

LEGISLATIVE ASSEMBLY OF SASKATCHEWAN
Fourth Session — Seventeenth Legislature
9th Day

Tuesday, December 11, 1973.

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

On the Orders of the Day.

QUESTIONS

TELEVISION & RADIO TIME RE ENERGY SITUATION

MR. D.G. STEUART: (Leader of the Opposition) — Mr. Speaker, before the Orders of the Day, I would like to direct a question to the Premier. Is it a fact that he is going on certain radio and television stations in the province to talk about oil and gas conservation and the general oil and gas situation? If it is true, I presume at Government expense, is he prepared to give the same privilege to the Opposition?

HON. A.E. BLAKENEY: (Premier) — The answer is yes. I am going on television tonight, partly at Government expense and partly on free time. The further answer is that this is a Government announcement and in the same way that the Government of Canada gave no time to its Opposition parties, it is not anticipated that there will be provision for the Opposition to have time on this basis. The Opposition is, of course, supplied with substantial funds to carry on its duties as an official Opposition, and if it feels that this is an appropriate way to expend those funds it is free to do so.

MR. STEUART: — A supplementary question. I should like to ask the Premier if he doesn't consider the fact that he is going to be talking about a Bill that will not be introduced in the House formally for second reading until tomorrow an indication of his contempt for this House? I would like to ask him very seriously if he doesn't consider this contempt of the Legislature, if he goes on television, before the Minister has a chance to present this Bill and explain it? Is it not contempt if he uses his power to pre-empt time, denies the Opposition the same kind of an opportunity and talks about this to the public before this House has an opportunity or a chance to even hear the explanation by the Minister concerned?

MR. BLAKENEY: — The answer is no, I do not regard it as any contempt of the House. The Bill is before the House, it is being commented upon freely by Members on both sides of the House, in the Press and in the media. I am doing the same thing. I am not aware, for example, that in the Parliament of Canada, from where we draw some of our traditions, there has yet been an announcement or any introduction of a Bill with respect to a national energy corporation. Yet if I recall it correctly I heard the Prime Minister discussing this on the television recently. I take the position that once the Bill is before this House it is free and open for public discussion and I know that the Leader of the Opposition (Mr. Steuart) does as well, because I read his comments in the Press this morning before second

reading of the Bill.

SOME HON. MEMBERS: Hear, hear!

PUBLIC HEARINGS ON BILL 42

MR. C.P. MacDONALD: (Milestone) — Mr. Speaker, before the Orders of the Day I would like to direct a question to the Minister of Industry and Commerce or Mineral Resources (Mr. Thorson). Is it the intention of the Minister to establish public hearings in relation to Bill No. 42, an Act respecting the Conservation, Stabilization and Development of Oil and Gas in Saskatchewan and to give the consumer, the farmer who uses fuel, the small service station operator, the small independent operator, the industry itself, an opportunity to make representations about the far reaching effects of this Bill, its impact in the future after they have had an opportunity of digesting its complexity. Or is it your intention to ram it through this house without giving any opportunity for representation from anyone in the Province of Saskatchewan?

SOME HON. MEMBERS: Hear, hear!

HON. K. THORSON (Minister of Industry and Commerce) — Mr. Speaker, the answer to the question insofar as what has just been said is a question, is no. I should also add that the Member for Milestone (Mr. MacDonald) may feel that he is unable to do the job that is necessary to scrutinize the Bill and understand it and debate; but so far as the Government is concerned it has confidence in the Members of the Legislature.

SOME HON. MEMBERS: Hear, hear!

MR. MacDONALD: A supplementary question then. If he has confidence in the Members of the Legislature then there is another opportunity. First of all the Premier has always stated, Mr. Speaker, that the purpose of this fall Session was to place controversial legislation before the House, recess, feel the public pulse and the pulse is . . .

MR. SPEAKER: — What is the question?

MR. MacDONALD: — That if the Minister has confidence in the Members of the Legislature will he refer this to a Legislative committee of Members of the Legislature and then give the opportunity of the people of Saskatchewan to make representations to the Members of the Legislature so that they can make the kind of representation he refers to?

SOME HON. MEMBERS: Hear, hear!

MR. THORSON: — Mr. Speaker, I appreciate that some minds are slower than others but so far as people on this side of the House are concerned we think we can move fast enough to keep up with events.

SOME HON. MEMBERS: Hear, hear!

MR. RICHARDS: — Mr. Speaker, I would like to . . .

MR. STEUART: — This Session was called to give people a chance to understand . . .

MR. SPEAKER: — Order! The Member for Saskatoon University (Mr. Richards) has the floor.

WOOD ALLOCATED TO PRODUCERS' CO-OPS

MR. J.C. RICHARDS: (Saskatoon University): — Mr. Speaker, I want to address a question to the Premier in continuation of a theme raised yesterday. I raised the question about how much wood could potentially be allocated to producers' co-ops, should they make appropriate applications. Obviously the fear of the co-ops is that there will be committed by the Timber Board so much wood to various projects that there would not in the future be sufficient wood for them. The figure of 400,000 cords a year has been bandied around in various government circles as being a potential figure which would be set aside of the sustainable yield for producers' co-ops and would not be committed to Timber Board projects. Is the Premier prepared to make any comment about the validity of that 400,000 cord per year figure?

