

LEGISLATIVE ASSEMBLY OF SASKATCHEWAN
Fourth Session — Seventeenth Legislature
7th Day

Friday, December 7, 1973.

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

On the Orders of the Day.

WELCOME TO STUDENTS

HON. N.E. BYERS: (Kelvington) — Mr. Speaker, before the Orders of the Day I should like to introduce to you and to the Members of this Assembly 33 students seated in the Speaker's Gallery. They are from the Invermay High School and they are the Grade 7 and Grade 12 classes. They are accompanied here today by their teachers Mr. Mike Kaminski and Mr. Ken Krawetz and their bus driver Mr. Wiwchar. They left home early this morning and they have been viewing such attractions in Regina as the Museum of Natural History and the RCMP Museum. I hope that all Members will join with me in welcoming this group of students with the hope that their visit to this Legislature will be both informative and educational and that they will see fit to return again on a future occasion.

HON. MEMBERS: Hear, hear!

MR. E.F. FLASCH: (Maple Creek) — Mr. Speaker, it is my pleasure to introduce to you 23 students from the Mendham School, that is the school of which I am normally principal. They are here today with their teacher Mr. Nasserchuk and their drivers, they are seated in the west gallery. They came to Regina yesterday noon. Since then they have visited a number of places of interest and I know that the Assembly will join me in wishing them a successful afternoon and an interesting and entertaining one here in the Legislature.

HON. MEMBERS: Hear, hear!

INTRODUCTION OF GUEST

MEMBER FOR REGINA LAKEVIEW CONSTITUENCY

MR. D.G. STEUART: (Leader of the Opposition) — Mr. Speaker, I should like to introduce in the Speaker's Gallery a student of the political scene, Mr. Ted Malone who will soon be down here taking post-graduate work.

SOME HON. MEMBERS: Hear, hear!

QUESTIONS

HIRING OF LEGISLATIVE REPORTER

MR. J.G. LANE: (Lumsden) — Mr. Speaker, before the Orders of the Day I have a question of the Hon. Premier. There is a rumor, not a Liberal rumor, that either the political party of which the Premier is head or the Government intends to hire the chief Legislative Reporter of the Regina Leader-Post at the end of this Legislative Session. Would you verify the accuracy of that statement?

HON. A.E. BLAKENEY: (Premier) — I am not in a position to comment on that rumor.

MR. LANE: — As a supplementary, I am wondering if we can accept that as an admission that such a hiring is to be made. In light of statements and the story in the Leader-Post of December 6th, of which I have verified the accuracy for the information of the House — it was a byline of Mr. Mel Hinds, the statement was very inaccurate and I must say unfair and unfortunate and inaccurate. The misleading statement was in the Lakeview by-election that the general consensus was that the voters were pleased by the Government's performance and didn't bother to vote. In the light of that statement if the Premier would consider making the appointment effective today.

MR. SPEAKER: — These questions while they may be entertaining, they are not seeking information. The Hon. Member said when he rose that it was rumor. I should like to see those rumors dealing with questions based as much as possible on fact for the benefit of the House.

DEMANDS ON DEPARTMENT OF NORTHERN SASKATCHEWAN

MR. D.G. STEUART: (Leader of the Opposition) — Mr. Speaker, before the Orders of the Day I should like to direct a question to the Minister of the Department of Northern Saskatchewan (Mr. Bowerman). In the light of the 150 or whatever number of people from Northern Saskatchewan, 200, 250, there are more coming in, I understand, who are camped out here, they were here last night and are still here today, I have two questions: (1) Is he now prepared to admit that the Department of Northern Saskatchewan is in a mess and is he prepared to do something about it; and (2) is he prepared to give any commitment to these people, these unfortunate people who can't seem to get heard, who can't seem to get their legitimate complaints listened to, is he prepared to give them a commitment today that he will give them some solid facts, something that they can go home with and know that they can have some opportunity of earning a living in the bush and the woods of northern Saskatchewan. Is he prepared to give them some commitment?

HON. G.R. BOWERMAN: (Minister of Northern Saskatchewan) — Mr. Speaker, one of the reasons that we face the problem that we have today is because of the actions of that Government from 1964 to 1971. You gave the forests of this province to the corporations that are not of Canada, that are outside of Canada, outside of Saskatchewan. And 95 per cent of the commercial forests of this province have been given to these corporations. I say that the reason these people are here today is to try and recover some of those forests for their own interests. Yes, we will make a commitment to these people. We have already made a commitment to the people of Saskatchewan that we will recover the commercial forests of this province as quickly as we can on their behalf.

SOME HON. MEMBERS: Hear, hear!

MR. STEUART: — A supplementary question. Mr. Speaker, you know he may be able to kid those people out there, but obviously he hasn't kidded them, he might try to kid the Press and the public but he can't kid us. In the last session of the Legislature by the amendment to The Forest Act it is a fact that the NDP Government, the Blakeney Government, broke every contract, opened up every contract that was held in the forests of northern Saskatchewan. Now, Mr. Bowerman told them yesterday that they could not give them what they wanted because — the Premier at least told them the truth — they had to break leases. Now are you prepared to give this House a commitment.

MR. SPEAKER: — Order! Will the Hon. Member ask a question. This is not a place for a statement, there is lots of time for debate during the debate that is before the House. That is not a question, that is taking part in a debate. I think we cannot permit that type of statement.

MR. STEUART: — It was just the odd word I had to say to sort of set the stage. I will ask the question. The question is: are you prepared to give them the commitment, the nine-point commitment that they have asked for? Are you prepared on behalf of the Government to give them that commitment today?

MR. BOWERMAN: — I don't know of any nine-point commitment that they have asked us for. I was presented with a document which has seven articles on the page. There are some of those which we already have made and we are already committed to making. There are some of them that we cannot commit ourselves to. I have discussed it with them and I suggest to you that there will be no commitment made with respect to some of them.

ADJOURNED DEBATES

ADDRESS-IN-REPLY

The Assembly resumed the adjourned debate on the proposed motion of Mr. Kaeding (Saltcoats) and the proposed amendment thereto moved by Mr. Steuart (Leader of the Opposition) and the proposed subamendment thereto moved by Mr. Richards (Saskatoon-University).

MR. K.P. MacLEOD: (Regina Albert Park) — Mr. Speaker, I was pleased to see presented in the introduction of bills today one that will bring Ted Malone down to this part of the House to bring the third lawyer to our side of the House, thereby, Mr. Speaker, along with the other Members on this side of the House producing what appears to be an equality of ability on both sides of the House — which is what democracy is all about.

I observe by the newscast today, Mr. Speaker, that the Government appeared to have agreed to have a seven point program presented to them by the people outside in the corridors. I observe this morning that the Government appears to have reneged on five out of seven of these points . . .

SOME HON. MEMBERS: Hear, hear!

MR. MacLEOD: — . . . and it appears to me that obviously the natives and other people outside and the Hon. Minister of Northern Saskatchewan dance to or march to a different drum.

I do oppose these tactics and sit-ins, I regret that these seem to be necessary in our society. I was incensed at the sit-in by university students some months ago at the University of Saskatchewan, Regina Campus, and I oppose the necessity of this kind of thing and I oppose it in our own Legislature. It does not go beyond our notice, however, that this type of thing would not be necessary if the Government of Saskatchewan were to manage its affairs in northern Saskatchewan with a little more efficiency.

SOME HON. MEMBERS: Hear, hear!

MR. MacLEOD: — Mr. Speaker, I want to announce and make plain to this House that the Saskatchewan Liberal caucus does support the energy policy outlined by Prime Minister Trudeau in the House of Commons last night.

SOME HON. MEMBERS: Hear, hear!

MR. MacLEOD: — The Prime Minister's announcement is a logical extension of the present energy policy that has been carried on by the Federal Government and our Members here support the program. At the same time, of course, we do caution the Federal Government and the Government opposite not to close off any possible avenues of energy resource development. We agree that prices must be monitored but it is also necessary that the rate of return to oil companies remain at such a level that further exploration in Canada will be encouraged. The Federal policy announced last night has three basic intentions. Firstly, it is intended to alleviate the current energy crisis in Canada, secondly, make the nation self-sufficient in oil and thirdly, further national unity, an item with respect to which . . .

SOME HON. MEMBERS: Hear, hear!

MR. MacLEOD: — . . . an item on which the Liberal Party in Canada and the Liberal Party in Saskatchewan and the Liberal Government of Canada is totally dedicated, and the destruction of which appears to be one of the prime objectives of the party opposite.

Mr. Speaker, before we can talk sensibly about a national oil policy in broad and general terms we must recognize the facts of the world oil situation. The proven reserves of oil and petroleum in the world today are approximately 550 billion barrels of oil. We are talking about the 35 imperial gallon barrel, we are not speaking of the large 45 gallon or larger drums which are common on Saskatchewan farms today. Of this 550 billion barrels of oil of proven reserves in the world the Arab states of the Middle East and North Africa have about 400 billion barrels. This means that the Arab states have today more proven reserves of oil than all the rest of the world combined, more than twice as much as all the rest of the world combined.

For example, Kuwait, a tiny kingdom one-twentieth the size of Saskatchewan, so small that you could hide it in the northern part of Saskatchewan way back of Prince Albert National Park, with a population far smaller than that of Saskatchewan, has as much proven reserves of petroleum as all of North America, Central America and South America combined. That little kingdom virtually sits on a sea of oil. Kuwait therefore has as much in proven reserves as all of North, Central and South America. With the Arab nations having most of the world's petroleum the potential danger is obvious. The Western world, particularly North America has developed a huge appetite for oil, creating a gigantic increase in the demand for petroleum products. This has been coupled with a steady shrinking in the easily accessible reserves in North America and in other high demand areas such as Europe. At the same time there has been a realignment of the Arab world. Until recently Arab states competed with each other for world markets. Now the Arab states are united. They no longer compete with each other. They have full recognition of the increased demand for oil and the increased value of their product, a product which in the future will command an even higher and higher price as continuing shortages of this irreplaceable fuel occur elsewhere through the world.

Wars in the Middle East will undoubtedly create oil ripples around the world. There are biblical scholars who say that in the end the greatest conflict of all time will be fought in and about the Middle East and that such a disaster may cause the end of civilization itself. Now, this is the world situation — the predominant location of oil in the Arab world — with respect to which Canada must develop an oil policy.

The policy we adopt must be a recognition of these facts and of our own demands and limitations.

Our oil policy then is almost obvious. We must simply make our oil and gas reserves last as long as possible. To meet this objective we must do three things. Firstly, we must obtain as much oil and petroleum products as possible from outside Canada, particularly from the Arab states. Secondly, recognizing the inevitable interruptions which are likely to occur from now on, we must be able to supply our own needs when outside supplies are interrupted. Emergencies are likely to arise on the shortest of notice. We must not only locate our own oil and gas, we must have a delivery system which makes them readily available to all parts of Canada. And thirdly, we must immediately examine and develop alternate sources of energy to make our own oil and gas reserves last as long as possible. We must get the maximum mileage out of our reserves, we must use them only for the highest and best use.

We must therefore be selective in the items which are permitted to use oil and gas; and any form of energy, any energy demand which can be met with a lesser fuel, a less unique fuel must be used whenever possible.

To carry out this policy, I would propose the following. Firstly, that Canada immediately create a foreign oil purchasing agency, a Federal Agency with the deliberate purpose of acquiring as much oil as possible for Canada from foreign sources. This foreign oil purchasing agency should have power to deal in co-operation with our well established oil industry, to bring to Canada as much oil as possible in each and every minute of each and every year that we possibly can, starting

right away. The agency should have power to finance the construction of tankers and super-tankers. It should have the power to store oil. It should have the power to build up a Canadian national reserve of petroleum, from foreign commitments and with deals with other governments and, for example, in conjunction with the Department of Trade and Commerce, it should be able to sell and commit our own products such as wheat in exchange for commitments for oil.

Secondly, Canada must have a fully integrated, internal petroleum industry. This involves the exploration for, development of all oil fields and the establishment of efficient refineries. We must have a total oil package from exploration right down to the final delivery of gasoline, natural gas and all petroleum products to all parts of Canada.

This involves the Government of Canada in the petroleum industry, as a leader, as a partner and when necessary as a financier and participant. The petroleum industry has served us well, Mr. Speaker, and will continue to do so. The petroleum industry has the expertise which is not available to governments. The integrated oil companies of Canada can and may provide services necessary for the accomplishment of a totally internal and self-supporting oil industry. The Canadian government must of course lay down long range objectives. A totally integrated industry, capable of immediate delivery of quantities of fossil fuels to all parts of Canada is not possible unless that system is in constant use. But the system should be used at a level below its full capacity. Putting this in reverse order, the capacity must be there beyond the intended immediate use and it must be held as a national asset.

Thirdly, Canada must explore every possible method of alternative energy. We must not be using oil where some cheaper or better or long lasting resource will do. Accordingly a national electric generating grid is essential. The Government must explore on a national scale the available hydroelectric sources. They must be considered on the basis of an integrated development across Canada. The Federal Government in a federal state must give guidance and integrate the planning of all the provinces. At the earliest possible moment, generating stations which use petroleum products must be converted to some cheaper form of energy.

And fourthly, we must urge the world to consider oil and petroleum products as a natural resource of the world. We should encourage through the United Nations, the formation of a world commission on petroleum, suggested yesterday by Senator Edward Kennedy of the United States.

These then are my recommendations as part of a long term national energy policy for Canada. That we obtain as much oil as possible from outside Canada. That we create energy delivery capacity in Canada, underutilized, except in emergencies. That we assess proper priorities of use to various forms of energy. Use renewable resources such as hydro-generation in preference to non-renewable resources.

