

LEGISLATIVE ASSEMBLY OF SASKATCHEWAN
Fourth Session — Seventeenth Legislature
8th Day

Monday, December 10, 1973.

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

On the Orders of the Day.

ROYAL ASSENT

At 2:31 o'clock p.m. His Honour the Lieutenant-Governor entered the Chamber, took his seat upon the Throne and gave Royal Assent to Bill No. 39 — An Act respecting a Certain Election in the Constituency of Regina Lakeview.

PRESENTATION OF MR. MALONE

MR. D.G. STEUART: (Leader of the Opposition) — Mr. Speaker, I have the honor to present Mr. Ted Malone, the Member for Regina Lakeview.

HON. MEMBERS: Hear, hear!

MR. SPEAKER: — Let the Hon. Member take his seat.

HON. MEMBERS: Hear, hear!

QUESTIONS

INTERPRETATION OF AGREEMENT WITH PEOPLE'S WOOD PRODUCER'S BOARD

MR. J.G. RICHARDS: (Saskatoon University) — Mr. Speaker, before the Orders of the Day, I should like to place a question to the Premier. I should like to ask the Premier his interpretation of the agreement which was arrived at between the People's Wood Producer's Board and the Government in a tentative form last Friday?

HON. A.E. BLAKENEY: (Premier) — Mr. Speaker, I doubt whether I can accommodate the Hon. Member in that regard without some notes. We had written out seven particular items which we had decided that we had agreed upon and decided that we would confirm it by an exchange of letters. Basically they indicate that the Government will use its best endeavors to find wood for Wood Producer's Co-operatives which wish to operate in northern Saskatchewan — Native Wood Producer's Co-operatives — within the existing timberland which are under lease to various companies that we would use our best endeavors to find them close to the settlements in which the native people live; in the course of attempting to provide the co-operatives with cutting rights we would negotiate through the Wood Producer's Board with respect to those co-operatives who are members of the Wood Producer's Board from time to time and wish to and are represented on its Board; that this arrangement would continue for six months, I think the figure is. The Board being an interim board for that period and during that period it is anticipated that the active co-operatives in the area will select their own board and we the Government if the co-operatives wish it would negotiate with that board for the

allocation of cutting rights to the co-operatives. I think this probably covers most of the items that were in the agreement, I cannot recall the others off hand, but they are all consistent with that general idea.

I think that as the Minister of Natural Resources has indicated, all of this is in compliance with existing government policy of making available to the native people in the North, cutting rights. We really do not anticipate any great difficulty in that regard so far as the Government is concerned or the co-operatives are concerned, and we doubt whether the existing major companies in the area will raise any strenuous objections to the allocation of cutting rights to co-operatives in the areas close to the native centres.

MR. RICHARDS: — Mr. Speaker, a supplementary question. I trust that all Members of this House will agree with me that this was a most satisfactory conclusion to the events last week that there be such an agreement. I should like as a supplementary question to ask the Premier up to what limits does he envisage the provision of cutting rights in some terms such as cords per year to be made available to the producers' boards, realizing of course, it is always subject to the applications that are forthcoming?

MR. BLAKENEY: — Really we haven't faced that question yet. There is only — and I am subject here to correction from the Minister of Natural Resources — as I recall it there is only one co-operative now which is operating and cutting extensively at Beauval. That is about one million fence posts a year, or one million fence posts in the last period and I guess it would be a year.

The forests in Saskatchewan will stand a good number of co-operatives cutting at that rate. It may be that at some future time there will be in fact a genuine conflict as to whether or not wood is to be allocated to one of the existing forest industries or to be a wood cutting co-op. Now I think there is no conflict in terms of quantity. There may in fact be conflict in terms of the wood in a particular area, but that's the sort of thing that can be negotiated out. As we now view it there is lots of wood for all and we haven't come to grips with any limits which might need to be assigned either to the wood cutting industries over and above what are there now or to the potential cutting operations of the northern native co-operatives.

MR. RICHARDS: — The Premier states there is no immediate question . . .

MR. SPEAKER: — Order, order!

MR. RICHARDS: — I am trying to . . .

MR. SPEAKER: — We allow one question and one supplementary question. Furthermore the rules are that questions must be asked of the Minister of what is a fact and not of Minister's opinions. I realize the topic raised is of considerable importance to all Members, but you are asking for the opinion of Ministers rather than of what is fact. We can't permit a debate on it.

MR. RICHARDS: — Mr. Speaker, I was asking

December 10, 1973

for a particular fact, namely, did the Government have a precise figure in its mind, in its calculations that it was prepared to allow to the People's Wood Producer's Board as an upper margin subject to the applications. I was trying to arrive at what that figure was, if any.

MR. BLAKENEY: — As I attempted to answer no figure has at this time been set.

ADJOURNED DEBATES

ADDRESS -IN-REPLY

The Assembly resumed the adjourned debate on the proposed motion of Mr. Kaeding and the proposed amendment thereto moved by Mr. Steuart.

MR. A.W. ENGEL: (Notukeu-Willow Bunch) — Mr. Speaker, as I mentioned last day when I asked for adjournment of this debate, I was congratulating both mover and seconder for the fine job they did. I also made mention of the Member for Lakeview (Mr. Malone) who won his seat. I would personally at this time like to congratulate you, and welcome you into this House. I am sure, speaking just for myself, I appreciate you in person much more than the picture we had last week. It is a pleasant change to have you here.

Mr. Speaker, I represent an area in the south country Notukeu-Willow Bunch. I should like to take some time today to talk about this constituency and what kind of country it really is. This is a beautiful country, an area that is made up of wide open spaces, some wilderness, some good hunting country, some good wheat land, lots of cattle country, you name it, in Notukeu-Willow Bunch we have it.

The Cypress Hills range runs through the constituency from the south side the length of the constituency and there is an area just north of the Cypress Hills range that the people refer to as the 'Bench'. There is quite a distinct change in the landmarks and the location and even in the climate between the Bench and just south of the Bench. In fact this past weekend the storm that the residents faced here in Regina just didn't get down in our country, it was that much nicer. We live in the banana belt.

Located just north of this range of hills are five regional parks. I should like to take you on a tour of these parks at this time. I am sure you would enjoy visiting the area. The regional park and the furthest north located on Highway 58 between Lafleche and Gravelbourg is called Thompson Lake. This is one of the heaviest utilized regional parks in the whole province, Mr. Speaker. Back in 1956 the Wood River circled between Gravelbourg and Lafleche through some open farm land. The effort and work that went into this park is a credit to the community and the people of that area. The kind of achievement that has been attained in such a short time — to transfer wide open country into a beautiful place like Thompson Lake. I should like to give the local people particular credit at this time. At Thompson Lake you can golf on grass greens, you can go on a picnic in a shaded area, you can water-ski on a large reservoir, you can swim and play on a sanded beach, it is really

a wonderful spot.

From here you travel east to the new Highway 358. I should like particularly at this time to compliment the Minister of Highways for taking this into the highway system. This road goes from the 13 Highway down to No. 2 Highway at Killdeer, it passes the Wood Mountain Regional Park. This park has located within its boundaries a rodeo ground. I should like to make mention of this at this time. This is the oldest continuous rodeo in Canada. It was first organized by the North West Mounted Police who were located just north of the park site. This annual two day event draws visitors from a large area, many come annually from south of the border. The park also offers a swimming pool, it is the home of the United Church camp called Woodboia, it has some beaver dams, it is a beautiful natural treed area. Just south as I already mentioned where the RCMP post was is a historic site that contains a RCMP museum.

From this park I suggest you take a grid road called the Lower Meadow road east to the No. 2 Highway, then south to the town of Rockglen. Near Rockglen there is another regional park called Rockin Beach. I have been to quite a few ball parks in my day, I enjoy sports, I am not even sure if Frisco's Candlestick Park could hold a candle to the ball park at Rockin Beach. The maintenance of this park is an indication of the value the residents of this area pay to good sports. If you add the facilities they have there, a golf course, a sandy beach it is really a nice place to stay and play. For the tourist who does not wish to camp or pull a trailer you will not have to take second rate service if you stay a night at Rockglen. The hotel accommodations there are tremendous.

From Rockglen let's go north to Willow Bunch there you visit a museum, you can swim in their pool or you could go out to the Louis Jean Legare Regional Park and you wouldn't believe that you are still on the prairies. This natural treed area is watered by springs, it has many picnic sites, a golf course and other forms of recreation are available at this beauty spot.

From here you travel, and I am sure by the time the tourist season rolls around this summer, on a black top road, one of Mr. Kramer's (Minister of Highways) Open Roads programs to St. Victor. This community has demonstrated to all of Saskatchewan that survival does not depend on highways and rail lines. St. Victor is the head office for the Family Life Insurance Company. I would just like to put a plug in at this time because this company rates sixth in Canada, as far as size is concerned.

While at St. Victor I should like you to visit the cultural centre, go out to a regional park, and the historic park that depicts the days before the settlers arrived. And I really would be insulting the area, Mr. Speaker, if I did not mention the short grass, or wilderness area as it is sometimes called. It's just south and east of the parks I have described to you.

The Sinking Hill, the Badlands, a prairie dog colony, and miles and miles and more miles of open country is more than just another tourist attraction. Man's effort to improve his lot has left very little of this world in its natural state. The few ranchers privileged to be living in this area are busy being the world's best but most underpaid tourist guides. I

December 10, 1973

would recommend, action be taken very soon in consultation with local residents to settle the unrest that still exists there.

It's true that the Minister of Natural Resources, Mr. Bowerman, has laid out public guidelines under which we would co-operate with the Federal Government, which by the way is very anxious to make a national park in that area. These guidelines that Mr. Bowerman set up are straightforward. They are; (1) We would not go along with the park if it would take away the grazing rights of the local ranchers. (2) We would not give up provincial rights to our mineral resources, nor would we take the control of our natural resources away from the province.

Mr. Speaker, I should like to make one thing clear, that all I am endeavoring to do is to report on the extent of the negotiations. I do not intend to debate what the answer should be at this time. In the light of the need to preserve the historic value, and the local farmers are aware of this, I suggest that either negotiations be reopened with the Federal parks people, or the province accept the responsibility to preserve this heritage for future generations. I've spent a considerable amount of time talking about the tourist potential of Notukeu-Willow Bunch, and I'm looking forward with keen interest to further expansion and development in this regard in that area.

We have more than just parks and recreation in the south country.

Did you know that the largest town in my constituency has a population of less than 700 people? In spite of the small size of the towns, the people from this area have within driving distance most of the essential services at their convenience. If you take Mankota, for example, the population is 400 people. Through the Department of Health, we recently remodelled their hospital to the tune of over \$100,000. It's like a brand new facility offering first class care. In the curling rink, artificial ice was installed with help from a Winter Works Grant, and they also received aid in the construction of a fire hall, town office and space for a new library.

Let me tell the members opposite that the people at Mankota are very happy with what this Government is doing to assist them with providing some of the services that are so necessary.

SOME HON. MEMBERS: Hear, hear!

MR. ENGEL: — I am pleased with the intention to expand capital programs to develop more winter works recreation facilities throughout Saskatchewan. In Glentworth we helped build their ice palace, and that is exactly what it is. In Lafleche we helped build a skating rink. In Melaval we built a new curling rink. Woodrow made improvements to their rink with the help from this kind of program. The Throne Speech calls for aid for more. I can assure you it will be appreciated.

There is another program that Mr. Taylor, the Minister of Social Services mentioned in his speech the other day. And I should like to comment on the success of this program in Willow Bunch. Some \$14,000 was granted for a Works Program. The Mayor of Willow Bunch was telling me how pleased he was with this program. It gave work with dignity to special cases who had

earnings. This money was used to clean up and plant trees, to beautify their town, old unsightly buildings were removed and landscaping was done on some public property, the former hospital grounds. These grounds had been vacant for some six or seven years. I wonder who was in power at the time that hospital was closed? The only problem with this program, Mr. Speaker, is that we do not get assistance from the Federal Liberals as they would do if we were paying these people welfare.

The present Minister of Health (Mr. Smishek) sat down with the hospital board at Willow Bunch and they are now providing an alternate service. With close to a \$10,000 grant, a special place was fixed up for the senior citizens. Let's just look a little more at Willow Bunch's history. About ten years ago they had a sewage disposal system installed. The Department of Municipal Affairs, under the same leadership as that department has today, Mr. Wood, had a very ambitious program. To help our small towns which needed sewer and water they got involved in a substantial financial way.

At that time Willow Bunch had a doctor, a dentist, a hospital and a population of close to 800 people. If my memory serves me right we hooked up some 125 house connections. I had the contract for installing the sewer system down there.

When I went back to campaign ten years later, after seven years of Liberal administration, I don't know how many of you remember that magic number of new jobs they promised, 80,000 new jobs. This town placed their confidence in these promises of prosperity. Did they get any new jobs? Did they get better health facilities? Did their small businesses grow and expand and did new businesses move in? They did put sewer and water systems in. They built a new school and they built a new church, the town did their part, Mr. Speaker, the local people were involved and they believed these promises. But what thanks did they get from the able-bodied leadership that sat on this side of the House during those years, in the words of our Premier, "those seven lean, miserable years"? A population of 800 grew in Liberal terms to 460. Lots of new jobs and business; the dentist pulled out, the hospital was closed, the doctor left, and in June of 1971, when the people were asked, "how they liked it, or do you want more of the same?", they decided for a change in no uncertain terms.

SOME HON. MEMBERS: Hear, hear!

MR. ENGEL: — Mr. Speaker, they got a change and they are happy with it. The council with new hope and a new attitude have taken advantage of winter works and make-work programs. They have cleaned up their town, they've planted trees, they've removed unsightly buildings and they're ready for more.

Not only had our small towns lost hope, but so had many of our small farmers. You know, all too well what the result was and I am proud of the progress that has been initiated under the able leadership of the Agriculture Minister, Jack Messer.

SOME HON. MEMBERS: Hear, hear!

MR. ENGEL: — The Land Bank is a very successful vehicle to help transfer land from those seeking to retire because of age or

December 10, 1973

health reasons. What is the beauty of this program? The effort and the work that went into building up a yard and land mark is not wasted, as it would be, where only the rich and the big farmers are able to get bigger and richer.

FarmStart is off to a good start. Young people who love to farm and love a rural way of life have been able to build viable units. Five million dollars in this program, to date, more to come.

Mr. Speaker, I just want to draw your attention for a few moments to the business community of this province. I had the privilege of tabling the Final Report of the Special Committee on Friday. Many of the government departments have kept their ear to the ground and have moved on programs that are of special benefit to the businessmen of this province.

One of the most worthwhile, in my opinion, is the Business Rep Program. In the past, technical advice was difficult to obtain in the out-of-the-way places. Today we have personnel on the job in six regional offices. It has been less than two years since this Legislature, eighteen months in fact, since this Legislature has set up a Special Committee on Business Firms. Since that time we listened to the problems of the people, we made an interim report, the department has passed legislation and the help is where it is needed. The business rep for our area is located in an office in Swift Current at 176 - 5th Avenue North West. These field men are on the job and doing a tremendous job. There has been some criticism in this House by Members opposite of regional business representatives. The selection of these people was based on a number of criteria; their formal training or education, a significant basic experience was taken into account; analytical ability in communication skills, personal initiative and integrity.

Once selected these representatives are supported by the expertise in the head office in the Department for Specific Problems. They are also supported by the capability that we contract for in the business community.

These people are receiving intensive, regular operating seminars every six weeks. This is a tough course I am told and they are doing a tremendous job and I'd like to compliment them at this time.

Financing and obtaining loans of all types, emerged as the main topic in our final report. Special emphasis was given to the development of a new program similar to that of FarmStart.

Words of commendation are specially in order to the Minister, Mr. Thorson, for the special emphasis he has placed on the Saskatchewan Economic Development Corporation. He has moved some very capable men into this division and Saskatchewan Economic Development Corporation is on the road, making more loans to people who would otherwise not have expanded or started a new business. The last several months have seen a marked growth in our economy. Ten per cent increase in manufacturing in Saskatchewan, much of it was SEDCO money, has created an additional 2,000 stable jobs.

Mr. Speaker, before sitting down, I should just like to make one short comment on the energy situation.

The Member for Saskatoon Nutana (Mr. Robbins) gave a very good talk on the kinds of profit that some of the major oil companies are reaping in Saskatchewan. It has been pointed out in great detail that the amount of profit made is not related to the amount of exploration that is carried out. In fact, the opposite is true. The major companies are skimming the cream off our oil reserves and doing nothing in return for those unearned windfall profits.

Mr. Speaker, I endorse new legislation that will control the price of oil. There is no need for price increases in Saskatchewan when the industry has already earned more than 100 per cent profit.

I am sure by the remarks that I have made today, Mr. Speaker, that I intend to support the motion and not the amendment.

SOME HON. MEMBERS: Hear, hear!

MR. E.F. GARDNER: (Moosomin) — Mr. Speaker, I should first like to congratulate the mover and the seconder of the Throne Speech and I should like to welcome the new Liberal Member from Lakeview, Mr. Ted Malone, who has just officially taken his seat in this Legislature. We all know that Ted is a man of great ability and we look forward to working with him here. I should also like to congratulate him and his helpers for the overwhelming victory, Liberal victory in Lakeview. We know that they were fighting at that time, a well oiled NDP machine which was backed by all the resources of the Government, and this included, of course, a large number of highly paid people working for various NDP Cabinet Ministers and various government departments. And many of these people of course, were campaigning for the NDP at taxpayers' expense.

Lakeview was won this time by about 1,750 votes. This is not far from the 1967 results, and it appears that the Saskatchewan people are reverting to the voting patterns of 1967 when the Liberal Party won that general election.

SOME HON. MEMBERS: Hear, hear!

MR. GARDNER: — However, Mr. Speaker, there is one disturbing factor about this by-election, which should be brought to your attention. The NDP candidate, Mr. Keith was rejected by the voters, but he has been given a high paying job immediately by the NDP Government. A \$20,000 a year NDP job is a pretty good consolation prize. Mr. Speaker, fair minded people of all parties have reason to be concerned by this display of arrogance by the Blakeney Government.

Mr. Speaker, I should like to make a few comments on some recent agricultural problems in this province. The message I get from the country is that farmers are getting fed up with the political bickering and programs that affect them. They are fed up with the NDP continually bringing partisan politics into important agricultural issues. Any program that's suggested by the Federal Government is automatically opposed by this NDP Provincial Government for strictly political reasons. They don't care if the program is good for farmers or whether it could stand some improvement. Mr. Blakeney, Mr. Messer, Mr. Romanow put NDP politics first and the interests of the farmer

December 10, 1973

second. This first became very obvious with the Federal Stabilization Plan.

The Stabilization Plan was a classic example of NDP political interference in the affairs of the Saskatchewan farmer. The Stabilization Plan proposed by the Hon. Otto Lang in 1971, was basically a very simple plan. It said that a fund would be set up to pay money out to farmers in years of low production, poor markets or poor prices. The fund would be made up as follows: From the farmer two per cent of his gross sales of grain, from the Federal Government four per cent of the farmer's gross sales of grain. The details of when it would be paid back etc. were relatively unimportant. The significant point was that all of this money would be available to farmers when they needed it. For example, in 1973-74 the Federal contribution would have been about \$150 million on gross grain sales of an estimated \$370 million. In the past two years the farmers would have received a Federal contribution of over \$200 million, but did the farmers get this \$200 million, Mr. Speaker and this amounts to about \$3,000 for each Saskatchewan farmer? No, of course they did not.

In the fall of 1971 this NDP Government sabotaged and destroyed the Federal Stabilization Plan. They boasted about it publicly and took credit for its destruction. Those chiefly responsible, and the Minister, the Attorney General says he still takes responsibility for its destruction.

Those chiefly responsible were the NDP Minister of Agriculture, Mr. Messer, the Attorney General, Mr. Romanow, because of their actions we still have no Stabilization Plan and no \$200 million from the Federal Government. No two men in history have ever cost the Saskatchewan farmer so much money.

I hope the farmers of this province will look at these two NDP Cabinet Ministers, Mr. Romanow and Mr. Messer and decide which they would rather have. Romanow and Messer or \$200 million. I believe that most farmers would give you a pretty quick answer to this question.

A more recent example of NDP interference, concerns the feed grains controversy. The Hon. Otto Lang realized that feed grain marketing in past years has been disastrous for farmers. He proposed a number of changes for this year and an improved and permanent plan starting next year. He invited constructive suggestions and co-operation from provincial governments, farm organizations and individual farmers, so that the best possible plan could be developed. All he got from the NDP Provincial Government was political interference. They refused to work with Mr. Lang to develop a sound program. Mr. Messer can only say that he wants to maintain orderly marketing. And I should like to ask the farmers of this province, Mr. Speaker, was it orderly marketing when feed, barley, oats and wheat were selling in Saskatchewan for about a cent a pound, was it orderly marketing when farmers were forced to sell in another farmer's quota book in order to get rid of their grain, when we had only a one bushel quota from August to January or February, when we had perhaps a four bushel quota in the whole crop year? When we had a terrifically high inventory of grain and the values of this grain was being eaten up by storage costs? Was this orderly marketing, Mr. Speaker? When we had Wheat Board officials

who were not aggressive enough to sell our grain and when eastern Canadian feeders were buying United States corn and our barley was rotting in our fields and in our bins?

For years we have not had orderly marketing. We have had a marketing mess and isn't it strange that the NDP want to preserve these things that I have just mentioned. They run around the country and say we want to preserve orderly marketing. These are the things they want to preserve. Mr. Lang recognized the marketing mess we were in and was determined to correct it. Feed grains are now moving smoothly off the farm and in large volume. The pipe line is clear, there are almost no storage charges. The prices for feed grains are good, the quotas are good, the outlook for the future is good, but, for political reasons the Blakeney Government and their friends are saying that orderly marketing is being destroyed. The farmers are finally enjoying a well deserved and a long overdue break as far as feed grains are concerned. The only threat at the moment that I can see to this favorable situation is that NDP political interference may destroy it as they destroyed the Stabilization Plan.

SOME HON. MEMBERS: Hear, hear!

MR. GARDNER: — Orderly marketing is a catchy phrase. It is being abused by the NDP and their supporters. David Lewis, the Federal NDP, comes out from the East to make a speech at Loon Lake, Saskatchewan. He doesn't know a load of barley from a load of hay. He gets a little advice, probably from the local Minister of Agriculture and he makes headlines by saying that orderly marketing is being threatened. You know, Mr. Speaker, in early September the Minister of Agriculture (Mr. Messer) urgently set up a Provincial Feed Grains Commission supposedly to set floor prices and protect the farmer. Now I don't know why anyone would want to be protected from the good prices and the good markets that are now being enjoyed. However, he did set up a commission for political reasons. No one has ever heard of it since and three months have gone by. I am sure that the Minister himself wishes he had never heard of it as it is bound to be an embarrassment to him.

I hesitate to discuss the rapeseed vote at this time. The rapeseed vote is another example of NDP partisan interference in the affairs of the farmer. I should like to make the following point. The Federal Government first of all has invited the people on both sides of the controversy to prepare material on their views, this material has been sent to all farmers involved to help them make a rational decision. This is the Federal position, they will send material on both sides of the issue. The Provincial NDP Government, however, sent out material at the taxpayers' expense presenting only one side of the issue and the reason, of course, that they're doing this is that the NDP doesn't really favor any type of a vote.

SOME HON. MEMBERS: Hear, hear!

MR. GARDNER: — The NDP rammed the Hog Marketing Commission down the throats of the farmers without a vote. The NDP simply doesn't want informed farmers. The NDP want to keep the farmers in the dark because the NDP know that when the farmer does become fully informed the NDP will not win a seat in rural

December 10, 1973

Saskatchewan.

Mr. Speaker, orderly marketing may or may not mean Wheat Board marketing. We do know that a tremendous rapeseed market has been built up under a free and open system and prices have been good. I don't know if this would be maintained under the Wheat Board. This is a decision that will have to be made by the farmers involved. Personally I favor the principle of a Wheat Board but we are all aware of the tremendous problems faced by farmers over the past years while feed grains were handled under this so-called orderly marketing system. Mr. Messer keeps saying that the Wheat Board should be the sole marketing agency for feed grain and that the Wheat Board should set the price. Yet at the same time his own department is trying to squeeze the cheapest possible price from farmers on NDP Government purchases of feed oats and barley and I would like to refer you to the following ad that appeared in the Outlook paper. This is where Mr. Messer's Department is calling for tenders and I will quote briefly from this:

Tenders will be accepted until 4 p.m. Monday October 1st, 1973 to supply approximately 2000 bushels of No. 1 feed oats and 1000 bushels of No. 1 feed barley, delivered to the Matador Community Pasture headquarters. Further information can be obtained by contacting the Lands Branch, Administration Building, Regina.

This is the Saskatchewan Department of Agriculture, Administration Building, Regina. It is strange, Mr. Speaker, that this NDP Government is trying to get this grain by tender at the cheapest possible price and at the same time they are saying that grain should only be handled through the Wheat Board and at the Wheat Board price.

