time.

MR. STEUART: — We had it last night.

MR. MEAKES: — I just wonder if my hon. friend from Prince Albert West (Mr. Steuart) would like to have had his last election done that way. You know he wouldn't even be sitting in his seat now if it was operated on in that kind of figures.

Then let me turn to the next step that he makes certain sure, he makes certain sure that it is not going to go to the Wheat Board. He leaves an extra place on that ballot, an extra place for them to mark an X, for those who are undecided. If they had done that in the last election in Prince Albert West, for the undecided ones, I am afraid that he wouldn't have been here. An extra place for those to put an X for those who are undecided, but, they are all going to count for the Grain Exchange. All those would be counted as though it was a negative vote and that they are not in favor of it going to the Wheat Board. You know it is only a Liberal who could think up a ballot of that kind.

I didn't realize, Mr. Speaker, that the Leader of the Opposition was a master of the sign language.

All I want to say, Mr. Speaker, is that when the next federal election comes around, and it may well be in the next two months or so, that you are going to find that the Member for Saskatoon-Humboldt, the farmers at least of that area, are going to reject the Minister of Justice.

SOME HON. MEMBERS: Hear, hear!

MR. MEAKES: — You know the ironical part of it is that here is a man, besides being the Minister in charge of the Wheat Board who is the Minister of Justice. And he would conceive a ballot that was as unjust as this ballot. Then he made one more step. He wasn't satisfied that he made sure that it would stay in the Grain Exchange, he took another step. One had to have grown rape two out of the last three years. Now that meant that a young man who started farming this spring and had started rape . . .

MR. STEUART: — . . . new . . .

MR. MEAKES: — Right, I take that back. That wasn't in my notes, Mr. Speaker, and I wouldn't like to mislead the Leader of the Opposition. Let me put another example to him. One of the guys whom I went to school with, I met him in town about the end of July and he was very cross. He had grown rape one year ago and he sold it last April. He netted \$10,000 on his rape crop. If he had held it until July he would have made another \$12,000. He said to me that he would never grow rape again until it comes under the Wheat Board. He grew rape last year; he was hailed out this year and has nothing on his permit and so he doesn't get a vote. This whole thing was loaded to make

sure that rape continues under the Grain Exchange.

Really, Mr. Speaker, what the farmers of this province want is some stability. They don't want the ups and downs of the speculative market. They object to a few people becoming millionaires out of the products that they grew on their soil, that they worked hard to produce. They sell because they need the money and then suddenly someone makes \$12,000 on a \$10,000 investment.

You know as another friend of mine says, every time that he hears Otto Lang open his mouth and he listens to him, he said, I can hear the words of James Richardson and Sons, the great masters of the Winnipeg Grain Exchange. And when the Grain Exchange says for Otto to move he not only moves, he jumps.

Turning, Mr. Speaker, back to provincial affairs I am proud to see the rejuvenation of the Department of Co-operation.

SOME HON. MEMBERS: Hear, hear!

MR. MEAKES: — Under the previous government it had been let slip until there were plans for doing away with it. In fact, the then Minister in charge sitting on this side of the House, the then Member for Lumsden (Mr. Lane), made that statement, told me personally, that the Department of Co-operation was on the way out. I want to compliment the Minister of Co-operation for finding a minister like Harry Gemmel, a man known throughout the co-operative movement as one who gets things done.

I am pleased to read in the Speech from the Throne and which my hon. friend from Saskatoon University discussed, that it says there will be some decisive action on the so-called energy crisis. There is going to be action to protect the rights of Saskatchewan and Canadian citizens. I am not going to deal with that. I could spend a lot of time on it but I think our Leader, the other day, did an extremely good job and I certainly listened also with interest to the Member from Saskatoon University (Mr. Richards), and most of what he said I agree with.

But there is one thing we must not forget in this so-called energy crisis. We must not forget that the agricultural industry in Saskatchewan is the major consumer of petroleum products. And any cutback or increase in price of any consequence would spell doom to most farmers and cause irreparable damage to the industry. It would seriously affect the entire economy of our province. As democratic socialists we must see that unearned excessive profits are returned to the owners of our natural resources, the people of Saskatchewan.

SOME HON. MEMBERS: Hear, hear!

MR. MEAKES: — Mr. Speaker, this week has been designated as Human Rights week. I cannot sit down without some comments on human rights or the lack of them. In this great new technological society that we live in, in many ways we seem to be losing rather than gaining ground in achieving all basic human rights.

One cannot visit cities like London or Tokyo or Hong Kong or Los Angeles or New York, without realizing that our society is becoming more and more dehumanized. The rights of the individual become more and more obscure. And we as human beings become less aware of our fellow man. I cannot help but comment on some remarks that were passed across the House yesterday and today in terms about remarks passed about certain civil servants who were out working in the election.

As far as I am concerned I made my position clear many years ago in this House, I make it clear again. Whether they were working for Don Keith or whether they were working for Malone, I for one will fight for the right for those people to go out and exercise their democratic rights.

SOME HON. MEMBERS: Hear, hear!

MR. MEAKES: — If they want a leave of absence I will fight to see that they have that leave of absence. I say again for whatever political party they want, my feeling on this through the years has been very clear.

Mr. Speaker, basic human rights can't be achieved by only part of our society. I cannot have them unless my brother also enjoys them. In the Western world the rich are getting richer, the poor are getting poorer. This not only applies to us in Canada as a nation but also between countries. There is racism in South Africa or in the ghettos of New York or Montreal or London. Then, there is racism here for us. The attitude of the white society to the native population in Saskatchewan is little different or better than in other parts of Canada or the United States or South Africa. We are a little bit more subtle about it that is all. Racism is not just race against race, it can be economic status against poverty. It is little use talking about being our brother's keeper, then neglect to help our brother who is in trouble, whether financial or some other way. It is not good enough to give him the bare necessities to stop starvation and human degradation. But we must find ways to lift them both physically and spiritually. Everyone in our society must feel needed and useful. Everyone must be able to face the world and say, "I am a useful necessary person." Until that happens, we ourselves have not achieved our own basic human rights. We are our brother's keeper, and our brothers are all the people in the world.

The Hon. Member for Rosthern (Mr. Boldt) talked yesterday about moral revival. Well, millions of people die of hunger and yet in some places we are overproducing food. We could get to the moon and yet we wouldn't find ways to get food to Biafra, or India or now Ethiopia. We are taught to love one another and yet we have wars and rumors of wars and violence, racial hatred and prejudice. And above all the worst in my opinion is indifference. Our society passes by on the side. Yes, we must have a moral revival, we must become our brother's keeper. Not by the lash but with love.

Mr. Speaker, because I believe this, because the Speech from the Throne is based on this philosophy and because the Government under Premier Blakeney is endeavoring to bring about a society that is fairer and juster and more human, it will give me great pleasure to support the motion and oppose both the amendment and the sub amendment.