Canada of course, is competing for oil with other countries and the price is going to rise. Cheap oil and gas is over. It's gone forever. Efforts to keep the price down artificially can and will make the situation worse. People driving down Grant Road, Westfield Drive in Regina or out in Stoughton do not

want to pay \$2 a gallon, within the next three or four or five years from now, just because the Government of Saskatchewan or the Government of Canada did not allow the price to rise a little bit today. We must remember that one-third of the cost of a gallon of gasoline is a direct, provincial tax and this Government can keep price- down by taking off some of that tax.

SOME HON. MEMBERS: Hear, hear!

MR. MacLEOD: — The Government of Alberta has taken a narrow, provincial stand on the issue. It wants to gouge the rest of Canada at the moment, because it has most of Canada's oil reserves. That is a game that cannot win and should not win.

Saskatchewan is mixed up. If possible the NDP Government would like to get in on the gouging, but we are very vulnerable in this province. Two-thirds of our natural gas comes from Alberta.

The Saskatchewan oil industry has been going down hill for two reasons. Firstly, because major finds of gas and oil in Saskatchewan are not likely — although, Mr. Speaker, we hope that the big discovery is still out there to be made. Secondly, because of the unfortunate noise made by politicians, notably, Members of the New Democratic Party.

We are, therefore, in Saskatchewan in a quandary. Higher prices mean higher royalties. The Premier in his letter enclosing the one-half year hospitalization card boasted about these additional revenues. But higher prices mean more, mean that we have to pay more for gas in Saskatchewan. We have to pay more for the gas we get from Alberta and if we don't pay higher prices there will be reduced exploration, which in turn results in greater shortages. On February 15th of this year, in this Legislature, the Minister of Mineral Resources (Mr. Thorson) pointed out that Milk River gas was becoming more economic now that well-head prices had risen to reasonable levels. We therefore win and we lose at the same time. The Government condemns price increases which the Minister himself praised some ten months ago.

Knowing that we must acquire more gas, the Government has failed in its duty. It has had opportunities in the past two or three years to acquire gas at four or five cents per thousand cubic feet (that is, per MCF) in the ground.

The Minister himself, last February acknowledged that six cents per MCF was a good price in the ground for natural gas. Yet, the Government has passed up opportunities to purchase gas at these lower prices, knowing full well that the prices would rise, and indeed, knowing that prices must rise if we are to get Milk River gas and other gas which today is uneconomic.

The Government's proposals in the Throne Speech are therefore intended to do little for the national good. They do little for the people of Saskatchewan except to create more shortages. The Government has made no plans of its own in anticipation of a national electric power grid.

Saskatchewan could be a great partner to have in the energy crisis of the future. Saskatchewan has more different kinds of

sources of energy, coal, uranium, oil, natural gas and water power, than most of the nations of the world. We could do ourselves a lot of good and we could do Canada a lot of good. I suggest the Government immediately consider plans for the construction of a dam on the Saskatchewan River at Nipawin, Saskatchewan.

SOME HON. MEMBERS: Hear, hear!

MR. MacLEOD: — Let me say in closing, that when people drive down Gordon Road, or Compton or Westfield Drive or anywhere in Saskatchewan, the nationality of the oil or gas is not going to concern them. If they pay a fair price for the oil, they care not who earns that price. And they care not that some of that money goes to Alberta or the Arab states. What they are concerned about is that Saskatchewan will not be deprived of needed oil, that they will be unable to fill their tanks because the Saskatchewan Government in furtherance of the designs of David Lewis, has embarked upon an unfair and unwarranted attack upon the Federal Government.

Mr. Speaker, I look forward in anticipation to some of the proposals which arise out of the Throne Speech. I do not wish to prejudge them. I hope they are better than the Throne Speech. The Throne Speech as it relates to energy is narrow, selfish unco-operative, confused and dangerous. It practically eliminates the oil and gas exploration from Saskatchewan. It is an attempt to stand with both feet in the air at the same time. As a result, Mr. Speaker, it is my intention to support, not the subamendment but the amendment. I do not intend to support the main motion.

SOME HON. MEMBERS: Hear, hear!

MR. H. OWENS: (Elrose) — Mr. Speaker, it is indeed a real honor to be permitted to take part in this debate.

Firstly, may I heartily congratulate the Members from Saltcoats and Watrous for their speeches in reply to the Speech from the Throne.

SOME HON. MEMBERS: Hear, hear!

MR. OWENS: — It is natural, I suppose, for a backbencher to expect a rousing oration from our Leader and the Cabinet Ministers and possibly other long time Members of the Legislature. To be treated to presentations like those we were privileged to hear from our fellow backbenchers further endorses the facts that we have learned since June 1971. Saltcoats and Watrous constituencies chose representatives with superior knowledge and sound judgment, and oratorical ability to represent them ably and honorably in this Legislature.

SOME HON. MEMBERS: Hear, hear!

MR. OWENS: — They have, Mr. Speaker, initiated a pattern of debate in opening this Session that will be difficult to follow. It is indeed a privilege to sit with them and support them in this debate.

Before beginning on my script on the Throne Speech, Mr. Speaker, I should like to at this time, do what might be classed as a rather unpleasant task, because I am a Member on your right. I congratulate the Members opposite and the Liberal Party for their success in their recent election in the constituency of Regina Lakeview. I look forward to the opportunity of meeting their new colleague. I hope when he takes his seat in a few days he will enhance the appearance across the way.

SOME HON. MEMBERS: Hear, hear!

MR. OWENS: — It would indeed be a sad disaster if his stature as depicted in the facsimile staring at us from his chair, cost his supporters a reputed \$30,000. When I gaze at that picture I adjust my spectacles and force myself to realize that those other chairs are actually occupied by flesh and blood individualists, not just immobile statues. I feel sure, Mr. Malone's presence will spark much more lively activity in the Opposition benches, as he will without doubt be another contender for the Leadership.

Mr. Speaker, I want publicly to express my disappointment on learning of the decision of the Member from Saskatoon University (Mr. Richards) to retain his seat in the Legislature as an Independent. I am sorry he is not in his seat at the moment. I was disappointed on behalf of his constituents who supported him as a New Democrat, who are no longer represented on the Government benches. I was disappointed with the loss of his support and criticism of the New Democratic Party. But my greatest disappointment was for the Member himself. I felt he had substantially ruined a most promising political career.

As a lone Independent his abilities as an economist, a researcher and a fluent debater will be all but lost for the betterment of our society. It is my hope that the Hon. Member in the not too distant future, and remembering that time waits for no one, will find a suitable place in our public life wherein he can use his God given talents for service to the people of Saskatchewan in a fruitful manner.

SOME HON. MEMBERS: Hear, hear!

MR. OWENS: — Now, Mr. Speaker, just a couple of remarks made by the Member from Rosthern (Mr. Boldt) in his speech a few days ago. I see this Member is not in his seat, but I do believe that he is sitting in the Speaker's Gallery this afternoon. He said in part and I quote:

Well, it is obvious to Saskatchewan farmers that the United Farmers of Canada have no influence on Otto Lang.

He was referring to Mr. Lang's refusal to appear at the United Farmers convention in Winnipeg a few days ago. Could I suggest to the Member from Rosthern that although the United Farmers of Canada may have no influence on Mr. Lang, it might be a brotherly act on his part to inform his good pal and colleague that very shortly Saskatchewan Farmers in Humboldt may have a very great influence on his career as an MP for that constituency.

SOME HON. MEMBERS: Hear, hear!

MR. OWENS: — On another point the Rosthern Member endeavored to prove his prowess in mathematical ability and claimed he could file proof for his statements. Mr. Speaker, he pulled the old Liberal bogey out of the ragbag and stated that the personal income tax in Saskatchewan had been increased by the NDP since 1971 by 17.6 per cent. And in another point again tried to prove the increased costs of gasoline during the same period were the direct result of increased government taxes. I am surprised the Hon. Member so carelessly discounts his credibility in this Legislature. He knows very well that the increase in personal income tax, provincially, was 3 per cent. The balance of the increase was the result of increased exemption at the Federal level resulting in a change from 34 to 37 per cent when related to the Federal tax rate without bringing any additional revenue to Saskatchewan. The increases on the price of petroleum products were made directly by the oil companies at the retail level. There has been no increase in gasoline tax by this Government since the election in 1971. The last gas tax increase of 2 cents per gallon was put on by the Liberal Government of which Mr. Boldt was a Member of the Cabinet.

Mr. Speaker, each year every citizen of Saskatchewan, or at least the majority of the citizens of Saskatchewan, look forward with eager anticipation to the reading of the Speech from the Throne, anxiously awaiting the forecast of things to come. Each year since 1971, they have been overwhelmingly surprised at the ambitious plans and proposals announced and this one has upheld the tradition. Further, Mr. Speaker, the people know from past experience at least two things; first, that the Government of the NDP can be depended upon to carry out the announced plans and proposals and much more, and secondly, that when the Opposition violently opposes those plans and proposals the province can look forward to good legislation and good government for the people.

SOME HON. MEMBERS: Hear, hear!

MR. OWENS: — Yes, Mr. Speaker, the people of Saskatchewan have learned that the Opposition refuse to support progressive policies for the rank and file residents of our province.

Mr. Speaker, I am privileged to represent the famous constituency of Elrose, famous for the fine people who live within its boundaries, famous for the fine livestock raised on the farms and ranches although fewer in number than in many other areas of our province, famous for our progressive farms and towns — there is no city in that constituency — famous for the thousands of boxcars of high quality grain shipped out of the area to feed the people of the world. Also, Mr. Speaker, for the tax contributions to help fill the coffers of the treasuries in Ottawa and Regina as well as local governments. Mr. Speaker, Elrose could quite rightly have been called Eden, but let me quickly add that like the early garden, Elrose does have problems and I will be pressing our government for changes and programs that I feel should be considered in the not too distant future.

Mr. Speaker, I will not, at this time expand on the now widely accepted Land Bank Commission. With reservations, I would commend the Members opposite and the Liberal Party for the

publicity they have given this program. Their violent opposition has done more, in my opinion, to make the people of Saskatchewan study and accept this method of land transfer, than any amount of advertising by the Government would have achieved. A real good example of Liberal philosophy, "What is good for Saskatchewan we will oppose."

The companion piece of legislation, FarmStart, will be continued and expanded. Up to this time designed to assist in the production and expansion of the livestock industry, it is my hope that the expanded version will assist farmers, especially young farmers, that live in those areas of Saskatchewan that are not conducive to profitable livestock production, to get started in farming by granting assistance to a wider base of farm products.

Mr. Speaker, during the past several months much has been said and I am sure much more will be said in the months ahead about marketing, currently as it affects feed grains and rapeseed. Mr. Speaker, I will not discuss, at this time, the policies of pricing and freight rates, but I do dare to predict we are presently hearing only the sweet strains of unpopular music. Unless some drastic and positive steps are taken now, we will in the foreseeable future hear storms of unrest and distress. In spite of all the protests made and being made by most of the farm organizations in western Canada, with the exception of the Palliser Wheat Growers, the Federal Minister of Justice, Minister in charge of the Canadian Wheat Board, with support from his Liberal Party Members, including, Mr. Speaker, the Liberal Members opposite, have made a decision to give the rapeseed growers the opportunity to vote on how their rapeseed should be sold on the open market as at present or by orderly marketing through the Canadian Wheat Board. The die has been cast, a vote will be taken and the rapeseed producers will make a decision. In my judgment it is very difficult to beat a loaded ballot especially to the tune of 60 per cent. However, the eligible rapeseed producers have to make the decision, I hope 61 per cent plus will study the decision seriously, study the Saskatchewan Pool advertisement that appeared in many papers recently and it is called "Rapeseed Roulette." And I am sure many of you have seen a copy of it in a good many of the papers. It states in part, it begins with the big name "Rapeseed roulette."

More than 17.50 a bushel for rapeseed. If you were lucky and sold at the peak of the market in the 1972-73 crop year. If you picked the wrong time you received as little as 12.50 a bushel or less. Of the rapeseed delivered in 1972-73 less than 18 per cent sold at \$4 per bushel or more. About one third went for \$3 a bushel or less. About half of the rapeseed brought \$3 and \$4 per bushel.

That is how things go on the open market. It should be read by every rapeseed producer before he votes.

Mr. Speaker, flaxseed is not being talked about at the present time. It is in much the same position, with fluctuations in prices even wider. Although acreages seeded to rapeseed in western Canada have increased greatly in the last few years, a cash crop and lifesaver for many during the period of the great wheat surplus, Canada's supply is very small in the world markets. Producers would be well advised to vote for orderly marketing through the Canadian Wheat Board.

Mr. Speaker, rapeseed production in west Central Saskatchewan is small relative to total acreage, so whatever the result of the vote the effect in that area of Saskatchewan will be of small significance. However, feed grains is another story. Feed grain is grown province-wide and is a major source of income for Saskatchewan farmers. The Members of this Assembly are fully conversant with the implications of the problems, especially as they are proposed after this crop year. Why, may I ask, the need for an Agricultural Products Board? To buy feed grain in competition with the Canadian Wheat Board is to me an unanswerable question. How an orderly marketing system can be maintained with feed grains on an open quota system and all other grains on a quota system is also unanswerable. Our grain handling system is presently taxed to capacity, no need to create more confusion and confusion it will be. Along with grain moving confusion we will be faced with price confusion.