SOME HON. MEMBERS: Hear, hear!

MR. GARDNER: — Is it any wonder that the farmers of this province have no faith in statements made by Mr. Messer.

You will recall, Mr. Speaker, that the NDP Land Bank has been a very controversial issue in the past two years and I can assure you that the Land Bank will continue to be a controversial issue. Events of last summer have confirmed some of our worse fears about the Land Bank. Case after case come to our attention where the Land Bank has stepped in and bought land ahead of some young farmer who needed it to make a decent living. While the young farmer is making financial arrangements to buy the land through the Farm Credit Corporation, and as you know this takes time, the Land Bank jumps in with the taxpayers' money and grabs the land often outbidding this local farmer. I should like to ask the farmers of this province if they feel that this is a fair type of competition. Mr. Speaker, I will go into the details of a number of these transactions later on in the Session at the appropriate time.

Mr. Speaker, I will mention in a word or two about the hog marketing mess that we now have in the province simply because of the Hog Marketing Commission. Again I don't have the time to go into details but I should like to remind you of the following points. First of all remember the Commission was set up by the NDP without a vote of producers. Secondly, remember the Board is controlled by the NDP Government, not by

the producers. Third, hog marketing in Saskatchewan is drastically down and farmers are getting out of the hog business largely as a result of interference from the Hog Marketing Commission. NDP interference has hurt the hog market.

SOME HON. MEMBERS: Hear, hear!

MR. GARDNER: — We know recently, we read in the Manitoba papers, of disastrous contracts which have been entered into between Japan by the NDP Hog Marketing Board in Manitoba. Now we do know that the Minister got up here last spring and said that we were associated with the Manitoba Hog Marketing Board in Expork. I hope we are not associated with some of these disastrous contracts. They are resulting in losses to Manitoba farmers of \$7,000 to \$8,000 every day. One of the members of the Commission is being asked to resign over this and they have difficulty in getting the information from the NDP Government in Manitoba. The orderly flow of hogs to market in Saskatchewan has been destroyed and I will go into the details of these points at a later time.

Our party was disappointed to find out last summer that the NDP had abolished the student employment plan for farmers. You will recall that we started this plan in 1971, the NDP carried it on in 1972 and they abolished it in 1973 and this valuable program is no longer available to farmers.

I want to bring one other situation to your attention, Mr. Speaker. In recent weeks we have been extremely concerned about a secret and confidential study that is apparently being carried on in this NDP provincial Department of Agriculture. I hope the Minister is listening to this. We know that in the past two years the planning, research and statistics staff has doubled and an extra \$500,000 of the taxpayers' money has been allocated to them. Why all of this extra staff and extra money? Information coming to our attention is that they are doing an extensive study on the possibility of establishing state farms in Saskatchewan. This matter, Mr. Speaker, is so important that I don't believe it should be kept secret any longer and I would hope that the Minister of Agriculture if he gets up later in this debate to speak, will explain this to us because we have been kept in the dark long enough. In the middle of November we do know that the NDP had their annual convention in the city of Saskatoon. A number of resolutions were presented which were of interest to farmers and we watched these very closely. One was especially significant. One NDP constituency organization, Saskatoon-Sutherland, submitted a resolution calling on the NDP Government to do away with purple gasoline for farm trucks. Remember this was an NDP constituency organization which sent in a resolution to the NDP convention calling on the Government to do away with purple gasoline for farm trucks. Purple gasoline was a program brought in by the former Liberal Government. We know that it has bothered this NDP Government for the last two or three years. We know that the NDP want to abolish purple gas but this is the first time that it was openly brought in as a resolution at a convention of the NDP.

Mr. Speaker, I believe it is obvious that I will not be supporting the Throne Speech motion.

SOME HON. MEMBERS: Hear, hear!

December 10, 1973

HON. E.L. TCHORZEWSKI: (Minister of Youth and Culture) — Mr. Speaker, this has been a rather amazing bit of oratory that we have heard from the Member from Moosomin. I will be more kind than that. I am almost lost for words trying to find how to reply to some of the totally unfounded and ridiculous kinds of suggestions that he has been making. Now his reference, Mr. Speaker, to the matter of the Government of Saskatchewan looking at the possibility of establishing state farms, I don't know where he gets that kind of information. But I would suggest, Mr. Speaker, that maybe he should consider going back into the dark ages where that kind of talk comes from.

SOME HON. MEMBERS: Hear, hear!

MR. TCHORZEWSKI: — A Member came over to me as I was sitting here listening to that and he said something about a Mid-Summer Night's Dream, or something of that kind. But I think more and more, Mr. Speaker, that it is more like a nightmare and a sign of Liberal desperation because of the lack of anything positive that they may be able to propose in this House yet because they haven't since 1971.

SOME HON. MEMBERS: Hear, hear!

MR. TCHORZEWSKI: — Mr. Speaker, during the campaign of 1971 those Members, including the Member from Moosomin, went around the hustings and they said that the New Democratic Government, if it is elected to Government, is going to do away with purple gas for farm trucks. Now, Mr. Speaker, I think it has been indicated and shown in the last two years that this Government has been the Government that that has not happened and they still continue to talk that kind of language. They still think they are fighting the election campaign of 1971 in which they were more than adequately flogged by the people of Saskatchewan.

Mr. Speaker, the Member also indicated that this Government doesn't care about programs that are good for farmers. Well I don't think I need to spend a great deal of time to repeat it to you because it has been adequately done by many Members on this side of the House. Programs such as FarmStart, an improved crop insurance program, the Land Bank Commission, an interim hog stabilization plan, which have all benefited farmers considerably in the Province of Saskatchewan.

SOME HON. MEMBERS: Hear, hear!

MR. TCHORZEWSKI: — I listened to the Member and although I was disappointed that he could talk in this kind of way in this House I was somewhat pleased because for the first time that I have been in this House where I have heard a Member from the Opposition admit that the Liberal Members in this House are against the Canadian Wheat Board.

SOME HON. MEMBERS: Hear, hear!

MR. TCHORZEWSKI: — I think that the farmers of Saskatchewan who are voting on the rapeseed vote at the present time should keep

that in mind and should keep it in mind that they should be casting their ballots positively in favor of including rape under the Canadian Wheat Board. Among all the reasons that they should be doing so they should be doing it in order to indicate to the Federal Liberals as well as Saskatchewan Liberals that they are determined to stand together to make sure that the Canadian Wheat Board that they have fought for for so many years remains intact for their benefit. It's rather a strange stance to see Saskatchewan Liberals defending Federal Liberals. I can't recall when that happened last. My only message would be to my Member of Parliament who happens to be Otto Lang in the Saskatoon-Humboldt constituency, that he should beware because I think that some of the actions that have been coming out of the Federal Government lately the last thing that Mr. Lang and the Federal Government needs is the support of the Members opposite.

Well, Mr. Speaker, as the Member for Humboldt constituency I want to say that it is an honor for me to once again take part in the Throne Speech Debate. Since my election in June of 1971 I have had the privilege of working with many groups and individuals and all the local governments in my constituency. Many things have happened which have helped to improve opportunities for people on the farms and in the towns, the villages and the hamlets since 1971.

Operation Open Roads and Main Street has provided oil surfaced main streets and roads to the nearest provincial highway for the communities of LeRoy, St. Brieux, and Annaheim. Other communities will soon be completed. Regional parks are located at Waldsea Lake near Humboldt, at Middle Lake, at St. Brieux and at LeRoy. Winter Works grants have provided improved recreation facilities in Annaheim, Englefeld and Maryburg. This year the town of Humboldt is renovating and adding on to the Humboldt Arena with the assistance of a \$33,000 grant under the winter Works Program. A program which will result in paving all of the streets in Humboldt has been made possible through assistance by the Department of Municipal Affairs.

In 1973 three gymnasias have been constructed by the Humboldt School Unit. These are the first gyms in the unit and will do much to improve educational opportunities, as well as provide much needed facilities for the whole communities in which they are located. During the times of the Liberal Government that kind of a thing was not happening, Mr. Speaker. These gyms were made possible by assistance from the Department of Education.

The Carlton Trail Community College has proven to be an overwhelming success. Community colleges are one of the major developments by this Government to provide greater educational opportunities for all people in their own communities throughout Saskatchewan.

The Humboldt Collegiate Board is proceeding with plans for a major improvement and expansion to the Humboldt Collegiate and the Provincial Government will assist by a construction grant through the Department of Education estimated at \$351,000 and Winter Works Assistance in the amount of \$200,000.

These projects throughout Humboldt constituency, Mr. Speaker, have been made possible by provincial assistance, but also

December 10, 1973

because of the enthusiasm and the determination and initiative of the people who live in these communities. I consider it an honor to represent these people in this Government.

The Throne Speech on November 29th, Mr. Speaker, once again is an outline of legislation and programs that will be of benefit to the people of Humboldt constituency, just as they will benefit all of our province.

More people will be able to benefit from programs such as the Senior Citizens Home Repair Program, FarmStart, recreational and cultural activity assistance.

The Throne Speech outlined this Government's bold approach to the energy issue. We welcome the recent announcement by Prime Minister Trudeau of a new policy on energy. We welcome it for two reasons:

1. Because the policy is long overdue.
2. Because it is another example of the kinds of things that New Democratic Party Members of Parliament have achieved by using their balance of power position for the benefit of Canadians.

SOME HON. MEMBERS: Hear, hear!

MR. TCHORZEWSKI: — And that is just another item that you can list to the many improved things that have happened because of New Democratic Party Members of Parliament, such as improved pensions and family allowances and so on.

In Saskatchewan our major industry is agriculture. It is very dependent on a supply of fuel to run tractors and combines not only in the present but also in the future when the sons of present farmers take over the operation. We must ensure an adequate supply. Our Government is taking the necessary steps to ensure this supply. A Bill was introduced today and there will be ample time to discuss it in second reading debate.

Mr. Speaker, in rising to take part in this Debate I do so with the feeling of satisfaction, optimism and pride. I say this because since 1971 our province has progressed and developed at a pace never before equalled in the past. There is a new optimism about. Saskatchewan people are enjoying the many benefits that they have gained since the general election of 1971 and the oppressive actions taken by the former Liberal Government have been eliminated.

Bill 2 is gone; deterrent fees have been abolished, and the 25 to 1 teacher-pupil ratio has been wiped out.

SOME HON. MEMBERS: Hear, hear!

MR. TCHORZEWSKI: — Saskatchewan people can look forward to the future with confidence. Before I continue with some of the other things that I wish to say today, Mr. Speaker, I want to take this opportunity to join with others in this Assembly in congratulating the Members who moved and seconded the Throne Speech. The Members from Saltcoats and Watrous, Mr. Kaeding and Mr. Cody, showed in their addresses as they have shown on many occasions in the past, why their constituents elected them to be their

spokesmen and their representatives in this House. Their speeches showed that they are concerned and dedicated MLAs and their work throughout the year on behalf of their constituents is an example for all Members in this House to follow.

I, too, should like to take this opportunity to congratulate the new Member recently elected in the Lakeview by-election. I am sure that he will become involved in the work and the debates of this House from time to time and I, at this time, wish to extend my personal welcome.

Mr. Speaker, even if he never says a word in this House — I know that that won't be the case — but even if he never said a word his presence over there would be an improvement over what we have heard during this Session from the members opposite and during the last two sessions.

SOME HON. MEMBERS: Hear, hear!

MR. TCHORZEWSKI: — I thought that an Opposition has an obligation to provide constructive and positive criticism and it has, I believe, an obligation to offer some alternatives, but on both counts the Steuart Liberal Opposition has been a miserable failure. One only has to check the debates of the House and the newspapers since 1971, and the picture one gets is a very grim picture. What does one see? Throughout it you see something like this you see Steuart attacks Liberals. I'm sorry, Steuart attacks welfare. I would not blame him if he attacked Liberals because there is certainly reason to do so. But he can't make up his mind totally what he should be attacking on welfare because at one point he says that the Government should be moving to increase social assistance payments. And he said that it should be going up by about 20 per cent and then when the Government moves and increases social assistance to people in need because of the tremendous increase in the cost of living, he says that the 17 per cent is atrociously too much.

The Member for Kerrobert-Kindersley, the Hon. Minister for Social Services (Mr. Taylor) clearly indicated the other day that there are those who have received 150 per cent increase in profits — the corporations — and 44 per cent increase in profits for some corporations, and 80 per cent increases in other corporations, but the Leader of the Opposition did not bother to speak of that, Mr. Speaker.

I say that if one looks over that record all one sees is Steuart attacks welfare; Liberals attack the Hog Marketing Commission; Liberals oppose the Land Bank Commission; Liberals oppose the removal of medical and hospitalization premiums; Liberals oppose the establishment of the Ombudsman; Steuart criticizes the Department of the North, and that list goes on and on, Mr. Speaker. And in each case all you hear is criticism, opposition and attack.

SOME HON. MEMBERS: Hear, hear!

MR. TCHORZEWSKI: — Mr. Speaker, the Members opposite at no time have been able to propose any alternatives and that is truly a sign of a political party that has only its self-interest in mind and cares not for the people of Saskatchewan.

December 10, 1973

SOME HON. MEMBERS: Hear, hear!

MR. TCHORZEWSKI: — But we know what they support. We know that they supported deterrent fees and implemented them in Saskatchewan. We know that they legislated Bill 2 which took away the rights of labor in Saskatchewan. The people of Saskatchewan know they were in favor of the LIFT Program, in favor of the 25-1 teacher pupil ratio. We know that it was they who legislated the most despicable gerrymander of constituency boundaries in the history of this country. Mr. Speaker, this is only a small part of that Liberal record.

Now the record of the Government is one which speaks for itself. In 1971 the New Democratic Party presented to the people of Saskatchewan on its election platform The New Deal for People. And in that New Deal . . .

MR. GUY: — I have it right here.

MR. TCHORZEWSKI: — You should read it, Mr. Member for Athabasca. Because if you read it and compare it to the record you will find that in the New Deal there were 139 points and you will find that as you consider the performance of this Government, that the tabulation will show that 133 of them are either fully completed or at some stage of development.

SOME HON. MEMBERS: Hear, hear!

MR. TCHORZEWSKI: — And that, Mr. Speaker, is a record that is impressive to say the least.

In the area of agriculture alone, many items which I have referred to previously, great accomplishments have been made. The Throne Speech indicates further action in agriculture including the re-establishment of agricultural machinery testing which the former Liberal Government did away with. It includes legislation to pursue markets for Saskatchewan products throughout the world and the expansion of FarmStart.

The list of NDP commitments which have been delivered by this Government is a long one. The removal of deterrent fees; assistance to small business through SEDCO; establishment of a Department of Consumer Affairs and legislation on pyramid franchises, credit reporting and residential tenancy. Reducing the costs for education paid by property owners to an overage of 25 mills and The Teacher Collective Bargaining Act. Time does not permit to list all the accomplishments, but these items mentioned are sufficient to show why there is a feeling of confidence and optimism in Saskatchewan.

Our economy has never been so good, Mr. Speaker. Unemployment has been lower than anywhere in Canada for the last six months. Farm income has improved considerably. But as I speak of these things I must regretfully say that there is reason for concern.

For many years, Mr. Speaker, the farmers of western Canada have struggled to establish the Canadian Wheat Board. They wanted a central selling agency through which sales would be made in an effort to maximize returns to producers rather than to

large traders who manipulate the market for their own gain. And, this, they finally achieved, but now there are strong forces that are at work promoting a return to an open market grain selling system as has been indicated by the speaker before me. Large sums of money that have been made from farmers of this province are being spent in an attempt to convince farmers that the open market system will serve them well.

Mr. Speaker, I want to place myself on record at this time as one who will do all that must be done and all that I am able to do to develop and protect the Canadian Wheat Board so that the farmers of Saskatchewan can have the protection, the equality and the stability that they must have and have fought for for so long.

SOME HON. MEMBERS: Hear, hear!

MR. TCHORZEWSKI: Since the election of this Government very significant progress has been brought about in many fields. Programs for our youth and for our elderly, programs and legislation in the areas of agriculture and small business and health and education, protection of our environment and the development of our resources to the benefit of all Saskatchewan people. But this Government has not stopped at the traditional areas of governmental concern, and new areas needing attention and recognition are receiving priority attention.

It is with a great deal of pride that I am able to refer to a portion of the Throne Speech which dealt with multiculturalism. This Government indicated soon after its election that a provincial policy on multiculturalism would be developed. Mr. Speaker, just as most of the commitments made in our New Deal for People have been implemented, so over the past year and a half major strides have been made in the area of multiculturalism.

During the 1972 session of this Legislature, Members approved legislation creating a new Department of Culture and Youth in Saskatchewan. And in November of 1972 a Cultural Activities Branch of that Department was established and charged with policy and program development in three crucial areas; multiculturalism, cultural conservation and the arts.

Like the ethnocultural groups in its neighboring provinces, those in Saskatchewan have been quick to respond to the growing feeling of multiculturalism. Indeed, Saskatchewan should lead the way in this area due to the fact that it is the only province in Canada whose inhabitants consist of many various origins to the extent that the majority trace their origins to non-British and non-French sources. We are a prime example of cultural diversity. With the work done by this Government in the past year and the announcements in the Throne Speech, this province is, indeed, leading the way.

The International Community, as represented within the United Nations, has long recognized and reaffirmed its faith in fundamental human rights, the dignity and worth of the human person and equality between sexes. In recent years, however, this recognition has been more specifically extended to the value of cultural diversity. A democratic community is enriched by the existence of a diversity of cultural groups, a fact recognized in recent years by a number of UNESCO sponsored

December 10, 1973

international conferences on cultural policies. At one such conference in 1970, at which Canada was represented, governments were called upon to take the diversity of cultural and linguistic communities within their borders as a starting point for the formulation of any cultural policy.

Accordingly, governments have a duty to take measures to make the exercise of these rights possible with a view to aiding all sectors of the population, to give shape to their own culture, participate therein and through it express themselves in a way that comes most readily and naturally to them. This Government is especially concerned since until very recently Saskatchewan could not meet the measure of these international standards.

With the intention of resolving the contradiction between Saskatchewan history and current world-wide concern about multiculturalism, the Cultural Activities Branch established a \$50,000 miscellaneous grant program as an animating feature intended to demonstrate to all native and ethnocultural groups for the first time that our Government shares their aspirations and concerns. We believe that an accounting of \$30,000 of that fund expended in support of multiculturalism reveals that we have been astute in analyzing the seriousness of assimilation, judicious in making others aware of its price and eager to share common concerns.

Many of our grants have encouraged a rediscovery of language which may, at times, Mr. Speaker, seem remote and may at times seem frivolous to those unfamiliar with Slavic poets, pow-wow dances and the Vedic texts. We believe, however, that culture cannot survive without language. We believe that a knowledge of more than one language is a valuable asset to any and every individual.

The statement in the Throne Speech indicating that this Legislature will be asked to consider legislation permitting a language of instruction in schools other than English or French, where the community so wishes, is positive action in this belief.

Culture, Mr. Speaker, we all know is very attractive. In order to promote public interest in song and dance, the Department of Culture and Youth joined with the Regina Multicultural Council to produce Mosaic '73. The three day event featured displays of ethnic arts and crafts, television features, public lectures and culminated in a performance at the Saskatchewan Centre of the Arts involving 500 citizens representing some 20 ethnic groups. In addition to providing many with their first experience in witnessing live performances of folk song and dance, such events allow participants to become more familiar, more aware of common achievements and problems and hopefully more secure in the knowledge that their arts meet with public acclaim.

In future years, the Cultural Activities Branch intends to stage similar festivals throughout the province, thus allowing local residents the same satisfying experience.

Last September, the Department of Culture and Youth held Saskatchewan's first conference on multiculturalism. Close to 500 participants, representing almost all of the province's ethnocultural groups, attended, many giving up a day's pay in

order to seize the opportunity to voice their recommendations for a provincial multicultural policy. A total of over 70 recommendations emerged from Seminar '73. Virtually all of these recommendations are being studied by the Department. Seminar '73 was a benchmark. For those three days the concerned man on the street was admitted as an equal to the planning arm of a Government Department. As a result, multicultural policy will not have been fashioned by civil servants working in a vacuum.

The establishment of a multicultural advisory council is further indication of efforts which are to be made to assure continuing public involvement.

We conclude, therefore, that a policy of multiculturalism in Saskatchewan has been long overdue, that our Government has a mandate to continue to foster and encourage our ethnocultural heritage.

Multiculturalism in Saskatchewan is a concept that embraces the entire population. Indian and Métis, English and French, along with many other cultural groups, are all parts of the Saskatchewan Mosaic.

We are proud of this heritage. We recognize that this cultural diversity is a great wealth. The interaction between people from all parts of the world has provided greater understanding among our people in Saskatchewan. Because of this we have a great and a unique unity. We can develop an example for the whole strife-torn world to look upon as a model.

Mr. Speaker, with these words I notice that I have run out of my time and I want to conclude by saying that I will not support the amendment but I will certainly wholeheartedly support the main motion.

SOME HON. MEMBERS: Hear, hear!

MR. A.R. GUY: (Athabasca) — Mr. Speaker, first of all it gives me great pleasure to welcome our new colleague, the Member from Regina Lakeview (Mr. Malone). It was most gratifying to see the greatly increased majority that Mr. Malone was able to garner in spite of the full weight of the New Democratic Party and Government being thrown against him. I certainly join with others in this Legislature wishing him many years of service with the opportunity after the next election to serve in a Liberal Government.

The Member for Prince Albert West (Mr. Steuart) and the Member for Rosthern (Mr. Boldt) and myself can tell you that there is nothing better than the experience of being an Opposition Member to prepare you for taking over the reins of government in a few years.

SOME HON. MEMBERS: Hear, hear!

MR. GUY: — While the victory of Mr. Malone brought joy to the Opposition and the people of Saskatchewan it was also with some regret, I suggest, that this by-election was used by the Government to discredit this Legislative Assembly. We are not surprised to find that a member of the Public Service Commission, whose appointment was political to begin with, had taken a month off to run the campaign, or that the Attorney General's

December 10, 1973

executive assistant who also received his position because he was a defeated NDP candidate in the last election, spent the day as a scrutineer at the polls and apparently with the blessing of the Attorney General and at the taxpayers' expense. However, we were surprised and dismayed to learn that the Assistant Clerk of this Assembly who is responsible through the Speaker to every Member of this Assembly, took the day off to work for the NDP candidate on election day. This does nothing for the image of this Assembly and, unfortunately, his blatant political manoeuvre reflects on each Member of this House.

SOME HON. MEMBERS: Hear, hear!

MR. GUY: — The Lakeview by-election was of tremendous significance to the people of Saskatchewan since the main issue was the same as that that has been raised by every Member opposite in this Throne Speech Debate and that's this New Deal for People. You know it's particularly significant when we realize that as the Premier was saying Wednesday afternoon and I quote, "ordinary people want NDP action rather than Liberal promises", that these same ordinary people were trooping to the polls in regular procession to show the NDP Government what they thought of NDP action.

SOME HON. MEMBERS: Hear, hear!

MR. GUY: — Sixty-three per cent of these ordinary people said, we've had enough 'Blakeney Baloney' and are prepared to improve our diet with some 'Steuart Steak'.

SOME HON. MEMBERS: Hear, hear!

MR. GUY: — But it appears that they haven't learned their lesson. Member after Member of the Government are standing up there today talking about the New Deal for People in spite of what the people of Lakeview told them.

You know, the Government has bragged that the New Deal for People promised in 1971 is nearly complete and the people of Saskatchewan are saying "thank goodness" because it is significant that at the first opportunity that the people of any constituency had to look at the total package of the New Deal they turned thumbs down on it by overwhelming numbers.

This would lead all the people of Saskatchewan to believe what we've been saying all along. That it may be a new deal but it is not a good deal for Saskatchewan people.

You know, one of the advertisements used by the NDP candidate in the Lakeview by-election provides the key to the whole New Deal package and that was the one, "Action speaks louder than words". The NDP and Blakeney Government found on Wednesday how true and prophetic that statement was. Particularly the point, action has been taken on several programs not contained in the 1971 program. These are the ones that I wish to refer to for a few minutes today, because the NDP didn't have the courage to tell the whole truth in 1971 when asking for support.

It is true the New Deal looked good on paper, it sounded

good when NDP propagandists and some politicians distorted it during the heat of an election campaign, but when the NDP Government and its bureaucrats, led by its socialist Premier, started to implement it then it became perfectly clear that actions do speak louder than words and the people of Saskatchewan do not appreciate the actions of this NDP Government as they implement their New Poor Deal for People.

It is another hard learned lesson that it is not what political programs and platforms say before and during election campaigns but in the framework and philosophy of how they are carried out by a government after the election that really counts. Policies that could make economic and social sense lose their portent for good when implemented by a government obsessed with a desire for power and political gain. Bad policies can never be successfully implemented by a government, but the Blakeney Government has proved time and time again that even good policies fail when they are implemented for the gain of a political party rather than for the common good. I'm only going to refer to several examples to show why the people of Saskatchewan are becoming disenchanted with the NDP New Deal for People.