MR. BLAKENEY: — I think the answer, Mr. Speaker, is no. It is a very hypothetical question as to what might be allocated at some future time given certain hypothetical events in the future and I think it would be better if I did not attempt to make a specific answer to that question.

MR. GUY: — You don't know.

MR. BLAKENEY: — That's right. I don't know what will be allocated to any particular forest use in the future because I, unlike Members opposite, do not claim clairvoyance, I just try to struggle with the problems of the day.

MR, MacDONALD: (Milestone) — Mr. Speaker, I find it a little difficult that any time a Member from this side of the House gets up and makes any kind of comment you jump on them. Mr. Speaker, the Premier answered the question for the Member from Saskatoon and then got on his feet and made a speech in relation to a comment from the Member from Athabasca. I would like to suggest that equal time and division be given to both sides.

MR. SPEAKER: — I would suggest that Members should look around before they make statements like that. I would suggest that I am trying to be fair to both sides and I have asked order from both sides, not one side, but both sides, don't seem to realize when I am on my feet.

ANNOUNCEMENTS

DOMTAR CHEMICALS LTD EXPANSION

MR. BLAKENEY: (Premier) — Mr. Speaker, I should like to advise the House that I am advised that Domtar Chemicals Ltd., will be announcing today a \$1.5 million expansion project for the company's Sifto Salt Plant at Unity, Saskatchewan.

SOME HON. MEMBERS: Hear, hear!

MR. BLAKENEY: — It was an operation commenced in 1949 and expanded in 1970 and the current operation involves the production of 145,000 tons per year. The expansion will bring it to 200,000 tons per year. This stage is scheduled for completion early in 1975.

SOME HON. MEMBERS: Hear, hear!

MR. STEUART: — I should like to congratulate the Government. I wonder why the Premier didn't let Kim Thorson announce that. He hasn't had much to announce except failures. Certainly it's not new, it's not very big but we certainly congratulate the Government. They have finally made a little tiny break through.

AN HON. MEMBER: — They will probably have a DREE Grant.

MR. McISAAC: (Wilkie): — Just a comment in passing. That announcement was in the Unity paper about two weeks ago. I am glad the Premier brought it to our attention.

ADJOURNED DEBATES

ADDRESS-IN-REPLY

The Assembly resumed the adjourned debate on the proposed motion of Mr. E. Kaeding (Saltcoats) for an Address-in-Reply.

MR. H.E. COUPLAND: (Meadow Lake) — Mr. Speaker, when I adjourned the debate last night, I had been talking about the arrogance of the Minister of Agriculture (Mr. Messer) but now we can add the Premier and a few more in this House today.

Last night I offered my congratulations to the Member from Regina Lakeview (Mr. Malone) and I should like to repeat that congratulation. I also congratulated the mover and the seconder of the Throne Speech and pointed out that they did have a tough job to say very much good about that document.

The Throne Speech, Mr. Speaker, has given us no indication that the Blakeney Government is going to ease up on the heavy hand of Government. On the contrary there is every indication that they are going to increase the pressure by taking more controls away from people. Mr. Speaker, we have just seen an indication of that in this House today because there is a piece of legislation before the House that I can assure the Members

opposite there will be a lot of debate on before it gets through.

You know, Mr. Speaker, I listened to an address given at the annual convention of the School Trustees and found quite a similarity in what is happening to School Trustees and other groups in this province as is happening to the people of Saskatchewan under this Blakeney Government. In that speech, Mr. Speaker, the trustees were warned not to let the so-called professionals take over the field of education in Saskatchewan. I hope by the same token the people of Saskatchewan will not let any government take over control of their lives which is happening in this province today.

Mr. Speaker, the way this Government is hiring people for the Government should be cause for concern. They are not only increasing civil servants but are setting up boards and commissions which also hire a lot of staff. On top of this, Mr. Speaker, the Government has a system of contracting people to do work for them so that one cannot really find out the exact number who work for the Government.

Mr. Speaker, the taxpayers of Saskatchewan are concerned about how their tax dollars are being spent, and concerned they should be. When we see how expenditures for welfare are increasing and talk about guaranteed annual income, especially Mr. Speaker, when farmers and employers throughout this country cannot find help to do the jobs that are waiting. It is no wonder that people wonder what is happening to our society. You know, Mr. Speaker, a lot of our farm women around the province this fall had to go out and shovel grain, haul grain from the combines, yes, I saw a lot of them stacking bales and doing this heavy type of work because they couldn't hire anybody. Those same farmers know a lot of people who are sitting on welfare and quite able to do these jobs but they just won't work. Welfare is too easy to obtain.

Mr. Speaker, as I represent a northern seat, I would be remiss if I did not mention the Department of Northern Saskatchewan. First, Mr. Speaker, though I should clear up some misinformation, about where I live and where I intend to run in the next election. Mr. Speaker, I was surprised to see an article in the Leader-Post by the Premier in which he is quoted as saying that I have not lived in Meadow Lake for the last ten years. Well, Mr. Speaker, for the Premier's information I live in Meadow Lake and I have lived in Meadow Lake and I might say for a lot longer than the Premier has lived in Saskatchewan.

SOME HON. MEMBERS: Hear, hear!