SOME HON. MEMBERS: Hear, hear!

MR. T.M. WEATHERALD: (Cannington) — Mr. Speaker, it is now my privilege to enter the Speech from the Throne. I have listened with considerable interest to the Member from Saskatoon and the Member for Touchwood who just took his seat. I might say that our philosophy and theirs would differ substantially, not on whether we are capable of justice or less justice than the Members opposite. I think all Members share a similar type of social conscience but where we disagree very violently with the Members opposite and the Member from Saskatoon is that we simply don't think the Government has to own and control most of the province in order to bring social justice about. I think this is what has always separated the Liberal Party from the socialist philosophy and I am quite convinced will continue to do so for a long time to come.

Mr. Speaker, I want to deal with a number of subjects in the Speech from the Throne. But before I start to do this I want to congratulate the mover and seconder of the Speech. The Member from Saltcoats (Mr. Kaeding) was down to my constituency last fall, in fact my home town of Wawota. On checking around I found that the attendance at the meeting was extremely poor. This was unfortunate because I think that by his speech the other day that if the crowd had been a little bigger they probably would have appreciated some of the things he said. In fact I was told that the organization meeting of the new constituency of Moosomin was so small that if the ladies hadn't come to serve lunch it wouldn't have been worth having.

I was most interested in one thing that the Member had to say at that meeting. He proclaimed that they had now taken off Medical Care premiums that this would save \$4 million for the Government of Saskatchewan in administration alone. \$4 million which provoked a lot of people on coffee row the next day to say if it is costing the Government of Saskatchewan \$4 million to be able to collect \$15 million from Medical Care premiums I wonder how much it is costing them to run the rest of the administration.

Mr. Speaker, I think that that was likely long before the Member for Saltcoats knew that the Premier was going to send two letters a year out instead of just the one.

Mr. Speaker, this Speech from the Throne indicates that the Government intends to do absolutely nothing to control inflation in our province, with the possible exception of their usual attempt to try and blame it on the Federal Government.

Everywhere in the Throne Speech, Mr. Speaker, we are spending more money despite the fact that it is obvious all across Canada that government spending is one of the most serious causes of inflation.

The Government in its Speech indicates it will continue also to centralize and to take more and more control over Saskatchewan people. Nowhere even in a superficial manner is individual initiative, ownership or development of our resources given the slightest mention. This of course shouldn't surprise the people of Saskatchewan, it has always been the socialist philosophy to own, through government ownership, planning and control.

I am convinced that inflation is still a prime concern

to our province and our country in general and requires a concerted effort by all levels of government to hold prices down and to hold government spending down. This Government shows no indication whatsoever towards prudent spending in a time of extremely buoyant economic conditions.

Many of the costs that are being built in by the Government, this NDP Government, Mr. Speaker, will be there when the economic boom subsides as it most surely will. The Government's answer is obvious in regard to inflation. They simply intend to spend as much as they can, as fast as they can, for as long as they can.

Mr. Speaker, let's look at the last two years of office of this Government and what they have brought. Mr. Speaker, \$50 million has been appropriated in the Estimates for the Land Bank and as yet no one knows precisely how much of this has been spent. \$15.2 million has been spent in IPSCO without a single new job. The stock today as an investment is worth less than it was at the time of the investment last year. What is more, Mr. Speaker, is that it is returning an extremely low rate of dividend return on the investment, approximately three per cent or less.

The Government of the day has now invested \$10 million in Intercontinental Packers for 45 per cent. \$5 million which anyone with any financial competence or an investigation shows that Premier Blakeney's Government simply gave away. Dun and Bradstreet, Mr. Speaker, said that the Government gave away \$5 million; the Financial Post on investigation showed they gave away \$5 million. And indeed after the Leader of the Opposition and other Members on this side of the House carried out an investigation it was proven beyond all doubt that they gave away \$5 million.

Meanwhile in the background besides these enterprises the Government planners are operating in the direction of more and more Government takeover of oil and potash industries.

We now have a plywood plant. The Government rejected an offer from Simpson Timber Company to build a plant in the Hudson Bay area. The Government of this province is now spending \$6 million to build that plant.

Mr. Speaker, despite the fact that most of these industries can be controlled and regulated, the potash industry, the oil industry and the forest industry can be regulated and controlled by strict rules and legislation passed in this Session of the Legislature, the Government's answer is strictly government ownership and government takeover.

Mr. Speaker, add this to the Government's actions in the Ward System and the Hog Marketing Commission. Add this to suggestions of regional governments and a cattle marketing commission, it is very easy to see the direction that our province is taking and has been taking for the past two years.

I want to say a few words about the Hog Marketing Commission. It has now been in operation since last August. The Government having refused a vote to producers, and now having imposed a government operated board, the producer has absolutely no course of action left. Consistently, although, I admit not every individual day, but most days, prices in the Manitoba

markets in Brandon and Winnipeg have been running 30 cents to 70 cents higher per hundred weight than our Saskatchewan prices. This means, Mr. Speaker, a loss to a producer of approximately \$1 per hog. At present, administration costs in Saskatchewan are lower than Manitoba but I suggest that this is a temporary situation existing because the Government here is subsidizing the Commission with tax dollars out of the Treasury. Despite this the Provincial Government has made it as difficult as possible for Saskatchewan producers to sell outside the province. Despite the fact that many producers along the Manitoba-Saskatchewan border get nearly \$1 a hog more most days though it does not happen every day. But on checking prices consistently I find it has happened most days. Despite this the Government of Saskatchewan does everything possible to prevent a producer from crossing the borders of our province to Alberta or to Manitoba.

First of all one of the hindrances put in a producer's way is they require a special permit. Secondly, then by dictating that hogs sold outside Saskatchewan by Saskatchewan producers will not be eligible for the subsidy in this province. I was absolutely amazed why this Government would want to prevent any individual selling out of the province from receiving any subsidy which he has justly earned.

SOME HON. MEMBERS: Hear, hear!

MR. WEATHERALD: — This, Mr. Speaker, is of course outright blackmail. It is blackmail by the NDP and it is considered absolutely despicable by producers along the borders of the Province of Saskatchewan. A strange and unfair situation, when one considers that both Manitoba and Alberta operate compulsory Hog Marketing Commissions and those hogs sold outside our province in either Manitoba or Alberta would be required to go through these compulsory commissions. The whole hog marketing set up by the Government is an attempt by the NDP to keep hogs in this province even though it is costing producers money to do so.