You know, when the new deal for agriculture in rural life was announced little did the people of Saskatchewan realize that in two years the Land Bank would purchase \$30 million worth of Saskatchewan's most productive farm land and never sell an acre of it. This is turning our next generation of farmers into tenants and sharecroppers unable to own land that in many cases had been acquired through the blood, sweat and tears of their forefathers.

Little did they realize that a government controlled and operated hog marketing commission would be forced on them, by a power hungry Minister of Agriculture (Mr. Messer) who was fresh from sabotaging a Grain Stabilization Program and planning to do the same with the feed grains policy and the rapeseed vote.

Little did they realize that foreigners to the Blakeney NDP Government, meant sons and daughters of Saskatchewan farmers living in Manitoba, Alberta or other parts of Canada.

When the new deal for labor and business was announced, little did businessmen and employees realize that hundreds of jobs would disappear, that the owners of small businesses, particularly in rural communities, would have to work extra hours, seven days a week to survive bankruptcy. And I am sure the power of the Government to close businesses down for five days, with no compensation or recourse to the courts, is not considered a new or a good deal for people.

Resource and economic development received major emphasis in the New Deal for People. But at that time were we told that this New Deal of the Blakeney Government was going to pay \$6 million of our hard earned tax dollars to stop a pulp mill, \$10 million for a share of a packing plant, \$5 million for additional shares of a steel mill, without creating one new job. Neither were we told that in the first three years of Premier Blakeney's Government, industries and jobs would leave the province with not one new industry to take their places.

Nor did we know that the cry, "The Roumanians are coming", would be followed by "The last industry leaving the province,

December 10, 1973

please turn out the lights.”

Saskatchewan people would have been shocked if Mr. Blakeney had told them that the New Deal meant the breaking of contracts and absolute control of the forest industry. Or Saskoil legislation which had destroyed our oil industry as evidenced by decreased exploration and reserves. Or that twenty-six Government prospectors in 1973 would spend the summer at the taxpayers’ expense and not stake one new claim.

The New Deal for People in the field of taxation did not tell the people that when the Federal Liberal Government reduced their income tax that the Blakeney Government would increase income taxes by 17 per cent or that succession and estate taxes would be imposed to destroy the family farm and business. We were not told that automobile premiums would go up each year, that property taxes would continue to climb, that taxes, fees and licences would increase more than \$105 million in the first two years of an NDP Government.

Farmers and businessmen were not told that prosperity created by the good Lord and the Federal Government would be drained away by the Blakeney Government to pay his bureaucrats for their extravagant socialist dreams.

When the New Deal for People promised to eliminate government waste and mismanagement no one suspected that meant adding a thousand more civil servants costing an extra \$10 million a year. Neither would one want to believe that Premier Blakeney’s staff would cost the province \$429,000 compared to \$47,000 for the former Premier or that Executive and Special Assistants to the Ministers would cost the taxpayers an additional \$200,000. And not even the most skeptical, Mr. Speaker, among us would have believed the New Deal would increase the staff of Information Services, better known as the NDP propaganda mill from seven to twenty-four. Or that Government advertisements would finance the NDP newspaper The Commonwealth. Or that the taxpayers’ money would be channelled through Service Printing, the NDP owned printing company, at a rate of \$50,000 a year to finance the next election campaign. Yet that is the elimination of waste and extravagance, NDP style.

A few examples show that nowhere in the New Deal for People were Saskatoon and Regina people told that they would have the ward system whether they wanted it or not. Or that school boards would be faced with a similar system. Nowhere were we told that the Minister of Municipal Affairs (Mr. Wood) would advocate larger rural municipalities. At no time were school boards and parents advised that they would lose their autonomy under a new teacher bargaining act. Nowhere were we told welfare costs would rise 30 per cent in one year or that increased family allowances would be taken from welfare recipients by the Blakeney Government. When an Ombudsman was promised we weren’t told that the Government would be exempt from his enquiries, so that they would be free to carry on unfair labor practices among their own employees, as is being done in the Department of Highways and Natural Resources.

SOME HON. MEMBERS: Hear, hear!

MR. GUY: — When we were told by the NDP that they intended to improve the quality of life in Saskatchewan, they didn’t tell us that meant subsidizing beer while food prices rose.

Finally, at no time were we told that the New Deal was a Big Brother Deal with Brother Blakeney and his Government regulating, controlling and interfering in every aspect of our daily lives.

In two years, more than 250 pieces of legislation have been passed and almost without exception each one has restricted the rights and freedoms of people individually or collectively. And these are just a few examples where what was not said was far more important than what was said and it is why the slogan, actions speak louder than words, led to the resounding Liberal election victory in Lakeview constituency.

SOME HON. MEMBERS: Hear, hear!

MR. GUY: — At this time these actions along with many more, are being digested thoroughly, mostly with heartburn, by the people of Saskatchewan.

Now, Mr. Speaker, I should like to congratulate the Member for Saltcoats and the Member for Watrous for being chosen to move and second the Speech from the Throne. The difficulty they had in keeping to the subject of the Throne Speech showed what a barren and dull document the Blakeney Government presented to the people of Saskatchewan at a time when bold, new approaches were anticipated.

It's hard to believe that a Government with forty-four members and a Waffler on the side, who have hired planners and researchers from all across Canada, could become so absolutely barren of new ideas in less than three years. Never in the last twenty years has a Throne Speech had so little for so many in Saskatchewan. There were no programs to fight inflation; in fact, the increased spending promised will only fuel the fires of inflation. There was no welfare policy to improve the lot of those in need and provide work for those capable of work. There were no answers to the problems of the North other than more wasted money by more civil servants.

The fact that the Member from Watrous became the new apologist for the North would lead us to believe the Premier has given up on Mr. Bowerman to provide the answers and it's conceivable a new Minister of Northern Saskatchewan will soon be announced.

SOME HON. MEMBERS: Hear, hear!

MR. GUY: — The Member from Watrous would be a logical choice as it would be consistent with the Premier's approach of sending people to run the lives of northern residents who have seldom if ever been north of Prince Albert and have had little if any contact with native people.

The Member from Watrous, now that his constituency has disappeared in the new redistribution, perhaps will run in one of the northern seats, since he voiced such dismay that I would not be running there again.

SOME HON. MEMBERS: Hear, hear!

MR. GUY: — And again it would be

December 10, 1973

consistent with his thinking, that he should run in a constituency far removed from where he lives.

For my part I make no apology for not running in the Athabasca seat again, because first of all the constituency disappeared, thanks not to the Independent Boundaries Commission but thanks to the Blakeney Government and the Attorney General who didn't want to leave northern Saskatchewan for the Independent Boundaries Commission to make the decision on where the boundaries should go, they might make the boundaries in such a way that the Members from Meadow Lake and Athabasca would be back in this House with an easy election like we had last year. And secondly, as our Leader mentioned, it will open the way for northern residents to win a seat in this Legislature. Because unlike the NDP we have no objection to Indian people seeking and winning a Liberal nomination. In fact, we are prepared to assist them by making the two new northern constituencies available for northern residents. We have every confidence that there will be many capable people in the North who will seek and win a nomination and then win the next election to continue the solid representation the Liberal Party has received from northern people over the years.

SOME HON. MEMBERS: Hear, hear!

MR. GUY: — There is considerably more to be said yet about the bitter failure of the Department of Northern Saskatchewan. However, since my colleagues who recently visited the North have made extensive reference to many of the examples of gross extravagance and mismanagement by the Premier and his Minister of Northern Saskatchewan (Mr. Bowerman) I do not intend to say more at this time as it can be better debated on my resolution, calling for an independent inquiry into the Department of Northern Saskatchewan.

I shall refrain with some restraint from answering the foolish charges of the Member for Watrous because his complete lack of knowledge and limited experience in northern Saskatchewan is excuse enough for his misinformation. His enthusiasm as a new Member vying for a Cabinet post in the new Government can excuse his bragging over what his Government has done. Because anyone, anyone including his colleagues who had visited the North over the last ten years, knows that his claim that his Government since 1971 built the first auditorium, provided the first sewer and water system, the first roads, first airstrips, first adult education courses, job opportunities for Indian people is utter nonsense and not even worthy of a reply.

I did not intend, in my remarks today to refer to the Métis Society or the comments of the Member for Watrous regarding our relationship. The Métis Society has shown, as they did again last week, that they are quite capable of bringing their problems to the attention of any Government. I have deliberately refrained over the years from getting into public debate with members of the Métis Society even though they take the odd pot shot at me. Because they are an organization who believe that they have certain responsibilities to the people they represent and they conduct their activities and make their utterances with that thought in mind and I don't believe anyone of us who believes in the democratic system can quarrel with them on that basis.

One of their criticisms of Members on this side of the House and myself was our failure to attend their meetings when we

have been invited. I think perhaps we're even on that score at this particular time. There have been times, when perhaps we haven't attended meetings, I think in most cases there's been a valid excuse of not being advised early enough in order to make the necessary arrangements to attend. Because I have always held that prior commitments should be honored in the order in which you have accepted or taken them.

On November 26, I received a letter inviting me to attend the Forest Conference in Prince Albert, sponsored by the Métis Society and even though the Legislature was in session I accepted the invitation on behalf of the Liberal caucus. I checked two days before to be sure the conference was on and Thursday was the day they wanted me to attend and everything was as planned. So Thursday morning I went to Prince Albert and went to the Coronet Motor Hotel where the meeting was supposed to be and was advised that the meeting concluded the night before and everyone had gone. Now it might have been consistent with the Métis Society to advise the Members on this side of the House of that meeting being cancelled but under the circumstances, I'm quite sure that they had sufficient on their minds to excuse them for this particular time. There were extenuating circumstances created by the Minister of Northern Saskatchewan again, who reneged on his promise to attend the conference only two hours before he was to appear, thus necessitating the march on the Legislature that occurred last week.

Before concluding my remarks I should like to refer to several matters which I think deserve to be brought to the attention of the public. And I think the people of the province would be dismayed and shocked if they knew of some of the activities that are carried on in premises owned and operated by the Provincial Government and I refer particularly to the old Fort San property at Fort Qu'Appelle, and I'm sorry that the Minister of Government Services (Mr. Brockelbank) is not here, but I'm glad the Attorney General is, since he is also involved.

Because even though rent is charged, Mr. Deputy Speaker, you would agree with me that the Government has some responsibility to see these public premises owned by taxpayers of the province are used in a manner that will not offend the decency of the majority of our citizens. And unfortunately this does not appear to have always been the case.

I asked a question the other day regarding the renting of the facilities at Fort San and this was the reply that I got. That in October a Northern Psychotronic Institute, the altered state of consciousness, had been using the facilities for almost a week. They had paid rent, there's no question about that, and the request for the premises had been made by Dr. Duncan Blewett, great friend of our socialists opposite.

Well, then I was surprised by a story in the November 15th issue of the Georgia Strait, which is well known also to Members opposite. It's the newspaper that the Minister of Education (Mr. MacMurchy) thought was suitable for Grade six and seven students in certain schools throughout the province. And there was an article there, "Stoned, Saskatchewan Encounter," is the title of it and it was written by a Mr. Bruce Erlick who had travelled all the way from Los Angeles to attend this encounter and it shows that Dr. Duncan Blewett was also there and some members of the NDP had been involved according to the report. And this was a very enlightening report.

December 10, 1973

I entered the garden gates (Mr. Erlick said) of the former sanatorium appropriately called Fort San near Fort Qu'Appelle near Regina. Having been invited to deliver a lecture on the subject on LSD now and tomorrow, I had really no idea what to expect from this gathering. I walked into building 22 and sat down on the floor in the middle of a collection of students, street people and psychologists, all listening to a tall grey man, Mr. Clark, a psychedelic drug researcher and member of a theological institute. People were wandering around the hall after the rap. Someone passed me a joint and I realized that this conference was hipper than I thought. It was the beginning of what turned out to be a week long party. Every evening there would be parties in which all the middle aged men and some young students would mingle with the local ladies. A couple from a farm in Ottawa brought a kilo of home grown marijuana and there was a constant stream of joints flowing throughout the parties which made the meeting room quite smoky. A fire burned in the place and couches were filled with pairs and crashing hitch-hikers. I had taken a bus from Los Angeles a 1,500 mile trek and this means real fatigue. I was too out of it to party. But there were many not tired who made connections, a constant procession of pairs filing into bedrooms. The next day was the big one. Duncan Blewett had the morning with a talk on the psychotronic revolution. The afternoon was taken up by Tom Hanna and myself. The body of my message was that LSD could provide an enlightenment experience if used correctly and that it is a perfect drug to expand consciousness. I called for there being LSD centres in all the major cities and rural areas, parks and facilities where people could take pure LSD under paranoial conditions with experienced users as guides.

Some local people were trying to take over Fort San with NDP government grants. They planned to make it into a human development centre on the model of Esolan in California, with encounter groups, sensory awareness, radial therapy and LSD therapy.

The people took me for a tour. It will be quite an impressive project if it comes off. We returned to the building 22 and sat around the table smoking pot. A girl named Jane acted as a medium and the spirit of Timothy Leary, United States political prisoner and former drug researcher was evoked and made its presence known. Of course, this led up to the climax, a group acid trip. Twenty plus people all got high on assorted underground LSD material. None very pure but the people got together in a group. More street people floated in. The locals had a party complete with feast while the others sat around the TV set and commented on Nixon's sanity or lack of it at a news conference. The salty old dogs from the couch rooms continued their relentless pursuit of bed companions. The rest of the kilo got smoked during the next 24 hours as people started heading for the airport. Numbers diminished. Duncan Blewett arrived with wife to drive the remainder from the halls and the first conference on altered states of awareness was over.

Now from this report by a person who was there and presented a paper, there are several obvious conclusions. One, that this was not a closed conference. It was open to local people, to hitch-hikers, to anybody in the area regardless of age, sex, occupation or anything else. Two, it was obvious that LSD, and pot and marijuana were used illegally. Probably trafficking in drugs occurred since local people and others in the community became involved. And the NDP supporters and the Government was probably involved. First of all they rented the premises, secondly, grants were mentioned that were being received or at least were being asked for to carry on a similar type of conference in the future. And Duncan Blewett, of course, has always been known as a well known supporter and has been on the Provincial Executive.

The questions that have to be asked: First of all where was RCMP law enforcement when the obvious drug abuses and offences were taking place? Did the Attorney General's Department issue directives to overlook this particular conference? Did the Government Service Minister know what type of activities would take place when renting the place? Did the NDP Government give grants as suggested for a project? How much of the \$906 in rent that was paid, was actually paid from an NDP grant which they received to put on this performance? And finally, should the public facilities of the Government be used for illegal activities?

I am sure that the Attorney General will look into this particular matter and give us a report before this House adjourns for Christmas. Because it is a serious matter, not that the conference was held but there was illegal use of drugs at a time when the Attorney General has told us in previous debates that he is concerned about the growing drug use. I am sure that he would like to get to the truth of the matter probably as much or more than anybody on this side of the House. But I think on behalf of the public of Saskatchewan where these public facilities were being used, that it is his responsibility to look into the matter. And if there are grants going to these groups, then certainly he should see that no further grants are given in this regard.

Now, Mr. Speaker, I should like to turn to another interesting advertisement that appeared in the Saskatoon Star, in fact, it appears quite regularly. And it says, "Speak Up, Your Government Wants To Hear You". It says:

If you have any questions concerning the Government of Saskatchewan, now is your opportunity to speak up and get an answer. The office of the Cabinet, Saskatoon.

Well, one of the first Members to attend at that particular Cabinet office was the Hon. John Brockelbank on November 19th, Monday, three weeks ago today. I thought, well there is no reason why I shouldn't phone up and get an answer like it says. So I phoned my friend, and I told him who it was. I said, "John, your old pal Allan here, I got a question for you." He said, "Good". As a matter of fact, the Saturday and Sunday before I had received several calls from Uranium City regarding snowmobile regulations. Did they apply to the far northern regions of the province? Did it mean they couldn't be used in the municipal corporation and so on. So there were some questions that I thought certainly a Minister as long standing as John Brockelbank would have the answer at his finger tips. So he said to me, "I will let you know". I gave him my phone number, and he said, "We prefer to give it in writing rather than over the phone." I said,

December 10, 1973

“Well, these aren’t difficult questions, couldn’t you phone the appropriate authority and let me know in a matter of half an hour or an hour?” He said, “No, I will look into it and I will be right back to you”. Now that was three weeks ago and I haven’t heard from him since.

But I did run into the Attorney General at the opening of the Session and he said, “We are looking into that snowmobile problem”, but I haven’t heard from him yet.

You know, Mr. Speaker, I didn’t know whether those Ministers were up there to look into the problems of the people that phoned or whether they were there for political reasons. So I suspected I might be a little late getting the answers so after I hung up talking to Mr. Brockelbank, I phoned the traffic officer in Saskatoon who is with the Highway Traffic Board. I asked him the three or four questions I had, he very politely and very distinctly gave me the three or four answers I wanted. I phoned Uranium City, gave them the information and the whole thing was solved to their satisfaction.

But as far as, “Speak Up, The Government Wants To Hear You” is concerned, I still haven’t heard from the Government. All I am saying, Mr. Speaker, this proves conclusively there is absolutely no need for a Cabinet office in Saskatoon.

SOME HON. MEMBERS: Hear, hear!

MR. GUY: — They have got a Provincial Inquiry Centre, they have got a hot line for roads, they have got a hot line for baloney, they have got a hot line for every thing else. This is nothing but using the taxpayers’ money for political purposes on the poor people of Saskatoon. “Speak Up, Your Government Wants To Hear You”. Yes, they want to hear you as long as you speak the NDP language, but they don’t want to hear from you if you have really got a question of concern. Because basically they haven’t got any answers. If you want to get an answer from the Government, you go to one of the employees who have been there for a number of years and they will provide you with the information you require. You don’t need any Government Cabinet Minister or executive assistants cluttering up the space in Saskatoon with an office building, desks and secretaries and phones and cars. It is going to be like La Ronge. The first thing you know, you wont be able to move for Government people going up and down the streets.

And talking about travelling, that brings me to another interesting return, that was given at the beginning of this Session and that was the trips made by Cabinet Ministers outside the Province of Saskatchewan.

SOME HON. MEMBERS: Hear, hear!

MR. GUY: — Everybody had a chance to read it, but I think it doesn’t do our province very much good in the public eye across Canada when you see headings in the Toronto Globe and Mail, “Blakeney and His Boys Get Around”. “Join The Cabinet And See The World”. You know the people of Canada are making fun of our Cabinet, and even though I am on the other side of the fence, it is still part of our Legislature, it is still part of Saskatchewan and I feel badly when they are being criticized and made fun of

from one end of Canada to the other. Even in our own province where people probably don't know the Cabinet are travelling around so much they are "Globetrotters or Politicians". Well now that is not a very good headline for the Attorney General to have to read when he picks up the paper in the morning. Then there is the other one "Thorson, Byers, Lead Cabinet Travelling Set". You know your jet set now, you have got your 'Saskatchewan travelling set'. And this, Mr. Speaker, is only a nine month period, we haven't even got the return for what they did this year. We all know that the Premier took another tour this summer, but I am hoping the legislation that we are going to look at in the next day or so will put a stop to these tours because I noticed, and I think it was the Attorney General who brought in legislation to repeal The Travelling Shows Act.

SOME HON. MEMBERS: Hear, hear!

MR. GUY: — So that at least should get rid of the Cabinet tours and trips all around the world. But you know it was interesting, Mr. Speaker, that of all the Ministers who travelled, the Minister of Industry (Mr. Thorson) did most of it. He even beat Mr. Blakeney and his boys when he got to travelling around the world. You know he is the one Minister who has had the least success on his travels. He had to appear one night in Estevan before the Rotary Club. The Roumanian plant had gone down the drain. He hadn't had an industry since he became the Minister. He had travelled outside the country more than the Premier or any other Minister of the Cabinet. He was one of these 'globetrotters', "Join The Cabinet See The World" boys, with Mr. Blakeney and his boys. So he had to make a speech. I never dreamt we would see the day when the Minister of Industry would go back into the history books and come up with a heavy water plant for Estevan. The 50 members of the Estevan Rotary Club were told Wednesday that a heavy water producing plant is a possibility in the Estevan area, in the near future. And he said, when this heavy water plant comes we can foresee an additional 300 jobs in the plant itself, in the companion steam plant and in additional coal mining. He said:

Your Provincial Government is leaving no stone unturned to show the advantages of Estevan for one of the new plants. We would hope to have an answer in the very near future.

Well that was on October 11, and I guess the answer came perhaps a little quicker than he anticipated because on November 21st we see a headline in the Star-Phoenix, "Heavy Water Plant Will Cause No Tears".

Kim Thorson, Saskatchewan Industry Minister says he will shed no tears if the Federal Government decides to select Quebec instead of Estevan as the site of a \$250 million heavy water plant.

Again, blatant political advertising to a service club when he knew very well there was no chance for Estevan to get a heavy water plant. And then to make it even worse he said, "I don't really care". You know if he was sincere in trying to get the plant for Estevan as he should have been, he should have been disappointed when Estevan was not chosen. Instead he said, "We will shed no tears". I suspect he is so used to failure by now that nothing would create tears as far as the Minister of Industry

December 10, 1973

is concerned.

There are only a couple more things that I should like to refer to before I take my seat. One is the NDP lack of support for Canadian unity which I think must be of concern to all Saskatchewan people.

SOME HON. MEMBERS: Hear, hear!

MR. GUY: We have had several examples over the past few months. We saw Mr. Messer trying to pit East against West over the feed grains policy. We saw Thorson refusing to co-operate with the Federal energy crisis situation even though he didn't know what he was talking about at that particular time. Then we find the continual uniting of the three western NDP Premiers against other areas of Canada, Canadian Unity Policy. But I suggest, Mr. Speaker, that perhaps the most dangerous policy of all is the NDP policy of courting Quebec separatism. Started by Barrett of British Columbia but supported by the NDP Federal leader. And if the Federal leader supports it, certainly then it has to be supported by Premier Blakeney and Premier Schreyer. David Lewis said, "British Columbia Premier Dave Barrett's invitation to the Parti Quebecois to align with the NDP held great possibilities". The Federal leader speaking at the Provincial NDP annual convention endorsed Mr. Barrett's overture to the Parti Quebecois.

SOME HON. MEMBERS: Hear, hear!

MR. GUY: — Well they will understand it on that side. However, the Press weren't quite so pleased, they said that Barrett was on an odd mission, and I suggest that the people of Saskatchewan will think that it is rather odd that Premier Blakeney and the NDP in this province have not made any statements that they disassociate themselves from a party that has supported Quebec separatism.

Now, the other matter that I wanted to refer to has already been referred to by my colleague and mentioned continuously by people in Lakeview during the campaign and that's the arrogance of Premier Blakeney and the NDP Ministers.

The ward system, the Hog Marketing Commission. The indecent haste of hiring an NDP candidate before the results were fully in. And the refusal of the Department of Northern Saskatchewan Minister, Mr. Bowerman to listen to the Métis people, are all examples. But I suggest, Mr. Speaker, that the final straw will turn out to be their plan to turn all of us into numbers for the ease of manipulation. I refer here to the Star-Phoenix of Wednesday November 21st, "Saskatchewan Studying Number Plan."

Not since the Second World War when civilians were required to carry national registration cards have government issued identification cards been compulsory in Canada. Saskatchewan is studying the possibility of giving every resident a number to be used in dealing with the Provincial Government. The number would appear on drivers' licenses, medical care cards and other documents.

Well, if we are going to have a number to deal, every time we deal with that Government opposite, we will be using that number every day. I don't think that the people of Saskatchewan want

to be referred to by numbers. It is bad enough to build a wall around Saskatchewan, it is bad enough to be supporting Quebec separatism, but surely we don't want to have everybody end up with a number. I could see again, phoning John Brockelbank, in Saskatoon, or maybe even the Attorney General when he is up there, and instead of answering the phone and saying what number are you calling, he will say, "What number is calling please". Then it will go into a computer in the Premier's office and all the "stats" will be out there particularly on how you vote before the answer ever comes back to you.

I don't think the Saskatchewan people will stand for this treatment and they will say so at the next opportunity the same as they did in Lakeview last week.

Well, finally, Mr. Speaker, before I take my seat, I would be remiss if I didn't congratulate our new Mayor of Regina. After all I have been one of his constituents for quite some time.

SOME HON. MEMBERS: Hear, hear!