MR. COUPLAND: — I wish he would get his figures straight. I have been honored to represent the constituency of Meadow Lake since 1964 and will continue to represent them if that is the wish of the people in Meadow Lake constituency because that is where I intend to seek the nomination. I am sorry the Government saw fit to divide the seat by cutting out the north half and putting it into Athabasca. But I guess they had their reasons for that. At the same time, Mr. Speaker, I should like to welcome the new area that was added to the Meadow Lake seat, we couldn't have asked for a better change and I am sure they will return a Liberal Member in the next election.

Mr. Speaker, I have been at several meetings in the North in the last few months and one thing that comes out loud and clear is that the people in the North want to be treated the same as any other resident in Saskatchewan. They ask, why should we be relegated to deal with only one department of government and that one in La Ronge, which is not very much closer by road than Regina, where they would have the opportunity to deal with any or all departments of government. They ask why should they be segregated into some special group with a special Minister. Mr. Speaker, the situation in the North is not good. Programs that were in effect when we were the Government were cancelled and conditions were gradually deteriorating. These people had been looking forward to better roads and TV and conditions in general because of the pulp mill. I might interject here, Mr. Speaker, to say thank you to the Government when they went ahead and put the microwave towers which now give some of our communities on the northwest side private telephone communication. But, Mr. Speaker, the people in the North feel they were really let down by the NDP Government when they cancelled the pulp mill.

It is very interesting, Mr. Speaker, when the Members to your right, for political expediency, wanted to cancel the pulp mill. They put up a good story to the effect that there was not enough timber in the North. We all know the story they told of what a terrible thing it would be to cut any of the trees. But, Mr. Speaker, for some reason or other the worm has turned. All of a sudden there is lots of forest that is going to waste. I think most of us saw the half-hour film produced by the Government in regard to the mill at Hudson Bay and I am wondering who paid for that bit of politicking. We heard the Minister of Resources tell us how we should harvest this wonderful renewable resource which wasn't there two years ago. And that's not all.

Mr. Speaker, I hear they are planning another saw mill for Meadow Lake, one for Prince Albert, probably one for Big River and a couple of plywood plants along with this. Where did all this forest come from, Mr. Speaker? By their own words, it wasn't there two years ago.

On our fact finding trip to the North, Mr. Speaker, we found dissatisfaction and lots of it and I might add while we only spent two days, that was long enough to know conditions with the Department of Northern Saskatchewan were not good. We found people who were not getting paid their bills, some behind as much as six months, but worst of all we found some who were behind in wages and this I cannot understand, not from a Government which professes to be the friends of the people.

The only place, Mr. Speaker, we found some degree of satisfaction was at Beauval where people were working. This is mainly due to the aggressiveness of the people in Beauval who went to work and got a grant from the Federal Liberal Government of \$114,000, and a mere \$12,000 from the Province to set up a post cutting operation which is very successful and has taken a good many people off welfare.

Mr. Speaker, I notice the Minister in charge likes to take credit for everything that was put in there. Why not give the Federal Government a little credit for that \$114,000 that they put in.

It was interesting, Mr. Speaker, on our arrival at the Beauval Mutual Products Limited, we just missed the Minister of Natural Resources (Mr. Bowerman) by about fifteen minutes, in fact, not that long, because we saw his plane leaving as we drove in. Apparently he didn't get up for the opening of the plant, so he had to fly in especially to pick up a trophy he should have got at the opening.

I wonder what the taxpayers think of the Minister cruising around in a twin engine plane to pick up trophies. I hope the Bill that they've introduced regarding road shows will put an end to this sort of thing.

SOME HON. MEMBERS: Hear, hear!

MR. COUPLAND: — On this subject, Mr. Speaker, I understand the Minister has had some phone calls from that area, Beauval, also Buffalo Narrows, regarding the sit-in in the Legislature last Thursday and Friday. And I understand these groups want to disassociate themselves from the Métis sit-in in the Legislature. And I hope that the Minister takes a good look at what he does in this regard and that he checks with some of the people on the local level before he hands out any money to a group that is really not interested in the areas in the North. But I noticed in a little clipping in the paper where this interim board, using financial assistance, not yet disclosed, but rumored to be in the range of \$29,000 will organize a general meeting to elect a permanent board. But before he gives out \$29,000 I would hope he would check with the local people in the North at the grass roots level, so that he knows what they are thinking.

Other speakers have mentioned the school situation in the North, but I must add a few words. I think it is a terrible situation that 450 children and 23 teachers should be sitting at home because of mismanagement by the DNS. And this what it was and is. They knew there was a water problem in the school at La Loche last April, but did nothing about it, especially during the summer holidays, when the children were home and the weather was fit for digging wells. And when the school started in the fall, of course, they run into water problems. And on a temporary basis they started hauling water for the cistern at \$50 a tank and then they found the cistern was leaking so the water all ran away and they still couldn't have water for sanitation purposes, so the children were out. I understand it is almost impossible to fix water systems at this time of the year in that country and I venture to say these poor children will miss a lot of school this winter.

I am disappointed the Minister has the audacity to say that former civil servants of the North were incompetent and didn't measure up to the standards of the DNS, because there were a lot of dedicated civil servants, Mr. Speaker, who looked after the North and I can assure the Minister that there weren't nearly the problems up there when those former civil servants were looking after it, as there are now.