I want to make some concrete and positive suggestions to the Government in this regard. First of all a vote of producers for or against the commission should be taken immediately. Secondly, if that vote is favorable towards the commission, the board should be run then by elected producers with absolutely no government interference whatsoever. Thirdly, all regulations should be removed to allow Saskatchewan producers to sell outside Saskatchewan if they wish. The barriers and the methods of trying to prevent individuals who live along the Alberta or the Saskatchewan border should be removed immediately and producers should be given access to either the Alberta or the Manitoba Hog Marketing Boards. Fourthly, Mr. Speaker, any subsidy that is currently being applied to hogs produced in Saskatchewan should be available to all farmers in Saskatchewan regardless of where the hogs are marketed. I think that if these four criteria, if they are immediately acted upon, the Government would do much to improve the hog marketing situation and satisfy many producers in the province.

Mr. Speaker, I went to northern Saskatchewan, not for the first time, this summer, not for the first time for I have been there a number of times. I want to say a few words about my current trip to northern Saskatchewan, because I think that it is a most serious matter and requires . . .

MR. BAKER: — You don't know anything about northern Saskatchewan.

MR. WEATHERALD: — Mr. Speaker, this fall when I went to northern Saskatchewan I found a number of problems that I think require serious attention. I find that the Government opposite is not giving that type of attention to it. And, in fact, they are answering most serious matters with clichés, political flack. I want to deal with each of these charges in a comprehensive manner.

I first want to start by saying the morale amongst the many people who have lived in the North is extremely low. It is low because of the ineptitude of the Department itself and its Minister, Mr. Bowerman. Many of the problems that currently exist in the schools and hospitals exist because the Blakeney Government has literally chased out and I say chased out, many long time public spirited persons. The answer to this serious matter is contained in a press release by the Minister, Mr. Bowerman, and I quote. This is what he says about the people when we suggested in a press release that many worthy people and experienced people in northern Saskatchewan have left:

Many of them have been transferred from the North because of their incompetency and just didn't measure up to the standards of the Department of Northern Saskatchewan.

Such an answer is indicative of how out of touch with the situation the Minister really is.

SOME HON. MEMBERS: Hear, hear!

MR. WEATHERALD: — Many of the people who have been forced out were top people who have been in the area for many years. Local residents indicate how severe the loss of these people have been. The reason for the loss of these people is more clearly stated in a letter by Premier Blakeney. A letter which I might say that according to the press release was not intended to become public:

As you make clear (the Premier says in answer to a letter) the community development officer according to your concept must have no stake in Government policy.

The Premier goes on to indicate that he believes all government employees must have a real stake in the government, which, Mr. Speaker, and according to most people's interpretation is a nice way of saying all employees must be loyal NDP workers. Which is precisely why so many good civil servants have left. Secondly, Mr. Speaker, the department itself has had no direction or planning. It is obvious that the idea was an election gimmick with no thought whatsoever particularly at that time of how it would work.

Just look at La Ronge as the headquarters. Residents of Buffalo Narrows, LaRoche, etc., have no land communication with that area except by coming south first. To this, the Minister replies, a road will be built across to La Ronge laterally. That, Mr. Speaker, in looking at a map suggests approximately 150 to 200 mild — and I say approximately

because the distance of the road will depend largely on how much water you want to go around or how much you want to go across. The cost of the road would obviously be large and the time of construction several years. The building of such a road before La Ronge was made the headquarters would have been a logical approach — and I stress the words, would have been a logical approach — but it is doubtful if the Minister, Mr. Bowerman, would be able even to comprehend such a complex idea as building a road before the whole department was moved to La Ronge. The lateral road may be years in the making and the lack of communication will exist for all that length of time.

Third, Mr. Speaker, we said when we came back from our investigation that the Department of Northern Saskatchewan is largely a group of bosses . . .

SOME HON. MEMBERS: Hear, hear!

MR. WEATHERALD: — . . . and practically all of the problems of the Department of Northern Saskatchewan of any magnitude are still ending up back here right in the city of Regina. This itself strikes at the very heart of the concept of the Department of Northern Saskatchewan as it has been presented by this Government. The department itself simply will never, at least for many, many years, have the necessary backup personnel, technical people in each of the departments because that would be duplicating practically every facet of government as we know it in Regina. It is obvious that the Department of Public Health, with their backup personnel, Social Services, Municipal Affairs, that it is not feasible to duplicate them in La Ronge. So many of the complex problems that people have to deal with simply end up back here in Regina because of the lack of personnel in La Ronge.

MR. ROMANOW: — . . . how can you criticize”

MR. WEATHERALD: — Well, it is completely not feasible to duplicate the whole Department of Health in La Ronge. You can tell that.

Mr. Speaker, the fourth thing that we suggested in our comments upon investigating the North was that there was no co-ordination of jobs. Now, I recognize that there are many people in the North who simply have not work available for them and there needs to be great emphasis put on economic development and the creation of jobs.

Some jobs exist, however, in that area and they are certainly jobs that fit the skills of the people who live there. They are not onerous jobs, they are jobs that the people who live there would find satisfactory and worthwhile. However, we found absolutely no effort whatsoever by anyone working for the Government being made to put people into these jobs. No co-ordination of trying to find able-bodied persons to undertake the employment where employment was obviously available.

The Government's answer to these problems is to simply spend more and more money on planners and on welfare.

The Minister of Northern Saskatchewan, Mr. Bowerman, says if anything social assistance has been reduced. Once again,

he doesn't back up the facts or have any statistics to prove his case. It is obvious that this NDP Government hasn't got the slightest idea of what they are going to do in northern Saskatchewan or are trying to do to solve its problems.

I want to say a few words about the Ile-a-La-Crosse school. The complaint regarding the school, again, indicates the: Minister's dictatorial action. He justifies the replacement of a three man board on the basis of the fact that the board was appointed. I want to make a correction note to the Press, Mr. Speaker, because there was an error in my typewritten copy. In actual fact, when a Minister makes a reply in his press release that the board was appointed, in actual fact the three man board in Ile-a-La-Crosse was elected. The board that he would be referring to as appointed was the Northern School Board and I accept the fact that the Northern School Board is appointed, but the board to which we were referring to is the local Ile-a-La-Crosse Board, which was elected.

This board should have been allowed to fulfil either its term of office in Ile-a-La-Crosse until the December 6th election of a new school board, or, if they wish to resign voluntarily, they should have been allowed to do so. The change in the legislation last year, of course, provided for the election of a new seven man board. But that is not the way the Minister would do it. He didn't want to bother giving the local school board at Ile-a-La-Crosse that had been duly elected time to offer to resign. He didn't want to bother giving them time to resign, he didn't want to bother letting them fill out their term of office until December 6th. No, he would sooner have the three man board call a meeting to explain what their plans were for a school, have some of his officials crash the meeting and illegally elect a new provisional board.

MR. COMER: — . . . you were complaining . . .

MR. WEATHERALD: — It is obvious that the Member for Nipawin (Mr. Comer) doesn't know what he is talking about. I maybe should review it a little bit more for you. I think he is a little touchy about it. I should maybe review what happened.