Mr. Speaker, I firmly believe we are witnessing a 'backdoor' undermining of orderly grain marketing for our western farmers. I firmly believe that the powers of the Canadian Wheat Board are being reduced and eroded by the Federal Government under pressure of the Winnipeg Commodity Exchange and associated interests.

I am amazed beyond words, Mr. Speaker, beyond imagination. Surely the Federal Government, yes, our Federal Liberal Government, could not be that brazen to western Canada. Political suicide, Mr. Speaker, but that is their business, that is their decision, however, they have not that many to hang from the West. But now, Mr. Speaker, I challenge the Liberal Members opposite to stand up and support their eastern counterparts. I challenge them, Mr. Speaker, to campaign the next election in Saskatchewan against the Canadian Wheat Board and orderly marketing. Orderly marketing of all commodities not just grain. I am not a crystal ball gazer, Mr. Speaker, but it would be an odd and unique situation to have a Saskatchewan Legislature without at least some Liberal Opposition, ineffective as it may be.

Mr. Speaker, the Throne Speech promises legislation to re-establish a farm machinery testing institute. This very popular action will be welcomed by all sectors of the farm community in western Canada. Pamphlets of tests made by the former Agriculture Machinery Administration were welcomed not only by the farmer, the user of the machine, but also by the dealership. Unbiased assessments of farm machines are valuable for both buyer and seller. As a former dealer it is my opinion that no sale is better than an unsatisfactory one. Too often we learn too late, that an implement that performs well in one area is not suitable in another. I welcome this legislation with the hope that the testing can be started at an early date.

Mr. Speaker, the announcement of the establishment of a Saskatchewan Development Fund is most welcome and timely. During discussions with managers of local banks and credit unions, I have learned that at no previous time have deposits of all types been as high as now. Saskatchewan people are seeking to invest their savings in sound securities and most of these people are prepared and anxious to use their surplus funds to help Saskatchewan grow. The amazing growth of the credit union movement indicates the desire of our people to have a voice in the administration of their financial resources. This fund will provide another source for secure investment, whether large or small, guaranteed by our government. Mr. Speaker, it

is simply just good common sense to provide an opportunity for Saskatchewan people to invest in Saskatchewan as an alternative to Bay Street, Wall Street and their counterparts.

Mr. Speaker, while speaking on the topic of money, may I say a word about taxation, a subject very important to most of us, especially as it affects our pocketbook.

As a party we pride ourselves in supporting the formula of 'ability to pay' as the fairest and most equitable and with which I fully agree. However, I must say that in some particular areas of taxation we are still in the horse and buggy days, so to speak. Glaring inequities still prevail, probably some persons are paying too much, I am of the opinion that others are not assessed their rightful proportion and most of these would be willing to accept changes.

We have had studies made in many fields for the purpose of assessing our present position and using the data collected to propose future action. Possibly a look into the total field of taxation would be in order.

In the same vein, Mr. Speaker, and in view of the factors of inflation during the last few years, mainly as it pertains to farm lands and therefore farm estates, I would further propose a study and possible upward revisions of the exemptions in The Succession Duties Act.

Mr. Speaker, I repeat what has been said by others about the buoyant economy of our province and especially in the prairie agriculture sector. As we all well know the fluctuation of agriculture and of our farm population sets the tone for the whole province and, indeed, has a large effect on the total Canadian picture. Financial returns predicted for the coming year continue bright. Increasing returns for farm products continue to offset the increase in operating costs. If present demands for food can be attributed to a growth in high protein diets created by global prosperity, then farmers in western Canada may look forward to a new era of unprecedented market stability.

Saskatchewan has long been noted as the great grain growing province of Canada. Add to this knowledge the tremendous growth in our livestock production, our economic development in numerous fields, our overwhelming tourist potential and our unprecedented developments in our forests and its by-products, to mention only a few facts of our future potential, what do we see, Mr. Speaker? We see a province with an enviable future, we see a province that will challenge its residents to leadership in new fields of service, we see a province that will continue to be governed by a strong and progressive Legislature.

Mr. Speaker, the Speech from the Throne opens many opportunities, this Government is prepared to accept opportunities for our people unprecedented in the history of western Canada.

Again, I congratulate the mover and seconder and pledge them my wholehearted support. I cannot support the amendment or the subamendment.

SOME HON. MEMBERS: Hear, hear!

MR. M. FEDUNIAK: (Turtleford) — Mr. Speaker, it is indeed a pleasure that I again participate in the Throne Speech debate in this fall Session of the 17th Legislature.

First of all I should like to congratulate the mover and the seconder in the meaningful way that they moved and seconded the Throne Speech. They both revealed to us the obvious facts. Mr. Speaker, the Throne Speech endorses the continuation of our aims to pursue and carry out the rest of our promises to our people which we outlined in our program The New Deal for People. To date our NDP Government has either fully or partially introduced or completed some 133 out of the 139 promises that we made to our people of Saskatchewan in our election campaign.

Mr. Speaker, our NDP Government, not only fulfilled most of our promises of our four-year program in the short time of two and one-half years since we took office, but we also took action on several other major programs, which we did not promise. Mr. Speaker, one of which we are proud to mention as a highlight is the abolition of the hospitalization and medical care premiums to our citizens . . .

SOME HON. MEMBERS: Hear, hear!

MR. FEDUNIAK: — . . . in this great province. This, Mr. Speaker, is the action taken by both the NDP Governments in Manitoba and Saskatchewan. This is another first of its kind, not only in Canada, but also the first in the world. Mr. Speaker, I should like to remind this House, particularly the Members on the opposite side, what they said during the election campaign about what the NDP Government would do about this health service. They said it, over and over, that if we were to form the next government of Saskatchewan we would increase the hospitalization and medicare premium.

Mr. Speaker, our NDP Government programs and actions are proving to them and their few supporters that they were and are continuing to be completely wrong in their loose and incorrect statements.

SOME HON. MEMBERS: Hear, hear!

MR. FEDUNIAK: — They have not changed one bit to this day. Mr. Speaker, when you consider the high cost of a hospital bed each day now how could some of our unfortunate sick people afford to be hospitalized for any length of time at this rate. It could cost them hundreds or perhaps thousands of dollars. A good example is in the United States where some of the hospital beds are running over \$100 a day. Mr. Speaker, the abolition of the hospitalization and medicare premiums, the removal of the deterrent fees, the lowering of school taxes, the increased Home Improvement Grant, the removal of the education and hospitalization tax on meals up to \$2.50, the low cost of hearing aid program, the home repair program for our senior citizens, increased home builders grants, a decent program for the mentally ill, the reduced bus fares for our senior citizens, the Land Bank and the FarmStart programs and many, many others too numerous to quote, did not happen by accident. They happened because of our NDP policies and concern for people.

These programs happened because we do not take orders from multimillion and billion dollar corporations. Mr. Speaker, the Liberals say that these are bad programs and they do believe in such programs. The reason the Liberals do not believe in such programs is because they have to take orders from the large corporations.

SOME HON. MEMBERS: Hear, hear!

MR. FEDUNIAK: — After all they are the ones who pay for their election campaign expenses, so they have no choice.

Mr. Speaker, the programs we are introducing will cost a lot of money, some of our constituents might like to know how we are able to do this. May I give you just one example; royalties from potash and oil in Saskatchewan.

During the Liberal administration — 1970-71 fiscal year — the revenues to the people of this province were \$15.6 million. By our NDP Government policies, our estimated revenue for the 1970-75 fiscal year will be \$44.6 million, an increase of \$29 million or an increase of almost 300 per cent.

Mr. Speaker, this is just another example of how our NDP policies are designed for the people, while Liberal policies are against the people.

Mr. Speaker, the Liberals have made many accusations and false predictions in their speeches. In the last session they signified that many industries were moving out of Saskatchewan — Degelman Manufacturing, Regina; Smith Roles, Saskatoon; Morris Rod Weeder, Yorkton to mention a few. These firms that I mentioned are not only still operating in Saskatchewan but they have expanded on a large scale and more are moving into Saskatchewan, the last being the GWG garments from Edmonton, Alberta, one of the largest firms in the manufacturing of shirts, pants and overalls in Canada.

Mr. Speaker, this is an indication of the thinking and confidence they have in our NDP Government and in our province.

SOME HON. MEMBERS: Hear, hear!

MR. FEDUNIAK: — New industries in manufacturing and processing is another indication of satisfactory progress being enjoyed by all in this province.

Mr. Speaker, our NDP Government through their new policies are creating many new young farmers through the Land Bank. This program is working out very well. Now with FarmStart another splendid program has assisted many young farmers to become established in livestock production. Two hundred and five loans amounting to \$5 million have been approved. Hundreds more applications are under consideration. This program is to continue and will be expanded.

Mr. Speaker, remember the fight the Liberals put up against the Hog Marketing Commission? They even brought a pig in to help them out during the last session.

SOME HON. MEMBERS: Hear, hear!

MR. FEDUNIAK: — When we realize the price the producers are receiving for this product, I am sure that the producers do not think it is important where their hogs are marketed or how they get there. A guaranteed price of 57 cents is quite a spread between the 17 cents they used to get under the Liberal program of open markets.

SOME HON. MEMBERS: Hear, hear!

MR. FEDUNIAK: — The Liberals are saying because of the Hog Marketing Commission, hog production has dropped in Saskatchewan. The truth is that under the orderly marketing we have in Saskatchewan now, hog production dropped 4 per cent this year, but in Alberta where they do not have the same kind of hog marketing commission, hog production has dropped over 10 per cent.

SOME HON. MEMBERS: Hear, hear!

MR. FEDUNIAK: — Mr. Speaker, speaking of open markets brings me to the marketing of rapeseed issue. The method by which the Hon. Otto Lang is trying to enforce this Bill is most unfair. The Liberals are saying that the majority is no longer 51 per cent. They say that the majority is 60 per cent. Typical Liberal policy!

SOME HON. MEMBERS: Hear, hear!

MR. FEDUNIAK: — Here again they are against the small operator who will be forced to sell his rapeseed when it is at the lowest price.

Mr. Speaker, I welcome the intention of our government to re-establish agricultural machinery testing in Saskatchewan. This was, and will be, a very desirable program which the Liberals did away with when they became administrators.

Mr. Speaker, during the seven lean years of Liberal rule in Saskatchewan, the lowest hourly wages, the longest working hours per week drove most of our trained people out of our province. As a result, today under the NDP administration, who created the greatest expansion and progress in every area, including public services, there resulted a severe shortage of tradesmen in practically every field. Carpenters, plumbers, electricians, doctors, nurses and many others. We are training tradesmen and personnel with our programs and are also acquiring some from other parts of Canada to fill our vacant positions.

Just pick up the local papers and you will have to agree that many jobs are available — what a change from the Liberal seven lean years.

SOME HON. MEMBERS: Hear, hear!

MR. FEDUNIAK: — Mr. Speaker, during the seven lean, windy years of Liberal administration, building construction was almost reduced to zero. Since we took office construction has been on the increase constantly. In 1973 a new record will be set of over 6,000 new homes, this is in addition to the industrial, business and government buildings which are also on the increase

in numbers. Many projects are being delayed due to shortages of trades people and materials.

Mr. Speaker, we the people of Saskatchewan and Canada are fortunate to have the privilege to be living in such a country as ours, where we are blessed with such abundances of unlimited wealth, natural resources of almost every description, the unlimited potential of producing vast amounts and variety of foods and all other merchandise and materials which help to make life a comfortable and a happy one.

SOME HON. MEMBERS: Hear, hear!

MR. FEDUNIAK: — Mr. Speaker, in the midst of this abundance we still find ourselves with all kinds of deficiencies because of the irresponsible, capitalist oriented, liberal, federal governments who have been administering our affairs for over 100 years.

SOME HON. MEMBERS: Hear, hear!

MR. FEDUNIAK: — We still find ourselves with ever increasing problems. They are not able to come up with any decent solutions on balance. In such a vast country as ours, with such a small population, we are always faced with high unemployment — be it depression or be it the best of times. Unemployment, inflation, overproduction or underproduction, now the energy crisis. These only apply to common people, They never apply to giant multimillion dollar corporations. Why?

SOME HON. MEMBERS: Hear, hear!

MR. FEDUNIAK: — Mr. Speaker, unemployment has created a situation where it has forced thousands of our responsible citizens into a dismal state depriving them of their integrity and self-respect.

In my life up to the present day I have met and known many people, and I found that our people are very responsible. I know that the people who are given a fair chance to make their own living in sharing and contributing towards making and building a better society are happy people.

SOME HON. MEMBERS: Hear, hear!

MR. FEDUNIAK: — Mr. Speaker, for too long in our country our people who have given of themselves in providing necessary services and those who have toiled and produced our food have been short-changed. They have very little to show for their lifetime contributions.

It is very satisfying to know that in the short period since our NDP Government's policies have been applied, it has brought our unemployment down to 1.9 per cent, the lowest in Canada.

SOME HON. MEMBERS: Hear, hear!

MR. FEDUNIAK: — In spite of the fact that there are 4,000 more people working in Saskatchewan than there were a year ago, it is very

encouraging to note that in the last year over 1,000 individuals who were receiving social assistance are now working. This has happened as a result of a good planned program in our Social Services Department.

Our NDP Government Is proceeding with effective means to increase jobs for our people. We know that the jobs are found in secondary industries. We therefore are beginning to diversify some of our industries such as the case of our forestry products. By establishing the veneer manufacturing plant at Hudson Bay we will provide three to four times more job hours utilizing the same amount of wood as is being used through the pulp mill.

SOME HON. MEMBERS: Hear, hear!