SOME HON. MEMBERS: Hear, hear!

MR. COUPLAND: — Mr. Speaker, at the Ile-a-La-Crosse School the school burned down about a year ago now, the local board which was a democratically elected board in accordance with The School Act had made arrangements to rebuild that portion that was burned at a reasonable cost to the taxpayers. But when they called a meeting to inform the residents of Ile-a-La-Crosse of their progress and plans, lo and behold a plane landed with some ten DNS and MSI officials. These officials took over the meeting, Mr. Speaker, they told the elected trustees their services were no longer required and they proceeded to have the meeting elect a seven man provisional board without proper authorization. As a result of that meeting, Mr. Speaker, virtually all the teachers left who had been in Ile-a-La-Crosse, some for up to eight years.

Construction didn't start last spring like it should have, so the school has to operate on a two shift basis. One from 9:00 a.m. to 3:00 p.m. and one from 3:00 p.m. to 9:00 p.m. The DNS are now in process of putting up a hodge-podge of trailers to act as classrooms.

Mr. Speaker, the people in Ile-a-La-Crosse elected a new slate of trustees last week and I hope that the DNS and MSI will keep their nose out of the business of the trustees and let them get on with providing educational facilities for the children in Ile-a-La-Crosse.

SOME HON. MEMBERS: Hear, hear!

MR. COUPLAND: — All in all, Mr. Speaker, this new Department for Northern Saskatchewan is a total fiasco and should be abandoned before a lot more money is wasted, all that is needed is a co-ordinator to make sure all departments of government work together for the best interests of the people of the North.

SOME HON. MEMBERS: Hear, hear!

MR. COUPLAND: — As was mentioned by the Member from Cannington (Mr. Weatherald) there is no way there can be enough backup staff or support staff in La Ronge to make the different segments of the department effective.

Mr. Speaker, the Throne Speech presented by the Government last Thursday was a disappointing document, which was full of oppression and lacked any imagination. Our Leader, Dave Steuart, expressed the opinion of many of us when he referred to the Speech as barren and inadequate.

On the topic of agriculture, which is still the basic industry in Saskatchewan and I might add, will continue to be, and more so, Mr. Speaker, after this Throne Speech and some of the Bills that are coming in are going to drive investment capital out of the province. We are going to have to depend more and more on our agricultural industry.

But in the Throne Speech there were no new programs of assistance to farmers, but then, Mr. Speaker, maybe we don't want any more, if they are going to be like the Land Bank or the Foreign Ownership Bill or the Hog Marketing Commission. These kinds of things for agriculture, we don't need.

SOME HON. MEMBERS: Hear, hear!

MR. COUPLAND: — Mr. Speaker, when speaking about agriculture, I should like to repeat what I said last night about the Minister making a big point about the feed grain trade being in the hands of the international traders. I'm sure, Mr. Speaker, that if the proposed changes took place to allow private trading in feed grains, the United Grain Growers and the Wheat Pool would be in the forefront and we see no reason why they should not actively participate in selling feed grain.

I should also like to repeat my statement about the Minister of Agriculture (Mr. Messer) having the audacity to criticize the Federal Government for allowing the rapeseed growers to have a vote on how their produce will be marketed. This is not really very strange, Mr. Speaker, coming from a man who would not allow the hog producers to have a vote as to whether they wanted a hog board or not. The same will happen to the cattlemen of the province, Mr. Speaker.

When is the Minister going to do away with purple gas for the farmers? I hear he's contemplating that too.

SOME HON. MEMBERS: Hear, hear!

MR. COUPLAND: — You know, Mr. Speaker, the Throne Speech points out the difference of systems. As I said before it was barren. We on this side of the House believe in the freedom of the individual.

SOME HON. MEMBERS: Hear, hear!

MR. COUPLAND: — In individual's abilities to cope with the problems in his own way and solve them to his own satisfaction without interference from the bureaucrats. Ours is a society which recognizes the need for individual freedom and the right of self-determination within reasonable limits. We also realize that leaders in every aspect of its social structure, political, financial, industrial, etc. should follow high principles and if they do not then government intervention brings them into line.

Mr. Speaker, the free enterprise system of government has served the common good of all people and not solely provided benefits for the owners of capital as Members opposite like to infer. I think it was Sir Winston Churchill who said that contemporary democracy is the worst form of government, except for all those forms that have been tried from time to time.

I hope, Mr. Speaker, that we can learn a lesson from countries like Sweden, Norway and Denmark which have gone through the welfare state system and found it wanting and are now trying to get back to a system that recognizes the rights of individuals and their freedoms, a system that has given this country one of the highest standards of living in the world.

SOME HON. MEMBERS: Hear, hear!

MR. COUPLAND: — As I stated before, in this speech, Mr. Speaker, the Throne Speech was a disappointment in its lack of real solutions, in spite of the promises of more Government spending. I'm sure that in the year ahead, residents of Saskatchewan will see more laws, regulations, bureaucrats and taxes and more loss of individual freedoms than ever before and we will have the same ineffective Government machinery on which to spend our tax dollars.

Mr. Speaker, I think you can see by this that I will not support the motion.

SOME HON. MEMBERS: Hear, hear!