In Ile-a-La-Crosse there was a three man board in existence. That three man board was thrown out on their ear when they called a public meeting, by some of the DNS officials. Thrown out on their ear. The three man board that was elected in that town called a meeting with their plans for the replacement of the school and in walked some officials, threw the three man board out and elected a new seven man provisional board.

The Minister of Northern Saskatchewan should have allowed that board either to fulfil their term of office or should have given them the opportunity of resigning.

SOME HON. MEMBERS: Hear, hear!

MR. WEATHERALD: — It is interesting to know that in yesterday's composition of the seven man provisional board, only one was elected.

Mr. Speaker, I want to speak about the situation at La Loche. La Loche School, when we arrived there, had been closed approximately three weeks with no water. It is very strange that one

week after we had been to the area the school was again opened. The water problem had been known since last April, with no one taking much interest or responsibility for it. There was no evidence of anyone taking any interest or responsibility when we were there until it was brought to the Government's attention when we returned to the city of Regina. Yes, the school operated very satisfactorily for two years up until about six months ago. It was operating very, very well up until six months ago.

MR. ROMANOW: — The school or the water?

MR. WEATHERALD: — The school. Mr. Speaker, the most amusing statement is the one referring to the 48 hour southern experts.

I don't doubt that given the Minister's mental ability as to the same problems we uncovered it would have well taken him two months, but we accept that. In any event we said from the start that our investigation in that area of northern Saskatchewan was only a beginning and that if we had stayed longer, many other problems would have been uncovered. His response, of course, is a response of an inept politician with no answers but simply clichés to cover up his ineptitude.

I should now like to make a few remarks regarding the Government's proposals on the current energy crisis. It is almost amusing, Mr. Speaker, to watch our NDP friends become the saviour of all humanity now that the current energy crisis is with us. It is particularly unusual when we consider that it was the old CCF in Saskatchewan that put us into the current position. The old CCF first gave away our Crown mineral rights to the oil companies. The old CCF Government set up the present system of royalties and bonus bids and leases that most companies now use and enjoy in the Province of Saskatchewan.

Now, the same Premier who as a member of the civil service prior to 1960, an elected Member since 1960 along with several of the current NDP MLAs, who gave away many of our resources in the 1950s and '60s are now coming back to be the great champions in the fight of the common man against the oil cartel.

People, Mr. Speaker, will remember where the current responsibility lies and who it was who then made the first overtures to the international oil companies. The NDP in their typical manner first played Santa Claus and getting tired now of playing Santa Claus they want to play Scrooge.

SOME HON. MEMBERS: Hear, hear!

MR. WEATHERALD: — Strange as it may seem, society can quite possibly thank the Arabs for bringing much of the world to its senses. We are consuming oil at such a rate in the world that the reserves under our current system of use will not last for a very substantial length of time.

I was totally amazed that when the Federal Government called for conservation measures, our dear Attorney General (Mr. Romanow) and the Minister of Industry (Mr. Thorson) roared out that we should continue to burn all we like just as though the oil was going to come out of the ground forever. Even now the Premier thinks that if we now control the oil resources of Saskatchewan

we are in great shape.

The day before yesterday, in listening to his future visions of our province, I concluded that Saskatchewan, under his leadership, would be the only place in the whole world where the people were going to be prevented from the cold and darkness descending upon them. This is all going to come about by controlling the reserves which the old CCF gave away.

Now the fact that the rest of the world may not be completely satisfied with this arrangement, when they are without heat and light, I don't think ever dawned on our dear Premier. However, Mr. Speaker, when the invading armies line up at the Saskatchewan borders from Japan, United States, Great Britain and Western Europe, the representative of the Republic of Socialists of Saskatchewan, Mr. Romanow, will undoubtedly meet them at the borders and blame the whole world crisis on the Federal Government.

SOME HON. MEMBERS: Hear, hear!

MR. WEATHERALD: — Undoubtedly he will tell the hostile visitors that the world would never have run out of oil if the NDP could only have won one federal election.

Of course, Mr. Speaker, the Attorney General himself unquestionably concluded that he could have solved the world problem himself if he was only given the chance. This, of course, was in spite of the fact that a few years earlier he advised the public to keep using all the oil that they wanted to. Mr. Romanow, Mr. Speaker, will conclude by saying that the NDP in one last desperate effort for electoral support east of the Ottawa Valley, the NDP has sent the King of British Columbia, Mr. Barrett, down to talk to the separatists in Quebec. Of course, all in the interest of national unity.

Mr. Speaker, to say the very least it is very amusing to watch the NDP in the current oil crisis. I want to make a few serious observations about the current oil crisis. I want to make a few serious suggestions that I think are of a positive nature in a period of obviously difficult times throughout the world regarding energy.

The Federal Government, in conjunction with the provinces, obviously must act to provide Canada with a two-price system for oil. The imposition of the export tax is a step in the right direction. Current world prices for oil are unrealistic and they should not have to be paid by Canadians.

2. Efforts must be made to guarantee that the oil companies spend a substantial percentage of profit on further exploration for reserves in the Canadian boundaries and jurisdictions. It is obvious that the high level of profitability does not necessarily mean further exploration of oil in Canada and that we will require restrictions to ensure that a certain amount of the increased profitability to oil companies is spent in Canada.

3. The profit level of the oil companies developing our reserves should be determined and regulated. I stress that the profit level should be determined and regulated. Such a level must be high enough for the various companies involved to carry on substantial exploration programs. And the profitability must

be sufficient to be able to obtain risk capital in these companies. This, Mr. Speaker, may be only necessary for a specified period of time until a more normal, competitive world energy situation returns.

4. The export tax now being collected by the Federal Government should be divided as follows: Part of it should be returned to the producing provinces as owners of the resource. I think that it is most disturbing to find that the NDP have been saying extremely little in representing our province on this matter. Part of the export tax should be spent on national projects to develop increased energy resources for our country. Some of these projects should be the Athabasca Tar Sands, the various pipelines required to eastern Canada; the nuclear development and coal development to improve our energy requirements for the coming years. Part of the revenue should also be given to all provinces in Canada, with the provision that this revenue be used to reduce the tax load on petroleum products in the province.

This would have the result of offsetting any increased price to the consumer. Not surprisingly, the Premier never mentioned how Saskatchewan or other provinces would use these additional windfall revenues to hold down consumer prices. It is very obvious in any energy statement from the Government opposite, that they never suggested any use of holding down the price of gasoline or fuel oil in our province, when the Government of Canada returned some of the windfall revenues to them.

I want to dwell at some length on how some of this revenue should be applied in our province. Let's look at some of the provincial taxes levied by the NDP Government here.