MR. FEDUNIAK: — Mr. Speaker, inflation started in Canada as soon as the Federal Government took the price controls off after the last world war. Inflation affects every one in our province. It could be corrected immediately if our Federal Government would have the decency to implement parity prices to apply to wages, materials, products, transportation, taxation, interest rates, rents and profits. In my opinion the net profits are the worst offenders.

The Liberals blame the labor unions for the cause of inflation, but the true matter of the fact is that only 17 per cent of our labor is unionized.

Take the price of a product sold. Only 20 per cent of this is labor, and the other 80 per cent is material, transportation, taxes and profits. If you want to blame labor for inflation, take 17 per cent of the labor, multiply by 20 per cent of labor portion in a product and what do you get — 3.4 per cent. Using the basis of 10 per cent increase of the price of the product, it would result in an increase of 3.4 per cent, multiply this by the 10 per cent increase and the answer is 1.34 cents or 1 1/3 cents, and if the product increases 20 per cent, labor would be responsible for 2 2/3 cents.

According to the Dominion Bureau of Statistics the Steel Company of Canada increased their profit in one year by 45 per cent while at the same time the increase to their employees was 16.5 per cent in three years. The Liberals support this type of action.

Mr. Speaker, let's take overproduction. It is very interesting that it seems that overproduction only applies to agricultural products and when this happens, the farmers sold wheat at 17 cents a bushel and beef and apples sold at one cent a pound. But any product that is controlled by big business, whether there is overproduction or not prices do not go down, they remain the same.

Mr. Speaker, now all of a sudden we have the energy crisis. Personally I do not think that there would be an energy crisis in the true sense if our government were controlling the petroleum industry. Today we have the technology. If applied and utilized to the utmost, we could make our energy products go at least twice as far or more. As long as the giant corporations have management and controls and a monopoly over our energy resources, this will never happen. I believe the energy crisis has been created in order to prepare the public for an illegitimate price increase in petroleum products.

SOME HON. MEMBERS: Hear, hear!

MR. FEDUNIAK: — It is noteworthy that according to the Financial Post survey of oils in 1973, the net increase of profits are as follows: Imperial Oil 1967 — \$95.5 million, in 1972 — \$151 million; Shell Oil 1967 — \$45.6 million, 1972 — \$79 million; Gulf Oil 1967 — \$44 million, 1972 — \$64.5 million; Texaco 1967 \$17.1 million, 1972 — \$42.2 million; Hudson Bay 1967 — \$22.1 million, 1972 — \$27.7 million. The fact is that with the increased profits enjoyed by these oil companies, in my opinion, there is no reason whatsoever to increase prices on petroleum products.

SOME HON. MEMBERS: Hear, hear!

MR. FEDUNIAK: — I believe that they are purposely creating a shortage image in order to hide the price increase in order to further increase their percentage of profits as usual. With the present technology, I am sure we could have cars and motors made with carburetors that would run our motors at least twice as far.

Mr. Speaker, in view of this petroleum shortage in the United States, and recognizing the fact that Saskatchewan only utilizes 20 per cent of our petroleum output, it is time that we begin to take over our oil industry here in our province without a doubt, and to proceed with extensive exploration to find new deposits. The use and control of our petroleum industry by the giant oil corporations is also affecting the cost of our agricultural productivity which will increase the price of our food supplies. The abandonment of our passenger and freight train services in Canada will further create a petroleum shortage where more trucks and passenger cars will be used replacing train services.

Mr. Speaker, I am happy that the Throne Speech contains measures that will give our government powers to control and develop our oil industry for the benefit of our people.

Mr. Speaker, during the seven lean, Liberal years, or should I say seven wasted years of Liberal administration of this province, the Federal jurisdiction of the Indian Affairs were predominantly dictated by the Provincial Liberal Government. During this period, the most damaging programs were introduced and practised. As a result of this our native people became very disillusioned and frustrated. In the past these people lived a useful life by working and production in trapping, fishing, guiding and many other occupations. The Liberal Government did nothing to improve and promote their livelihood, but instead put them on social aid and just left it at that. What happened was that most of these people became absolutely useless to society and to themselves.

The leaders of the native people are very disturbed and concerned about what has happened to their people. They have lost their self-respect as the result of all this treatment. Now they are very difficult to deal with.

Mr. Speaker, the Department of Northern Saskatchewan has been set up. This department has a very difficult job to do, and it is not going to be fast and easy. It will take a long time. There are many things to do in this large area where

communications are very limited at the present time. The department will be involving native people in solving the problems of the North. Consideration will be directed to projects like roads, air strips, power, social services, health services, education, adult education and training, housing, trapping, fishing, trading, tourism and recreation. We have already begun a boat manufacturing and forestry operation. All these will promote and provide work opportunities for the people of the North.

Mr. Speaker, it is obvious that I will be opposing the amendment and supporting the main motion.

SOME HON. MEMBERS: Hear, hear!

HON. A. TAYLOR: (Minister of Social Services) — Mr. Speaker, I take this opportunity of entering the debate on the Speech from the Throne to speak primarily and report on some of the activities of my department.

I should like to start by looking at the Saskatchewan Assistance Plan itself and let me say first of all how disappointed I've been to see the political machinations of the Members opposite in regard to this program.

SOME HON. MEMBERS: Hear, hear!

MR. TAYLOR: — I had mistakenly believed I suppose, that the day was past when politicians would use the disadvantaged for their own personal gain and profit, and I thought that politics and politicians had matured beyond this point.

Apparently, in Saskatchewan at least, this is not the case. This can only suggest to us, Mr. Speaker, that the Members to your left are clutching at straws in a desperate attempt to find some excuse for their continued existence.

The Leader of the Opposition (Mr. Steuart) was at least honest enough in speaking to his own convention, to acknowledge that it was not enough to be critical of any system. You had to put something in its place and he went on to say that there is no perfect answer to the welfare problems. For once, I am forced to agree with him.

From the Opposition, however, have come no answers at all, perfect or otherwise. Merely negative criticisms that indicates, I suppose, that: the patient suffers from two difficult diseases at one time — verbal diarrhoea and constipation of ideas.

What we have witnessed has been politicians attempting to regain some credibility by the deliberate attempt of setting one segment of society against the other. Certainly they have gained some experience in this field. You will remember, Mr. Speaker, that it was this same Opposition that attempted to divide the farmers and our laborers. That didn't work either. Nor will their attempt to divide the advantaged and the disadvantaged. This to me, indicates that their whole attitude towards welfare is not much more than a political ploy.

As an example, Mr. Speaker, in July of this year the present leader of the Liberal Party publicly demanded a 20 per

cent increase in welfare allowances. He made this demand, reasonably enough, because of the great increase in the cost of living in the previous twelve months. And yet, four months later we hear the same leader of the same Liberal Party, screaming that a 17 per cent increase is too much. It will not sit well, he said, with the majority of Saskatchewan citizens. Then he went on to say, "I don't know of too many other groups in the province who received a 17 per cent increase this year." I can only ask, does he really believe that the cost of living has gone down so dramatically in four months? If not, and if 20 per cent was needed in July, why is 17 per cent too much in November? Was the November statement aimed at creating a backlash against welfare which he might then be able to turn to his political advantage? Did the Member for Prince Albert West (Mr. Steuart) also conveniently forget that the 17 per cent increase he speaks of came over a one and half to two-year period and not just in one year?

There is one question, however, Mr. Speaker, that the Leader of the Opposition did ask and I should like to try to provide at least a partial answer.

He says he didn't know too many other groups who received this 17 per cent increase this year. I should like to name a few of these groups United States Steel — 62 per cent increase in profits; Bethlehem Steel — 57 per cent increase in profits; Texaco — 44.5; Gulf — 82 per cent increase in profits; Occidental Petroleum — profits up 566 per cent; Ford — 39 per cent; Chrysler — 59 per cent; American Motors — 117 per cent; and one could go on with the list. All of these examples substantially exceed the 17 per cent spoken of by the Members of the Opposition. And not, Mr. Speaker, in two years, but in one. Why were there no Liberal voices raised in anger and in protest over this kind of abuse of the system and living off the people? Nor have I heard their voices raised in anger over the increased automobile prices this year, even though the company profits have already increased by some 40 to 117 per cent. If they are looking for abuse in the system, maybe they should start looking at their friends in the corporations and see the abuse being carried out there. Now they will argue that the profits were too low to start with and, therefore, they needed 80 to 90 per cent increases. Maybe we should also argue that the income of the poor was too low and they needed substantial increases.

Let me review for you, Mr. Speaker, some of the work undertaken by the department in this program in the last year. In the field of allowances we have increased the amount available to recipients and we'll be making a further adjustment on January 1st. At a later point, when I'm finished speaking, I will provide for all Members of the Assembly, examples of allowances in August of this year and also the examples as they will be January 1st of next year. I might indicate that the increases provided up until now have cost the Province of Saskatchewan something over \$4 million a year. The increase anticipated for January will cost about a quarter of a million dollars additional. I might mention that there are a few families — we do not attempt to hide this — that might find from their present cheque to the future one, a slight decrease. There has been an attempt to rationalize and to provide greater increases for particular types of families. The largest group of families will find that both their family allowances have increased and their cheques from the Saskatchewan Assistance Plan.

Now my department is also in the process at the present time of completing the housing survey conducted during the summer. We will soon begin the tabulation of results. As a Government we are greatly concerned over the vast increase in rents being charged to those in need. And this, in itself, creates considerable drain on the funds of the Saskatchewan Assistance Plan, since in this province, unlike some of the other provinces, we pay the actual rent rather than a straight rental allowance. The housing survey was conducted by clients of the department not by professionals hired for the job. During the same period a number of our clients were provided with a work opportunity program operated by the Department of Natural Resources. Also during the summer we operated, as a department, an employment support program whereby about 300 clients of the Department of Social Services received work opportunities. All in all, through these particular programs between four and five hundred clients of the Department of Social Services found work this summer.

Mr. Speaker, the success of these programs indicates to me that the vast majority of people receiving public assistance would far sooner work if work were available for them. Our only problem indeed in the Employment Support Program was in turning away clients. It was an experimental program designed for 200 clients and all the spaces were filled within three weeks of the announcement.

This type of thing ought to destroy once and for all the myth that welfare clients are shiftless or lazy or that they don't want to work, a myth that is perpetuated by Members of the Opposition.

It is also interesting to note, Mr. Speaker, that in seven years of Liberal misadministration no such work program was ever attempted. But it should also be noted that work programs such as these are extremely expensive for a province. Let me remind the Members of this House that while the Federal Government will share 50 per cent of the cost of public assistance, or welfare, they will not share one red cent in the cost of such work creation activities. In other words, these programs involve total provincial dollars with no cost sharing of funds. Maybe if the Opposition Members are really concerned they will speak to their friends in Ottawa and get them to cost share work creation as they cost share welfare — an attempt we have been making for some time.

SOME HON. MEMBERS: Hear, hear!

MR. TAYLOR: — We would be happy with their support in this regard.

Because of such programs, and because of such other activities of this Government, such as the Housing Corporation, which has given a great impetus to house construction in Saskatchewan, we've been able to reduce the number of cases on public assistance by over 1,200 in the last year. Or if the Opposition prefers the other figures, by about 3,000 people in the last year. The number of employable people or cases on welfare has dropped by over 1,000, dropped by one-third in one year.

SOME HON. MEMBERS: Hear, hear!

MR. TAYLOR: — I should also ask the members to remember that the employable people on assistance are those who, for the most part lack many of the necessary skills or even educational backgrounds for finding work. It is not their fault, Mr. Speaker, that they live in a technological society that demands training and ability they may not have acquired and may not possess. To assist them we have established this past year in Regina, a work preparation centre which, besides helping the clients to obtain the necessary skills is working with Canada Manpower in an attempt to find placements for them. Another new program operated by this Government.

We've also made changes in the Saskatchewan Assistance Plan regulations which will permit some particular individuals to receive assistance while attending university, when their course will equip them for employment. Mr. Speaker, under the Liberal administration it's interesting to note that they provided some assistance for those taking a university course, but they limited it to one type of course, and that type was teacher training. Now it was rather amazing that they limited it to teacher training in a time and in a period when there were hundreds of teachers in the province that no one knew what to do with. There were no jobs available. But they wouldn't permit them to take other courses in university.

At the same time, this past year, we have provided a grant to the Saskatchewan Council of Anti-Poverty Organizations to assist them in organizing people on assistance and low income, that they might work together to improve their lot.

MR. STEUART: — Shared by the Federal Government!

MR. TAYLOR: — Certainly — shared by the Federal Government!

Mr. Speaker, we have also changed the cash asset exemption for some senior citizens. Under the Liberal administration, and they have made comments relating to senior citizens, when one partner had to go into a nursing home and they had some funds in the bank, these funds had to be used up down to the \$1,000 exemption before they could be provided with any assistance. Under our Government, for those couples in receipt of income supplement, their assets are divided and only at least half has to be used up before assistance is granted.

SOME HON. MEMBERS: Hear, hear!

MR. TAYLOR: — Now, Mr. Speaker, we look also to the future. We intend to pursue our course in work creation, even if we must do so at sole cost to the Province of Saskatchewan, if the Federal Government continues to ignore its responsibility in this field. We will continue in the field of work preparedness and assisting clients to enter the work force and, Mr. Speaker, as circumstances necessitates it we shall continue to provide increased assistance through the Saskatchewan Assistance Plan. For far too long we have seen politicians use the poor of this country as a tool in their struggle for power. We have seen political parties and their spokesmen use the poor as scapegoats for every economic ill that besets the country. And we believe it is time that some government stood up and spoke on behalf of the disadvantaged and this we intend to do.