HON. G.R. BOWERMAN: (Minister of Northern Saskatchewan) — Mr. Speaker, the previous speaker in his comments about the Department of Northern Saskatchewan, made a couple of points to which I should like to refer.

He made the comment that northern people want to be treated like any other citizens of Saskatchewan. I say that that is exactly why we have a Department of Northern Saskatchewan, in order to be able to provide northern people with some of the amenities of life which over the last two hundred years they have not received. Most of those years being government administered in the province by the Liberals and in the last seven years from 64 to 71 again being administered by Liberals, when they received some of the nothing government which Liberals usually give to the people whom they administer and govern.

SOME HON. MEMBERS: Hear, hear!

MR. BOWERMAN: — People, he said, were let down by the loss of the pulp mill on the west side. The Hon. Member from Meadow Lake (Mr. Coupland) knows very well that there are today more northern native people employed in the Beauval Mutual Wood Producer's Co-op, than there is employed in the Prince Albert pulp mill and that is without contradiction, Mr. Speaker.

SOME HON. MEMBERS: Hear, hear!

MR. BOWERMAN: — More people involved in employing themselves in woodworking operations in Beauval and their own local organization than there is in the Prince Albert pulp mill, with all the fanfare and all the money that was put into that operation.

SOME HON. MEMBERS: Hear, hear!

MR. BOWERMAN: — He made reference to the money which the Federal Government had put into the operation at Beauval, and I want to remind the Member, that if we were waiting on Federal Government money that the Beauval operation would not be in operation today because the Federal Government, almost for a year, have continued to lag behind in providing those people with the funds necessary in order to be able to start their operation. It is true that the Department of Economic Regional Expansion will be coming forth with some money in this operation, but up to

the time when the Member was talking about, there was no federal money available for them.

Mr. Speaker, it is with a good deal of personal pleasure that I join with my colleagues this afternoon, in extending whole-hearted support for this 1973 Speech from the Throne. The 1971 New Deal for People Program was indeed a dynamic and a vigorous proposal. By some it was thought to be impossible and by those same few, mostly those who sit to your left. Mr. Speaker, they wish it were still impossible.

Saskatchewan people were challenged by this imaginative program and by the scope and potential which it offered to the people of Saskatchewan. They entrusted it to a government which they knew would carry it out and that trust is, with each new legislative session, being justified. Therefore, it is indeed a pleasure to begin the third of four successive chapters towards fulfilment and the ultimate completion of that commitment to bring about a New Deal in Saskatchewan and this Throne Speech is the beginning of the third chapter.

SOME HON. MEMBERS: Hear, hear!

MR. BOWERMAN: — I want to congratulate the mover and the seconder for a job well done and I want particularly to express my appreciation for the efforts of the seconder, who took the time to research and to inform himself on the New Deal in northern Saskatchewan. I would commend this challenging study to many others in the Legislature and particularly to those in the Opposition.

Mr. Speaker, before I move into the main thrust of my remarks this afternoon I should like to mention my constituents. I want to thank them for being the source of much encouragement and support to Mrs. Bowerman, our family and myself. Shellbrook is a typical rural Saskatchewan seat and is one of the first that was named in this Legislature many years ago.

Now that the Independent Boundaries Commission has unravelled the Liberal gerrymandering of the 1960s the historical Shellbrook constituency will lose many of its life-long members to the Redberry and Turtleford constituencies. However, Shellbrook will be renewed and strengthened by new additions from the former Prince Albert East and Cumberland constituencies.

I want to express my appreciation for their continued confidence and support.

Mr. Speaker, before going further, on Friday last the Leader of the Opposition rose before the Orders of the Day and tried to make some cheap political mileage, by posing as an ally of the protesters in this Legislature. He asked if the Government were going to consider the request of the protesters by allocating some forest resources to them. Mr. Speaker, this political head of that little band of Liberal renegades who sit to your left, is the very group who perpetrated one of the greatest resource give aways on Saskatchewan people that this province has ever known.

SOME HON. MEMBERS: Hear, hear!

MR. BOWERMAN: — I want to spend a few minutes pointing out once again to Saskatchewan people and reminding Liberals everywhere the absolute disaster of their government's policy for managing Saskatchewan forest resources. These champions of the private enterprise system, these modern-day Jesse James's who steal from the public and give to their friends. Let's just for one moment look, Mr. Member from Milestone (Mr. MacDonald) at the Simpson Timber Agreement.

Twenty-two thousand acres, Mr. Speaker, is an area on the east side of our province which is 100 miles wide, 200 miles long, going from No. 49 Highway in the south to north of the Churchill River. An area which has an annual allowable softwood forest resource of about 650,000 cords, was virtually given to the Simpson stud mill operation at Hudson Bay to produce 200,000 cords of wood annually.

Mr. Speaker, we gave away 22,000 square miles of the prime forest of Saskatchewan for an estimated annual allowable cut of 650,000 cords of softwood until the turn of the century, until the year 2,000, to a foreign corporation presently utilizing 200,000 cords of that 650,000 available. But we nailed down the other 450,000 cords so that no one else could get it either. That's what they did, Mr. Speaker.

I should like the Leader of the Opposition or whoever stands and follows me in this debate to tell us the real reasons why it was necessary to give away that much of our forest, to one particular corporation.