I am sure, Mr. Speaker, the consumer would welcome these windfall resource revenues applied to, firstly, reduce our provincial tax at 19 cents per gallon at the pumps on clear gasoline. That 19 cents levied by our NDP friends represents about 33 per cent of the cost of one gallon of gasoline in the province. Secondly, some of the windfall resource revenues accruing to the Province of Saskatchewan, and I stress the term 'windfall revenues' because I am sure the Provincial Treasurer in his budget last year never anticipated anything like the revenue accruing from the oil resources that we are getting now, should be used to reduce our trucking costs in the Province of Saskatchewan. The NDP are always and constantly talking about the freight costs and they have an admirable chance to apply some of this revenue to reduce their trucking costs by eliminating at least some or all of the 21 cent gasoline NDP tax on clear diesel fuel. This 21 cent tax on diesel fuel, which is a substantial portion of the trucking costs in our province, represents 50 per cent of the cost of such fuel. Thirdly, our NDP Government could apply these windfall resource revenues to also reduce the four cent per gallon tax on purple gas. This is gasoline used in road construction and equipment other than trucks. It is obvious, Mr. Speaker, that the Federal Government should only return, and I stress only return, a portion of these windfall revenues to the province, to all provinces of Canada, on a condition that they be used to hold down the consumer price of all petroleum products.

SOME HON. MEMBERS: Hear, hear!

MR. WEATHERALD: — This policy along with proper conservation measures, a concerted effort to develop new energy sources and controls on company profits, should guarantee energy to Canadians at a price which we can afford.

Mr. Speaker, I have only dealt with a few matters that I consider of importance in our province today, but I am sure that I have already indicated that I am convinced that the Government can deal with the oil energy problem by levying the proper regulations and controls on the oil companies without government ownership of such an industry. I have indicated at length my dislike for socialist regimentation, government ownership and control, in sufficient detail to make it amply clear that I will not be supporting the Speech from the Throne.

SOME HON. MEMBERS: Hear, hear!

MR. H.H. ROLFES: (Saskatoon Nutana South) — Mr. Speaker, before I get into the text of my address I want to take this opportunity to congratulate the mover and the seconder for the splendid way in which they participated in this debate. Also, I want to congratulate my colleague from University. I always enjoy listening to what he has to say. I must admit that I agreed with most of what he had to say.

Also, Mr. Speaker, at this time I want to take the opportunity to congratulate a girl who graduated from a well known school in this province, a school called Holy Cross high school. Yes, that's the one where I have the privilege to work. I want to congratulate Miss Wendy Mills, who was chosen as Miss Grey Cup.

SOME HON. MEMBERS: Hear, hear:

MR. ROLFES: — Also for the edification of the people here I should like to inform, especially the Member from Milestone (Mr. MacDonald) who last year in the debate on teacher-trustee bargaining called the legislation a time bomb, that the Queen's Bench Court today ruled in favor of the Government.

SOME HON. MEMBERS: Hear, hear!

MR. ROLFES: — I believe it was Judge MacPherson. Also, Mr. Speaker, I want to say a few words about the Member from Rosthern (Mr. Boldt). I admire the Member from Rosthern in the sense that he seems to stick to his principles. That sort of a blind self-righteous attitude could be characterized as those who in the past were in favor of the Inquisition in the Church. It is that kind of an attitude that drives people away from the Christian Church.

AN HON. MEMBER: — I'll go and get the Member.

MR. ROLFES: — Okay, I'll wait then and in the meantime I'll talk about the Leader of the Opposition.

SOME HON. MEMBERS: Hear, hear!

MR. ROLFES: — I have an article here from the Star-Phoenix which reads: “Farmers Back Steuart’s Claim, Hog Commission Doesn’t Work.”

SOME HON. MEMBERS: Hear, hear!

MR. ROLFES: — When I read that article in the Saskatoon Star-Phoenix I wondered why a special news conference was called in Regina, why bring in two people to Regina where no one knows them. One happened to be Bud Roenspies from Annaheim here I was born and raised. I’ve known Bud for about 20 or 21 years.

AN. HON. MEMBER: — Is he a good Liberal?

MR. ROLFES: — Yes, he is a good, a very good Liberal. He is on the executive of the Humboldt constituency. The other day I was told that Bud Roenspies is expecting an appointment from the Leader of the Opposition as the candidate for the Humboldt constituency. But the Leader of the Opposition has some difficulty in that there is another fellow who is somewhat interested by the name of Mat Breker. In this particular article, Mr. Roenspies said that he was giving up the hog business for several reasons. One of the reasons he mentioned was the Hog Marketing Commission. Well, I want to inform this House that Mr. Roenspies quit the hog business for three basic reasons. Number one, his three sons have given up on Bud Roenspies and don’t want to farm with their father and have moved to the city. Number two, his hired man quit. Number three, Mr. Roenspies’ hogs were infected with a disease called infectious rhinitis, commonly known as bullnose. These are the reasons. Now there is one other reason that Mr. Roenspies gave and that was the high feed prices . . .

MR. SPEAKER: — Order! There is too much crossfire going on.

MR. ROLFES: — Thank you, Mr. Speaker. The second individual mentioned in this article was Louis Raab. I have known him for approximately 25 years. There is one thing about Louis, he doesn’t make any bones about where he stands in politics. He is a die-hard Liberal and always has been.

SOME HON. MEMBERS: Hear, hear!

MR. ROLFES: — It was interesting to note that the Leader of the Opposition (Mr. Steuart) didn’t call the news conference in Saskatoon nor did he call it in Humboldt or St. Gregor where the people might have known the individuals but he had it in Regina so that it can be in the Star-Phoenix and the Leader-Post where nobody knows Bud Roenspies or Louis Raab or what there politics are.

AN HON. MEMBER: — All hog producers aren’t Liberals.

MR. ROLFES: — No, I agree they’re not. When I was home last weekend my brother indicated that there is still good money in hogs and he intends to stay in it and so do many of the other

farmers .

Before I spoke of the Leader of the Opposition I had a few words to say about the Member from Rosthern (Mr. Boldt) and I should like to repeat them for his benefit. Yesterday the Member from Rosthern came in with his blind, self-righteous attitude about Christianity and I was saying of the Hon. Member that in my opinion this characterized those people who in the past have been in favor of the Inquisition in the Church and it is people like you, who think like you, who drive people away from the Christian Church. I would hope, Mr. Speaker, that the Hon. Member from Rosthern will hold to these principles when in due time the Leader of the Opposition appoints the Hon. Member from Athabasca (Mr. Guy) as the candidate for Rosthern. I say, if you believe in your principles Hon. Member then you must insist that the person who follows you will also believe in the principles that you seem to believe in. I am willing to wait to see if this is going to be the case.

Mr. Speaker, turning now to the text of my address I want to say that this Throne Speech like previous Throne Speeches clearly indicates that the Blakeney Government will make every effort to fill the promises made in 1971.

SOME HON. MEMBERS: Hear, hear!