MR. GUY: — I know that he's going to miss me, now that I've moved to Saskatoon. He was a good Member, he always came to see me and spoke to me when he had the opportunity and I appreciated the concern that Henry had. I only hope, Mr. Mayor, that the things that Premier Blakeney mentioned in his Throne Speech the other day that have been accomplished in Regina in the last three years, under Mayor Walker, will be continued under your guidance, because I think back to what the situation in Regina was before Mr. Walker became Mayor and the taxes were going up, the streets were full of holes, and then Mr. Walker came along and Premier Blakeney, himself, said in the last three years, Regina had never had it so good. And certainly it has to be at the hands of the municipal government, not at the hands of the Provincial Government. So I only hope, Mr. Mayor, that you will carry on in the same manner that your predecessor has and at the same time I should like to say how pleased I am, that I am now in Mr. Rolfes' constituency in Saskatoon. I am a little disappointed that I've been there for three months or so and he hasn't come to see us, he hasn't sent us any of the literature that I understand he puts out. There is one thing that I'm looking forward to, I'm sure that by living in that constituency that there will be lots of opportunities to play bingo over the winter, because he was a bingo player supreme in Uranium City and I'm sure he has carried it over to his own constituency.

Well, Mr. Speaker, I'm sure you will gather from the comments that I've made, that I will be supporting the amendment, but I will not be supporting the motion.

SOME HON. MEMBERS: Hear, hear!

MR. J.K. COMER: (Nipawin) — At the outset I should like to congratulate the mover and the seconder of the Address-in-Reply, I think they showed themselves to be very capable, showed themselves to be representatives that their constituents can be proud of and representatives that we, on this side of the House, can certainly be proud of.

SOME HON. MEMBERS: Hear, hear!

MR. COMER: — I should also like to

December 10, 1973

congratulate the newest Member of the House, the Member for Lakeview, on his election. We look forward to crossing swords with him in the future.

I should like to extend my condolences to the Leader of the Opposition on that attempt he made on criticizing the Speech from the Throne. It's too bad the new Member wasn't here to see him. He only had five Members sleeping behind him.

SOME HON. MEMBERS: Hear, hear!

MR. COMER: — Five and a half, the Member from Albert Park was coming in and out, like an itinerant magazine salesman.

And you know the day after the by-election, there were a lot of grins on the other side. But there weren't fourteen grins. The Leader of the Opposition was grinning, Member from Whitmore Park was grinning, the Member from Milestone, he had a long face. So did the Member from Lumsden and the Member from Albert- Park. Here they'd hoped the Liberals would lose the by-election so that they would be able to get their claws into the Leadership. Well, better luck next time. And I'd like to go on to comment, it seems as if I'm always following the Member from Athabasca, soon to be the Member from no one knows where.

You know, he talked about his constituency disappearing. He talked about bingo at Uranium City. They didn't go to Uranium City on their flying circus up north, they didn't go to Uranium City. But you know, the Member from Athabasca, he was at Uranium City this summer, he was there. He went to a wine and cheese party. And he wine and he wine and he wine all night. While the rest of the people there got quite cheesed off at him.

SOME HON. MEMBERS: Hear, hear!

MR. COMER: — I hear that the next morning, and for a few days after, the Hon. Member from Athabasca was suffering from a sore arm. He swung and he missed, but the guy he swung at didn't miss. I don't think it's a matter of him running out of the North, he got chased out.

SOME HON. MEMBERS: Hear, hear!

MR. COMER: — And you know, listening to his speech today was interesting. Generally he gets up, he tells us about the North, about the terrible things we're doing up north. You remember, last year he got up, he waved a letter from the sister from Saskatoon. He did it on air time and the next day the Métis Society attacked him and he got up again and repeated the same thing and again the Métis Society attacked him. Today, I noticed — I was watching very closely, the Hon. Member from Athabasca — he talked about all kinds of things until four o'clock, then he went into the North. He knows, he knows after that counterpoint program, that those people up there are going to be listening and they'll be phoning. Well he's leaving, but it won't be for the North. In fact, today in his speech he says he's going to run in Rosthern. Now he's become a morals expert.

You know, I was sort of interested in some of the statements made by the Leader of the Opposition and the Member from

Athabasca concerning all the new civil servants. I don't know if any of you listened to that broadcast the Liberals had on the radio, Dave Steuart's nomination, only 600 Liberals from all across Saskatchewan came. They had to be chained to their seats because they'd leave. But that night Dave said we hired thousand civil servants for a million dollars. I thought that was awfully low wages. But today, the Hon. Member from Athabasca he's upped it to \$10 million. You know, I think maybe we should get a good auctioneer in. Pretty soon they'll have it up to twice the gross national product of Canada.

Mr. Speaker, I should like to turn now and spend a few moments talking about a subject that has taken a considerable amount of time in this House and a subject which I'm sure we shall be debating at great length in the future and that's the subject of energy.

First of all, I should like to make a comment on part of this master plan for energy that the Liberal opposition has. They've got up and they said, the way to have price control for energy is to lower the taxes on it. So then the petroleum companies raise the price cent, we lower the tax cent. Keep it up, up, up. Eventually there will be no tax, the oil companies would be happy, people of Saskatchewan wouldn't be too happy. We'd have to pay for it, we'd have to pay for it twice.

Mr. Speaker, I would like to join with the vast majority of the people in this province in congratulating the Government of Saskatchewan for the forthright and courageous action in meeting the energy crisis head on.

SOME HON. MEMBERS: Hear, hear!

MR. COMER: It is very important, Mr. Speaker, that this province have control of its own energy resources. Control to guarantee that oil and gas are available to the people of this province, control to guarantee oil and gas for our farmers and our industries. At the same time we must guarantee that the prices for petroleum products do not completely get out of hand. To achieve control over our supply of oil and to control price, we shall have to take what I'm sure will be termed drastic action and we know that the fifteen Members opposite will have to oppose it. The Liberals must oppose action to protect the petroleum resources of the people of this province for the people of this province simply to guarantee for themselves the thousands of dollars they receive from the oil companies to finance Liberal campaigns. You know, I'm sure that if the Bill that was tabled in the House today had been made public three weeks ago, the Liberals would have had \$140,000 to spend in Lakeview, instead of \$40,000. Mr. Speaker. I am not a Member who calls for nationalization of every industry, of every resource automatically. But I feel and I am convinced that the vast majority of the people in the province feel that if nationalization is necessary to guarantee the petroleum resources of Saskatchewan for Saskatchewan, I and the majority of the people in the province will support nationalization.

SOME HON. MEMBERS: Hear, hear!

MR. COMER: — Another lesson, Mr. Speaker, which must be learned, and I emphasize must be learned, from the present energy crisis is that

December 10, 1973

we must guard against wastage of our oil resources. We must take every opportunity to replace petroleum and natural gas consumption with consumption of more plentiful energy resources. You know there are certain pursuits in this province which absolutely, certainly at this time and probably for 40 or 50 years to come must use oil or petroleum products. There is no doubt that we do not in the foreseeable future have an alternative for oil in the driving of farm tractors. We can talk about solar energy, we can talk about electrical energy, but certainly today there is no practical method of using solar energy or electric energy to drive tractors and it's unlikely that there will be for some years to come. For that reason I feel that the most important use of our oil resources in this province must be in our most important industry, agriculture.

There are a number of ways in which we can conserve our consumption of natural gas. There have been a lot of suggestions recently in Canada and the world, some of which I don't think are particularly practical. One method that I should like to see the Government explore and one which the Government without a great deal of difficulty in the next few years can explore, is the curtailment of the vast amount of oil and natural gas that is being used by the Saskatchewan Power Corporation to produce electricity. The thermal plants that are now producing electricity should be switched with all convenient speed to the use of coal, which we have a great deal of. Although I think we must remember also that coal is a resource that can be depleted. We have an enormous amount of coal in this province, but I am convinced that as the years go by we will find further uses for coal and we will deplete our resources much more quickly.

A second area of energy development which I think is important is the development of further hydro sources. In Saskatchewan we basically have two potential sources of hydro electric production. First of all the Churchill River system and the Saskatchewan River system. Speaking first of the Churchill system. In the last eighteen months there has been considerable discussion about the development of hydro sites on the Churchill. These potential developments have met with widespread opposition from environmentalists in the south and from natives living along the Churchill. I think it's fair to say that much of this concern, much of this opposition to development is well founded. The effects upon the lives of the natives along the Churchill would be catastrophic. During the construction phase there would be massive employment in the area, boom towns of trailers and cabooses would spring up. Experience from elsewhere in this country indicates that in boom town developments of the type such as hydro developments, native people tend to participate only on the periphery of these projects. Once the projects are completed the natives are the only ones who remain, trap lines are flooded, commercial fishing in many areas is ruined. The natives come last in terms of the benefits of construction and are the real losers after construction. Let's not kid ourselves, the jobs that result around a modern hydro plant are very few. You know we can look at Squaw Rapids, we can look at Island Falls. There are not very many people working in those plants.

In the process of putting hydro dams on the Churchill we would ruin a large area of one of the few remaining wilderness rivers. I am not one of those people who says that we should save everything. I am not one of those people who says that we should turn the whole north into a wilderness area, this is completely unrealistic. But I do feel that we should save everything that we

can and in the case of the Churchill, let's not ruin the very best that we have.

The Saskatchewan River, I feel, is a different situation. It flows through settled areas, from its head-waters to Squaw Rapids. Altering levels behind the dam would not materially affect the lives of 99 per cent of the people who live along the Saskatchewan. The building of a number of dams along the Saskatchewan would increase the amount of water held, it would make it possible to produce a more steady supply of electricity from our hydro plants. There are a number of possible sites along the river for hydro plants, there is no appreciable opposition to such development. Living along the Saskatchewan I think, I know of what I speak. We would be wasting no other energy source, water flows in that river whether you dam it or not. SPC has already drawn up preliminary plans for the construction of a hydro station above Nipawin. This plant should be proceeded with as quickly as possible. The SPC engineers should be at their drawing boards now developing plans for a series of dams from Nipawin up stream.

Had Mr. Cass-Beggs not been fired by Steuart and company in 1964 and if men with the narrowness and lack of foresight of the present MLA for Morse (Mr. Wiebe) not been appointed to the Board of SPC following May 1964, there would be no urgency in developing additional electrical sources today. There would have been a whole series of hydro plants along the Saskatchewan River today.

AN HON. MEMBER: — . . . prime destruction . . .

MR. COMER: — In reality — you would have cried destruction of the environment. Is that what you were doing, you were saving the environment. You put the pulp mill on the Saskatchewan River, you were saving the environment.

There would have been a series of hydro plants along the Saskatchewan River today. In reality the accident of history, which was 1964, did occur, the cost of those seven years will weigh on this province for at least a generation. One of these costs will be the development, at inflated expense, of the necessary hydro dams on the Saskatchewan River. I urge the Government to act quickly and to begin the overdue development of the Saskatchewan River.

Mr. Speaker, I should like now to turn to another area of Government involvement, an area which the Minister of Culture and Youth (Mr. Tchorzewski) today touched on and this is the area of multiculturalism.

I am very pleased by the attention that the Provincial Government is paying to the multicultural nature of this province. In many respects we are fortunate in this province in having people of many ethnic origins, people from many cultures, people from the world over who have combined to make this province a great province. In a sense we are unfortunate in that we have by that process, which is known as assimilation, lost so much of these cultures. If I might speak personally for a moment, I come from an English background on my father's side and a Norwegian background on my mother's side. Turning to my mother's side of the 32 brothers, sisters, husbands, wives, nieces, nephews and so on, of my mother's family, who can claim at least one-half

December 10, 1973

Norwegian blood, only nine can speak any Norwegian. Not one of these nine is under forty. How many hundreds of thousands of people in this province can make a similar claim, whether, their ethnic background be Norwegian or Swedish, or German or French or Ukrainian or Polish, or Russian or Jewish or any other nationality. Those of us who can only speak English have not gained English, we have lost a language and we've lost a culture and I think we've lost a great deal in this respect in this province.

When I go into a home and fortunately there are many of them, where the parents are passing on. English as well as their native language, Ukrainian, French, German, etc., to their children, I feel these parents are doing something very good. These children are gaining something very important. They will not only face the future, they will better appreciate their past.

In my constituency, as we all have, there are people with diverse national backgrounds. The time is long past when we should discourage any culture or language from flourishing. The time has come to encourage these cultures.

In the constituency of Nipawin I think of various ethnic groups, Ukrainians near Carrot River, Nipawin and Gronlid; I think of the German Mennonites near Carrot River and Codette; I think of the Cree at Cumberland House, Red Earth and Shoal Lake; I think of the French at Zenon Park; I think of the Jewish people at Edenbridge. I could easily go on and on as any one of us could. We all have something to contribute, not only as Canadians, but as Slavs, as Anglo-Saxons, as French and as Germans.

The Government is to be encouraged and applauded for its interest in multiculturalism and is to be urged to continue and expand multicultural programs.

As a teacher of history and an avid student of Saskatchewan's history, I was heartened to see that the Government will be giving assistance for the preservation of historic sites. Even though we are a young province we have a rich history, and like most new areas we haven't yet developed a real appreciation of our history. Many of the buildings of our short history have already disappeared, many more are disappearing. We will not be able to save everything, nor should we try. We don't want to get completely cluttered with all the relics of the past, but we must save representative examples of our past. I think we should also be building, rebuilding some of the representative examples of our past. Some forts, some old buildings have been reconstructed. There are many more which could be reconstructed. One project, one historic site which I should like to see reconstructed at some time is the fur trading post called Francois-Finlay Post, which is south of Nipawin along the Saskatchewan River. This is one of the very early fur trading posts in this Province. It was not a permanent post, but it was, in its time, an important post. I think of something that is probably unique in Saskatchewan, something which is in my constituency which I should like to see preserved.

As I mentioned, there are Jewish people at a community called Edenbridge in my constituency, which is probably the only rural synagogue in Saskatchewan. I should like to see it preserved. This synagogue is no longer active but I think that it is unique and should be preserved for the people there and the people of this province for the years to come. I know that the local people have been attempting to raise the money to keep

the building up, but it is not an easy thing to do.

In the Throne Speech, mention was made of a fact that summer we will be celebrating the 200th anniversary of the founding of the first permanent settlement, permanent white settlement in Saskatchewan — Cumberland House. As many of you are probably aware Cumberland House is in my constituency. I am not going at this time to spend any amount of time talking about that bicentenary but I urge everyone of you when the celebrations are being held this summer and this fall, if you find the time, to come up and see what is Saskatchewan's first settlement.

I should like to turn to one more area today and the area of agriculture. I agree wholeheartedly with what was said the other day by the Member for Saskatoon University (Mr. Richards) when he said that probably the most progressive and the most active department in this Government has been the Department of Agriculture. There has been a great deal of landmark legislation passed in this Department. There have been many programs which are of positive benefit to the people of Saskatchewan, to the farming people of Saskatchewan instituted by this Department, and programs which the farmers, contrary to the hopes and the cries of the Liberal Opposition are accepting and welcoming. I mentioned FarmStart which has been very enthusiastically received. I think FarmStart will become a model for agricultural lending programs across this country as a program which attempts to get to the very root of the problem of the rural-urban shift. I look at the Land Bank which contrary again to the Liberal cries, is an extremely popular program. I am always a little dismayed when they say that you should be able to sell the land before the five years is up. You know, they were in for seven years and Crown lands couldn't be bought until after five years, but the Liberals have short memories. I look at the Hog Marketing Commission. You know, the Liberals managed to stir up quite a little dust storm on that matter.

AN HON. MEMBER: — A little stink.

MR. COMER: — Well, a little stink. A little stink from a big stink. And I think if you look at the price of hogs, compare them with the Manitoba prices since the coming into force of the Hog Marketing Commission, it is obvious that Saskatchewan farmers are benefiting from the Hog Marketing Commission.

I should like to turn to one other area. Again, it's a local concern. Although it doesn't only concern my constituency, it relates to agriculture. As many of you are aware this spring in the northeast corner of the province we suffered from very heavy rainfall. Many farmers, in fact most farmers, had to reduce the amount of crop they put in. Many farmers in the areas of Love, Whitefox, on over to Choiceland, Smeaton, in the Carrot River area and in the Arborfield area, were unable to seed any land. These farmers, I think, have come upon fairly serious economic straits and I would urge the Minister of Agriculture to look more sympathetically on their situation and attempt to come up with a program which will tide these farmers over what has been their worst year. Not all of them, not all of them have no crop, but there are large numbers who are faced with the prospect of no income from grain. Those without any livestock are faced with the prospect of no income this year, other than the final payment from other years.

December 10, 1973

I have reviewed some of the areas of Government activity. My colleagues have reviewed many others. I think that the record of this Government is positive, it is a record to be proud of. It is a record of action and it's a record of positive action.

Mr. Speaker, I am pleased to join with the rest of my colleagues in supporting the motion and opposing the amendment.

SOME HON. MEMBERS: Hear, hear!

MR. D. LANGE: (Assiniboia-Bengough) — Mr. Speaker, I rise in support of the main motion of the Throne Speech and I should like to discuss the energy crisis.

Although the phrase is only months old, already it is becoming a cliché which conjures many images in the mind of the public. For some it may mean a house low on fuel oil; for others it may mean a cancelled holiday because of no jet fuel or increased cost in the operation of the family car, farm or business. But for virtually everyone, it means contemplation about our society, our environment, our resources; contemplation about industrial development and government planning (or lack of government planning). I welcome the energy crisis. I think it is probably one of the most beneficial mistakes society has ever made. In this speech I will explain why.

I will discuss three areas. First I will discuss the need for government control of the oil industry. Second, I will discuss the need for a National Energy Policy and a National Transportation Policy. I will show how these two are related. Third, I will discuss the need for future planning with regard to energy by this Government and by all governments.

Throughout history, the standard of living of mankind has risen in direct proportion to his understanding of energy. Today, the energy consumption of any nation can be correlated with that nation's gross national product.

Energy is responsible for our high standard of living, but misuse of energy is responsible for pollution and other problems. Now problems in distribution of fossil fuels are causing an energy crisis. And I welcome that crisis.

The North American public is presently looking for someone to blame for the growing shortage and the rising cost of oil. Some will blame the oil companies. I cannot totally agree. One cannot blame the oil companies for striving under our competitive system, to control the lion's share of human, financial and natural resources. But one can blame the politicians. It is the politician who is theoretically at the apex of social change. It is the politician who, theoretically, controls the oil companies. It is the politician who is theoretically the architect of our society.

Scientists have for several decades predicted an energy crisis but most politicians didn't listen or couldn't understand. There were, however, some politicians who did listen. Four years ago Walter Hickel, the then Secretary of the Interior for the United States, warned the President of an impending energy crisis. Four years ago Members of Parliament representing the New Democratic Party in Ottawa warned the Trudeau Government of an impending energy crisis and urged that a pipeline be built to deliver oil East of the Ottawa Valley. Walter Hickle was fired

by the President and the New Democrats were unheeded by Trudeau. Why? Because the oil companies were putting pressure on the politicians who, after all, theoretically controlled the oil companies.

So the energy crisis in North America has been caused by failure of the politicians to control the rampant designs of the oil companies. The energy crisis has been caused by the failure of politicians to understand resource conservation techniques; by failure of politicians to understand the potential benefits and hazards of technology; by failure of the politicians to heed scientists; and by failure of the politicians to plan the development of energy over one, two or three decades (much less one, two or three years). Politicians must be responsible for the energy crisis. For if they are not, then the oil companies are. And if the oil companies are responsible for the energy crisis they must control the politicians. Now there's an interesting thought.

I stated that I welcome the energy crisis. I welcome the energy crisis because for the first time in the history of this continent the public is collectively aware that there is a limit to how much we can waste. For the first time the public is aware that resource conservation and recycling programs are necessary. For the first time the public is aware that it is necessary for governments to plan future development for society. I welcome the energy crisis because for the first time the public is aware that resources cannot be managed for profit alone. For the first time the public may accept a plan made by the politicians which extends beyond the next election. The job of this Government is to make such a plan.

Canada has, for a 100 years, needed a National Transportation Policy. Canada has, for 10 years, needed a National Energy Policy. Now is the time to accomplish both. Every level of government in the Dominion of Canada should presently be thinking about how it is going to rationalize the problems of energy and transportation. Even if it is a province like Saskatchewan, which is not affected by the energy crisis, it should be thinking about the future and drafting a policy on energy and transportation.

The Government of Saskatchewan has begun to draft such a policy. The first phase of action has been tabled in the House today in the form of an oil bill.

The Member from Saskatoon University (Mr. Richards) last week, accused the Government of having energy schizophrenia. Well, he may be right, perhaps we have been inconsistent in some areas. But I wish to assure that Member that the Government, during the past few months, has been taking large doses of nicotinic acid (vitamin B3) and Dr. Hoffer is right. Our schizophrenia is gone. We know what we are going to do about the oil industry. We know when we are going to do it and we know why. This bill describes the future development and conservation of oil in the Province of Saskatchewan. Undoubtedly, it will be discussed with some depth when the debate begins on Wednesday.

But oil is only one aspect of the energy spectrum. In my opinion, there should be other parts to the strategy of energy. One of these has been repeatedly called for by Premier Blakeney. He has, on several occasions asked for a federal-provincial

December 10, 1973

conference to draft a national policy on energy. This Government must continue to insist on a national policy. Although western Canada does not have a shortage of any form of energy I wish to demonstrate how important it is for us to have a long-term energy development plan.

Let us assume a modest energy growth rate of 6 1/2 per cent over the next 10 years for Saskatchewan and Manitoba. At that modest rate, in 1983 the two provinces will require 3,500 megawatts more electricity than we presently consume. The feasible hydro sources are available only in Saskatchewan. A \$2.5 million study is presently in progress to determine the feasibility of a 350 megawatt dam on the Churchill River. It takes \$2.5 million and two years of research to tell the Government what a woodland Indian could say in five sentences for nothing.

Assuming the study to be positive, and the dam begun, it would only be complete by 1983. Complete, largely to the glory of contractors and engineers and at more expense of Indian culture and tens of thousands of acres of North America's most beautiful natural habitat. Even then, it would supply only 10 per cent of the two provinces' power requirements. Aside from providing another 500-600 megawatts, by conventional means, it is not known from where the rest of this power would come. The only other feasible source is nuclear energy. But a nuclear power station takes three years to design and seven years to build. So if we were to begin tomorrow to design an electrical system for Saskatchewan and Manitoba, it would only be completed in time for power requirements a decade away.

The same is true for Canada. The strategically placed nuclear power plants in Canada could supply our energy needs for the next 40 years. But Canada doesn't have a policy on nuclear energy. Even though Canada builds and sells one of the most popular nuclear power generating facilities in the world and has a large percentage of the world's uranium, Canada has no policy on nuclear energy. My example assumes a modest 6 1/2 per cent rate of increase for our own needs. But when we consider that North America uses 10 KW for every man, woman and child in developing countries, we get some idea of the prodigious amounts of energy that will be needed over the next several decades. This should demonstrate the need for a national energy policy. The time to plan is now! This Government has repeatedly asked for a national energy policy. We are waiting for the Federal Government to respond. We must have a plan. Anything less is foolhardy and history.

I mentioned earlier that transportation is related to energy. If we could reduce the number of vehicles on the road and increase freight and passenger service by rail, it is estimated that we could have seven times the efficiency in transport that we presently have.

Let us suppose that we were to launch a transportation program which emphasized the use of trains. This system could use existing rail lines. Electric commuter and freight trains would operate on these rail lines using Saskatchewan hydro electricity. Electric commuter trains would operate between the major cities and towns, partially eliminating the need for cars with only one person in each. And in the cities and towns, instead of gasoline cars and trucks we could use electric vehicles. Electric vehicles which could be manufactured in Saskatchewan,

from Saskatchewan plastics and metals using Saskatchewan employment, and again, operated on Saskatchewan hydroelectricity. Such a system could function far more effectively than vehicles on roads. Very little extra track would be needed. The railways already go through every town in Saskatchewan, and few farmers are over ten miles from a rail line. As a matter of fact the Canadian Pacific Railway Company thought of that when they sold the land to the farmers and when they built the railway stations.

Let's look at some of the benefits that such a system would offer the province. First, we could rationalize the grain transportation and handling system by operating our own conveying and storage facilities. Freight and passenger service to towns and cities would be much greater and more frequent than at present with the use of cars and trucks. We could curtail further expansion on road building programs and simply upgrade and maintain existing roads. In an age of airplanes, hovercraft and electric monorails, a massive road building program is a stupid concept. Who wants to drive if he can get there faster by train while sleeping, reading or watching a movie? He can have an electric car or urban transport system at his disposal when he gets to the city. A few years ago a car was a status symbol. The more expensive your car the more vulnerable you were to emotional breakdown. Next year the more expensive your car, the more walking you will do.

Educational and cultural programs in rural Saskatchewan could be greatly expanded due to the mobility that scheduled rail service would provide. Using a rapid transit commuter train, students could leave Swift Current, Saskatchewan, at noon to attend a class at the Saskatoon Technical Institute and be home for supper. Cultural patrons could leave Big Beaver, Saskatchewan, after supper to attend a show at the Centre of the Arts in Regina and be home in time for the late movie on TV. A rapid transit system would greatly reduce the problems of urbanization, over-congested cities and pollution. It would provide for planning to be done around an urban-rural development design.