SOME HON. MEMBERS: Hear, hear!

MR. TAYLOR: — When I hear people saying, Mr. Speaker, that welfare families tend to produce welfare children, I can only say that wealthy families tend to produce wealthy children; and when I look at Statistics Canada and see that in their latest report the bottom quintile or 20 per cent of the economic group in the population saw their share of the total income of Canada drop between 1961 and 1971 from 4.4 per cent to 3.6 per cent, while the highest quintile rose from 41.4 per cent to 43.3 per cent. When I see this I say that the money is there but the distribution is lousy.

SOME HON. MEMBERS: Hear, hear!

MR. TAYLOR: — And when I hear people talking about welfare clients who won't work, I ask how often that client applied for a job and was turned down because he lacked the skill.; and then how often he was turned down because the employer didn't want to take a chance on someone on welfare. Is it any wonder that people eventually give up in despair:

Mr. Speaker, our Government will not be panicked by the political gyrations of an Opposition that wants to make hay out of the sufferings of people.

We intend to remain sensitive and sympathetic to the needs of those less fortunate materially than many of us. We intend to speak out on their behalf at every opportunity and we intend to do all we can do to improve their ability to participate fully in society. And for this we make no apology.

SOME HON. MEMBERS: Hear, hear!

MR. TAYLOR: — As the Leader of the Opposition said some weeks ago, there is no perfect solution to the problems of welfare. I am convinced, however, that a guaranteed annual income for all Canadians must become part of that solution. A real start on this could very readily be made by one simple change in the Canada Assistance Plan. By going to an income test rather than a means test. In this way, those who are working and receiving a low income could receive a supplement which would take into consideration the size of their family and their responsibility. And, as an incentive to work if such is needed, and I'm not really convinced it is, income needs for the working person could be greater than that for the person on straight assistance. This can be reasonable since it does cost something additional to work; to own the tools, buy the work clothes and for travelling. So far, however, the Liberal Government in Ottawa has totally refused to move in this direction. It is true that a guaranteed income has its dangers. It would make people more free to choose the work that they will do and maybe it's for this reason that the old-line parties have consistently refused to even consider such an idea, since a corporation depends on a pool of cheap labor to keep the wheels of industry rolling, and more important to keep the growth and profits soaring.

The argument is used, Mr. Speaker, that Canada cannot afford a guaranteed annual income. I want to suggest that Canada cannot afford to go much longer without a guaranteed

annual income. It is only in this way that people will ever obtain real freedom of choice. The man who is born to a wealthy family can choose the route that he will take, the educational facility he will attend and the courses he will study. He can even, to a large degree, decide the business that he will eventually enter. The person born to a poor family must take only what is available and close at hand, and must, of necessity, accept whatever job happens to be offered because he depends upon it to eat. It is inane to mouth the platitudes that all men are born equal, when we know in fact that some are born more equal than others. We must work towards a better economic equality for all Canadians. And I say 'all Canadians', not just those in Saskatchewan.

This does not mean that everyone must be the same or that they must all receive even the same income. It does mean that they must receive a basic income which will enable them to take advantage of the various opportunities provided by society if, and when they wish.

If we really believe in freedom for the individual, then we must work to provide the economic base through which the individual may exercise his real freedom of choice. It does a great disservice to our people to have politicians standing back and criticizing those on assistance when the fault most often lies, not with the individual, but with the system which provides no way out. As the Members of this House will be aware, the Federal Government has instituted a study on income security for Canadians. I believe that the time has come when Canadians from coast to coast can develop and maintain a new income security system that will provide a decent and adequate standard of living for all Canadians.

We have committed ourselves to participate seriously and sincerely in this study. We will not, however, be satisfied with any piece-meal approach aimed at patching up the present system. We insist that the study include a willingness to change the basic security system itself. We are convinced the time has come to ensure a decent basic standard of living for all Canadian; from one coast to the other.

SOME HON. MEMBERS: Hear, hear!

MR. TAYLOR: — Mr. Speaker, this cannot come about as long as politicians attempt to use the sufferings of the poor for personal advantage. It can only come about when we recognize the inherent value of each individual and acknowledge the basic right of every person to a decent standard of living.

Mr. Speaker, the responsibilities of my department, as most Members know, are varied. We are charged with the responsibility that no citizen of this province shall live without sufficient funds to meet the minimum needs of existence. We are responsible for ensuring that the brave pioneers of our province, our senior citizens, secure a life of comfort, dignity and usefulness. We are accountable for the responsibility that children whose parents can no longer support them may find suitable accommodations. We are responsible for the organization and management of correctional institutions and probations. These are important responsibilities. They must not be ignored. Our Government welcomes these responsibilities and as a department we will work long and hard in order to fully satisfy the needs and requirements of all our clients.

Let me say that we do advocate and we do appreciate positive constructive criticism. We respect intelligent, well formulated criticism from any group, including the Members of the Opposition. However, it would appear that the Opposition unfortunately believes that it is its duty to chastise cruelly the disadvantaged people by promoting and perpetuating the philosophy of the 'welfare bum'. This accusation is not only unfounded, it is also unfair to those people receiving assistance from our program. The vast majority of the disadvantaged simply require a helping hand whether financial or otherwise in order to re-establish a sense of dignity, purpose and independence in their lives. The majority, incidentally, of helpful criticisms arise from groups receiving assistance or from concerned citizens who see a flaw in some of our services. This is the type of criticism we appreciate and listen to, not the unfounded and misleading information usually provided by Members opposite. But the needs of the people are far more than monetary. Our services and programs do more than provide merely financial assistance. We provide services for families who require special assistance to function normally within society. We offer aid to those who are on the wrong side of the law. We provide programs, services and aid designed to handle the special requirements of the elderly. A large variety of programs exist to meet the needs of those citizens who are socially, economically, mentally or physically handicapped.

In the last few years the field of corrections have been experiencing several significant alterations in both emphasis and policies. Perhaps the most important is the shift away from the mammoth cold institutions toward smaller personalized centres which stress the rehabilitation of the offender. From this has evolved the policy of eliminating the traditional isolationism of corrections. In lieu of this a philosophy of allowing an offender as far as possible equal access to a wide variety of community services and activities available to other people has become acceptable and somewhat successful. This approach is not only much more humane but it is also much more successful in terms of rehabilitation and re-socialization. I might say, Mr. Speaker, that the best protection society can gain from a correctional system is the rehabilitation of the offender, not merely shutting him away. We see this result, at least in part, in the community training residence. The fundamental aim of this residence, as with all other programs, is the protection of society through the rehabilitation of the offender. There are now five such residences in this province, an increase of three over the past year.

During 1972-73, 106 men participated in the program at the Regina Residence alone, with 82 in Prince Albert. By the end of the fiscal year, eight participants had completed their stay in Saskatoon. A residence is not a jail and does not contain any physical constraints to restrict the residents movements. The selection procedure is one that attempts to ensure that only men who are able to benefit from the program, and have the proper motivation and skill, are allowed to enter the residence. Of course, if an offender proves unable to cope with the added responsibility he is returned to the main facility. The men live at the residence much as they would at any other house on the street. They pay room and board, co-operate in the cleaning and maintenance of the residence. A 24-hour supervision is maintained with a graduated method of passes and privileges being extended to the residents as they demonstrate their ability to handle responsibility. The community training program is

designed to reflect a shift in emphasis toward training individuals to live within the community in an acceptable manner.

se look also, Mr. Speaker, at community services for the aged. Our Government is firmly committed to the policy of ensuring a better quality of life for our senior citizens. It was, after all, these very pioneers who overcame many obstacles and disasters in order to establish the foundation of our present society. As they approach the later years of their life, it is the responsibility of each of us to guarantee that they are able to lead a life of dignity, comfort and enjoyment. In order to accomplish this our department encourages the development of an integrated community and institutional service for the aged. The programs are designed to enable senior citizens to continue independent living in the community as long as possible by helping to prevent or delay disabling conditions and by promoting physical, mental, and social well-being for the aged.

This philosophy in practice is well demonstrated by examining the current number of existing community service projects and the number of new ones planned. Presently there are 27 communities in the province providing 45 service programs to senior citizens. They range from a meals on wheels program in Moosomin to a homemakers' service in Swift Current and an activity centre in Wolseley. The number of planned community projects is 55. The number of services to be provided will be 63. These programs as well as the already existing ones include such diverse services as Senior Care Centres, Local Transportation, Centre Activity Centres, Meal Services, Information and Referral Centres, Visiting Homemakers and Aids to Independent Living.

in order to provide financial aid the department provides assistance to the extent of 40 per cent of the approved operating costs. This money will be allotted to communities initiating and operating their own programs providing that such programs meet the normal criteria.

Now the above mentioned programs are designed to provide the senior citizen with the opportunity of remaining in the community and being relatively independent and this, many of the senior citizens of our province want. However, some require special nursing care and there are facilities to accommodate this. From April 1972 to October of this year 579 additional special care home beds have been brought into operation to provide services to Saskatchewan senior citizens. As well the Government has now approved projects which are now under construction or in the planning stage for an additional 521 beds expected to be in operation during the next 12-month period.

As well during the last two fiscal years the department has assisted Special Care Homes to develop activity and recreational facilities and expand kitchens and dining rooms in 25 projects. The upgrading and expansion of activity space emphasizes the priority the Government has placed on development of programming for the aged in these facilities instead of simply institutional care. The Senior Citizens' Commission was established by the Government in January of this year, its purpose to study and evaluate the needs of the elderly. It was to look at the whole spectrum of senior citizens' problems and programs designed for the aged. I am informed that we should receive their report sometime in January.

In April of this year, as I have mentioned earlier, we started an employment support program. We had, I might mention, within this program 1,100 inquiries and 60 formal applications within a very short period. Unfortunately because of our own restrictions and because it was a pilot project we only employed around the 300 mark.

Now, Mr. Speaker, I should like to say just a few words regarding the reported increase in the number of employees in the public service. In recent months we have been hearing a great deal about this from Members of the Opposition and primarily the Leader (Mr. Steuart). One of the difficulties in such a discussion is the fact that many people don't realize what is meant when we speak of employees in the establishment of the public service. It should be pointed out very clearly that this has never included all the employees of the Government of Saskatchewan. There are a very large number, a substantial group, that are not part of the establishment figures. For example; labor service, part-time, employees in the old supernumerary program, were never included in the number of positions listed in the Estimates, and this was perfectly normal. It is with this in mind I ask the Members to try and follow as I explain what has happened regarding the number of employees in the public service. I am using September figures because it is the latest I have available. In September of 1971 there were 338 supernumeraries in the supernumerary training program. As I said in the House a year ago I believe that originally this was a well intentioned program. Unfortunately it didn't work as well as intended. It tended to lock our native people into positions where they had no opportunity for advancement. It also became used as a method for the Government to obtain additional employees without them showing up in the establishment figures. As I said in September of 1971, there were 338 supernumeraries, today there are none. We have brought the supernumeraries into the permanent public service and have shown them honestly as employees.

SOME HON. MEMBERS: Hear, hear!

MR. TAYLOR: — By so doing we have been able to provide them with job security. They cannot be dismissed now except for just cause. By so doing we have provided them with benefit of superannuation, sick leave and so on. Superannuation itself was a vital benefit that they didn't enjoy before. By being in the regular public service they now enjoy union membership and all the advantages that members can receive from belonging to a union. By making them part of the regular public service they received seniority rights that had been denied to them as supernumeraries.

In the labor service in September 1971, there were 3,587 employees, in September of this year there were 3,513. Again, Mr. Speaker, a drop of 74. During the same period there has been a drop in part-time employees of from 115 to 97, or a net drop of 18. These three programs alone have a total reduction of 430. But let's be quick to point out that it is not a reduction in the number of employees in government, it does in fact show up as an increase in the establishment figures in the public service. What has really happened is that most of these people transferred from one type of employment within the Government to another.

Now, Mr. Speaker, the Leader of the Opposition (Mr. Steuart) has been heard to speak of an increase of about 1,000 in the public service. Well, I just want to give him some assurance. For once he is almost right. It is slightly over 1,000 increase in the public service and there are three good reasons for this. The first I have already mentioned, the transfer of employees from one type of employment to another where they have job security, superannuation, seniority and the like. The second reason is an expansion and improvement in the services provided. I can think, for example, within my own department, Valley View Centre in Moose Jaw for the retarded which has seen an increase in its population of about 140 and has had a number of new staff added. We have taken this step because we believe that more than custodial care needs to be provided. This was basically what had been provided in the past. I say this, Mr. Speaker, without any criticism of the employees or the staff, most of whom are dedicated, committed individuals concerned about the needs of the retarded. I say this because of the under-staffing under the previous administration where they were unable to provide the kind of care they wanted to provide. We have provided additional employees, about 90, even though we have cut back on the number of patients in the institution, and so more of this type of personal care can be provided in the future. It may very well be that we will increase this even further and add additional staff in the future. Also within my own department we have added additional social workers to properly carry out the responsibilities of the Department of Social Services, responsibilities given to it by the Legislature. In Regina alone we have added 16 permanent social workers this year. I have said on more than one occasion that money alone is not the answer to people in need. It is part of the answer but not the only answer. It is very likely there will be further increases in this program area in the near future.

We have also made a substantial addition to the number of probation officers available. We have taken this step because we believe wherever possible and where the safety of the public permits, probation rather than incarceration should be used. We believe in far greater emphasis on rehabilitation and this can best be done by rehabilitation within the community.