MR. ROLFES: — This Throne Speech testifies to the fact that the Government is prepared to take measures to alleviate the problems of urban and rural Saskatchewan and to launch new programs for the future. Lastly, Mr. Speaker, this Throne Speech indicates that the Government will implement the necessary legislation to protect the interest of the people of this province from foreign domination.

This Government has a pretty good record. for passing legislation and implementing programs which have eased the burden for the ordinary citizen caused by inflation. Since the last session the Government has raised the minimum wage to \$2, increased welfare benefits, eliminated medical and hospital premiums, given assistance of up to \$500 for senior citizens for the repair of their homes, and it has established a hearing aid plan which will provide aids at greatly reduced costs. These, Mr. Speaker, are only a few of the things that this Government has done since the last session.

There are other measures that this Government has taken to offset the hardships of the cost of living increases since we were elected in 1971. It has, Mr. Speaker, eliminated deterrent fees, it has, Mr. Speaker, substantially increased the property improvement grant, it has increased school grants by about \$22 million, it has increased assistance for low income families for the purchase of homes, it has implemented a hog stabilization program. These are only a few of the many significant steps taken by this Government to assist ordinary individuals, the middle and low income family in its struggle to cope with the intolerable increases in the cost of living.

It seems to me that the Federal Government is either unable or unwilling to take the necessary steps to curb inflation. Could it be that the critics who say that governments are controlled by the multinational corporations are right? Are governments and politicians merely puppets manipulated by the

conglomerates in such a way as to maximize their interests and to protect their profits? Rampant inflation, the energy crisis and the recent overthrow of the Allende Government seem to give some credence to the accusation of these critics.

I want to turn now to the topic of energy which has been so concisely explained by the Premier and others on this side of the House. I agree with the principles enumerated by the Premier which are:

1. That control of the oil resource must be firmly vested in the people of Saskatchewan,
2. That future supplies of petroleum for Saskatchewan farmers and other Saskatchewan users must be assured,
3. That oil explorations must be stepped up to meet going demands.

However, Mr. Speaker, these principles do not go far enough in my opinion. The oil companies' annual profits, if our exports continue at the present rate, will still be well over \$100 million from our present known reserves, without any guarantee that they will have to invest any of these profits for exploration in Saskatchewan.

In addition to this the legislation should protect the people of Saskatchewan in the event that oil companies shut down their Saskatchewan based facilities for more lucrative opportunities elsewhere. The legislation should make it mandatory for oil companies to give at least six months' notice before they can shut down their oil facilities which are essential for the refining of oil in Saskatchewan.

Secondly, if oil companies by consolidating their refineries in another location are endangering the refining of oil in Saskatchewan, then the Government should have the right to expropriate the facilities for a reasonable fee and operate it as a public utility.

The Throne Speech makes mention of assistance to urban transportation. I trust that the Government will devise a plan to give significant assistance on a conditional basis. Hopefully such assistance will enable city councils to lower their transit fares to such a degree that people will find it much more profitable to use public transportation rather than their private vehicles.

Over the past two years, many employees have inquired of me as to when the Government would increase vacation leave. These people and many others will be very pleased when the Labour Standards Act is changed to provide for three weeks' vacation leave after one year of service.

Free dental care for children will be most welcomed by the low and middle income families.

Too often, Mr. Speaker, society does little to preserve buildings and sites of the present as monuments for future generations. They are allowed to deteriorate and be demolished and are lost for the enjoyment and education of people from other parts of the world. Therefore, I was very pleased that the Throne Speech indicated that some measures will be taken to

preserve historical buildings and sites.

In my maiden speech, Mr. Speaker, I spoke about the importance of early childhood education. I said that kindergartens could do much toward prevention of problems in children from broken homes. I said that prevention was much cheaper than rehabilitation, and that kindergartens should be publicly supported and implemented as soon as possible. I am grateful to the Minister of Education (Mr. MacMurchy) for including in the Speech from the Throne a province-wide system of grants for kindergartens under the direction of school boards.

Before concluding my speech in reply, I want to deal with a few issues pertaining to Saskatoon: A provincial office building for Saskatoon was promised by Members opposite when they were the government. Some of the Members, including myself, on this side of the House had requested it. In my opinion the need is there and I ask the appropriate Minister to start planning immediately for the construction of such a building. At present government offices are scattered throughout the city, even offices for the same department are located in different areas of the city. This makes it virtually impossible for people to transact business with government officials especially for people who depend on public transportation as their mode of travel.

I should like to say a few words about a Field House or a Sports Complex for Saskatoon. Saskatoon is known not only in Canada and in the United States but also in Europe for its annual Knights of Columbus indoor track and field event. Every year between Christmas and New Years the Knights of Columbus hold this event and invite world renowned professionals in track and field to participate. Although it cannot be touted as a big success measured in terms of finances, it is highly successful from the standpoint of the number of young people who prepare for this event and the number of amateurs who participate from the four western provinces, but especially from Saskatchewan.

I should like to see this Government make substantial grants available towards the construction of a Field House in Saskatoon. Such a complex is necessary so that training in track and field and other sports can take place under the right conditions and so that an event like the Knights of Columbus Indoor Games can also be carried out in a suitable location.

The last local issue that I want to deal with, Mr. Speaker, is the Hotel Bessborough. On July 30th, 1973 many Saskatonians were shocked to hear that their pride and joy, 'the Bess' had been sold by the Canadian National. The Bess had become a land mark for many Saskatonians. It was our pride and joy. The Star-Phoenix very aptly described this in the September 29th issue the feelings of many Saskatonians toward the Bess and I quote:

In times of financial stress, tax write-offs or relief were provided by the city, and Saskatoon's Bessborough continued to be the community's pride and joy, a monument to civic faith on the riverbank, a brightly-lit hope during holiday seasons.

It goes on to say:

Recent events culminating in the change of ownership of the Bessborough Hotel have caused many Saskatonians to take a nostalgic look at what Macleans Magazine called in its February 15, 1955 issue, 'Saskatoon's Love Affair with a Hotel named Bess.'

For those of you who don't live in Saskatoon or haven't lived in Saskatoon you won't understand the feeling and the pride that people had for the Hotel Bessborough. It was ours. I think the people of Saskatoon may have been wrong in claiming it as theirs because it rightfully belonged to the Canadian people. However, let me go into some of the details of the sale of the Bessborough.

On July 30th, I received a phone call from an individual in Saskatoon who was very irate about the headlines that he had seen in the Star-Phoenix. And in that article it says, "Local Businessmen Buy Bessborough." I want to read just a few things from that particular article. One of the things that it mentions is this:

No purchase price has been disclosed but it is thought to be \$12 million.

When the individual heard that it was \$12 million he phoned me and said, "Now look, aren't you going to do something about it." I said, "Look, I haven't even heard about it yet." He said that that \$12 million simply means that each Canadian got 60 cents for the sale of the Bessborough.