Let's look at the Prince Albert Pulp Company lease. The Member from down in the southeast corner wants to know about the Prince Albert Pulp Company lease. Eighteen thousand square miles of forest resources, an annual cut of some 700,000 cords of softwood and another 350,000 cords of hardwood, or about an annual cut of one million cords annually. We turned over this total area to another foreign corporation to do with as they wished and in the use of these forest resources they harvest only half of the amount that is allocated on an annual allowable basis. Mr. Speaker, I should like the Members opposite who follow me in this debate to stand and tell us the reasons why it was necessary to give the Prince Albert Pulp Company a commitment of that kind. After deals of this kind, Mr. Steuart would like to pretend that he is the friend of Saskatchewan Native Wood Producers Co-op. Mr. Speaker, Liberal action speaks louder than their pretensions.

Mr. Speaker, despite many attempts by certain politically motivated elements in our society the Department of Natural Resources, the Department of Northern Saskatchewan and the Human Resources Agency are meeting the expectations of the public of Saskatchewan. The majority credit must go to the dedicated employees within these Departments, who, despite a number of rather insincere and vicious attacks on them personally and on the tasks which they are performing, are doing a tremendous job, and I want to thank them for their continued dedication to that job.

SOME HON. MEMBERS: Hear, hear!

MR. BOWERMAN: — Many of them have given far more of themselves than normal dedication and duty require. Mr. Speaker, having once been a long time employee of the Department of Natural Resources, perhaps I have somewhat of a prejudice for that Department. I have always regarded it as one of the better Departments in Government.

Their record of performance and degree of public respect speaks for itself and later during this Session I shall have much more to say on the activities present and future in that Department. Mr. Speaker, I am sure that the Members in the Opposition will wish now that I should turn my remarks to deal with the Department of Northern Saskatchewan.

Over the past number of months, this Department has been criticized and condemned by the Liberal opportunists; by those social cop outs; by the Wafflers; by the skeptics and by the ill-informed. But nothing from true native northerners living in northern Saskatchewan that do not have an axe to grind on one of those membership lists that I have mentioned. Mr. Speaker, not the Mathius Maurice from Patuanak; not the J. B. Sandypoint from the Churchill River; no, not the Louis Bennonie from Wollaston Lake; no one in the Province of Saskatchewan has heard criticism from these people. These people while they don't fully understand and don't fully appreciate perhaps all of the things that are being done, nevertheless see the potential that this Department has for solving some of the problems that they have lived with for many, many years.

The approach of the critics and their attitude are indeed difficult to comprehend but once you consider the motives behind their critical stand, one can recognize that what they are attempting to do is to detract from their own deplorable record and lack of solutions or alternatives.

SOME HON. MEMBERS: Hear, hear!

MR. BOWERMAN: — The Member from Prince Albert West (Mr. Steuart) says the first thing a Liberal Government would do if it ever was again elected in this province would be to abolish DNS. That sounds like the same kind of program which plagued the North from 1964-1971, a barren do-nothing program for seven years. But Mr. Steuart admits he really doesn't know what he is talking about. Not only is that my opinion but it is also shared by the Leader-Post reporter who covered the Liberal convention and I want to quote from the Leader-Post. November 17th.

MR. MacDONALD: (Milestone) — Is that Mel Hinds?

MR. BOWERMAN: — No, it is from Ed Olson, in fact.

As full of thunder as Mr. Steuart's speech was, it took second place to the unintended irony that arose from his comments. The Department of Northern Saskatchewan was no good. Bowerman has the instincts of a dictator, and yet Mr. Steuart has tacitly admitted he didn't know what he was talking about when he earlier announced he would lead a group of northern Liberal MLAs to the North to find out what the situation really was.

Mr. Speaker, the Member from Prince Albert West has a flair for being spectacular, however, the unfortunate aspect of this kind of behavior is that innocent northern people continue to suffer the consequences of unsolicited public exposure for political expediency.

True to form, Mr. Steuart was on province-wide radio last month attempting to paint a picture of doom and gloom for the Department of the North. The next day we had the big headlines in the Press — “Liberals to Investigate Government in North”. What did Fr. Steuart say? I quote him from the Star-Phoenix.

Mr. Steuart said that the Liberal MLAs will walk into every Government building to investigate the DNS on their northern trip which will take place within two or three weeks. The only way that they will be stopped is by physical force. He said that he is demanding the right to investigate every aspect of DNS operations, not as a Liberal, but as an elected representative of the people of Saskatchewan.

Mr. Speaker, did the Member from Prince Albert West go to the North, did he go to the North with his hand picked truth squad to determine the facts? No way! Did those who did go carry out any extensive investigation to substantiate or disprove their theory or allegations? I suggest that they did not. In fact their big investigation consisted of a 48-hour whirlwind tour of prairie-born MLAs, without Mr. Steuart, and when they came back they ran to their leader confident that the worst problems had been identified, although they had no solutions, Mr. Speaker, and then the Leader of the Opposition called for a Legislative investigation.

It strikes me a bit strange that they should be so insistent that an investigation is warranted when one considers the kind of trip which they made, looking only for the worst, Mr. Speaker, and having only inference, innuendo and rumors, without one substantial fact to report. This is another evidence of the Liberal credibility gap.