Now these programs, Mr. Speaker, in the past were starved, not just for funds but for the people to carry them out. The other Ministers I am sure will be able to speak of the improved services in their departments. I can think, for example, of the Department of Co-operation which was literally being starved to death in seven years of Liberal administration. Certainly employees were needed and we make no apology for providing this kind of resource for the people of Saskatchewan.

The third reason for the increase, Mr. Speaker, has been the number of new programs developed and implemented by this Government, and we are certainly not apologizing for developing new programs. New programs were expected by people who are looking for progressive ideas and programs from a progressive government. Have a look at just a few.

The Department of Agriculture, just to think of a few of their programs, FarmStart, Land Bank, the provision of a regional service, has needed a number of employees to carry out its function. FarmStart and Land Bank have been successful in spite of the comments of the Opposition. The people of Saskatchewan would not like to see a cutback in this field. Nor

do I think that the farmers of Saskatchewan would like to see us cut back on our regional services in agriculture. They have been impressed with the department's move out into the country to place people closer to where the farmers are. To do this, this takes people and it takes funds.

In the Department of Education in one large program area alone, the Wascana Institute of Applied Arts and Sciences — this wasn't started by our Government but we had to staff it after coming into office and it has taken 125 employees to provide training in the health-sciences field and dental nursing. I doubt very much if the people of Saskatchewan are unhappy with us providing this kind of training.

The Department of Industry and Commerce in an attempt to provide assistance for the small businessman as well as industry has added 22 employees. There are not many businessmen in Saskatchewan whom I have talked to who would like to see us withdraw from this program. They like the approach of regionalization, they like the idea that they can have someone to talk to about their problems and their interests.

Mr. Speaker, the Municipal Road Assistance Authority has started a new program of street improvements in towns, villages and hamlets. To carry out this program they needed employees. I can't think of anyone who lives in the towns, villages or hamlets who would like to see this program curtailed or cut back. Certainly if you were to visit the towns of Perdue, Bladworth or Aylesbury or Eatonia and many others, you would not find the citizens very pleased with any suggestion that they should not have received assistance for hard surfacing of their streets. For this program staff was needed, staff to provide advice and guidance, not just to do the paper work.

SOME HON. MEMBERS: Hear, hear!

MR. TAYLOR: — What about the Department of Highways and its operation Open Roads. You wouldn't find people, for example, in the village of Smiley very happy if you were to suggest that the department should not have hired additional employees to enable them to provide hard surfacing out to the nearest highway. Nor would you find the rural municipal council very happy with the thought that they should have been left totally responsible for that grid road. These are programs that the people want and deserve, programs we intend to provide and can only provide with the manpower to do the job.

Of course, we have Public Health. A new program of hearing aids and the dental program. I really don't think the Opposition are going to win any friends in Saskatchewan by suggesting that we shouldn't staff such programs as the hearing aid program or the dental care program. The hearing aid program is already popular beyond all expectations. The people of the province I have talked to have indicated an excitement and interest in the coming dental program for children and would not be enthused by any cutback here.

Well, Mr. Speaker, these and other new programs have added some 470 employees to the public service. That's the new programs. But if the Opposition expects us to suffer from a guilt complex because of this, they are sadly mistaken. We feel no guilt about providing over 400 government employees with more

permanent status and job security than they enjoyed in the seven years of the Liberal administration.

SOME HON. MEMBERS: Hear, hear!

MR. TAYLOR: — Nor do we feel any remorse for the number of employees whom we have engaged to carry out the new and progressive programs of this Government. The people of the province expected us to act to implement our programs and we have acted. They expected us to improve and upgrade the old programs and this we have done. The day is long past when governments can scrape by by providing minimum standards of service to their citizens. Our Government committed itself to providing a New Deal for the people of this province and this we intend to do. We intend to provide the kind of programs and the kind of service the people of Saskatchewan expect and deserve. As new programs come on stream as old programs are improved and updated, we will continue to employ the number of people needed to do the job that needs to be done. Nor will we attempt to hide our figures in such columns as supernumerary or part-time. The Public Service of Saskatchewan has a long history of faithful service to the people of this province.

For seven years the former government saw its ability to provide service dwindling and its programs suffering. It is still recovering from a seven-year shock.

Yes, Mr. Speaker, there has been an increase in the public service, but there has also been a vast increase in the programs and the services offered to the people of Saskatchewan, programs that I am convinced our citizens would not like to see cut back or curtailed.

Mr. Speaker, the Throne Speech will continue to provide more of these programs for the people of Saskatchewan. We look at the programs mentioned under Urban and Housing Affairs and we note that we will have provided over 6,000 houses this year. And we will do more in the future.

We look at the program for oil. I, for one, think it is high time that Saskatchewan decided its own destiny in relation to its natural resources.

SOME HON. MEMBERS: Hear, hear!

MR. TAYLOR: — Mr. Speaker, I am particularly pleased with the reference in the Throne Speech to the work that the Government intends to do to counter alcohol abuse. Like many other Members I am concerned with the growing dependency on drugs and alcohol, and believe that it is time that major action were taken in this regard.

I am particularly pleased with the legal assistance that is promised, because from our department's point of view we see the people in need, the people who need the help.

Mr. Speaker, you will have recognized by now that I certainly will in no way be able to support either the amendment or the subamendment, but will most gladly support the main motion.

SOME HON. MEMBERS: Hear, hear!

MR. D.F. MacDONALD: (Moose Jaw North) — Mr. Speaker, I listened with interest to the Minister of Social Services (Mr. Taylor). He said he intends to speak for the disadvantaged and that he is looking for constructive criticism. I hope he stays this afternoon because I have exactly that for him.

Mr. Speaker, I should first of all like to register my displeasure with the form and the content of the Throne Speech. I find it inexcusable to have to use this document for pure partisan politics. Surely there is more than enough petty politics in this Legislature without having to use the Throne Speech. I recognize that the Premier writes the Throne Speech for the Lieutenant-Governor to read but I consider it to be a gross insult to the Lieutenant-Governor who is a representative of the Queen to have to read such a political piece of trash.

SOME HON. MEMBERS: Hear, hear!

MR. MacDONALD: — I am sure that if John Diefenbaker was in this Legislature he would label the Premier's speech an attack on the Monarchy. This might be considered a slight overstatement but it is not an overstatement to say that asking the Lieutenant-Governor to read this year's throne speech was an insult to a very fine gentleman.

I noted with some delight that the Throne Speech promises increases in assistance to urban governments for recreation, transportation and other services. If there has been any part of our society that has suffered under Blakeney's administration it has been local government. This Government has consistently eroded the power of local government and short-changed the treasuries of cities, towns and municipalities. I will watch with interest to see what form this promised assistance will take. The wording of the Throne Speech suggests that when this assistance is given the Blakeney Government intends to further erode local control by specifying and controlling the way that the increased assistance will be spent. The Blakeney Government is the only province in Canada that does not give unconditional grants to municipal governments, city governments. This is a very unjust position that our cities find themselves in. The Blakeney Government is deliberately eroding the power and effectiveness of local government because it realizes that local government, whether it is municipal or school board is the kind of government that people have the greatest control over.

Under the NDP locally elected officials have been reduced to the role of rubber stampers. I will resist any forms of increased assistance to urban governments that tend to further erode local control. Local governments have had enough. They are through with begging for help and being slapped around by the NDP. The people in the cities and municipalities have had enough. The people in rural Saskatchewan will reject the county system as has already been instituted by the NDP in Manitoba.

SOME HON. MEMBERS: Hear, hear!

MR. MacDONALD: — It's interesting that the voters in Regina elected Henry Baker. He campaigned on the promise that the current

trend towards wild and municipal tax increases must be curbed. Henry is right. It is this Government that is responsible for these wild increases in the mill rate. The voters in Lakeview have made it clear how city people regard the NDP. The voters in Lakeview gave Mr. Blakeney the resounding defeat that his Government deserves.

I should like to thank the Premier for a minute for choosing Saskatoon as the site for the Roumanian tractor factory. You know if the Premier is not going to locate a factory anywhere, I would much rather he locate it in Saskatoon, than not locate it in Moose Jaw.

SOME HON. MEMBERS: Hear, hear!

MR. MacDONALD: — You know we in Moose Jaw are used to losing industries owned by the free enterprisers like Robin Hood and Husky Oil. We are even used to losing socialist industries like the Woolen Mills and the Shoe Factory. But our record is clear, we have never lost a communist industry and we thank the Premier for this.

SOME HON. MEMBERS: Hear, hear!

MR. MacDONALD: — You know it is a fact that the people of Saskatchewan can be very thankful to the Federal Government. During the last year we have seen the Minister of Industry (Mr. Thorson) set up a deal with Roumania. The terms were made very clear. The Saskatchewan Government would own 49 per cent for \$1 million. Mr. Thorson was ready to spend that \$1 million, ready and eager. The only thing that stopped him from spending that \$1 million, was that the Federal Government wouldn't provide a grant. The Federal Government said it was a bad deal. This made the NDP very unhappy. They had a million dollars and they wanted to get on with it. So they blamed Ottawa for holding up the deal. We all now know and Mr. Thorson acknowledged that it was a bad deal. The Federal Government by realizing it as a bad deal and refusing the grant has saved the taxpayers of this province \$1 million. I can only say that it is too bad the Federal Government wasn't around when Mr. Blakeney paid \$10.2 million to Mr. Mendel. Or when SEDCO paid far too much for IPSCO shares. Taxpayers in Saskatchewan could likely have saved a further \$7 million if they had asked advice from the Federal Liberal Government. It is also a good thing that Dave Steuart was here to save the Saskatchewan taxpayers \$100,000 a month.

Mr. Speaker, the field of health and welfare has virtually been ignored in this Throne Speech. This matter is of particular concern to the people in my constituency in Moose Jaw. I speak in particular of the problems in the field of mental retardation and the Saskatchewan Training School now known as Valley View Centre. There is no other constituency in Saskatchewan with as great an understanding or with as great a concern for the mentally retarded. Moose Jaw has over 600 families that work at Valley View Centre. Many people in Moose Jaw are associated with the Sheltered Workshop. Others are associated with the Saskatchewan Association of the Mentally Retarded and others are parents and families of mentally retarded people.

Because of this tremendous involvement that our city has in mental retardation and because of the commitment that so many

of my constituents have made to mental retardation and because it has been ignored in the Throne Speech, virtually ignored by the minister of Social Services who just spoke, I should like to say a few words.

The problems at Valley View Centre have come into public focus, especially since early September of this year. They were highlighted at that time by the forced resignation of the Director of Training and Research at Valley View, namely Dr. Lorne Elkin. I should like to admit at this time that the bad conditions and services in Valley View have been made known to me by both staff and relatives for some length of time and yet I have not made public statements nor did I raise the issue in this Legislature before this time. However, I have raised the issues privately with Ministers of this Government and with other officials involved with mental retardation. This approach is based on my beliefs that generally a co-operative approach is better than one of confrontation. And also the fact the mental retardation is a very emotional issue and hopefully the problems could be defined and solved by means other than political debate. However, this approach has not been successful in solving problems at Valley View Centre and is evidenced by the rapidly worsening situation. At my annual meeting in my constituency on October 30, 1973, I did mention the deteriorating condition of Valley View. And I remarked on the early resignation of the former Director, Dr. Betty and the forced resignation of Dr. Elkin. I also observed that Dr. Elkin had accused Labour Minister Snyder of political interference. Press coverage of that meeting implied that it was I who criticized and accused Mr. Snyder of political manipulation. Of course, this prompted an oversensitive denial from Mr. Snyder. And also the usual rather typical vitriolic attack on my integrity and my ability. The subsequent Times Herald report of my meeting and the release that the Labour Minister gave to the Times Herald prompted a great rash of people wanting to talk to me concerning the mess that existed at the Training School. In every case, whether by staff or relatives, I was asked to keep their names in confidence because of fear of losing their jobs or because of possible reprisals to the residents of Valley View Centre.

SOME HON. MEMBERS: Hear, hear!

MR. MacDONALD: — I will respect this confidence. The result was that I soon learned from staff and parents that what I had thought was a problem could more accurately be called disaster. I should first like to examine some of the events which surround the breakdown of the Centre.

MR. SNYDER: — They're laughing at you.

MR. MacDONALD: — The typical attack as I mentioned earlier. Core Services which the Minister of Social Services is responsible for and failed to mention among his many other responsibilities, Core Services is a relatively new government agency set up to co-ordinate the activities of the Departments of Health, Education and Social Services. It is to provide human services to the handicapped in Saskatchewan within the philosophy of normalization. This concept of the rationalization of programs and the co-operative approach among the three departments is a good concept. The concept I endorsed at the time of formation

and which I still think could be workable. To this date Core Services has failed miserably. And with its failure it has adversely affected the existing institutions at Moose Jaw and Prince Albert. Core Services has failed for several reasons. First of all there was a great rush by planners in the Premier's office to establish an agency in order to take advantage of Federal funding programs. This may be an admirable objective. However, the consequences of this hasty decision to chase after Federal money is that the goals and programs of Core Services have been determined by available Federal funds and have little relationship to the needs of the mentally retarded. Surely common sense would dictate that the needs of the mentally retarded should be the criteria upon which new programs are formulated.

We court disaster when we formulate programs according to funds just because we can obtain them outside of this province. Obtaining federal funds and cost-sharing programs has become the sole priority of the Premier's office. The needs for adequate services and programs to suit the needs of the mentally retarded are secondary and almost inconsequential to the planners in the Premier's office.