MR. STEUART: — I haven't got mine yet.

MR. ROLFES: — You probably own part of it. So I phoned a hotel businessman in Saskatoon and asked him about the quoted price of \$12 million. He indicated to me that he felt \$12 million might be a little high for the Bessborough if you wanted to reconstruct it. I said to him, "Would you not have been interested in the Bessborough?" He said, "Yes, if it had been sold for \$6 or \$7 million, I certainly would have been interested."

MR. STEUART: — Who said that?

MR. ROLFES: — A businessman in Saskatoon . . . you said it, I didn't. That is exactly what went on. I think Mr. Steuart knows how these deals take place.

Mr. Speaker, it is interesting to note that in the November 28th issue of the Star-Phoenix we find the headline:

Hotel Price Under \$2.3 Million, says CN Official.

Last weekend I talked again to this same businessman and his answer was that it was a scandal, a complete disgrace and the individuals of the CNR involved should automatically be dismissed from their positions.

SOME HON. MEMBERS: Hear, hear!

MR. ROLFES: — He indicated to me that he found it very difficult that no public bids were obtained for the sale of the Hotel

Bessborough. In the opinion of Mr. Craston the CNR from 1967 to 1969 spent over \$2 million on renovations on the Bessborough. Over \$2 million from 1967 to 1969. I have it here in an article in the Star-Phoenix, April 16, 1969. Mr. Speaker, what I want to know is this, if it is true that Mr. Collver says and I quote:

Mr. Collver and his associates say (this is from September 29th, 1973, Star-Phoenix), 'Hotel Sale Rumor Nonsense.'

Mr. Collver says he and his associates had been working on the Bessborough purchase for about seven years before finally coming to an agreement with CN. My question, Mr. Speaker, is, if the negotiations had been going on for seven years to sell the Bessborough, why then did CN officials spend over \$2 million in renovations, ending up selling the Bessborough for less than \$2.3 million? The latest figures have it, Mr. Speaker, that the Hotel Bessborough was sold for \$1.6 or \$1.7 million.

MR. MacDONALD: I think they gave it away.

MR. ROLFES: — They might have done that. I see Mr. Grant is somewhat dubious about the figures that I am using. But I have before me the minutes of the Proceedings and Evidence of the Standing Committee on Transport and Communications, and I can quote for what Mr. MacMillan said to Mr. Gleave when he was questioned. Mr. MacMillan in answering the question from Mr. Gleave:

I have asked this question before and I will ask it again (says Mr. Gleave). What was the hotel sold for?

And Mr. MacMillan goes on to say:

I would be very pleased to tell you anything else, but the selling price. I will do so after the Session.

And he gave as his reason that the purchaser asked not to have the price released.

Certainly I can understand Mr. Collver not wanting to have the price released because the \$2.3 million or \$1.8 million certainly has enraged the people of Saskatoon. It is not a fair and equitable price, it is a steal from these people of Saskatoon and a steal from the Canadian people.

SOME HON. MEMBERS: Hear, hear!

MR. ROLFES: — Mr. Speaker, I note that my time is almost at an end. I want simply to ask the Federal Government to set up an independent committee to investigate the sale of the Bessborough. In this investigation, Mr. Speaker, it should be found out exactly why there were no public bids. Why did we not have an opportunity to sell the Bessborough for the highest price? Secondly, why did the CN officials spend over \$2 million in renovation and at the same time negotiate to sell the Bessborough? And thirdly, why, Mr. Speaker, is the exact price not released to the public.

Before I sit down, Mr. Speaker, I want to say that this

Throne Speech is an excellent Throne Speech as have been the other three this Government has brought before this House.

SOME HON. MEMBERS: Hear, hear!

MR. ROLFES: — I think our Premier and the Cabinet must be congratulated for looking into the future, especially in the energy crisis and making absolutely certain that Saskatchewan will be protected and that Saskatchewan farmers will have the energy needed in ten or 15 or 20 years from now. Some of the new programs that will be implemented will certainly help both urban and rural Saskatchewan.

Mr. Speaker, from what I have said you can gather that I will not support the sub-amendment or the amendment but that I will support the main motion.

SOME HON. MEMBERS: Hear, hear!

MR. G.P. LOKEN: (Rosetown) — Mr. Speaker, since the last session of the Legislative Assembly this Government has confirmed every suspicion and misgiving the thinking citizens of Saskatchewan had about its actions.

SOME HON. MEMBERS: Hear, hear!

MR. LOKEN: — I should like to point out what I consider to be some of the more serious wrong-doings of the NDP administration so as to set the record straight.

Contrary to the Speech from the Throne, the speeches of the mover and the seconder of the motion we are now debating, Saskatchewan is facing serious problems. And the Government has been remiss in its duty to act upon them. I shall point out that in many of these cases where the Government has acted, their actions have not been in the best interests of the people and have often been contrary to the beliefs and traditions which we in this province hold dear.

An area of great concern for me and for the members of my constituency is the field of agriculture. During the past year Mr. Messer and his department have continued to blunder along not providing real answers or solutions to agricultural problems in Saskatchewan. They have decided that the political gain from confusing the feed grains issue is more worthwhile than doing something to help the farmers.

SOME HON. MEMBERS: Hear, hear!

MR. LOKEN: — Mr. Messer has the responsibility to agriculture producers and to the Saskatchewan economy to sit down with the Federal Government in a reasonable manner and contribute to the new feed grains policy that will take effect next year. If he does not do so, I am convinced that our province's farmers will recognize the fact that his interest in agriculture is secondary to his own political well-being. I am also concerned about the Land Bank Program. Rumors abound about the high price the Government has been paying for farm land, and the political manner in which this land is being leased to farmers.

Of more importance is the fact that the Government has not sold an acre of this land which it has bought. The farmer is beginning to realize that it never will. The Land Bank system of the Provincial Government is a thinly disguised method to own this province's greatest resource, our farm land.

Another area of deep concern in agriculture is the Hog Marketing Commission established this summer by the NDP. First, I should like to remind the Members, this Commission was established arbitrarily without allowing the hog producer to vote on it and without allowing them to control the Commission themselves. Mr. Messer got up in this House last spring and in speech after speech told us how this marketing commission would stabilize the hog industry. And yet today the hog industry in Saskatchewan has never been more unstable, uncertain and bleak. This compulsory marketing commission has been a disruptive force in the industry and the blame lies squarely with the Minister of Agriculture and the Government opposite.

Closely related to the Hog Marketing Commission have been the recent developments in the meat packing industry in Saskatchewan. Those people who have concern for this province's prosperity and industrial development cannot help but be disturbed by what has happened. Firstly, the Government of Saskatchewan has purchased 45 per cent of shares in Intercontinental Packers for a ridiculously high price. They did not add one new job or in any way advance the stability of the industry. And now we hear that Burns Foods are not only cancelling construction of their multimillion dollar facility in Regina, but are actually closing down their entire operation in the city. One hundred and forty have been lost, and the Blakeney Government has done nothing. Burns announced their closure and they stated specifically that one of the major reasons for the decision to close down was because of the uncertainty of the hog deliveries in this province. Mr. Messer's hog commission has certainly demonstrated its inability to help producers. The closure of Burns was not an isolated or unique occurrence.