SOME HON. MEMBERS: Hear, hear!

MR. BOWERMAN: — Whom did they consult in the North, Mr. Speaker? When they returned to Regina they told the news media the native people were crying out to be helped. From that assertion from the Member from Moosomin (Mr. Gardner), it is fair to assume they talked with native people, but whom did they talk to in Stanley?

Stanley is an isolated Métis and Treaty Indian community on the Churchill River. They were in the community of Stanley for less than one hour- and they talked with the priest, they talked to a member of the RCMP and they talked with a Department of Northern Saskatchewan employee by the name of Lynn Steuart, who is the daughter of the Member from Prince Albert West.

SOME HON. MEMBERS: Hear, hear!

MR. BOWERMAN: — Mr. Speaker, I am convinced that the . . .

MR. WEATHERALD: (Cannington) — Mr. Speaker, on a Point of Order. We were not in Stanley whatsoever and we didn't talk to Miss Steuart.

MR. SPEAKER: — That is a Point of Privilege.

o

MR. BOWERMAN: — That is typical of the level of understanding of the Member from the southeast. Didn't even know where he was.

SOME HON. MEMBERS: Hear, hear!

MR. BOWERMAN: — And, Mr. Speaker, furthermore he doesn't know where he is.

SOME HON. MEMBERS: Hear, hear!

MR. BOWERMAN: — Mr. Speaker, despite the lack of positive reporting, of much of the innuendo and half-truths that have existed, the Department of Northern Saskatchewan is realizing the goals which were set by this Government when it made the commitment to establish this new program for the North. Liberals don't like being reminded that when they sat on this side of the House that they had the opportunity to do something for the people of the North, but they decided that the task was too great and they were content to do nothing, with the hope that the North would go away. Much of the criticism we receive today follows as a result of those seven do-nothing years.

SOME HON. MEMBERS: Hear, hear!

MR. BOWERMAN: — Mr. Speaker, the single agency concept for the people of northern Saskatchewan is not new. The Liberals keep trying to convince us that we are moving too fast. They are saying that this whole matter should be studied in more detail before we embark on such a comprehensive social and economic program.

Mr. Speaker, the single agency concept was sparked back in 1939 by the former CCF Government. From 1964 to 1971 the Liberal Task Force on Northern Saskatchewan was established and recommendations were forwarded to the former Thatcher-Steuart Government. And what did they do with the recommendations? High on the list they recommended, and I want to quote from the general recommendations section of that Task Force Report. Item No. 3 and I quote:

Legislation should be introduced to designate northern Saskatchewan as an area of special concern to the Government of the province and deserving of special programming.

Mr. Speaker, from their own Task Force Report, they recommended a single agency approach. But the Liberals did not want any part of any program which would improve the economic and social well-being of northern residents. They didn't want to risk their political future. In fact, their attitude is documented in a marginal notation written beside the single agency recommendation. The feelings of the Liberal Government of the

day was that it was “too early” — “too soon” to do something. For over 200 years, the people of northern Saskatchewan were living in a state of poverty and despair and yet Liberals still thought the time had not arrived to do something.

The New Democratic Party views things differently, Mr. Speaker. This Party has a history of breaking new ground and has a history of doing things based on social and economic need rather than on a political expediency. For decades the people of northern Saskatchewan labored under, what may be termed, the ‘Colonial system’ whereby they had little or no input into the types of programs and policies which were brought forward.

It was this Government which took the first major step in eliminating this problem and at the same time provided meaningful consultation and decision-making at the local level.

In May of this year, Mr. Speaker, northern delegates met in La Ronge to discuss and approve the legislation for a northern municipal council. Boundary recommendations for the five northern municipal council divisions were received and approved. In the early fall the election was organized and on October 5th, the first Northern Municipal Council was elected. Thirty-one candidates contested the five positions and of those 31, 28 were of native ancestry.

The role of community authorities is being expanded as well. Five area co-ordinators have been appointed, Mr. Speaker, four of the five new positions were filled by northern native people. In December, meetings are being held in Cole Bay on Canoe Lake, Jans Bay, Doré Lake and Michelle village, to establish local governments in those points.

As we go down the list let’s take a look at northern school boards. We are recommending that these positions be filled by election rather than by an appointment of government. Northern people are enthused with this change, Mr. Speaker. As an example, at Ile-a-La-Crosse, as the Member for Meadow Lake (Mr. Coupland) referred to in his remarks, at Ile-a-La-Crosse 21 people were nominated to contest seven local school board positions in an election which was just concluded last week. The number of teachers within the system has been increased by 15. The number of teacher aides has been increased by 8, all of whom are local native people and the number of councillors has been increased from two to four. Superintendents and consultants have been moved into the North and are now residents of Buffalo Narrows and La Ronge. Provincial grants to the northern school board was increased by more than \$400,000 last year. The Department is now discussing with northern people the prospect of enabling the establishment of two elected regional boards to replace the appointed school boards. This proposal is being discussed in 27 communities at the present time.

As I mentioned earlier interest and participation is tremendous with 21 people nominated for the Ile-a-La-Crosse school board election which was held one week ago last Wednesday. Mr. Speaker, I challenge almost any school unit board in this province to have 21 nominees in place for an election to a school board.