Secondly, there is a completely ad hoc approach to establishing Core Services. There is no game plan and no recognizable goals. People have been hired with almost no job description available simply because Federal money is available for such a position. There is, of course, an attempt being made to develop a community based mental retardation program.

In Saskatchewan our programs formerly centred around an institutional program. There now has been no attempt made to establish objectives for Core Services based on the existing institutional program. There is now complete separation in programming and planning of the community program and that of the institution. This is an intolerable situation for all concerned.

As an example, the Minister of Social Services appointed Dr. Graham Clarkson in September of this year, a year after Core Services started, I quote, "to determine the aims and objectives of Valley View Centre within the context of a community mental retardation program." That is exactly the type of studying that should have taken place before Core was established not after.

SOME HON. MEMBERS: Hear, hear!

MR. MacDONALD: — The Government has obviously put the cart before the horse.

Mr. Potter of the Planning and Research Branch of the Executive Council says in his report and this is a report that leaked out to the public, that among the problems that he sees in Core Services is that community involvement is unstructured and is at the lowest level of planning in service delivery. That is from the Premier's office.

Thirdly, there is a definite lack of professional expertise in Core Services. Mr. Jack Funk was appointed Executive Director of Core Services. He obviously does not have professional expertise or experience in the field of mental retardation.

I am told he is excellent as a spiritual head and is a man with a so-called heart and soul for dealing with mentally retarded. To make things worse, Mr. Funk has not had access to professional expertise within his staff. His main source of help and guidance is from the political hacks who make up the hierarchy of Core Services. An example of which is Gerry Mundt who was supplied to Core Services by the Minister of Education. This is not good enough.

The Blakeney Government has gone too far in its attempt to remove the responsibility of health care delivery from the health professionals. Core Services proves this. There is no question that there is a need for an effective community based service for the retarded.

The Canadian Association of the Mentally Retarded were looking for new and better services. In 1965 the Federal Government gave funds to run experimental research projects, they called these crusade projects. These projects proved the need for a concept of comprehensive community based services for the retarded. And with this I find myself in total agreement. And generally I agree with the Core Services concept for developmental centres, which will provide the training and social development that families do not normally have the resources to do for themselves. This however, is by no means to suggest that there is no further need for the institution. The institution for the retarded must be a vital part of the overall program. Community and institution programs must be co-ordinated. In the case of Core Services there is no definition of goals or of the roles of the institution as related to this community program.

I should like to read into the record a statement by Dr. Lorne Elkin who was director of training and research at the Training School in Moose Jaw. This statement was made at the time Dr. Elkin was forced to resign by NDP politicians. Dr. Elkin named Labour Minister Snyder as that politician. This statement has proven subsequently to be quite accurate and members of the Premier's staff are now backing this statement up. I quote the statement from the Times Herald of September 7:

I have persisted in challenging what I consider to be piece-meal approach to the delivery of services to handicapped persons in Saskatchewan. Is it possible that my efforts to ensure that STS is not excluded from Core Services planning has earned me the reputation of being a troublesome employee. If the needs of the handicapped person in the community are to be served at the expense of the needs of the institutionalized handicapped person and of the needs of the staff who provide this service our understanding of justice, equal opportunity and democracy is shallow.

It is time we recognize and deal with the real problems in Valley View Centre. Many of these problems have been increasing over the years but have enlarged dramatically during the last short period of time because of the priorities placed on the community program.

The conditions which the residents at Valley View Centre institution find themselves in is intolerable. Their lot in life at the institution has to be examined. There is a critical shortage in staff and those are the exact words of the Director

of Valley View Centre and anyone associated with the institution will agree wholeheartedly.

Mr. Taylor does not agree that there is a shortage of staff and he claims that last year there has been an increase in the staff of 90 and a decrease in residents of 100. I don't know where the increase went but there is no increase in staff that care directly for the residents. This increase is likely associated with planners in Core Services. Out of 650 employees at Moose Jaw only 350 are involved in direct care to the residents. There may not be a shortage in some areas, for example, maintenance, but there is a critical shortage in direct care and contact employees.

The Minister of Social Services (Mr. Taylor) commented recently that compared to an institution that he observed in Ontario we are not overcrowded. This shows the lack of interest in the conditions which we are subjecting our Saskatchewan people to right here at home. I don't know how Mr. Taylor is able to pass his judgment, to my knowledge he has not visited the institution, the Premier's staff visited there, they have stated that there is no question that the institution is overcrowded and understaffed. The lack of staff is further aggravated by the higher turnover in staff because of the meagre wages that are being paid to direct care employees.

I should like to quote salaries of the different employees as of October 1, 1973, and which were negotiated by the Minister of Public Health, Mr. Smishek, the Union Agreement between local 600 of CUPE and the Minister of Health. These salaries not only point out the low wages but further point out the low priority that is given to people who give direct care to the mentally retarded. Nurses aides \$348 a month, barely over minimum wage. Compared to the nurses aide the laundry worker assistant, not the laundry worker, but the laundry worker assistant gets \$372, not \$348. The laundry worker gets \$411. The gardener gets \$477 compared to \$348. The gardener's helper get \$372. The watchman gets \$454 compared to \$348. The garbage personnel \$411 compared to \$348. The legislative guides in this building get paid more than the nurses aides who give care to the patients. Let's take a look at a nurse, a registered nurse at Moose Jaw gets \$559, a painter gets \$647, a blacksmith gets \$656. A head nurse, the highest level on direct care staff, \$656, but the plasterer doesn't get \$656, he gets \$813. The tinsmith gets \$854, the plumber gets \$942, \$300 a month more than a nurse.

These low wages and the priorities shown by comparing different types of workers will show one of the reasons for the low morale of the employees. There is no justification for the person cleaning floors to get paid more than the person cleaning people.

SOME HON. MEMBERS: Hear, hear!

MR. MacDONALD: — Why should the person cutting grass and emptying garbage or washing clothes get paid more than the person administering care to the mentally retarded. These are the questions that need answers. The institution is grossly overcrowded and there are inadequate physical accommodations.

MR. ROMANOW: — What was it like in 1971?

MR. MacDONALD: — This overcrowding combined with a shortage of staff make programming development at the Centre almost impossible. This combination has resulted in the residents of Valley View being treated almost like animals. Because of understaffing and overcrowding the residents are almost herded like cattle, their basic human rights are being eroded, denied. Drugs are used and overused because of lack of staff for direct care to residents. I make it absolutely clear that the staff at Valley View are not to blame for these intolerable conditions. Staff are doing the best they can. They are unable to deliver the type of care that they would like to see. The staff have made this very clear to the Government. The Psychiatric Nurses Association have made briefs to the Cabinet, outlining the dreadful shortage of staff. The staff raised such a commotion that they forced the Cabinet to tour the institution a little over a year ago. The Cabinet did go, and on that tour they could hardly have missed seeing the bad situation which has worsened ever since. The outcome of that tour was the formation of a staff advisory committee. The formation of this committee however was only a ploy used to divert attention from government inaction. The staff advisory committee has no real terms of reference and absolutely no power. The union is now threatening to withdraw its membership from the committee. I hardly need to add that the staff are demoralized but how could they help but be.

Mr. Potter's report criticizes management as being lacklustre and complacent. I will not echo this opinion. I feel management is limited in its approach by the lack of direction from Core Services and from the Government. I also believe that management is limited by the actions of the union executive which is threatened by any move towards progressive change at Valley View Centre.

I think the statement made at the banquet of the Psychiatric Nurses' Association sums up the feeling of a lot of staff in Moose Jaw, I quote:

Change does not cause uneasiness amongst us because we are afraid or threatened, it causes uneasiness because we become confused over lack of direction and explanation.

There are several recommendations I should like to make to the Government opposite and specifically to the Minister of Social Services or to whichever Minister is responsible or should be responsible. These recommendations will at least in a small way help to alleviate the terrible conditions at Valley View Centre.

1. Immediately establish a public advisory board to act at Valley View Centre. This board must have suitable terms of reference and a direct method of reporting to the Minister in charge and to the public at large. I would suggest that the board be comprised of members of the community, parents or families of residents, members of the Saskatchewan Association of Mentally Retarded, members of the professionals in mental retardation, staff members at the institution, and members of the Department of Health and possibly of the University.

2. The institutions at Moose Jaw and Prince Albert must be recognized as integral parts of the mental retardation programs in Saskatchewan and it should be made clear that these

centres will not become merely custodial centres.

3. Priority must be given to better wages for staff, especially those administering direct care to mentally retarded.

4. Understaffing must be alleviated.

5. The physical accommodation must be made adequate to alleviate overcrowding and to allow program development.

6. The basic human rights of the mentally retarded must be recognized and administered.

7. Both in-Core Services and the institution staff members should be involved meaningfully in discussions of programs and in the development of programs.

8. In attempting to utilize federal funds or cost-sharing programs the goals and needs of the Saskatchewan Mentally Retarded must become the deciding factor. Federal funds must not be utilized just for the sake of employment.

SOME HON. MEMBERS: Hear, hear!

MR. MacDONALD: — 9. Before instituting a community based service for the retarded there must be an effective program of education and explanation to the general public. The public must have an awareness and an understanding of the retardation program as it will relate to the community.

10. Expertise in the field of mentally retardation must be added to the staff of Core Services.

I think these recommendations will provide short-term alleviation of some of the problems and hopefully after the short term Core Services will become an efficient agent in the field of mental retardation. This is my hope and the Governments has it within its hands to make this a reality.

Mr. Speaker, it is obvious that I will not be supporting the motion, but I will support the amendment put forth by the Leader of the Opposition.

SOME HON. MEMBERS: Hear, hear!

HON. W.E. SMISHEK: (Minister of Public Health) — Will the Hon. Member answer a question before he resumes his seat.

I should like to ask the Hon. Member in light of his depth of research in the Valley View Centre did he during the course of his research find out that some additional 100 employees have been added to that centre. There are about 100 less patients in that centre and the employees . . .

MR. SPEAKER: — Order, order!

I think the question is getting to be a statement and not a question.

MR. MacDONALD: — Mr. Speaker, I was asked a question and I would answer it by saying that if the Minister of Public Health will read the transcript of what I said, he will find that I said those exact figures, that there had been 90 employees added but that none were added to direct care of the mentally retarded. I don't know where they are, in the planners . . .

MR. W.A. ROBBINS: (Saskatoon Nutana Centre) — Mr. Speaker, I should like to add my congratulations to the mover and the seconder in the reply to the Speech from the Throne, the Member for Saltcoats (Mr. Kaeding) and the Hon. Member for Watrous (Mr. Cody). They both gave creditable performances with respect to a very good Throne Speech.

I would also be remiss in my duties, Mr. Speaker, if I didn't congratulate the new Member from Regina Lakeview who was elected recently in the by-election. Perhaps the Members of the Assembly would permit me to indulge in a bit of verse with respect to the new Member, he is here in picture if not in fact.

The Liberals opposite their sins to atone
Have had an addition, his name Ted Malone.
He enters the Assembly a shining new member
Winning an election in chilly December.
His picture adorns the opposite bench
It is startling, Mr. Speaker, it comes as a wrench.
To suddenly realize that the picture out there
Which gazes at us with a vacant fixed stare
Is not one of the fourteen who have always been there.

SOME HON. MEMBERS: Hear, hear!

MR. ROBBINS: — I should like to make a brief comment with respect to the Member for Saskatoon University (Mr. Richards). I have a lot of respect for the Member for Saskatoon University, he is an extremely intelligent articulate individual. I regret that he saw fit to leave the caucus, he did make a comment that it was the only principled thing he could do. Mr. Speaker, I seldom find myself in agreement with the Member for Lumsden, but I do not think it was the only principled thing he could do. I think the most principled thing he could do was resign his seat. I say that in all sincerity because I do not believe any Member elected to any Legislature anywhere should continue to sit in the Legislature when he changes his position and does not represent the people who elected him in the first place.

MR. STEUART: — He didn't want to embarrass you with another by-election.

MR. ROBBINS: — I would be quite willing to take my chances in a by-election, Mr. Steuart, anytime.

I wonder, Mr. Speaker, if Members of this Assembly and particularly Members to your left fully understand the economic implications of energy and the power of the multinational corporations in the world of the 1970s. The Member for Albert Park (Mr. MacLeod) gave us some statistical information about the fact that there are 550 billion barrels of crude oil in the world, some 400 billion barrels of it in the Middle East.

He talked about Kuwait which is a tiny sheikdom in the Persian Gulf. He neglected to tell us that Standard Oil of New Jersey owns 50 billion of those reserves in the Middle East, it also owns some 126 trillion cubic feet of natural gas.

An American economist Paul Samuelson once talked about the manipulated fads engineered by profit seeking advertisers “designed to create private affluence and public poverty.”

The debate continuing and the question being put on the subamendment it was negatived on the following Recorded Division.

YEAS

Messieurs

Nil — 00

NAYS — 42

Messieurs

Blakeney	Byers	Hanson
Dyck	Thorson	Feschuk
Meakes	Whelan	Kaeding
Wood	Engel	Flasch
Romanow	Owens	Steuart
Messer	Robbins	Coupland
Snyder	Tchorzewski	Guy
Bowerman	Cowley	Grant
Thibault	Taylor	MacDonald (Milestone)
Kowalchuk	Matsalla	Mclsaac
Baker	Cody	MacLeod
Brockelbank	Gross	Lane
MacMurchy	Comer	MacDonald (Moose Jaw North)
Pepper	Rolfes	Wiebe

The debate continued on the main motion and the amendment.

MR. W.A. ROBBINS: (Saskatoon Nutana Centre) — Mr. Speaker, before the vote was taken on the subamendment I was making some remarks with respect to modern-day economics and I should like to proceed along that vein.