Finally a rapid transit system relates to the energy crisis by decreasing fossil fuels consumed and pollution created. It would free crude oil to be used for the manufacture of plastics. Structural plastics are fast becoming a substitute for depleting natural resources. The beautiful molecular (structure) of crude oil is the most prevalent source of plastics. A transit system such as this would utilize properly for the first time the rail lines which were built by private railway companies and paid for by Canadian people. You will recall that last session I suggested that we should buy the CPR lines and operate them. Lorne Harasen, without thinking, decided it would not be profitable and of course that ended that. This Session I have reconsidered. I think we should expropriate the CPR.

If some of you are incredulous of my idea of a rapid transit system, if you feel it is a pipe dream, then I would ask where you were a couple of years ago when they landed a man on the moon. I would ask where you were when they developed a computer which can recall information almost at the speed of light. I would ask where you were when they developed laser technology and miniature solid state circuitry. And for those who think it is beyond the organizational capabilities of this province or this country to introduce a sensible energy and transportation system, then I would ask where you were when a few months ago the American Central Intelligence Agency and

December 10, 1973

International Telephones and Telecommunications overthrew the Chilean Government.

Such an electric transit system as I have described has been technically possible to build for over 20 years. In fact North America is the only place in the world where electric trains are not found. The need for a sensible transit system cannot be over emphasized. The time to begin planning such a system is now. The energy crisis is making the public aware that such a system is desirable. But more than that, perhaps because of eastern Canada's need for energy, western Canada can trade energy to the Federal Government for a rational transportation system. A decent transportation system is second only to the need for energy.

Moreover energy and transportation are interdependent. The congestion and pollution in the major cities should indicate to us that unless we begin to plan now, the next major crisis will be a transportation crisis. At the Western Economic Opportunities Conference last July, the western provinces urged the Federal Government to consider a proposal for freight and rail line concessions. In July, the Federal Government didn't listen. Perhaps they could be persuaded to listen in January at the national conference on energy.

We have discussed two things this Government is doing: controlling the oil industry and pressing for a national transportation and energy policy. The third thing we should do is plan for the future to avert another crisis of this nature. Oil companies plan for the future. International corporations plan for the future. But governments merely react to the immediate situation. Oil companies are presently spending hundreds of millions of dollars researching alternate energy and transportation forms. Governments by comparison are doing nothing. Is it any wonder we have an energy crisis? We as politicians should be using this research for social development before we as a government are left in the dust by the oil companies. In my opinion the energy crisis is artificial and partly contrived by the oil companies for the purpose of immediately maximizing their profits to enable them to change to alternate sources of energy at the expense of the consumers. Oil companies are responsible for the present public psychology on energy and politicians are responsible for allowing it to happen. I suggest that governments should capitalize upon the present psychology and do some long term sensible planning — planning involving oil companies, scientists, the public and politicians.

To accomplish this plan and to remove it from the realm of politics, I would strongly urge that this Government establish an institute of research which would use as its theme, energy. This institute of research would be funded by public money. It would be an institute to design on a perpetual basis, the development of our society. It would utilize the talents of systems analysts, natural scientists, social scientists, demographers, urban and rural planners, architects, landscape artists, businessmen, oil companies, transportation companies, and all government departments and agencies. The institute could assemble and analyze all existing research data and could plan future development of society relating projected needs to present technology. Such an institute could be located at the Regina Campus of the University of Saskatchewan. Professionals from this university could co-ordinate personnel and pilot

projects, which could eventually become government policy. This campus is very much interested in such a proposal. This was demonstrated just last week, when scientists from across the world participated in a two-day energy symposium arranged by Dr. Sotos Hontzeas, and his planning committee.

Let me summarize. An energy crisis is here — perpetuated by the oil companies and caused by the failure of governments to plan for the future. Energy and transportation are closely linked to social development. Neither is controlled by government. Both should be.

There are three things this Government should do:

1. Take control of the oil industry. We are presently doing this with Bill 42.
2. Urge the Federal Government to formulate a national energy policy and while this policy is being drafted, bargain for a national transportation system. We are doing this.
3. Establish an institute of research at Regina. Using energy as its theme, this institute would advise government on future policy — policy not to emulate the political and engineering feats of the past; but using technology and energy, to design the future.

SOME HON. MEMBERS: Hear, hear!

MR. J.C. McISAAC: (Wilkie) — Mr. Speaker, may I join with others in both sides of the House in congratulating the mover and the seconder of the Speech from the Throne and also extending my welcome to the Member for Regina Lakeview who took his scat on this side of the Legislature this afternoon.

I thought in seconding the Speech from the Throne, the Member from Watrous (Mr. Cody) demonstrated his great versatility in emerging as the new spokesman for northern Saskatchewan. Now there is no doubt in my mind, Mr. Speaker, that the Hon. Member for Watrous could do a far superior job in handling that department than has been done by the present Minister. I think it is rather significant, Mr. Speaker, that the Government opposite should have the seconder of the motion a Member who knows less about northern Saskatchewan than most Members, and I am certainly no expert, devote most of his remarks to northern Saskatchewan in an attempt to cover up the recent foul-up of the NDP Government, namely their mishandling of affairs in northern Saskatchewan.

SOME HON. MEMBERS: Hear, hear!

MR. McISAAC: — Because no amount of talking by any Member opposite will obscure the fact that their colonial approach to the North is leading that area not into the 1970s but rather into the earlier 1900s instead.

Mr. Speaker, I should like to comment just for a moment on the remarks in this debate that were made earlier today by the Minister of Culture and Youth (Mr. Tchorzewski), the Member for Humboldt. He gave us a great commentary in this debate on the Seminar of 1973 Cultural Conference that was held in Saskatoon

December 10, 1973

in September of this year. It was billed and he had great things to say about it as a multicultural event. Well, Mr. Speaker, I wonder who the speakers were at that particular conference?

MR. BOLDT: — Socialists.

MR. McISAAC: — Socialists is right, as my friend said. Were they members of the many ethnic groups in this province? They were not. They were members, oddly enough, of only one group in the province, the NDP. If you just take a very quick look at the program. I didn't attend, there may have been changes but the program was mailed to us. On Friday, September 28th, the opening remarks were by the Minister of Culture and Youth. Well that makes sense, we'll pass on that. Later on after dinner an address by the Hon. Gordon MacMurchy (Minister of Education). The next one we have an address by Miss Carol Fogle, Saskatchewan Human Rights Commission. I don't know anything else about the young lady but I have been given to believe that she certainly is an avowed and affirmed member of the NDP. Julius Friesen, Saskatchewan Association of Human Rights, another well known NDPer and close advisor to the Minister of Education. At seven o'clock that evening another speaker, the Attorney General (Mr. Romanow) and the guest speaker was the Premier. In the entire conference not one person (outside of government people) were there to address that conference on multiculturalism that the Minister spoke so glowingly of this afternoon. It was another political convention, Mr. Speaker, designed to promote only one culture, namely that of socialism.

Mr. Speaker, one would have thought that on a question such as this that the NDP could have tried to keep politics out of it but quite obviously they couldn't.

Mr. Speaker, the Throne Speech that we heard over a week ago makes mention of energy both from the point of view of resources and the point of view of distribution. Today we had legislation tabled in this Legislature setting forth the Government policy on oil. Mr. Speaker, I have no intention at this time to debate specifics of that legislation but if I correctly heard the Member who just took his seat, the Member for Assiniboia (Mr. Lange), he was crowing about the fact and proud of this Government's record with respect to the confiscation moves that are contained in that legislation that is now before us. Mr. Speaker, that is beyond socialism. They did the same thing in Chile, they did the same thing in a number of other countries, and if my Hon. friend wants to call that socialism, that's fine. I think it is an interesting piece of legislation that shows us the color of the socialists opposite and how far they are prepared to go. Last year they moved in on land, this year they are moving in not only to buy our resources but to confiscate those resources personally held by companies. They may or may not pay them, that remains to be seen. My concern is certainly not for the oil companies . . .

AN HON. MEMBER: — Ohhh!

MR. McISAAC: — . . . my concern is certainly not for the oil companies, I am not really worried about the oil companies, they can look after themselves. They have other interests elsewhere. My concern is when this Government is going to get down to other classes of individuals in this province, and there are not too

many left they haven't got their hands on today. We certainly do need some action from the Government with respect to energy, Mr. Speaker, but we don't need this precipitous kind of legislation that we have seen put forward here today. I don't think we need a repeat of the blunders that this Government made in handling the latest resource that they had their hands on prior to this and that was the timber resources of the province.

How many Members recall the NDP speakers when they cancelled the Athabasca pulp mill. I think everybody will remember the Premier, the Attorney General and a dozen others over there talking about the terrible oversupply of pulp, the terrible pollution, the depressed prices and predicting losses in the millions so they had to cancel that project and spend \$6 million of taxpayers' money to get out of an industry that was designed and would have created hundreds of jobs for people up north. Less than a year and a half later, Mr. Speaker, today there is a pulp and paper shortage and that development would not only have utilized resources of Saskatchewan, but it would also have provided jobs for many, many people in this province. It would have prevented the kind of thing we saw here over the weekend the march on the Legislature by people from that particular part of the country.

Mr. Speaker, I want to say a few words with respect to the livestock industry. I am rather dismayed that no Members opposite other than perhaps the mover of the motion has made any reference to the livestock industry in this province at his particular time.

Before going into that I want to just comment briefly on the rapeseed situation in my own constituency. Up there once again we had a tremendous crop year, crops generally were a good deal better than most people anticipated in most areas. The rapeseed crop once again was the source of excellent returns to the farmers. Many growers up there have done very well by that crop over the last several years. I want to tell the Members that farmers in our country welcome the announcement by the Federal Government at the Western Economic Opportunities conference in Calgary of the establishment of an oil seed research centre in the city of Saskatoon. They welcomed also the Federal Government's announcement of a \$1 million crop development fund to carry on further work on new types of crops suitable to the prairies. But there is one class of farmers in my constituency and I am sure in many others, who haven't enjoyed the same kind of year and the same kind of prosperity that the grain grower and the rapeseed grower has, Mr. Speaker, and that is the livestock operator.

Throughout the first half of this year 1973 selling prices for both cattle and hogs increased steadily and net returns to the farmers until about mid August were probably the best they have been in many, many years. Farmers and feedlot operators who were marketing finished cattle were making a good dollar. Producers of other classes or replacement cattle were also receiving excellent returns and good prices. I think what made these returns more meaningful was the fact that the cost of forage and grain, your basic costs, going into production of cattle during the 1972-73 winter had not increased that much over the previous two or three years. Mr. Speaker, I suppose my friends opposite would call it an unearned windfall, but let me tell you it wasn't any tremendous windfall, it was however a welcome change for the livestock men and a very welcome shot in the arm insofar

December 10, 1973

as the beef industry in Saskatchewan was concerned. Because for many years they had been faced with the same situation that applies to other categories of farming, costs of machinery, balers and other equipment, barbed wire went up almost double in price in the last two years, hired help and all other relative costs had continued to increase over the last several years at a rate a good deal faster than the price of dressed meat was increasing over the butcher counters in this province and elsewhere.

Beef prices climbed, particularly during the first ten days to two weeks of August to something over 60 cents a pound for live beef on the Toronto market. Prairie markets were paying in the high 50s for beef on the hoof during the second week of August.

Now the major cause — I say major because there were many causes — of the rapid increase in beef prices was due to a price freeze on the retail level imposed by the Government of the United States and the Nixon administration. The result of that price freeze was that feedlot operators in the United States withheld their cattle from the market. This of course put the American packer buyer into the Canadian market and forced a rapid increase in the prices of Canadian beef. At the same time many Canadian consumers joined the parade by buying deep freezers at an unprecedented rate. Towards the end of August you couldn't find a deep freeze in most parts of this province and people filled them with beef to ensure that they had enough hamburgers and steaks to cover them for the summer season.

At the same time, Mr. Speaker, that meat prices were rising here in Canada, as Members are well aware other food prices were on the increase as well. A consumer clamor if you like was building all across this country at that time. I might say it was very well fanned by David Lewis and the Federal NDP in Ottawa, indeed the NDP all across the country and also by the Federal Tory Party who were seeking price freezes and price controls and so on at that time. I personally believe, Mr. Speaker, that we had seen the peak of beef prices around August 10th, 12th (that particular weekend) but in any event the Federal Government imposed an embargo on beef going into the States which came into effect on August 14th. The results of that move of course are history by now, certainly history to anybody who was lined up on the Monday of that week trying to deliver cattle and unable to sell them. Beef prices eased off almost immediately. The experts told us on both sides of the border that it would only be a short while after the American price freeze was due to come off in September that continental beef prices both in the United States and in Canada would again rise to a level ensuring a decent return for the producer.

Mr. Speaker, once again the results of these predictions are now history. The Nixon freeze did come off and beef prices continued to slide with the pendulum now swinging the other way, and American beef came into Canada at prices not at 60 cents, or 55 or 50 but 40 cents and below. The Federal Government then made a move on September 21st, to re-impose a three cent duty on dressed beef. The overall price situation for beef did not improve and as a matter of fact it still hasn't to date. Beef was being sold in the Omaha market today I am informed at top price of 36 to 37 cents, which is certainly far below the cost of production there and certainly much below the cost of production up here. Thousands of overfed cattle were still coming on the market in the United States and Canadian packers continued for another month or two through October and November to buy beef from the States.

In response to Federal Government concern over the predicament of the cattle feeder the Federal Government boosted the duty once again in November to three cents on live beef and six cents on dressed beef.

The Assembly recessed from 5:30 o'clock to 7:00 o'clock p.m.

Mr. Speaker, prior to the supper hour I had spent some time reviewing the developments and the predicament that the beef cattle operator primarily has encountered in this province in the last number of months. I pointed out that earlier this year sometime in August we had seen record prices for beef, record prices indeed for all classes and categories of livestock and how at that time for people putting cattle on the market it had meant indeed some pretty good returns, returns which I am sure everyone in this House was happy to see and returns that were welcome. But developments since that time, Mr. Speaker, have brought almost a complete turn around as far as the livestock feeder-operator has been concerned in these past few months. Because while all these developments were taking place with respect to the price of finished beef going up to the 60 cent mark and back down to about the 40 cent mark, and this is a tremendous difference in the return from one steer (up to \$200 per head), the price of replacement cattle through September, October and into November both yearlings and calves stayed fairly high. I say high, relative to the depressed price for beef and the new and dramatically increased cost of barley to finish those cattle. Feedlot operators today, Mr. Speaker, in Saskatchewan find themselves losing money at a rate which they haven't for years and certainly as much and more in most cases than they were able to make or pick up earlier on cattle marketed during July and August.

You know, Mr. Speaker, we hear a great deal from politicians of all political stripes about the so-called natural advantage that we have in western Canada for growing and finishing beef cattle. I agree that we have a natural advantage in most areas of Saskatchewan and indeed other parts of the prairies insofar as the cow-calf operator is concerned and the raising of beef calves with a good deal of range land and land suitable to pasture available. But I am not so sure whether we have any advantage whatever insofar as finishing beef cattle is concerned.

Both southern Alberta and Ontario can raise forage (perhaps two crops a year) put up silage and certainly they can put a pound of beef on a 700 or 800 pound steer in those regions much more cheaply than we can certainly here in western and northern Saskatchewan. The severity of our winters very simply means that it takes more energy and as a result more feed to put a pound of beef on a steer than is the case in most other regions of Canada. In short, Mr. Speaker, prairie winters are not a natural advantage insofar as finishing cattle is concerned.

The other aspect of the cattle finishing industry out here that is coming into focus pretty clearly right now, is that our feeding industry has been based almost entirely on feeding a full ration of barley, 20-25 pounds a day of straight barley and nothing else. One wonders with the present markets and potential markets of that crop, barley, a high protein crop, and the future human market for that particular crop, if this present approach of feeding pure barley is going to be good enough in the future insofar as the chief ration for cattle is concerned.

December 10, 1973

Mr. Speaker, I am sure we are all pleased to see the tremendous new markets that have opened up for feed grain and the record prices that barley growers are receiving today for their crop. But in the meantime the livestock industry has been left in the lurch and has been forced to bear the brunt of government policies or lack of them from inside our borders. I say that the Provincial NDP Government in this province has completely failed the livestock industry in Saskatchewan.

SOME HON. MEMBERS: Hear, hear!

MR. McISAAC: — The Blakeney administration has been in power for going on three years and they have done absolutely nothing to safeguard this industry against the kind of development that we have had this fall or initiate any research programs to equip stockmen with new approaches to this industry. Feeder cattle are going this year to Ontario and Alberta, some are staying here but not as many as should stay here. Hog producers have been dumping sows in the packing plants at a rate we have never seen before. Our hog production is down and it went down at a sharper rate than did the hog population of either of our sister provinces. The Minister of Agriculture (Mr. Messer) has made several moves, two in particular which I think shows his complete disdain for Saskatchewan's livestock industry.

First of all, his implementation of the Hog Marketing Commission last year said to farmers in essence that he doesn't think they are qualified or intelligent enough to run their own affairs. His floor price that he brought in a couple of months ago based at 52 cents and another 5 cents for the first 200 hogs certainly doesn't meet the cost of production today, it doesn't meet the cost of producing pork. If he wanted to put in a meaningful floor price that would have kept our hog population up where it should be and where he claimed it was supposed to be and where certainly it should be if we are going to maximize the use of Intercontinental Packers and indeed other packing plants in this province then his floor price should have been more like 62 cents or 65 cents instead of the 52 he announced.

Mr. Speaker, his antics, the Minister's, that of the Premier and the Deputy Minister of Agriculture I think in establishing a Provincial Feed Grains Marketing Commission very clearly demonstrates once again their complete lack of concern as far as the livestock producer is concerned. Not once during all the time that cattlemen were faced with decisions throughout the last number of months as to whether to sell or whether to buy feeders or to winter them, or put in more, not once was there one word of information or suggestion or advice whatever from the NDP Government or from the Minister of Agriculture.

Perhaps in many ways it is just as well that they didn't hear anything from him because I am not sure that they really knew what was going on and I am not sure that they have any plans or ideas whatsoever for the future development and the stabilization of this industry in Saskatchewan. Their total lack of concern is all the more amazing because it is coming from a government and a Minister who made great noises prior to and immediately after the 1971 election over the need in Saskatchewan for greater diversification of agriculture. I don't think that the Minister has even consulted with many of the experts in his own department, and he has got many. He hasn't consulted with them, let alone any of the knowledgeable people at the University

Campus in Saskatoon, particularly — and not to mention the many livestock groups and livestock associations in this province. The Minister has been too busy haranguing the Federal Government on the one hand and building a gigantic staff on the other hand to pay any attention to the real needs of the livestock industry in Saskatchewan. He has not only been building a staff in Regina, but he has been building it up in many other areas of the province under a new redistribution system or decentralization system in the Department of Agriculture.

Mr. Speaker, dozens of staff going to various offices . . .

MR. ROMANOW: — . . . to criticize. . .

MR. McISAAC: — . . . Who, Mr. Attorney General, apparently don't believe in even getting out on the farm to see the farmer, to talk to the farmer, but instead who seem to believe they can best help farmers and livestock operators by sitting there and operating desk and telephone and cranking out press releases in almost every area of the province.

Mr. Speaker, we did learn in a press clipping on November 2nd in the Star-Phoenix of one of the responsibilities that many of the new staff have been given. It was referred to to some extent earlier today by another speaker in this debate, I quote from that clipping, the Star-Phoenix, November 2nd. I believe the report I am referring to deals with a report from a panel at the NDP Convention.

Mr. Messer said the co-op movement is being encouraged by the Provincial Government through both the Land Bank and FarmStart programs . . .

MR. MESSER: — Anything wrong with that?

MR. McISAAC: — Nothing really wrong with that.

. . . And Department of Agriculture field staff (remember now there are three times as many now as there used to be) have been directed to encourage the development of co-operative farms in the province.

SOME HON. MEMBERS: Hear, hear!

MR. McISAAC: — The Members opposite are proud of this move in this direction to state farming in Saskatchewan. Members opposite are proud of it. Proud of it!

Mr. Speaker, the author was Mr. Messer. I just read it out of the Star-Phoenix.

One of the other phrases that has become really a catch phrase with the Members opposite, Mr. Speaker, and that is that phrase known as “orderly marketing”.

SOME HON. MEMBERS: Hear, hear!

MR. McISAAC: — We hear and we've heard a great deal from these people, who on the one hand would seem to think that they've invented the

December 10, 1973

phrase. What, Mr. Speaker, has this Government done, the Minister of Agriculture, to enhance the orderly marketing of farm products in Saskatchewan? The answer is very simple — nothing. They've done nothing. Then the Federal Government, under the direction of Otto Lang moved this fall to bring some order out of complete chaos. It was certainly the height of disorderly marketing, what had been happening before — did they receive any help or any direction from Mr. Blakeney, or Mr. Messer? Once again, of course, the answer is 'no', Mr. Speaker. None whatever. The NDP Government opposite did nothing, except engage in cheap petty partisan politicking at the expense of the Saskatchewan farmer.

You know, Mr. Speaker, the NDP object, so they have said, to the present proposals put forward for the marketing of feed grain in Saskatchewan. We've heard them say that. But on the other hand, they have sat around for two years and a half and done nothing whatever themselves to solve that situation. And all the while objecting to the move made by the Federal Government, and so far, Mr. Speaker, I haven't heard them put forward any policies of their own or any proposals to bring about more orderly marketing, either provincially or nationally. All they have done is object to the Federal proposals. Mr. Speaker, all they've done is object to the Federal proposals. That's all they have done so far to date.

You know, Mr. Speaker, the Federal Government has had a grassland incentive program operating in this province for the last three or four years, with payments of up to \$10 per acre, and that has been a good program. The Minister says that it is going to stop. It has been announced that it will stop sometime this year. Has the Government opposite done anything to request the continuation of that program? If they have, I haven't heard about it. Mr. Speaker, what has the Minister and the Provincial Government done with respect to grassland programs, or the rejuvenation of the many thousands of acres of pastureland in this province? Once again, he has done nothing. He has taken no initiative whatsoever for research for any new protein sources be it for human use or animal use in this province.

You know, there is one other area of real need with respect to the livestock industry in this province, Mr. Speaker, and I am sure the Minister is aware of it when I mention the subject. That is the need for a program to train better qualified herdsmen and managers for the many intensive livestock operations that are developing in this province. Once again, the Provincial Government has done nothing, nor have they consulted with the university to my knowledge — maybe the Minister has — to initiate any moves in this regard, to set up training programs to train the kind of people that the present day livestock industry needs. In short, Mr. Speaker, the Minister's policies of the 19th century really, as near as one can read, call for the dispensing of pitchforks and shovels, the old style approach to farming, rather than making any use of modern day technology in the production of beef, milk and any other of the livestock products.

SOME HON. MEMBERS: Hear, hear!

MR. McISAAC: — He's got a \$2.5 million plant, I understand, that's open or operating in Yorkton and I wish him all the success in the world with it, but I'm not sure where he is going to get the cows to keep the milk coming in there. At the rate cows are being marketed, dairy cows that is, in our country, if it is anything

like that in the Yorkton country, I'm sure the Minister is going to have a beautiful new empty plant, built on outdated technology, I understand, and nobody to milk the cows. indeed no cows to milk, to operate that plant.

Now, Mr. Speaker, I'm not sure whether all of the blame lies with the NDP Government, the Premier and the Minister. I'm not sure if it all lies with them. I think maybe some of the civil servants are partly to blame and I don't have very much time generally speaking to comment on people other than those in the Legislature and able to answer. But I am going to make comments about one gentleman employed by the Minister of Agriculture. That is his Deputy Minister of Agriculture, Mr. Speaker.

I think the Government opposite, the Minister, should instruct his Deputy Minister to initiate some sound agricultural policy, rather than engaging in partisan political pranks.

SOME HON. MEMBERS: Hear, hear!

MR. McISAAC: — You know, Mr. Speaker, the present Deputy Minister of Agriculture walked out of a conference in Winnipeg. I'm not sure how much the Attorney General (Mr. Romanow) had to do with this. I believe the Minister of Agriculture himself was out of the province at the time and the Attorney General seemed to be acting, or was spokesman for many agricultural policies at least, and it would appear he had no backup Member in the Cabinet who could help with agriculture because some of his remarks were pretty ridiculous. But the present Deputy Minister of Agriculture walked out of that conference. I have no quarrel with this man's ability, or his capabilities and I only say that he should get out from behind the mantle of the civil service and seek election to practise his political arts the same way the rest of us did in this House.

SOME HON. MEMBERS: Hear, hear!

MR. McISAAC: — You know, Mr. Speaker, I had high hopes for the Minister of Agriculture when he took over this job two and one-half years ago. I thought he would give us the new and modern approach to the development of future policy suited to the '70s for Saskatchewan. And instead, of course, as I say, we have the policies of the pitchfork and the shovel, suited to the '30s and not the '70s. We have policies like FarmStart, which are designed for the farm units of the '30s and '40s and not the farm units of the '70s. And I can tell the Minister that well over half of the people whom he claims he would like to help in his FarmStart program are unable to qualify for assistance under this program. We told him that last year when we debated that bill in the Legislature that he was not going to help many of the people that he intended to. And I don't care what figures he quotes now or at any time in the course of this Session as to how many applications were turned down and the percentage, because I can tell him that I know of dozens of people who would have applied except they knew very well they wouldn't qualify. People who should be applying, people who should be receiving assistance, and are unable to qualify due to the restrictions in that program.