All over Saskatchewan industrial growth has stagnated, particularly in those fields where the NDP Government has interfered. The classic example of this Government's incompetence to establish industry has to be the Roumanian tractor plant in Saskatoon. For over two years now we have witnessed an array of public servants, municipal officials trailing back and forth from Roumania and entering into negotiations for the establishment of this tractor company. The net result as announced by the Minister of 'No Industry' last month was that there would be no tractor plant and no new jobs.

I should now like to speak for a few moments on welfare. Just before the opening of this Session, in plenty of time to have as much impact on the Lakeview by-election as possible, the Minister of Social Services held a news conference reporting that welfare was down. His statement as reported in the Regina Leader-Post, was more than just inaccurate. He stated there were only 23,103 still on social assistance rolls. About two per cent of the population. The fact is there are 23,103 cases this is over 46,000 people and instead of representing two per cent of the population it represents over four per cent. If we add to this people on reserves who are on welfare and those people drawing unemployment insurance, the percentage of people receiving assistance actually total more than seven per

cent. The Minister also stated that less than 10 per cent of the people on welfare could be classed as employable. If you really feel that this is the case, I think it is a sad commentary on the way the Department of Social Services is being run. Surely those who are emotionally disturbed and those with physical handicaps could be rehabilitated and brought back into the mainstream of our society. For the Minister of Social Services to say, we give up, means that he is willing to confine these people to a life of welfare when it is not necessary. I say very bluntly that at least half of these people receiving assistance from the Department of Social Services are capable of rehabilitation. The sooner the Government recognizes that the first responsibility is to get these people off welfare, instead of keeping them on, the sooner our province will have the resources to deal with those people who really need assistance in an adequate manner.

Mr. Speaker, there are many other areas that I could mention which would point out this Government's failure to provide Saskatchewan with responsible administration. Some of these have been mentioned by my colleagues and we intend to bring up others as the Session goes on. Because of this, Mr. Speaker, I will support the amendment, I will vote against the motion.

SOME HON. MEMBERS: Hear, hear!

MR. K.R. MacLEOD: (Regina Albert Park) — Mr. Speaker, I do want to tell you that I congratulate the mover and seconder of the motion that we are speaking to today.

It has not been my practice to worry about whether people are in the House or out of the House, and generally I don't like to comment on whether someone is here or not here, but in the case of this evening I want to congratulate those who found themselves elsewhere because they showed a judgment which should be commended during the speech of the Hon. Member for Nutana South (Mr. Rolfes).

SOME HON. MEMBERS: Hear, hear!

MR. MacLEOD: — I was somewhat fascinated by the continuing saga of the sale of the Bessborough. It was not mentioned by the Hon. Member that the Bessborough Hotel had for years been losing money. I wondered if he was trying to tell us all of these problems would be solved if this business were nationalized. Because the solution to everything from the Members opposite is to nationalize it. And it does seem that if it were nationalized I suppose we wouldn't have had the problems. I draw the attention of the Member to something that he may not know, and that is the fact that the Bessborough Hotel has been losing something like \$250,000 a year for the past few years without any sign of improvement in that figure — this by a publicly operated corporation.

Using the type of mathematics that has been used by this Government in past transactions, if the NDP had bought this on behalf of the people of Saskatchewan, the price would have undoubtedly been something in the order of \$10 or \$12 million, perhaps more.

AN HON. MEMBER: — More like \$20 million.

MR. MacLEOD: — No. I think \$10 or \$12 million would have been the price they'd have paid. If, however, Mr. Speaker, it had been losing \$500,000 a year, I have no doubt that it would have fetched something like \$15 or \$20 million if it were bought by the Government. My colleague reminds me that the Government might well have done better by buying the Bessborough than Intercontinental Packers.

Mr. Speaker, I have had the opportunity to go through this Speech from the Throne. It is a longer Speech from the Throne than I am accustomed to observing. The Government had done a lot of congratulations for itself and to itself. Mostly, however, it has castigated the Federal Government, undoubtedly using this forum and the Speech from the Throne to assist David Lewis in his activities (and he needs it). It has also put words in the place of activity. For example, under Environment, the Government is apparently vigorously pursuing negotiations with the Federal Government. An interpretation of that means that they are trying to get somebody else to pay for it and all the while the water out there gets greener and greener. I should like to invite the Hon. Minister cut to my cabin on Katepwa Lake some day and he will see the most beautiful green he has ever seen. It is all in the water.

Another thing I noticed is that for multiculturalism the Government has stated that it has called a large conference. Now that is a tremendous contribution to multiculturalism. I wonder if they included at that conference the conference between Mr. Barrett and Mr. Levesque. That should produce some rather interesting fireworks for the future of Canada when we have a separatist now trying to get into bed with the NDP, or is it the other way around?

I want to suggest, Mr. Speaker, that this House has now started some seven days ago and it has already produced something like 28 Bills. If this means that we are going to get the legislation a lot faster this year than we did last year, I congratulate the House Leader, or whoever is responsible for presenting these to the House. Quite frankly, Mr. Speaker, it became close to a scandal last year the way the business of the House was being handled by the Government and we are very pleased to note what appears to be an improved technique and improved practice.

AN HON. MEMBER: — A change of heart.

MR. MacLEOD: — A change of heart — yes. I also observe, Mr. Speaker, that there are a few potential pitfalls in this Speech from the Throne. I notice under Civil and Human Rights the following sentence:

You will be asked to protect against invasion of privacy by prohibiting electronic eavesdropping.

Just looking at that it would appear that this Bill was to deal almost exclusively with electronic eavesdropping. But the actual Bill itself goes much farther. Now, of course, I was not in any way misled because the Hon. the Attorney General (Mr. Romanow) saw fit to present this promptly at the

beginning of this Legislature and consequently I was able to observe that the Bill itself went far beyond what was stated in the Speech from the Throne.

I might say, Mr. Speaker, that there are undoubtedly other items where to read what is put forward in the Speech from the Throne, is to be deceived. Because there is no doubt in my mind that this document was largely designed for political purposes intended to give us the minimum amount of information and certainly the minimum amount of ammunition to attack them. Mind you, our arsenal is fairly full from the contribution last week and we have had a good shot at them lately as the recent conflict in Lakeview indicates.

Now, Mr. Speaker, we have had a long day and the time has come to suggest that we wrap it up and I beg leave to adjourn the debate.

Debate adjourned.

The Assembly adjourned at 9:12 o'clock p.m.