Basic simplicity has been removed from our economics in recent times. We have been urged to keep ahead, to exhibit our individual affluence, to impress others and perhaps even ourselves. This is economic nonsense and can only lead to economic botulism.

Essentially, we are engaged in a contest between conservationists and technologists. The former, in the tradition of Malthus, Ricardo and John Stuart Mill, realize when we firesale natural gas and other non-renewable fossil fuels we eventually reach the ultimate end of supply. The Liberal Party, Mr. Speaker, it seems to me operates on a very simple premise, that somehow in technology and free market forces we will always find an answer to every economic problem. I believe that philosophy to be a self-deceiving rationale which will inevitably produce economic breakdown. I place myself, Mr. Speaker, firmly on the side of the conservationists. We should not succumb to the irrational imperative that we should, in the current crisis

make sacrifices to ensure energy supplies to our American neighbors. I question the validity of any such contention. The United States with 6 per cent of the world's population uses 33 per cent of the world's energy. We are not in a position to solve their problem or measurably alleviate it. Their crisis cannot be averted unless they alter their own course dramatically.

Rational measures to conserve energy are often as not nullified. Stiff taxation on wasteful large automobiles is needed. A massive swing to buses and rapid transit in downtown metropolitan areas is needed. However, when such approaches are promoted by political authority they are likely to be eliminated by the dead hand of corporate self-interest. Our imperative should be to husband energy resources still available and shun the trap of artificially created demands. The opposite road leads to almost certain disaster. The market forces theory of private enterprise obviously tends to break down when you deal with non-renewable resources. The tragic fire-sale of Alberta natural gas could only occur in a federal state that has not even staged the pretence of formulating a comprehensive energy policy. It has happened in a vacuum of national policy.

My Liberal friends opposite appear to believe we still have a competitive free market in energy. They are wrong. In the words of the popular song, "When Will They Ever Learn." Perhaps some examples will serve to illustrate. I hope they will at least help. The international petroleum cartel companies as defined by the United States Federal Trade Commission are seven in number. Five are American: Standard Oil Company of New Jersey, Standard Oil of California, Mobil Oil, Gulf and Texaco. Two are based in Europe, one in Great Britain — British Petroleum and one a British European Consortium — Royal Dutch Shell.

Let's take a brief look at least at two of them, Mr. Speaker. One American, Standard of New Jersey and one based in Europe, Royal Dutch Shell. They are incidentally the two largest. The economic power of such consortiums is incredible. For example, Standard of New Jersey controls crude oil reserves of 50 billion barrels and natural gas reserves of 126 trillion cubic feet. It directs the flow of its crude into 70 different refineries in 37 countries, with a total refinery capacity of 4,800,000 barrels per day. It owns 184 tankers and charters an additional 142. It has orders placed for 12 super tankers of 250,000 tons each. Each one of those tankers will cost more than \$100 million. It has orders placed for these in the world markets right now. It owns 95 per cent of Creole Petroleum, which was mentioned by the Hon. Member for Watrous (Mr. Cody) in his Throne Speech the other day. That petroleum organization controls 50 per cent, or one-half of the total petroleum production of Venezuela. It has important oil concessions in Canada, the Middle East, Africa, Indonesia, Australia and in world wide off shore locations. It holds a large volume of American coal reserves. It has interests in ore processing, real estate and uranium mines. It is engaged in research, Mr. Speaker, in hydrogen fusion with General Electric, is a part owner of the proposed Trans-Alaska Pipeline and has the controlling interest in Imperial Oil, the prime lobbyist in the Canadian Parliament for the Mackenzie Valley gas pipeline. In fact, Eric Kierans, a former Liberal Cabinet Minister in Ottawa at one time, made the statement that O.W. Twaits, the chairman of Imperial Oil was the most powerful man in Canada. I think that statement is accurate. Its directors have strategic interlocks with innumerable American corporations, for example, Morgan Guaranty Trust, Caterpillar Tractor,

Prudential Insurance are but a few examples. And, Mr. Speaker, if you want to get some idea of the size of these organizations, Prudential Insurance has assets in excess of \$100 billion. And, in Canada with International Nickel and the Royal Bank of Canada — the Royal Bank being the largest bank in Canada and International Nickel the largest in the nickel industry.

The Liberals, Mr. Speaker, say, “so what, they are successful business-like entrepreneurs!” I’ll say they are. Take note of this: The Dominion Bureau of Statistics in Ottawa discovered that at one point in the 1960s, oil that left the well-head in Kuwait at 6 cents per barrel and oil from Alberta at \$2. \$2.25 per barrel, reached their respective markets in Montreal and Toronto at an identical price.

The Hon. Member for Albert Park (Mr. MacLeod) made some remarks about Kuwait and its oil supplies and a lot of that oil was coming into Canada — at least coming out of the well-head at Kuwait, at 6 cents per barrel but selling in the Canadian market at the same price related to the Alberta price, simply because of the control of the multinational corporation.

Much of the oil used in Quebec comes from the Middle East. The world-wide market price of oil was the amount that was high enough to produce a profit on Texas crude, where production costs were then among the world’s highest. The producer of crude in one country who sells for export and the refiner who purchases the crude in another country — one discovers — are both subsidiaries of the parent international organization. The overriding consideration is the organization, not necessarily the interests of the countries where portions of the operations are carried out.

I wonder, Mr. Speaker, if Assembly Members are aware that Caltex — a combine of California Standard and Texaco — only emerged in the world pattern of cartel operations as the major supplier to Japan after the emergence of that country as one of the large energy consuming industrialized nations of this world. Lest the Assembly thinks I am being too harsh on an American multinational, Jersey Standard, I should like to refer to the Royal Dutch Shell group.

In 1970 its sales totalled 110.5 billion. Its net income was \$882 million. This consortium is headquartered in The Hague in Holland. It’s not as Dutch as you may think. It is 40 per cent British owned, 21 per cent American and 19 per cent Dutch. Its directors have interlocks with United States Steel, Dunlop Rubber, Caterpillar Tractor and Morgan Guaranty Trust. It owns 415 tankers, the world’s largest fleet. It provides 14 per cent of all the world’s oil and invests more money abroad than all other British industrial firms combined. It owns 35,000 miles of crude oil pipelines, 11,650 miles of natural gas pipelines. Its refineries process 252 million tons of crude per annum — 11 million tons in Canada. Shell Oil’s operations in Canada from 1964 to 1969 amassed profits in excess of \$500 million on which they paid not one cent of tax. It owns more than 500 subsidiary companies in chemicals, engineering, exploration, mining, metals, manufacturing, marketing and transportation from Trinidad to Tonga. It is a modern energy corporation. Multinationals of this size and magnitude tend to reduce governments to impotence when manipulating one energy source after another in pursuit of profits.

We should face facts. These are the organizations in this world which economists say vote with their feet, they simply move to other locations in terms of getting better tax deals. The only protection the Canadian consumer, and more particularly the Saskatchewan consumer, which is our major concern, has in the field of energy lies in co-operative and public action. I am pleased the Government of this Province will act to conserve and thereby ensure energy supplies for farmers now and farmers in the future. Any other approach or direction is inconceivable. I solicit support for such action from Members opposite, Mr. Speaker.

Mr. Speaker, I should like to make a few remarks about orderly marketing of farm products, particularly related to rapeseed and feed grains. Some of the Members of the Assembly may not be aware that I own some land. I am not an absentee landlord farmer. When I say farm, I mean farm. In partnership I work the land and handle the grain that is produced on it. The rapeseed ballot is drawn in such a way that my partners and I will not get a vote even though we have grown rapeseed in the past. I might tell the Members of this Assembly that I have bought futures on the Winnipeg Commodity Exchange and I have made some money on futures. If I had a vote in the rapeseed plebiscite, I would unhesitatingly vote for marketing under the Canadian Wheat Board.

SOME HON. MEMBERS: Hear, hear!

MR. ROBBINS: — For the average producer to get the average price throughout the crop year, is in my view a much more rational approach than for the average producer who invests his effort, time and capital to be caught in the wide-swings which occur in the market. Rapeseed, has in the last year sold under \$3 a bushel and up to \$7 per bushel. I ask, Mr. Speaker, the Members of the Assembly, would the truck manufacturer offer a specific model on the market with swings between \$3,000 and \$7,000 for it within a year? The market forces do not work in this context. The prices are controlled. The producer of the primary product requires price protection against the vagaries of the market. Orderly marketing provides basic protection. As difficult as it will be to secure a favorable vote for Wheat Board marketing under the type of ballot being used in the current plebiscite, I, for one, sincerely hope an affirmative answer for orderly marketing will result.

Oats and barley, the basic feed grains, have been under Wheat Board jurisdiction for a long time. The Hon. Otto Lang, who has jurisdiction over the Wheat Board, has clearly indicated that it is the Federal Government's intention to return them to the open market. He sets up an Agricultural Marketing Board to buy feed grains outright, delivered without quota, and expects the system to operate smoothly and not seriously congest and disrupt the whole marketing system. Or does he? Is he or anyone else that naive? No wonder those of us who believe in the orderly marketing approach anticipate undermining of the Wheat Board. It will be a miracle if severe disruption does not occur throughout the grain marketing system. Therefore I oppose the Federal feed grains policy, not as a New Democrat, but as a producer and marketer of feed grains. The Board should be retained as the sole marketing agency for feed grains delivered to the elevator system. The Board can schedule grain movement through the block shipping system, arrange deliveries under the

quota system and establish grain stocks where needed. The last thing the Canadian Wheat Board needs is an Agricultural Products Board to run interference and muck up orderly deliveries and disposition of feed grain stocks.

I am pleased, Mr. Speaker, to note the Government is to proceed with a major program to control alcohol abuse. I commend the Government for such an approach and I urge initiation of the recommendation of a health warning label on all alcoholic beverage containers. In addition, I would urge the Government to use a pricing policy through the Liquor Board designed to reduce the consumption of alcohol and therefore indirectly reduce the incidence of alcoholism. I am pleased the Premier in the Throne Speech debate emphasized that the Government is opposed to increased accessibility of liquor through an increase in the number of outlets. I believe that policy is realistic and sound in view of the increasing social problem created through alcoholic use and abuse.

Mr. Speaker, I was also pleased to see the Government intends to provide additional assistance to urban municipal governments and improve recreation, transportation and other municipal services. Mr. Speaker, Members on the other side have been critical of the Government for not giving sufficient assistance to urban governments. As a representative of an urban seat, I have commended the Government and strongly supported its stand in looking after the rural situation first. I think, Mr. Speaker, it is absolutely essential in this province that we underpin the rural economy and that the economies of the urban centres and municipalities in this province cannot survive unless that rural economy is soundly based.

It is clear that the city of Saskatoon, a portion of which I am privileged to represent in this Legislature, is in need of assistance particularly in the field of urban transit. I hope Mr. Speaker, such assistance will be provided in the form of a per capita conditional grant of a sizeable amount.

I should like, Mr. Speaker, to commend the Government for proposing to set up a Saskatchewan Development Fund.

For far too long the tendency in Saskatchewan has been to see invested funds funnelled out of the province. The implications for Saskatchewan, even if progress toward a sizeable accumulation of funds is relatively slow, is important. The investment funds available within the province, like investment funds from public programs and institutions, such as Saskatchewan Government Insurance Office and the Canadian Pension Plan are important functions of such organizations, although the implications for development within the province may not be generally or readily understood. I welcome the establishment of the Saskatchewan Development Fund.

Mr. Speaker, Members of the Assembly will have concluded by now or long before now, that I will vote against the amendment and support the main motion in the Address-in-Reply to the Speech from the Throne.

SOME HON. MEMBERS: Hear, hear!

MR. A.W. ENGEL: (Notukeu-Willow Bunch) — Mr. Speaker, I too would like to take part in this Throne Speech Debate. I should like to start off by

congratulating the members opposite for their victory in Lakeview and for Mr. Malone's personal victory.

I have often wondered why they put that picture across the way, that the Member who just took his seat mentioned in the poem he said about him. I was wondering if maybe the Leader of the Opposition (Mr. Steuart) has another motive in mind. When we see an image or see a picture, this creates a first impression on us. I am wondering if he is really anxious, now that Mr. Malone has succeeded in doing what they wanted (they won that seat) but let's leave it at that. Creating this kind of first impression on us here and maybe on his fellow colleagues, that that is the kind of a person he is going to be, that this isn't going to be nearly as big a challenge to him. He moved from there to there and I don't know how fast he's going to move to the left, but I wish you lots of luck, Mr. Steuart, anyhow.

I'd like to congratulate the Premier and his Cabinet on the fine job they did in preparing the material that went into the Throne Speech. They did their homework well, Mr. Speaker, and I really think they need a share of congratulations. They came up with such tremendous material that two of the Members opposite are even accusing us of becoming disloyal to Royalty. Now, as for one Member of this side of the House at 4:00 o'clock one morning I heard a commotion in our family room and I got up to find my two little girls watching television. We're loyal to Royalty, we watched their wedding, even at that horribly early hour and I don't think this Throne Speech challenges our allegiance to Royalty at all. The Throne Speech does talk about change and it does recommend advances for people and maybe this is why they are saying that it's a challenge to Royalty, but if the Hon. Member opposite would take time to talk to His Honour, the Lieutenant-Governor of Saskatchewan, I am sure he will find that he doesn't share his views.

Mr. Speaker, I have much more to say on this Throne Speech and I beg leave to adjourn the debate.

Debate adjourned.

The Assembly adjourned at 5:30 o'clock p.m.