Mr. Speaker, we've had FarmStart for one year and it has barely got started itself in that year. My constituents up there and indeed others in that area of the province, welcomed the

December 10, 1973

concept of the scheme when it was first announced, but they are getting very disillusioned with the restrictive requirements and the delay in getting that program operational.

Mr. Speaker, I regret very much that the Throne Speech contains nothing for the most basic industry we have in the province, namely the agricultural industry and nothing whatever for a sector of that industry that sorely needs help and needs help right now — the livestock industry. Nothing at all, even if it was only some moral support, that would be welcome. The livestock industry, Mr. Speaker, has been hurt and this Government has stood by and allowed it to happen.

Mr. Speaker, there is much more I could say on this subject. It is sufficient to say that I will not be supporting the motion, but will instead be supporting the amendment.

SOME HON. MEMBERS: Hear, hear!

MR. A. MATSALLA: (Canora): — Mr. Speaker, now that the Throne Speech Debate has been on for five days, it would seem that there isn't much that one can add to the many arguments, for and against, that have been raised by Members on both sides of the House. Nevertheless, in rising it does give me an opportunity if not to put forth new proposals, then to reinforce what already has been said and to state my position on the issues as I see them.

Mr. Speaker, the Speech from the Throne presented by His Honour the Lieutenant-Governor on the 29th last is one of the most forward-looking documents this House has ever heard.

SOME HON. MEMBERS: Hear, hear!

MR. MATSALLA: — The speech expresses concern over a number of issues, not only facing the people of Saskatchewan, but that of the whole of Canada — concern over the present transportation system and the inequitable freight rate structure; concern over the need for a more stabilized income for the agriculture industry; and concern over the immediate need for a national oil policy in view of the developing energy crisis.

Although it recognizes difficulties in legislating policies adequately to resolve the problems, we do have definite commitments that this Government will be proceeding with positive action to do all it can in its jurisdictional capacity. In my view the challenge to pave the way for future national policies taken up by Premier Blakeney and his Government is a bold and courageous one. I might say that challenges of this kind are a tradition with a New Democratic Government. Its predecessor, the CCF Government of Saskatchewan had pioneered a goodly number of programs that have been eventually instituted nationally.

Before I delve into the main thrust of my remarks, I should like to congratulate the Member for Saltcoats (Mr. Kaeding) and the Member for Watrous (Mr. Cody) for the excellent manner in which they delivered their assignments in moving and seconding in reply to the Speech from the Throne. The content of their speeches was well researched and well thought out, and of course, very relative to the issues of the day. Their constituents could well be proud to have elected them as representatives to this Legislature.

Mr. Speaker, I too, should like to join my colleagues in expressing regret to the Member for Saskatoon University (Mr. Richards) for his decision to leave the New Democratic Party and to sit as an Independent. I am certain that Mr. Richards had a difficult decision to make. The Member for Saskatoon University has had, and still has, my personal respect, and I feel certain, the respect of my colleagues for his capabilities and forthrightness in expressing his views. Mr. Richards and the Waffle Group within the New Democratic Party have made their mark in their contribution in helping to develop the policy for the New Democratic Party.

Our party, Mr. Speaker, is an open party. It holds the policy of accepting within its ranks anyone who wishes to join in our fight for the cause of democratic socialism. We are known to be tolerant and always ready to listen to new ideas. Although the Member for Saskatoon University was always quite free to express his views when a Member of our caucus, I believe that now he finds himself even freer, however alone, and may I suggest, much lonelier. I feel that in time the Member for Saskatoon University and his supporters will recognize that in the democratic electoral process one must be pragmatic and down to earth in policy-making, and that the New Democratic Party is the only major political movement that can offer acceptable social reform in an attempt to correct the economic ills in today's society.

SOME HON. MEMBERS: Hear, hear!

MR. MATSALLA: — Mr. Speaker, I should like to add my congratulations to the Member for the Regina Lakeview constituency. Mr. Ted Malone has come up with a decisive victory in the by-election. But I fear that in his joining with the group opposite, he will find the Liberal Opposition without any policy positions and without any courage to put forth positive alternatives to our present Government programs. Perhaps the new Member for Regina Lakeview may be able to inject some new life into that old party opposite. Perhaps then, Mr. Speaker, the Members on this side of the House might be able to hear something of newer ideas.

On Tuesday last, Mr. Speaker, I paid close attention to what the Leader of the Opposition (Mr. Steuart) had to say in his, I believe, major speech of the Session. Mr. Speaker, to say the least, I was disappointed.

SOME HON. MEMBERS: Hear, hear!

MR. MATSALLA: — I thought the Member for Prince Albert West (Mr. Steuart) would give this House a constructive critical analysis of the Speech from the Throne. I thought that he would tell this House where he and the Liberal Party stand on the FarmStart program, on agriculture machinery testing and on this Government's effort to provide more jobs for the people of Saskatchewan through development of secondary industries and local job-creating programs

Mr. Speaker, I thought the Leader of the Opposition would tell us about his Party's position on the proposed oil policy for Saskatchewan, on the Government's intention to develop a policy on urban assistance programs, and on the present education policy. I was hoping to hear whether he is in favor of a dental care

December 10, 1973

program for children, and whether he fully agrees with medicare premiums being abolished.

Mr. Speaker, I wanted to hear from the Opposition Leader whether he fully supports the principle of the Independent Boundaries Commission, and whether he believes that political candidates for election should be given more equal opportunity financially, and that in order to control election expenses there should be full disclosure of election contributions and expenses.

Mr. Speaker, I was expecting to hear some sincere and meaningful comments on all these subjects, but instead, Sir, the Leader of the Opposition kept talking about the little bit that the Federal Government has done, being very careful not to say and what it should be doing. I want to tell this House and the Leader of the Opposition, (sorry that he isn't in his seat) that if it hadn't been for the pressure and his New Democrats in Ottawa, the Trudeau Liberal Government would have completely forgotten the Canada.

SOME HON. MEMBERS: Hear, hear!

MR. MATSALLA: — Mr. Speaker, it is Mr. David Lewis and his team of New Democrats that should be receiving the credit for good legislation out of Ottawa.

SOME HON. MEMBERS: Hear, hear!

MR. MATSALLA: — What surprises me, Mr. Speaker, is that the Leader of the Opposition said next to nothing about what the Saskatchewan Liberals did, and what form and direction their new policies may take. It is quite evident that the Liberals opposite are bankrupt of any new ideas for future policies.

SOME HON. MEMBERS: Hear, hear!

MR. MATSALLA: — They have nothing to offer as alternatives to the programs of this Government. They have nothing new for agriculture, nothing new in health and social services, nothing new in support of rural communities and absolutely nothing new in resource development.

SOME HON. MEMBERS: Hear, hear!

MR. MATSALLA: — It would seem, Mr. Speaker, that the Members to your left are attempting to leave the impression that whatever problems exist in society today, it is due to socialism and the NDP.

You will recall what the Member for Rosthern (Mr. Boldt) said in this debate in his wild assessment of the situation. He made reference that all the problems that we have today are due to socialism. He referred to VD, prostitution, abortion and other social ills as being caused by socialism. I want to inform the Member that all these ills existed prior to socialism in Saskatchewan and Canada. They have happened to come up in society during the early and later years of capitalism and under the private enterprise system.

SOME HON. MEMBERS: Hear, hear!

MR. MATSALLA: — But, I personally would hesitate to say that these evils were due to the system. I would rather say and point out that they are the result of a lack of moral understanding, and education.

Mr. Speaker, I was amused by the Member for Rosthern when he made reference to the growing of long hair as somehow being a socialist evil. I then ask the Member, would you say that the relatively long hair being grown by the Leader of the Opposition and the Member for Lumsden is due to socialism?

SOME HON. MEMBERS: Hear, hear!

MR. MATSALLA: — Would you say, Mr. Member, that your colleagues are socialists or are being influenced by socialism. Mr. Speaker, I would suggest to the Member for Rosthern that he confine himself to more sensible and realistic remarks.

SOME HON. MEMBERS: Hear, hear!

MR. MATSALLA: — The Speech from the Throne makes reference to the establishment of a Saskatchewan Development Fund. The Fund planned as I see it, will have a two-fold purpose.

Firstly, the Fund will give the people of Saskatchewan an opportunity to invest in the development of their own resources. The investment will be made secure through guarantees backed by the Government.

Secondly, the Fund will provide much of the ready capital necessary to develop the rich natural resources of this province. Hopefully through the establishment of a sufficiently adequate fund the Government of Saskatchewan could avoid borrowing development funds from foreign money markets which carry the high risk of currency revaluation.

You will recall, Mr. Speaker, the loss this Government had to take on the German Deutsche mark loan negotiated by the former Liberal Government in 1969. The original loan amounted to some \$16 million, but due to the upward fluctuation of the Deutsche mark in recent years, the amount of the loan increased to well over \$21 million, an increase of over \$5 million.

This illustrates the kind of risks a government may take when it is dependent on the foreign money market.

Mr. Speaker, this Government proposes that one way of avoiding the risks of foreign loan money revaluation is to establish a development fund within the province. The people of Saskatchewan will become a part of the fund by investing their money through the purchase of shares. Our Government believes that the people of this province have a desire to develop their own rich resources, and that they have faith and confidence in investing their money where it will not only grow to their direct benefit but help develop the future of Saskatchewan.

The thought that Saskatchewan cannot provide sufficient capital, I believe, is a false one. Saskatchewan people on the

December 10, 1973

whole are a people who believe in investment and who over the years have invested millions of dollars in various shares and funds outside the province and outside Canada. Why couldn't we encourage them to invest in their own province and in their own resources? I say we could, and we will, through the establishment of the Saskatchewan Development Fund.

I'd like to turn now, Mr. Speaker, to another area and that is the area of northern Saskatchewan and the use of the forest resources.

This New Democratic Government has great faith in northern Saskatchewan, its people and its rich natural resources. Everything economically and socially possible will be done to develop the North. The prime purpose of establishing a separate Department of Government for Northern Saskatchewan was to deal more specifically with the problems that exist there by getting at the fundamental causes, and by trying to arrive at solutions in consultation with the people of the North.

The new department is not going to be a magic cure-all, but certainly it is a step in the right direction. The process is going to be a slow one. The new department is moving as fast as the people can follow. Programs will have to be worked out with the people of the North. Consultation and understanding are the key to the success of northern progress.

One of the basic resources of the North is our forests. This Government believes that Saskatchewan's rich forest resource is the rightful heritage of the people of our province. It believes that Saskatchewan people are capable of developing their own forest industry for their own benefit. Outside help is sometimes necessary, but a sell-out is not.

We, in this Government believe that new development of our forest resource must be done firstly, through public ownership, and secondly through co-operative development if and when appropriate.

The most current request for co-operative development of our forest resource was made by the Métis Society group who were with us last weekend. The natives proposed to set up a co-operative wood producers' board whose aim would be to enter forest operations as a means of providing a livelihood for northern residents. In my estimation, this is a healthy sign, and it could turn out to be a worthy and successful undertaking.

In the development of the forest industry, Mr. Speaker, we must make fullest use of the resource with the least possible waste. Under present forest operations, we find that much of the by-products of bark, chips and slabs, are being discarded as waste. Prime timber is being used for making pulp when it could be used for plywood and dimension lumber. High grade poplar is being used for the production of chipboard and particle board when the product could just as well be manufactured through the use of lower grade poplar product.

These are some of the shortcomings of our present forest use situation. These have not come into being last year nor the year before, but they came to pass during the years of Liberal Government when development of the forest industry was on the basis of a sell-out of our timber rights to huge American corporations with the aim of making a 'fast buck'.

Now, we must rectify the situation. To do this our Government took a major step in the last session of the Legislature by passing The Forest Act. The Act gives the Government the power to adequately deal with what is considered to be proper use of our forest resource.

I want to suggest to the Minister of Natural Resources (Mr. Bowerman) and the Government that if we are to provide greater returns from our forest industry to the people of Saskatchewan, we will have to move at a greater speed. When we consider the operations of the Prince Albert pulp mill and the waste connected with its operation, it is apparent that Saskatchewan people are not receiving the full benefits of the industry.

It is quite obvious, Mr. Speaker, that to provide for proper utilization of our forest, we should have not only to consider further development of the industry, but to re-plan and integrate the present operations. Operations by the private sector would have to be carefully assessed in terms of forest management, productivity, and public returns. The Saskatchewan Timber Board would have to play a much greater role in developing the industry. The Timber Board would have to accept the responsibility of moving into production areas where private enterprise has failed to give us full use of the forest resource.

Let us review some of the operations where full production use is lacking.

At the Prince Albert pulp mill there is potential to expand the operation to include the manufacture of products from the bark chips that are now being wasted.

Stud operations at Hudson Bay and Meadow Lake are using prime timber to manufacture studs when it could be used for the manufacture of plywood and dimension lumber which would produce higher value products and which would involve more labor. The fact that the cutting of studs is a saw timber operation, manufacturing at this level could just as well include both, studs and other saw timber, thus making the best and most complete use of the timber and plant investment.

I want to commend our Government and the Saskatchewan Timber Board for proceeding with the construction of a plywood manufacturing plant in Hudson Bay. This operation will fill in the gap left by the Simpson Lumber Company and MacMillan Bloedel.

For many years, poplar was considered a wood of limited use because of its unique qualities and difficulty in producing a satisfactory product. Today, the Saskatchewan Timber Board is moving into the poplar development area with the prospect of good markets. The manufacture of saw timber at Sturgis is proving very successful. I would urge the Minister and the Saskatchewan Timber Board when final expansion plans are completed that construction of a new poplar manufacturing plant be started as soon as possible. Might I suggest that in the construction of the plant, every consideration be given to utilize both high and low grade poplar, as well as the waste material, the high grade for hardwood component parts, while the low grade for the manufacture of interior building products, as well as chipboard and particle board.

Mr. Speaker, the Saskatchewan Timber Board has a great

December 10, 1973

challenge ahead. With careful planning and forest management, and with proper reforestation and conservation practices, the people of Saskatchewan, today and in the future generations, will reap many benefits from their rich forest resources.

One of our firm commitments in the 1971 election platform was to do everything possible to preserve and improve the life of small communities in rural Saskatchewan.

The former CCF Government has given our province a really good start by initiating the grid road policy, an electrical and gas distribution system, and a sewer and water program. I submit, Mr. Speaker, that these amenities have done much to make living in rural communities convenient and comfortable. But as time went on, there came changes in social attitudes and economic considerations. The population shift from the rural to urban communities was becoming very apparent.

This Government in recognition of the population shift and its implications has introduced the Operation Open roads and Operation Mainstreet programs which provide for assistance to rural municipalities and small towns in dust-freeing highway connecting roads and main streets. I want to commend the Government on the institution of this program. It is obviously a very acceptable program since the supply is unable to keep up with the demand. I should like with some urgency to suggest to the minister of Highways (Mr. Kramer) that consideration be given to obtaining more construction equipment in order to fill the orders to carry out this very popular program.

Under the present Grid Road and Main Farm Access Program, rural municipalities are unable to meet the demand for construction of all-weather roads to provide access to all resident farmers. The demand, I must admit, is reasonable, but under present conditions of the grant formula, municipalities are simply not in a financial position to construct more miles of farm access roads on their grant allotments.

I believe that in most cases the average annual construction mileage per municipality is five miles. In the event of high construction costs due to difficult working conditions and drainage requirements, a municipality may have its construction mileage reduced by half. At this rate, it could take at least eight years, if not more for the municipalities to complete their main farm access program. In the meantime, Mr. Speaker, life in rural communities could experience a further setback and deterioration. I would urge the Minister of Municipal Affairs (Mr. Wood) and this Government to give serious and immediate consideration to providing a greater grant allotment to rural municipalities so as to accelerate the main farm access program by at least fifty per cent. This would give the municipalities a greater financial base upon which to complete their present grid and farm access program within the next four to five years.

I want to repeat, Mr. Speaker, the Speech from the Throne is a forward-looking document. It promises more new and bold programs. It points to a continued social and economic security for the people of Saskatchewan. I believe it deserves the support of Members on both sides of the House.

I will not be supporting the amendment, but I will support the main motion.

SOME HON. MEMBERS: Hear, hear!

HON. J.R. MESSER: (Minister of Agriculture) — Mr. Speaker, I know that we are now close to the end of the debate on this particular Throne Speech and I think that one would have to say that there certainly has been much said in the past few days since the Lieutenant-Governor read to us the activities that the Government is planning and programming for the future of this province.

Many of the speeches have certainly in my mind and I think to the minds of many Members in this Assembly been well thought out and they certainly capture the objectives that the Government is looking to attain in its activities in the forth coming year.

Certainly in speaking to those proposals and to those policies there has been some repetition. But I think that is good as it has provided Members of this Assembly an opportunity to relate to how those programs and policies will affect their constituencies as the people of those constituencies and they as Members see it.

There have also been a number of requests for needs of constituencies which they represent and the programs they feel are required by the people of those constituencies and by the people of Saskatchewan.

I, however, Mr. Speaker, find it indeed most unfortunate that all of the meaningful observations and the legitimate requests all came from the Government side of the House to your right, Mr. Speaker.

SOME HON. MEMBERS: Hear, hear!

MR. MESSER: — The Members to your left with perhaps the exception of one or two, I leave the benefit of doubt as to the Member that we seated this afternoon, have chosen again, as they have in so many times in the past a course of narrow-minded criticism lacking basis of fact and in fact truth. It is therefore, Mr. Speaker, a pleasure to participate in the Throne Speech at this time, to speak from the Government side of the House, to compliment those who have spoken before me expressing their support of the Throne Speech, in outlining how the actions of the Government should affect their regions in the constituencies that they represent. I want also to take special pleasure in thanking the mover and the seconder.

But I think, Mr. Speaker, the most important thing that has to be said at this time, is the necessity to speak now in order to correct, in order to point out the half-truths, that have emanated from the Opposition, the Members that sit to your left.

SOME HON. MEMBERS: Hear, hear!

MR. MESSER: — The Leader of the Opposition (Mr. Steuart) and his fellow Members, the Member for Athabasca (Mr. Guy), the Member for Moosomin (Mr. Gardner), the Member for Rosthern (Mr. Boldt) the only one that is in his seat right now, have chosen to deliver speeches that are devoid of fact, and totally empty if you excluded the innuendo and the invalid statements that comprise those speeches. They have, Mr. Speaker, deliberately and in a planned way, misused facts and statistics to mislead those who listen and

December 10, 1973

those who are not well informed. I therefore take it upon myself, as other Members of the Government have done before me to correct those misleading statements. If I may, Mr. Speaker, start with a few general comments about the remarks by the Leader of the Opposition.

I obtained a copy of the Leader of the Opposition's speech from Hansard. It is a lengthy speech, unfortunately for him, one of his poorer ones. But I think that is understandable because he is finding it increasingly more difficult to criticise the Throne Speeches of this Government.

SOME HON. MEMBERS: Hear, hear!

MR. MESSER: — Mr. Speaker, there is a very interesting common thread running throughout his remarks. The Leader of the Opposition devotes most of his time to attacks on policies and programs and institutions put into place by this Government; put into place to assure Saskatchewan people a chance; a fair return on their labor and protection in the market place for the products of Saskatchewan resources that are sold outside.

I want to recall and comment on some of the issues that were raised. One such issue would certainly have to be feed grains. Others are hog marketing, rapeseed marketing, grain income stabilization, and energy. In each and every one of these issues, Mr. Speaker, the Leader of the Opposition has chosen to oppose the actions that would give the ordinary people of Saskatchewan, the people who produce the product, the people who should own their resources, a fair and stable return from our agricultural and energy resources. He and his cohorts oppose that kind of policy, that kind of philosophy and that kind of principle.

Mr. Speaker, I think a fair question to ask would be; why do he and his fellow Members oppose and take a negative position to these very important areas. And in effect they are against stability and the orderly marketing of our products, are in fact, against such agencies as the Canadian Wheat Board. Mr. Speaker, when you review their statements and their actions, the answers are simple and they are obvious. Any such approach to retaining those kinds of orderly marketing agencies would emasculate the power of the big corporations. The international grain trading companies, the international food processing companies, the international oil companies to only mention a few. Our philosophies and our proposals would translate and transfer the unwarranted and sometimes incredible corporate profits that these conglomerates have corralled and would pay those returns to the producer, to the primary producer who is deserving of them.

The Opposition has in fact, become inseparable bedfellows with these international corporations.

SOME HON. MEMBERS: Hear, hear!

MR. MESSER: — And in return for their political support, they can expect to have bulging coffers and other supports when they call on or need them.

The Liberal Party in order to assure continuation of this support, oppose any action that would weaken the domination and

the exploitation of our farm products and resource markets. In order for them to get votes in the urbanized East, the Federal Liberal Party supported by the Provincial Liberal Party will use and has used all of the powers at its disposal to create the illusion and/or the actuality of cheap western products for easterners. This has always been at the expense of western people rather than the large international corporations who are involved.

The Leader of the Opposition perhaps best explained by the Premier, has chosen to stoutly defend the Federal Liberal Party in this treatment of the West. Treated as no more than a colony to be exploited ruthlessly to feed the limitless greed . . .

SOME HON. MEMBERS: Hear, hear!

MR. MESSER: — . . . the limitless greed of international corporations in the demand by politicians for eastern Canadian votes. One must assume that the actions of the present Leader of the Opposition for Saskatchewan mean that he knows that the Federal Liberal Government's term is certainly in danger of coming to an end. And he has either chosen, as has been mentioned in this House before, to be the executive assistant of the Minister in charge of the Canadian Wheat Board if he is re-elected, which is not very likely whenever the next federal election is called. More than likely he is making a bid for that spare senate seat.

Mr. Speaker, the New Democratic Party has quite a different view than that of the Liberal Opposition, the Liberal Government in Canada today.

SOME HON. MEMBERS: Hear, hear!

MR. MESSER: — That view is that the resources of Saskatchewan do in fact, belong to the ordinary people of this province. And that there must be action and legislative policy in order to protect those resources for those ordinary people. Saskatchewan people have a right to sell their products to their own best advantage rather than to the advantage of huge corporations and eastern politicians.

Mr. Speaker, I predict that these two themes are going to dominate the debate of this Session. And that the people of Saskatchewan will know at the end of this Session where the major political parties in Saskatchewan stand on these most important issues.

SOME HON. MEMBERS: Hear, hear!

MR. MESSER: — Mr. Speaker, to return to some specific issues, to some of the remarks that the Leader of the Opposition has been making in the last several weeks. Probably the most important would have to be the feed grains issue. Nothing, Mr. Speaker, nothing, illustrates the points I have already made, more than the present and current feed grains issue. Two indisputable points underlie this action by the Federal Government today. One, has to be a search for a way to return grain merchandising in Canada to the private grain trade so that the biggies in the private trade, James Richardson and Sons, Pioneer Grain, National Grain, Continental, Cargill, Maple Leaf Mills and the rest of the

December 10, 1973

crowd can once again enrich themselves by exploiting Saskatchewan and western farmers.

SOME HON. MEMBERS: Hear, hear!

MR. MESSER: — The provincial Liberals clearly support the Federal Government's search for a way to provide cheap western feed grains to eastern Canada, which in turn produces livestock on an artificially low cost basis in eastern Canada.

Mr. Speaker, the question to ask here, is; who is going to be responsible for keeping down the cost of producing livestock in eastern Canada? Mr. Speaker, I propose to you that the answer is very simple, in that it is going to be the prairie grain and livestock producer who is going to pay that bill.

The Leader of the Opposition refuses to confront these issues. He instead says that the main issues are a floor price, higher cash advances, equitable freight rates for meat and feed grains. Mr. Speaker, I ask him and his colleagues, who, up until he recently chose to propose those issues, advanced them for so many years?

Mr. Speaker, it was the New Democratic Party in Saskatchewan and the New Democratic Party in Ottawa which has for years, Mr. Speaker, proposed a floor price, a fair floor price, higher cash advances and equitable freight rates for meat and grains. Not once, Mr. Speaker, in the time that I sat in this Legislature as Member of the Opposition, did I hear the Member for Milestone (Mr. MacDonald) or the now Leader of the Opposition, who is not in his seat, propose or in fact, identify themselves with those kinds of proposals when we made them during 1964 to 1971.

SOME HON. MEMBERS: Hear, hear!

MR. MESSER: — Not once! But now that it is politically expedient to make those kinds of statements they come out and say that they are the people who now say that we should have higher floor prices, higher cash advances and equitable freight rates. But, Mr. Speaker, even though these are issues of concern, they are not the main issues when we talk about the feed grains policy, an equitable feed grains policy for Canada. Furthermore, the Leader of the Opposition grossly misleads this Assembly and the people of Saskatchewan when he outlines the Liberals' position in regard to these most important points. The real and the true facts are that there are no federal proposals to establish a fair price for feed grains. There are no federal proposals to do that. I should like the Members opposite to tell me where they have made a statement or a commitment to establish fair prices for feed grains. No such statement has been made by anyone at the federal level.

For this crop year, Mr. Speaker, all they have done is introduce a ridiculous Agricultural Products Board price. A price so low that it is literally a joke to grain producers in Saskatchewan and the Prairie Basin. To further complicate that, they have established five prices for feed grains in Saskatchewan or western Canada. To take barley alone as an example. We have got an initial price through the Canadian Wheat Board, which is, in fact, authorized and endorsed and set by the Minister in charge of the Canadian Wheat Board. An initial price for feed barley of \$1.25 per bushel. We have the Agricultural Products Board price,

the one that no one really accepts of \$1.83 per bushel. We have a monitored off board price which is also set by the Federal Government and that price is purported to be in Saskatchewan \$1.92 per bushel. Then we have the Canadian Wheat Board elevator selling price of \$2.14 per bushel. And we have the estimated final payment of a total of \$2.41 per bushel. Each and everyone of these, Mr. Speaker . . .

MR. MacDONALD: — Your arithmetic sure is good.

MR. MESSER: — The Member for Milestone says my arithmetic is very good. I am simply quoting the prices that are set by the Federal Liberal Government, Mr. Speaker.

SOME HON. MEMBERS: Hear, hear!

MR. MESSER: — I have got nothing to do with them, unfortunately. But Mr. Speaker, including the final payments, five prices in a deliberate attempt to create chaos and confuse western feed grain producers so that they may be able to introduce a half-hearted program which is in fact an attempt to undermine the orderly marketing structure of the Canadian Wheat Board.

SOME HON. MEMBERS: Hear, hear!

MR. MESSER: — Mr. Speaker, for the next year and every year thereafter, domestic feed grains, according to the Minister's proposal, who is also in charge of the Wheat Board, are to be sold on the open market without the Wheat Board or Government involvement. No guarantee of fair or equitable pricing of feed grains under that kind of proposal. Now there are, Mr. Speaker, many, many points, many things that the open market can do. But one thing it will never do is establish a floor price. Never! Prices go as low as the surpluses of the private market manipulators can make them go. And we all know that in the case of grain that can be disastrously low for Saskatchewan and prairie grain producers. We only have to recall the situation of several years ago.

Higher cash advances have been promised and will, in fact, be welcome when they come. But they have absolutely nothing to do with how the feed grains are going to be marketed in Canada.

Nothing to date has been done in the area of freight rate adjustment on meat and feed grains to encourage prairie livestock production. In fact, feed freight assistance in eastern Canada has actually been increased in the last year. We on one hand have the Minister in charge of the Canadian Wheat Board saying that he is going to establish an equitable freight rate system. Then he, by his own admission says that the feed freight assistance to eastern Canada is loaded against western Canadian producers but at the same time he's saying that, he increases the assistance in feed freight assistance to eastern Canadian livestock producers.

Mr. Lang's promise to implement a change in freight rates is now apparently materializing. Not as a reduction in rate for meats and livestock but as an elimination of the Crow's Nest rates on grain shipments within Canada. This proposal of a change of freight rate is proving not only to be a cruel joke but actually to be a fraud perpetrated on the people of the prairies.

December 10, 1973

SOME HON. MEMBERS: Hear, hear!

MR. MESSER: — Mr. Speaker, let us again get this clear about the feed grains question. In September of this year, the Minister responsible for the Canadian Wheat Board, took the unprecedented step of preventing the Wheat Board from selling grains according to its wisdom and good judgment, and imposed on it an unworkable formula that not only has totally disrupted feed grain trading in Canada, but has in the process thrown prairie livestock producers into the worst situation they have faced for many a year. The Member for Wilkie (Mr. McIsaac) went to some length in explaining the disastrous effects that depressed prices for feeder cattle in Saskatchewan have on that industry. And a good deal if not all of that problem relates to the activities of the Federal Government in relation to feed grains policy.

This action by the Minister responsible for the Canadian Wheat Board constituted totally uncalled for political interference in the operation of the Canadian Wheat Board. And a good many people oppose it. In fact, just recently in the Leader-Post there was a statement in regard to feed grains, a statement made by Mr. G.N. Vogel, the Chief Commissioner of the Canadian Wheat Board and I quote to you what he had to say. He told delegates at a National Farmers' Union convention in Winnipeg:

That the Board had very grave misgivings about the plan and said it would complicate the Board's work in lining up sales of oats and barley for export.

He went on to say, and I quote:

Later during a panel discussion on grains and oil seeds Mr. Vogel in a rare comment on policy by a senior official of the Federal agency expressed the Board's concern. He told a reporter later that any decision of feed grains policy is a matter between producers and the Federal Government. But he added that the Board's misgivings have already been made known to the Minister in regard to his present proposals.

Mr. Speaker, these people know. These people who have administered the Wheat Board in the best interests of prairie producers know that the plan the Federal Government is now putting into effect is a plan that will ultimately end up with the total destruction of the Canadian Wheat Board.

SOME HON. MEMBERS: Hear, hear!

MR. MESSER: — It is the Federal Government's clearly stated intention in the case of feed grains to transfer the marketing to the private grain trade by August 1974. There can be no argument, no argument that the anti-orderly marketing forces in the Liberal Party — and that includes all of the Members opposite — all sitting to your left — are now in control of the Liberal agricultural policy. These actions are opposed by all reasonable people throughout Canada, people, who in fact, recognize the legitimate needs of farmers all across Canada. There are some of the organizations but perhaps not all of them but when you mention the United Grain Growers at least we know where they stand now in regard to orderly marketing.

But there are a number of other very large organizations which still support the orderly marketing concept and who, in fact, are the true voice of the farmers in the Prairie Provinces — the Prairie Wheat Pool, Provincial Federation of Agriculture, the National Farmers' Union and without exception, the three Prairie Governments, Alberta, Manitoba and Saskatchewan.

Now, Mr. Speaker, I should like to turn . . .

MR. WEATHERALD: — . . . what about . . .

MR. MESSER: — You should read the statement of Mr. Horner, Minister of Agriculture for Alberta, in regard to the retention of the Canadian Wheat Board, he makes it perfectly clear in that statement that he wants to retain the orderly marketing system of the Wheat Board, and that is not what the United Grain Growers are saying and you will have your opportunity to debate that at a later date Mr. Member for Cannington (Mr. Weatherald).

Mr. Speaker, I should like to turn to another deliberate falsehood being spread far and wide by the Leader of the Opposition (Mr. Steuart). He and his cohorts in this Assembly and at every opportunity possible have said that the Government of Saskatchewan has never, never attempted to consult with the Federal Government on this most important feed grains question.

Mr. Speaker, I should like to indicate to the Members the kind of communication that I and officials of my Department have had with the Federal Government, with the Minister of Agriculture and with the Minister in charge of the Canadian Wheat Board, the Minister of Justice, Mr. Lang.

As far back as November 22, 1971 we had a meeting of all provincial Ministers of Agriculture in Canada. Mr. Olson was then the Federal Minister of Agriculture. We met in Ottawa. It was attended by myself, Mr. Horner and Mr. McArthur. Proposals were presented at that time and agreed upon by all 10 provincial Ministers of Agriculture in regard to an equitable feed grains policy. And to this day, Mr. Speaker, there has been absolutely no response from any Federal Minister or any federal agency in regard to that proposal. None whatsoever! A proposal that was agreed to by all 10 provinces in Canada and they haven't seen fit to communicate with any of the provinces in regard to that proposal.

In March of 1972, Saskatchewan officials informed federal officials of amendments to The Grain Marketing Control Act and of Saskatchewan's willingness to make those changes part of an equitable national feed grains program. There has been absolutely no response to that communication to date, Mr. Speaker. On November 10, 1972, I instructed my deputy minister to send a letter to the Federal Deputy Minister of Agriculture, Mr. Williams, in regard to a feed grains proposal and our views as to what a feed grains policy should be. There has been no reply to that letter, Mr. Speaker.

November 20, 1972, we had another meeting in Ottawa attended by myself and my deputy and we, again, indicated to them our feelings in regard to a feed grains policy and there has been no indication from the Federal Government in regard to that proposal.

On December 1, 1972, we had a meeting in Ottawa which was

December 10, 1973

attended, again, by myself, my deputy, the new Minister of Agriculture, Mr. Whelan, Mr. Williams the deputy minister and Mr. Jarvis a representative from Mr. Lang's office, in regard to feed grains proposals and it was to be followed up with communications and dialogue or communications from the Federal Government.

On December 5, 1972, a letter from myself to Mr. Whelan in regard to specific feed grains questions — no answers in regard to those specific questions that were put to Mr. Whelan. On December 18, 1972, there was a further meeting in Ottawa, sponsored by the Canadian Federation of Agriculture. I, again, attended with two members of my Department, one from my planning secretariat Mr. Hutchin and my deputy minister. And, again, we made proposals to Mr. Whelan and to Mr. Jarvis, but there has been no communication from the Federal Government in regard to those feed grains proposals.

On January 11, 1973, there was a meeting in Ottawa between my deputy and Mr. Jarvis, again, to talk specifically about feed grain matters and there has been no response from the Federal Government in regard to those discussions. March 22, 1973, a further meeting in Ottawa attended by Mr. Hutchin and myself and Mr. Lang, the Minister responsible for the Canadian Wheat Board, and we proposed at that time a document that took some considerable time for my Department to work out in regard to comprehensive feed grains proposal for all of Canada. That document had the support of the National Farmers' Union, a general acknowledgment from the Saskatchewan Wheat Pool and the Saskatchewan Federation of Agriculture and, in fact, the Canadian Federation of Agriculture.

Mr. Lang told me positively that they would study that document and that he would arrange a further meeting to discuss the merits of that document, and to this day, Mr. Speaker, Mr. Lang has done nothing in regard to that presentation. Nothing! Mr. Speaker, the Members opposite, the Members to your left, go around saying that we have done nothing to propose an equitable feed grains policy for Canada.

Now that is not all, Mr. Speaker, we had yet further meetings in an attempt to try to convey to the Federal Government the kind of feed grains policy that was needed by Canada. On April 26, a further meeting in Ottawa, attended by my deputy with Mr. Williams in regard to feed grains. No results from that meeting. May 9, 1973, a meeting in Ottawa between the Saskatchewan Department of Agriculture officials and Canadian Department of Agriculture officials, to discuss feed grains. Nothing, Mr. Speaker! July 26th, a meeting in Calgary, the Western Economic Development meeting which was attended by my colleague, the Attorney General, the Premier, the Minister of Industry and Commerce, myself and a number of Saskatchewan officials, where we specifically and positively made recommendations along with British Columbia, Alberta and Manitoba, in regard to feed grains policy and nothing has come from the Federal Government in regard to those proposals, Mr. Speaker. But we still tried to communicate with them because we could see that chaos was developing in the country, that this feed grains issue, the politics that the Liberal Party, both provincially and federally, were trying to play was detrimental to agricultural production in western Canada.

SOME HON. MEMBERS: Hear, hear!

MR. MESSER: — So on September 26th at a further meeting in Ottawa between Whelan, Lang and myself, where I again proposed feed grains policies for Canada. Mr. Lang again indicated that he would communicate with us and open dialogue in regard to discussing those policies and, again, there has been absolutely nothing to date, Mr. Speaker. Nothing! Nothing from any Liberal official in Ottawa either at the elected level or the bureaucratic level.

Mr. Speaker, again on October 10th, because we could see desperate situation developing, I wired to Mr. Lang, offering him a counter proposal to which I received no answer at all other than to read in the Press criticism of that telegram which emanated from Mr. Lang.

I followed the remarks that I read in the Press by a letter to Mr. Lang on October 25th, in regard to specific proposals for a feed grains policy and I have yet to receive a reply from Mr. Lang to that letter. I, again, tried with a letter to Mr. Whelan because I was getting tired of writing to Mr. Lang. He never responds other than in the Press trying to play partisan politics. And I, again, outlined in a definite way the proposals of the Saskatchewan Government, the Manitoba Government and the Alberta Government and other farm organizations in regard to feed grains and I have yet to get a reply from the Federal Minister of Agriculture in regard to those proposals.

Mr. Speaker, literally dozens, dozens of letters and telegrams and telephone calls and meetings have been instigated by the Government of Saskatchewan in regard to a feed grains policy and on every occasion the Federal Government has chosen to play politics rather than to talk turkey about those proposals.

SOME HON. MEMBERS: Hear, hear!

MR. MESSER: — Mr. Speaker, the significant thing that we have to remember here is that in all cases Saskatchewan took the initiative to outline and propose a feed grains policy and tried, with sincere effort, to engage the Federal Government in discussing those proposals but failed at every opportunity.

Mr. Speaker, with the exception of the October 10, 1973 telegram which was responded to by Mr. Lang in the Press, with the policy which had then been announced by Mr. Lang already, and it appeared to be too late to talk to him about alternate proposals, the Federal Government did not once indicate its thinking or its intentions. In fact, all we ever got from Mr. Lang and his cohorts was a self-satisfied grin. I can't help but ask myself, why this kind of attitude? I think the only answer is that they have and had absolutely no intention of working out a mutually acceptable position for all parties concerned.

They intended right from the start to pull feed grains out from under the operations of the Canadian Wheat Board. They had already decided two years ago, when we had that Ministers' conference, all Agricultural Ministers in Canada, they had already decided then to sell farmers out to the grain trade. A further indication, Mr. Speaker, of the real intentions of the Federal and Provincial Liberals' intentions to destroy the single desk

December 10, 1973

selling agency of the Canadian Wheat Board, which has served prairie farmers so well.

Mr. Speaker, there were some other statements that have been made by the Leader of the Opposition and his fellow Members in the not too distant past. One of them was referred to by a couple of Members in this Assembly earlier today and this evening. That reference was to FarmStart.

Mr. Speaker, I said that the Leader of the Opposition's speech was, in fact, lengthy and that there was, in fact, a common thread or theme running through it. Part of that theme certainly had to do with the total disregard for the truth or anything related to fact pertaining to the activity within the Province of Saskatchewan, activity related mainly to our Government policy or programs.

The Leader of the Opposition's remarks indicated that the tactics and the attitude of the Liberal Opposition was one of total opposition to everything and to anything. The Leader of the Opposition is certainly consistent in that kind of attitude. He does it in various ways, two of them the most prominent.

One is totally to oppose anything and everything the doom and gloom attitude that the Attorney General makes mention of or else when that fails, an attempt to belittle or to make into a joke an undertaking of the Provincial Government. In the instance of FarmStart because he does not totally understand it or because he is somewhat hesitant totally to oppose it, he has chosen to attempt to belittle the merits and the objectives of the FarmStart program.

I refer to a statement he made during the Throne Speech where he attempted to pass off to the people of Saskatchewan that FarmStart had helped or would be helping only 205 farmers in this year and that if there were approximately 80,000 farmers in Saskatchewan, of which 40,000 would be eligible for FarmStart that it would take at that rate 200 years before we would be able to accommodate all of those 40,000 farmers.

Mr. Speaker, he knows full well that the reference made to the Throne Speech and the 205 farmers that had received recognition and credit from FarmStart were 205 farmers who had been processed and approved in the first month of operation. At that rate we will be accommodating nearly 2,500 farmers per year, with FarmStart. We will be making available in excess of \$15 million probably in excess of \$20 million worth of credit this year to starting farmers, to farmers who need credit in order to reach economic viability.

SOME HON. MEMBERS: Hear, hear!

MR. MESSER: — And that, Mr. Speaker, is 2,500 more farmers in one year's time who received credit in comparison to zero under seven years of Liberal Government between 1964 and 1971. That, Mr. Speaker, in one year is \$15 to \$20 million worth of credit to Saskatchewan farmers.

SOME HON. MEMBERS: Hear, hear!

MR. MESSER: — Mr. Speaker, if Mr. Steuart would take the time to move

about the country and really to listen to what rural residents of Saskatchewan are saying, he would know full well that FarmStart is without a doubt the most talked about program in Saskatchewan. It is a credit program which provides for the first time an opportunity for younger, unestablished or undeveloped farms to establish economic stability through a program that has been launched by the Provincial Government of Saskatchewan.

Another area, Mr. Speaker, that the Leader of the Opposition has made mention of on a good many occasions since the last session of the Legislature, pertains to the Hog Marketing Commission. Many of his colleagues have also made such statements, the Member from Moosomin (Mr. Gardner) and some of the other Members, who purport to know what the Saskatchewan Hog Marketing Commission is really all about.

Mr. Steuart is reported to have said in the Throne Speech and certainly at a number of meetings throughout the country, since the implementation of the Saskatchewan Hog Marketing Commission on August 6th of this year, that hog deliveries in Saskatchewan are down more in Saskatchewan than they are in any other province in Canada and that, in fact, and I quote from a number of sources including The Leader-Post, "Are actually down anywhere from 20 to 25 per cent".

Mr. Speaker, when the Leader of the Opposition relates to these kinds of figures, he further indicates his complete disregard of any kind of factual information that is available to him. He could have got statistics. He could have got them from the Department of Agriculture of Saskatchewan or he could have got them from Statistics Canada, which would show that there is absolutely no truth in regard to any statement that would relate to reduction in deliveries for Saskatchewan in the neighborhood of 20 to 25 per cent, and, Mr. Speaker, every Member opposite knows that, yet they spread about the Province of Saskatchewan untruths in regard to such a reduction. In fact he has stated, in order to give some credibility to those statements that he is using Statistics Canada figures.

Mr. Speaker, if he were referring to Statistics Canada he certainly wasn't looking at the year 1973. Perhaps by error he was looking at one of the years between 1964 and 1971, when there were reductions in the neighborhood of 20 to 25 per cent, but he certainly was not looking at statistics that related to activities in the Province of Saskatchewan or any other province for that matter in Canada, in the year 1973. I've got Statistics Canada here, comparing the average percentage change from November 17th, 1972 to November 17, 1973.

In the Province of British Columbia there has been a reduction in hog production of 14.5 per cent, the largest of any other province in Canada. They are small producers of hogs, nevertheless the reduction is 14.5 per cent. In Alberta, which is not an NDP Government, free enterprise government which has the marketing board, that the Members to your left talk and refer to so frequently as an example of orderly marketing system that works, one, in fact, that negotiated hog contracts to Korea and to Japan at such a low price that they couldn't fill the commitments and they came to Saskatchewan asking us to bail them out to fill the commitment, that's how orderly marketing works in the Province of Alberta under the system they have there. But nevertheless in that province, Mr. Speaker, hog production went down by 8.9 per cent up to November 17, 1973. Reduced by 8.9 per

December 10, 1973

cent. In the Province of Manitoba which my Members know full well is governed by a New Democratic Government, hog production there in spite of the bad deals that the Members opposite related in regard to long-term contracting to Japan and other countries on the Pacific rim increased by 2.5 per cent, the only province in Canada to have an increase. If they are doing so badly with their hog operation in Manitoba, why is it that the producers are increasing production in that province. Now if we take all of the average in western Canada up to November 17th 1973, in comparison to 1972, there has been a reduction of 4.3 per cent.

Mr. Speaker, I want to specifically turn to Saskatchewan. In Saskatchewan up to November 17th there has been a reduction, yes. Not a 20 to 25 per cent reduction as the Leader of the Opposition would have us believe but 3.2 per cent which is almost 1 per cent below the western Canadian average. The Members opposite, including the member for Athabasca . . . he goes ah, ha! ah, ha! But what was he saying when the Leader of the Opposition said the reduction was 25 per cent.

MR. GUY: — Saying oh, oh!

MR. MESSER: — Yes, saying oh, oh, trying to give credibility to a statement that he knows full well has actually no factual foundation whatsoever, none whatsoever, Mr. Speaker.

SOME HON. MEMBERS: Hear, hear!

MR. MESSER: — These statistics for the benefit of the Members opposite come right out of Canada Livestock and Meat Trade Report, Statistics Canada.

Mr. Speaker, another statement that the Members opposite refer to a good deal is the purchase of shares in Intercontinental Packers and that this has done absolutely nothing for Saskatchewan producers and in particular has in fact caused a decrease in employment in the packing industry.

Mr. Speaker, I have some statistics from Intercontinental Packers that show since March of 1973, since approximately the time the Government of Saskatchewan purchased shares in Intercontinental Packers that there has been a net increase in Intercontinental's operations in Saskatchewan by hiring an additional 102 people for that operation, since March of this year there has been an additional 102 employees employed by that plant. Yet they say that there has been nothing done in regard to increasing employment in relation to processing primary products in the Province of Saskatchewan.

Well, Mr. Speaker, another area that the Members opposite have said a good deal about relates to the rapeseed poll that is now being taken. The poll which is going to decide to include or to exclude the selling of rapeseed from the Canadian Wheat Board. That has certainly generated a great deal of interest and a great deal of debate, not only in Saskatchewan, but in the prairie provinces and in fact across Canada. And as most matters do in these complex times there are a good many people that were not at least initially able to decide as to whether they should vote for or against or whether they should choose to exercise the undecided ballot.

Well, Mr. Speaker, this Legislature and Members here as representatives of primarily farmers and certainly as representatives of the primary industry of this province cannot let the issue be beclouded or misinterpreted by those who oppose orderly marketing systems, cannot let the Members of the Liberal Party say that the inclusion of rapeseed in the Wheat Board is necessarily bad for producers and processors. This poll as it is now designed, Mr. Speaker, is loaded against orderly marketing and the inclusion of rapeseed in that orderly marketing system. The issue at stake is of fundamental importance to this Assembly, farmers of Saskatchewan and the Prairie Basin. I say that, Mr. Speaker, due to the fact that the present ballot system is a clear example of an attempt to manipulate the rights of the people to make a free choice of their destiny in the face of opposition from mainly special interest groups who have no interest whatsoever in this region except as an object of continued exploitation and unwarranted profit.

Mr. Speaker, the farming community has long since learned the lengths to which those who market some of their crops will go in order to retain control and to manipulate the primary producer. Farmers, primary producers unfortunately went through a good many hardships in the past because of that kind of control but they in their wisdom and their struggle for orderly marketing acquired the techniques, acquired the legislation, not only provincially but at the federal level, so that they would have an opportunity to be able to bargain and to market their products, their primary products with a fair return to themselves. What they cannot now accept and what this Legislature must also oppose is that a Minister of the Federal Government is now prepared to place all of this progress in the ash can, the trash can or the gutter in the name of political expediency. The decision by the Minister in Charge of the Canadian Wheat Board and the obvious concurrence by the Federal Cabinet and the provincial Members to your left to establish a poll on such clearly dishonest grounds is as repugnant as it is distressing. Repugnant in that it is a mockery of the very principle of democracy on which this country is built.

SOME HON. MEMBERS: Hear, hear!

MR. MESSER: — Distressing in that it shows how fragile and just how committed the Federal and the Provincial Liberal Party is to the orderly marketing system and in fact the livelihood of farmers who depend on that orderly marketing process.

Now in regard to this poll the Minister in Charge of the Canadian Wheat Board, the Minister responsible for this poll is quoted to have said that he does not wish to leave anyone out. He says some for certain will vote for it, some will certainly vote against, but in order to have an opportunity for everyone to vote he has included an undecided vote. Now, Mr. Speaker, if this was an exercise for information only and was not the issue that would decide as to whether rapeseed is in or out of the Canadian Wheat Board it might be acceptable. But the counting of the ballots will decide and the undecided or don't know is not only ridiculous but disastrous. Disastrous, Mr. Speaker, because the undecided vote will count exactly and precisely the same as a 'no' vote. The Minister is quite right in saying that no one will be left out of the vote, the only problem is that you can't really be undecided even if you indicate you are, because in his wisdom he has deemed that the undecided vote will count as a 'no'

December 10, 1973

and will opt for the continuation of rapeseed being sold outside of the Canadian Wheat Board. He has further excluded many producers from the very ground rules that you have to meet in order to be eligible to vote. You have to produce rape two out of three years. He knows as well as do other producers in the Prairie Basin that due to new crops being introduced in the last two years, low erucic acid varieties in order to offset the production of the older now unacceptable high erucic varieties, low erucic acid varieties having contributed to a cutback in the number of producers who are growing rapeseed because the yields are not as high in the low erucic acid varieties.

In the last two years rapeseed producers have been plagued with disease problems which has added to a reduction of rapeseed producers. In the last two years there have been insect infestations in a magnitude that have never been comprehended by farmers producing rapeseed in the past which has also contributed to the declining numbers of rapeseed producers. In the spring of 1973 a good many producers were betting that coarse grains were going to be able to be sold in larger quantities and at higher prices than in the past and they therefore diverted rapeseed acreage to the production of coarse grain. All of those indicate that there are less people producing rapeseed now than there would have been if the vote had been called several years ago. So by those ground rules he has eliminated a good many producers from voting. It is in fact loaded against rapeseed producers.

I say that if the Minister responsible for the Canadian Wheat Board wanted to have a real plebiscite or real vote in regard to whether farmers wanted to include cash crops in the Wheat Board marketing system, he should not have limited it to rapeseed but should have expanded it to flax and rye as well so that a larger number of producers would have had the opportunity to vote rather than those who were limited to rapeseed production alone. This adds up to something much more than just the rapeseed question, it is just another example of some people's determination come hell or high water to dismantle, to destroy and to wreck the single desk selling agency that is advocated and administered as the Canadian Wheat Board. It follows the announced intention to remove from the Wheat Board all of the powers of domestically sold feed grains at the beginning of the next crop year. There will certainly be other debates taking place in this Legislature in regard to that. I suggest, Mr. Speaker, that we compare the merits of the private grain trade vis-à-vis the Canadian Wheat Board.

If we want to look for an example we need only look south of the border where the private grain trade is in its full flower, and we see it condemned for the disaster it has brought in its dealing with the wheat sale to Russia. But in contrast here every publication which is likely to be read by farmers, especially rapeseed producers is plastered with slick ads sponsored by the Winnipeg Commodity Exchange, from apparently, Mr. Speaker, a bottomless pocketbook. These ads picture the grain companies and their employees as tireless protectors of the farmer, devoting themselves to the best interests and the best returns for the farmer. The same international grain companies, Mr. Speaker, are under investigation by the Commodity Exchange Authority in the United States, and for very good reason. The grain and soybean deals that those people were responsible for with the USSR have proved that these companies are not the super-efficient captains of industry made by the image makers of Bay Street or Madison Avenue but as a group who were at the best, Mr. Speaker,

childishly naive or at their worst quite happy to sell out their own country, their own farmers and every grocery buyer in North America in order to line their own pockets.

Now we see in Canada advertisements at tremendous cost, the contents of which are certainly questionable and they deserve little of our time. But I think they do tell an interesting story because they are not in effect modest three liners that may be economically placed in classified sections of the country papers but full or half page ads appearing in every publication that will hopefully be seen by farmers. They have been appearing quite regularly for the past six weeks, they not only cover the Province of Saskatchewan but the three Prairie Provinces. An independent observer has estimated that the cost of this campaign that the Commodity Exchange has launched is going to be in excess of \$1 million. They are attempting, Mr. Speaker, to brainwash the farmer. The unfortunate part of this is that no matter what the outcome of the vote is, the farmer is going to end up paying the bill.

Now, we might, I think, well ask ourselves why are these people going to all this trouble. If the pickings are so paper thin as the ads would have us believe, one would think that their attitude would be that if the farmers do not want the help of the Winnipeg Commodity Exchange that they would say the heck with them there is nothing that we can do for them, so that if he is willing to sell himself short by including rapeseed in the Wheat Board marketing system, let him do it and it is no concern of ours because we don't make any money on him anyway.

But, Mr. Speaker, we all know differently, they are about to lose that gold mine that they have hung on to for so long and they won't hesitate to use any deception or any kind of emotionalism to win the game and to retain the power that they have now.

Mr. Speaker, I should just like to turn to a couple of ads that I have taken out of the Free Press and I believe they are in the Western Producer as well, they are full page ads, at a cost I assumed a couple of thousand dollars a page. That is an estimate, but I assume it would cost that much to get an ad in a publication such as the Western Producer or the Free Press. One of them here has a picture of a group of men in the Commodity Exchange and it says, "Who would ever guess these fellows are creating stability." Mr. Speaker, there aren't any farmers that would guess they are creating stability because in 1972-73 crop year the price of rapeseed fluctuated from a low of \$3.00 per bushel to in excess of \$7.00 per bushel. That's stability for farmers, Mr. Speaker? Who would ever guess these men are creating stability. But nevertheless it is a campaign in an attempt to brainwash those who do not really think what the system does for them. It goes on to say, "They are not artificially established by a group of civil servants." They are relating to the suggestion that the Canadian Wheat Board sets its prices artificially by a group of civil servants. I want to comment about that in just a moment.

I have another full page ad, this ad was in the Western Producer and it says, "Are these men speculating on your crop?" Again a picture of another group of men in \$450 suits. Well, Mr. Speaker, I can say, you bet they are speculating on your crop and every farmer in Saskatchewan knows it too.

SOME HON. MEMBERS: Hear, hear!

December 10, 1973

MR. MESSER: — But the article says and they admit, they are half honest, not quite half but they have a bit of honesty, I quote:

Some of them maybe, others are trying to sell your crop at the highest price they can get.

You again can be sure they are trying to sell the farmers' crop at the highest price they can get. But not for the farmers, for the their own pockets, Mr. Deputy Speaker.

SOME HON. MEMBERS: Hear, hear!

MR. MESSER: — Mr. Deputy Speaker, there are dozens of such ads and they are nothing better than absolute rubbish. Rubbish! Because surely they don't expect thinking people, especially farmers in western Canada to believe that the Canadian Wheat Board, a multibillion dollar operation trading right around this world, sets prices artificially by civil servants. Utter nonsense, Mr. Deputy Speaker. Utter nonsense! In what possible way can they claim that the brokers who can and do trade rapeseed up to seventeen times between farmer and ultimate consumer, ever gave one solitary red cent of the initial price paid to farmers back to those farmers. I should like to know when did a broker ever go back to the farmer and ask the permission or give a thought to the farmer's interest when he made the second, or the fifth, or the tenth or the fifteenth or the seventeenth transaction in regard to that rapeseed, each and every time to give him a higher profit.

Now, Mr. Speaker, the Department of Agriculture put out a pamphlet which was attempting to convey to farmers in Saskatchewan what in fact were the benefits of orderly marketing and the inclusion of rapeseed in the Canadian Wheat Board. In that pamphlet there were a number of questions asked. One was — who benefits under the open market system? The pamphlet said, and I want to quote from that:

Marketing grain through the private trade and grain exchanges has been rejected by nearly all grain marketing countries in the world. The only notable exception is the United States, but in the United States the grain trade is presently under investigation by the Commodity Exchange authority for possible violations and manipulations designed to benefit the private traders, not the farmers. This investigation is the result of allegations that private grain traders manipulated the market during the summer of 1972 to realize an illegal profit on the huge grain sale to the Soviet Union. Manipulations to line their pockets not to return larger benefits to the farmers.

There were two other questions. How successful have the farmers been in outguessing the market? And two, is the average price likely to be higher on the open market?

Mr. Speaker, I made reference to the fact that in 1972, in the crop year of 1972-73, rapeseed prices fluctuated from under \$3 per bushel to an excess of \$7 per bushel. The Saskatchewan Wheat Pool and the statisticians within the Department of Agriculture Saskatchewan have attempted to break down just what percentage of sales took place during that fluctuating rapeseed

market. We started with the beginning of the crop year 1972-73 when there were some 3 million bushels of rapeseed sold for less, Mr. Speaker, than \$2.50. In fact, 5.6 per cent of the deliveries of the total rapeseed crops were made at that time. In the \$2.50 to \$3 set range there was 27.1 per cent of the total rapeseed crop delivered. In the \$3 to \$3.50 range there was 21.8 per cent of the rapeseed crop delivered. In the \$3.50 to \$4 range, there was 27.6 per cent of the rapeseed crop delivered. In the \$4 to \$4.50 range, when you start to get into the range where rapeseed producers were standing to make some money, the percentage of rapeseed delivered because most of the crop had already been sold, dropped to 3.1 per cent. In the \$4.50 to \$5 range, 3.4 per cent of the total crop sold. In the \$5 to \$5.50 range, 2.2 per cent; in the \$5.50 to \$6 range 3.2 per cent; in the \$6 to \$6.50 range 4.3 per cent and in the \$6 and over range, up to and in the excess of \$7 — 1.7 per cent of the crop delivered.

Mr. Speaker, these statistics indicate that about 18 per cent of the total rapeseed crop was sold at something in excess of \$4 per bushel and the remainder was sold for something less than what the farmers were deserving of. I think those statistics clearly speak for the inclusion of rapeseed in the orderly marketing system.

Mr. Speaker, I see that I have talked for a good deal of the time and I had wanted to make some mention of the energy crisis and the remarks that have been made in regard to the Grains Income Stabilization Program. However, I believe that there will be other opportunities, at later times during this Session, where I may make some reference to them.

In closing, Mr. Speaker, I certainly want to make reference to the Throne Speech again and indicate my support for it, to indicate and acknowledge the kind of progressive thrust, the kind of progressive policies that the Government of Saskatchewan is instigating in that Throne Speech, not only for agriculture, but for urban development and for the retention of the natural resources of this province and also recognizing the legitimate needs of the people of Saskatchewan, those ordinary people whom I referred to at the beginning of my speech. For those reasons, Mr. Speaker, I am very proud to be part of the Cabinet and part of the Government of Saskatchewan and will vote for the motion and vote against the amendment.

SOME HON. MEMBERS: Hear, hear!

MR. L. LARSON: (Pelly) — Mr. Speaker, I add my congratulations to the mover and the seconder in the Address-in-Reply to the Speech from the Throne. I congratulate the new Member from Lakeview (Mr. Malone). I hope that his stay in the House will be pleasant and, yes, short. I hope that he will allow himself to let his own personal convictions, rather than those of the Liberal Party, permeate his thoughts and his activities and his participation in this House.

SOME HON. MEMBERS: Hear, hear!

MR. LARSON: — I want now to spend a moment or two in the dying moments of this Debate, to talk about the lost and found again constituency of Pelly. I thought for awhile that it was lost and then I discovered that it had been found again for which I

December 10, 1973

am very happy and very pleased. I want to say that we represent possibly as much a mosaic of Canada as you will find anywhere. We have people of all nationalities, all racial origins including natives, and we have them in a pretty evenly divided number. It is one of the few constituencies where you will find people of these various racial groups living together harmoniously and happy. It is, of course, one of the better agricultural areas in the province. We have the wealthy, rich Assiniboine Valley where we produce some of the best malting barley as well as the best wheat in the country. Rapeseed is also a very important crop and I can assure Members opposite that very great note is being taken of their attitude with regard to the rapeseed vote and the handling and marketing of rapeseed.

SOME HON. MEMBERS: Hear, hear!

MR. LARSON: — We shall not soon forget the stand of the Liberal Party on this one.

Besides being very rich in agricultural production — grain production that is — we also represent a very rich livestock area. Some of the finest cattle in Saskatchewan are produced in the Pelly constituency. At the recent Agribition sale my next door neighbor sold a heifer for \$28,000. I saw her raised, I saw her grow up and certainly a very creditable animal. She came very close from home. We also have other very noted breeders in the area in Hereford and other exotic lines. There will be a sale in Roblin this coming week when some 400 head of Charolais cattle will be sold and anyone that is interested in quality Charolais cattle ought to attend that sale.

We also have some of the nicest scenery in the province. I invite you all to visit Madge Lake. It is one of the most heavenly spots in the province.

MR. BAKER: — Outside of Regina.

MR. LARSON: — My good friend, the Mayor, says outside of Regina. I challenge him on that. I invite you all to come and see for yourself and decide which is the best. Besides scenery, we have some of the best skiing and I am very proud that the Department of Natural Resources is going to develop, without building a mountain, without hauling in any dirt or snow, a ski resort that I am sure will be the best in Saskatchewan. So these are some of the things that we have in our little northeast community.

You know it is not for nothing that it is known throughout both Saskatchewan and Manitoba as the Garden of Saskatchewan. I invite you all to come for a jolly good time, friendly people, very hospitable and we will certainly make you all feel at home.

I want now to spend a few moments on the Throne Speech, the amendment and the subamendment. Following my good colleague, the Minister of Agriculture, of course it doesn't leave much to be said. It has been very interesting to notice the problems that the Opposition has had in dealing with this Throne Speech.

The Leader started off by jumping around in every direction. He didn't really get down to any concrete criticism. He thought he was doing pretty well but he just didn't hit on anything. Then when he came to where he thought he was really going to make a

few points and promote the policies and talk about the program of the Liberal Party, I noticed he choked up, and he had nothing to say.

SOME HON. MEMBERS: Hear, hear!

MR. LARSON: — I came to the conclusion, the desperate conclusion, that there just is no policy, that there is just no program. Of greatest amusement to me was when he tried to uphold the Federal Liberal Party. Certainly the Liberal Party in Saskatchewan should have learned the lesson a long, long time ago, that the way to utter doom is to try to support and uphold the Federal Liberals. Yet the Leader of the Opposition obviously hasn't learned his lesson at all. I am very happy to see a replacement on the scene.

AN HON. MEMBER: — Deputy Leader.

MR. LARSON: — Yes, Deputy Leader. I note that everyone is looking very longingly at the new member. Probably he will be able to fill his place a little better.

SOME HON. MEMBERS: Hear, hear!

MR. LARSON: — I certainly feel that to criticize is one thing, to do a good job of criticism is fine but if you can't replace what you have already destroyed through violent, bitter, cynical criticism then you have failed totally. So I would have to say that the performance of the Leader of the Opposition in this Debate was a total fiasco, a total failure.

SOME HON. MEMBERS: Hear, hear!

MR. LARSON: — Then I have listened to other Members. I have listened to them parrot the same theme, the same line of approach that the Leader started off with. Obviously there is no program. Obviously there is no thought. I had thought that the convention at Saskatoon would have brought out, at this critical stage in Saskatchewan, some real eye-catching and some real public appealing programs that we would hear a lot about at this Session. Very obviously they are relegated to the wastepaper basket and probably will never see the light of day again.

AN HON. MEMBER: — . . . 171 . . .

MR. LARSON: — Yes, 171 is probably going to come out with some of the programs and with some of the planks in their platform in the next election.

I noted that there was considerable criticism offered by way of the Throne Speech. The Throne Speech, in my opinion, did justice to the position that Saskatchewan finds itself in Canada with regard to our treatment and with regard to our position. Everyone had high hopes that the Western Development Economic Conference would produce some very good results not only for Saskatchewan but for Canada as such.

The Throne Speech recognizes precisely what went wrong at the conference. Certainly high hopes have been dashed. They have

December 10, 1973

been thrown out the window and we now know where we stand. So we really can't depend very much on what is going to come out of this Western Development Economic Conference. So when you criticize the stand that the Provincial Government has taken with regard to the results of this conference, I think you are criticizing in a very, very negative way something that is very true.

We talk about assuring that livestock producers in the West reaping the benefit of the natural advantage in livestock production. Certainly this is a very vital part and a very vital thing for Saskatchewan. For too long we have raised the livestock, exported the grain and exported the livestock. With it we have exported jobs and exported a lot of the potential earnings. Everyone knows that the livestock industry in Saskatchewan is a very important one, is a vital one to Canada as a nation. If you look at the possibilities of livestock in red meat production you recognize that Saskatchewan is one of the few spots where there is a real potential and where we have a real opportunity. And yet, the Liberal Party and the Western Economic Development Conference doesn't seem to want to recognize this.

The Minister of Agriculture has talked about the whole feed grain picture. From my viewpoint as a farmer the theme behind the whole process is to provide cheap feed for eastern Canada so we can continue to export our feed at a low price and continue to export our livestock and our jobs. This is the theme that is behind it. I have not heard anyone from the Opposition get up and say this is not so, or point out one way that it is not going to work that way.

The Member for Lumsden (Mr. Lane) obviously seems to think he knows a lot about it.

MR. LANE: — More than you do.

MR. LARSON: — You know if he would open his ears as wide as he does his mouth he might be able to learn and understand a little bit about the problems of western Canada.

SOME HON. MEMBERS: Hear, hear!

MR. LARSON: — I remind him of the old Chinese proverb — a man was given two ears and one mouth, therefore he should listen twice as much as he speaks.

Mr. Speaker interrupted the debate, the question being put on the amendment was negatived on the following recorded division.

YEAS — 15

Messieurs

Steuart
Coupland
Loken
Guy
Boldt
Malone

Grant
MacDonald (Milestone)
McIsaac
Gardner
Weatherald

MacLeod
Lane
Mac Donald
(Moose Jaw N.)
Wiebe

NAYS — 37

Messieurs

Blakeney

Pepper

Matsalla

Dyck	Michayluk	Cody
Meakes	Byers	Gross
Wood	Thorson	Feduniak
Romanow	Whelan	Comer
Messer	Carlson	Rolfes
Snyder	Engel	Hanson
Kramer	Owens	Oliver
Thibault	Robbins	Feschuk
Larson	Tchorzewski	Kaeding
Baker	Cowley	Flasch
Brockelbank	Taylor	Richards
MacMurchy		

The Debate continues on the main motion.

MR. LARSON: — I want for a few moments, Mr. Speaker, to continue with my remarks. It's very obvious from the remarks that have come across from the other side that the principle of orderly marketing is not the favorite of the Liberal Party. For the first time it is becoming very obvious. The Member from Moosomin, today, made it very clear. I think he ought to go back to his people in his own constituency and tell them that he is opposed to orderly marketing through the Canadian Wheat Board. I think he owes them this much, so that they will at least know where he stands. That the Liberal Party and probably the Palliser Wheat Growers are the only ones that are in favor of the open marketing system is and has been made very obvious during this last few months. The Saskatchewan Wheat Pool through their annual meeting made it abundantly clear and have taken a very positive stand with regard to their belief and their support of the Canadian Wheat Board and orderly marketing.

The Saskatchewan Federation of Agriculture in the 1973 policy statement makes this very clear. They quote under Feed Grains:

That the Federal Government establish an incentive policy for producers of feed grains and one step would be, guaranteed initial prices and so on.

And they go on under Marketing:

That the Canadian Wheat Board be retained as the principal marketing agency for prairie grown feed grains.

And they go on to talk about the whole structure of strengthening, Mr. Speaker, the workings and the operations of the Canadian Wheat Board. The National Farmers' Union have taken a very positive stand with regard to the orderly marketing of grains, including flax and rapeseed under the Wheat Board.

The Liberal Party and I include the Conservatives because they are being very ominously quiet in this whole debate and this whole feud. Oh, they're saying with tongue in cheek that, yes, they like the operation of the Canadian Wheat Board, but feed grains and inter-provincial marketing, that's another thing. So no one really knows where they stand. My guess, Mr. Speaker, is that they too are opposed to orderly marketing. I think that this is something that all prairie farmers ought to keep in mind. That there is no difference between the Liberals and the Conservatives, with regard to this important matter.

I was quite interested to notice that the Hon. Otto Lang, the Liberal champion, so called, of Saskatchewan, didn't have the courage, probably he had some other reason that he wouldn't reveal but didn't have the courage to meet the National Farmers' Union in Winnipeg. As I understand it, and my son was a delegate, he was in Winnipeg, he was invited, he was given every encouragement to come, yet he refused to come. This is rather strange, Mr. Speaker, when a couple of days later, the Minister of Agriculture came, he spoke to them, he listened to the farmers, he said, I am interested in what you have to say, I believe that farmers have a message that the rest of Canada need to hear. So he came, yet the champion of western Canada and the champion of the Liberals sitting on the opposite side didn't meet the farmers in annual convention in Winnipeg, farmers that represent Canada, the whole of Canada, not only Saskatchewan. The Liberal Leader is a little bit worried about this, he wishes that this had never happened. He is afraid that somewhere along the line there are going to be too many farmers who will come home and say that Otto Lang hasn't got as much courage as the Leader of the Opposition says he has; going to come back and say that he wouldn't meet with us. That he is scared of us.

But this happened, Mr. Speaker, and I think that it's a shame, I think it's a shame with the principle of orderly marketing at stake and the man that is perpetrating the whole issue refuses to speak to farmers across Canada. This is a real shame.

I want, Mr. Speaker, to put on the record some of the free enterprise results as they apply to all of Canada. We've heard a lot about inflation. We have heard the Opposition talk about all the glorious times that farmers are having. Yes, we are enjoying for the first time in my career as a farmer, fair prices. I don't say they are good prices, but they are fair prices. I was home over the weekend and I had a phone call from our fertilizer distributor. He said you better get your money to the elevator if you want fertilizer. Come Monday, fertilizer is going up six per cent. There is no more bulk fertilizer and you're going to have to settle for bags and the new price after today is going to be six per cent up. So if you look at the cost of production as it's rising and continuing to rise, this windfall that farmers are getting is just not going to materialize.

I want to compare this to some of the profits that are being reaped by some of the other organizations in this free enterprise system. I have before me a schedule that has been published by the Canadian Union of Public Employees. They list some very interesting business ventures and I suspect some of them are rather large and probably well able to handle themselves. They start off with George Weston Company. I'm sure Opposition Members don't know who George Weston is. Probably some share holders over there. Six months ending up August 3, 1973, 63 per cent profit; British Columbia Packers, 24 weeks ending June 17, 1973, 125 per cent profit; Maple Leaf Mills, first half of '73, 111 per cent profit; Dominion Stores, second quarter, 92 per cent profit; Nestles Limited, 1972, 93 per cent profit. And a few of the really hard pressed financial boys in the country, you've got the Toronto-Dominion Bank, three months ending July 31, 1973, 50 per cent profit; Montreal Bank, 46 per cent profit; Nova Scotia 14 per cent; Royal Bank, 26 per cent; Bank of Canada, the National Bank, end of July 31st, 78 per cent profit.

And then you look at real estate, and I suspect there are some real estate agents over on that side. Cadillac Development

Corporation, 45 per cent profit; Campo, first half of '73, 65 per cent profit; Monarch Investment, a real little one, first half of '73, 110 per cent profit; Mark Burrow and Associates Limited, first half of '73, 284 per cent profit; Inter-urban Properties Limited, first half of '73, 182 per cent profit. These are only a few, Mr. Speaker.

MR. STEUART: — I wonder would the Member table that.

MR. LARSON: — Oh yes, I would be very glad to table the document. I think the Members opposite ought to get photostatic copies and circulate them to all their Members. I recommend that you do this.

I would like to have this tabled.

AN HON. MEMBER: — They wouldn't understand it.

MR. LARSON: — No, they couldn't if you need any advice we will provide someone to interpret it for you.

So, Mr. Speaker, when you look at the windfall that is hitting farmers I think we ought to be almost ashamed to stand in this House and talk about the glorious times.

You know, I have done some checking on the average price of grain that we have been getting in the last ten years and at no time during the last ten years did we exceed a dollar and ninety cents a bushel for wheat, for number one wheat, the best in the world. And when you see profits like this, showing up and you recognize what farmers have been doing, then it's a rather difficult thing to believe that we are now hitting a windfall.

I could go on, Mr. Speaker, but I don't think it would serve any useful purpose. Members opposite have certainly closed their minds to the facts. Enough has been said by the Government of this side and the farm organizations and those that are concerned about where we're going. Concerned about the energy crisis, concerned about the food crisis.

You know, it's not too long ago when we were looking at the possibility of a protein rationing crisis. This can happen again. Let no one delude themselves into thinking that the days of cheap food are going to return, like the Members opposite hope they will. We are out of that era and that stage and let us keep in mind from both sides of the House, that we've got to work on keeping together and Canada as a nation. Being one of the greatest and the greatest potential food producer has a very vital role to play in all this and it's my suggestion that we all do our part, do our role rather than spend our time through this nonsense, this petty bickering over where we're going. Bickering when we really ought to be pulling together to try to salvage the most important industry in the world, because if we don't then we're all going to be in trouble.

Very obviously, Mr. Speaker, I will be supporting the motion.

SOME HON. MEMBERS: Hear, hear!

MR. H.E. COUPLAND: (Meadow Lake) — On joining this Debate, Mr. Speaker, I should first like to add my congratulations to those already extended to the Member from Regina Lakeview and wish him well. I'm sure he will be a big asset to this Chamber and especially to this side of the House.

I'd also like to congratulate the mover and the seconder of the Throne Speech. I realize, Mr. Speaker, that they had a pretty tough job, trying to say anything good about the document, but at least they tried.

In regard to the Throne Speech, Mr. Speaker, I was hoping to see some signs in the Throne Speech that the Government would be easing the heavy hand of Government off the backs of the people of Saskatchewan.

SOME HON. MEMBERS: Hear, hear!

MR. COUPLAND: — But no such luck. In fact, the contrary is true. There are indications that they are going to increase the pressure.

Mr. Speaker, I listened to the Minister of Agriculture and he likes to make a big point of the feed grains trade being in the hands of international traders.

Well, Mr. Speaker, I want you to know that if the proposed changes took place to allow private trading and free feed grain as of August 1st, '74, two of the agencies that I would expect to take the lead in the movement of feed grains would be the United Grain Growers and the Saskatchewan Wheat Pool. And we see no reason why they should not actively participate in selling feed grain.

The Minister also has the audacity to criticize the Federal Government for allowing a vote for the producers of rapeseed on the way they want to market their product. But this is not very strange, Mr. Speaker, coming from a man who would not allow the hog producers to have a vote on how they would market their product.

Mr. Speaker, he also tries to confuse the issue in regard to the number of hogs slaughtered in the province. The Leader of the Opposition said less hogs were slaughtered in the province since the hog marketing took effect. The Minister refers to production figures.

They are masters, Mr. Speaker, at trying to confuse the figures.

I will have considerable more to say in this Debate tomorrow and beg leave to adjourn the debate.

Debate adjourned.

The Assembly adjourned at 9:20 o'clock p.m.