I want to read a little story from the Northern News, which is a news bulletin put out by the Department to aid in the communications of northern Saskatchewan. It had to do with a new school at St. George's Hill. This is on the south shores of Peter Pond Lake.

The settlement of St. George's Hill near Dillon has established a school serving 30 students from about ten families. The school has given a new sense of stability to the community and is an indication of what can be accomplished when people work together and co-operate. Until this year all students had to travel six miles to Dillon to attend classes and the attendance rate was very poor. The problems of getting back and forth by boat and ski-doo made attendance difficult for the St. George's Hill youngsters. Residents of St. George's Hill got together and planned the one-room school which they proceeded to build themselves. A cabin was renovated for use as a teacherage and even tables and chairs were built locally. Some salary assistance and building materials were provided by the Northern School Board. About ten men were employed on the project which also involved volunteer labor. Coleman lanterns and heaters were added and the school was ready for use. The School Board recruited an instructor, Jack Grover, who met with the community and became the settlement's first resident teacher.

Mr. Speaker, a story of success in northern Saskatchewan which has not been heard over the years of its history in developing for the people of northern Saskatchewan a pride in the accomplishments which they have put themselves to the task to accomplish.

Liberals don't like talking about community involvement because they don't believe in it. But for the record I want to continue, Mr. Speaker. Adult education committees are being established in the North. Local welfare committees are being established and have been set up in Sandy Bay, Green Lake, Beauval, Stoney Rapids, Cumberland House, at La Ronge and at Camsell Portage, and welfare committees are also being organized in three other communities.

Probation officer staff is increased from one to four. Child welfare workers have been increased from five to seven, and the new workers are now located in Buffalo Narrows and Green Lake. A child welfare centre is being established at Sandy Bay.

Ten supernumerary positions have been converted to permanent social service positions and all of these, Mr. Speaker, are northern native residents.

Adult education and training courses are being expanded, with 15 different skill training courses now being offered for the first time to the natives of the North. In addition, five mobile training units are in the North, providing service and training for these people.

Mr. Speaker, for a Department that, according to the Liberal soothsayers, isn't doing anything positive in the North, a lot seems to be getting done.

SOME HON. MEMBERS: Hear, hear!

MR. BOWERMAN: — The Liberal excursion into the North also said that there was a definite lack of any positive economic development going on.

My colleague from Watrous did an excellent job of listing the Liberal economic development record over their seven years in the Government, and not surprisingly, it didn't take him very long to do it.

In the short time since the Department established the economic development fund, I am pleased with what has been done to date and I am committed to further improving the record in the future.

This past summer, an initial development fund of \$500,000 was established and it is anticipated that this fund will be expanded in the Budget address. At that time if you refer to the records of the House, Mr. Speaker, you will find that Liberals criticized the \$500,000 as being not enough money and they joked and they laughed about the fact that \$500,000 in the North was a New Democratic Party economic development program. But then you hear the comments of the Leader of the Opposition today, when he says that we are plowing in too much of Saskatchewan's financial resources into the North and he criticizes us for economic development in the North.

The Member from Rosthern said following his trip to the North, and I quote him:

The few grants that have been provided have resulted in failure.

I am sure that the people who have for the first time been given the incentive to establish their own small businesses will not be very pleased to know the Member from Rosthern and the Liberal Party think they are failures. I don't share that type of insincerity, Mr. Speaker.

In the few short months that this fund has been available, let's look at what has happened. I have here a list of the number of loans and grants which have been made to northern operations. I find that their woodcutting operation for a total loan and grant of 130,000, mostly made up of one at Beauval and one at Portage La Loche, employing up to 130 people. Tourist outfitting — three of them for a total of \$32,600. Cabin and boat rental operations — two of them for a total of \$137,000, eight people employed. Recreation — three, \$25,000 with the loans and grants, eight people employed. I can add to the list, a general store operation, a garage operation, boat building operation, taxi operation, a launderette, a commercial trucking, a commercial trapping and fishing operation. A total of \$355,136 in loans and grants under the economic development program, employing 181 new people in northern Saskatchewan.

SOME HON. MEMBERS: Hear, hear!

MR. BOWERMAN: — We have an amount remaining in this economic development fund of \$144,000. we have 56 loan applications pending for a total up to another half a million dollars.

Mr. Speaker, we will be looking forward to the Budget address in which there has been some indication that we will be receiving some additional funds in this area.

I want to ask the question why Davy's travelling circus didn't visit Beauval where the unemployment rate is virtually at this time at zero.

MR. WEATHERALD: — We did.

MR. BOWERMAN: — You did. Why didn't you make some comments with respect to the operation at Beauval. Oh, he said it was a good operation. Today I heard him say it. Did you make the same comments to the Press? This operation, Mr. Speaker, was initially expected to generate 23 full time jobs but there are today from between 90 to 120 full time employees generating a payroll of \$10,000 to \$12,000 a week. I want the Member for Meadow Lake to ask the Chamber of Commerce in Meadow Lake whether they agree with this project and whether they think it is viable, a potentially viable income source for those people in Beauval.

These people are not frustrated. This is what the Member from Cannington had to say to the Press about Beauval and about his visit to the west side. He said, "The people were frustrated, they were desperate, they found DNS overbearing." But I suggest to you, Mr. Speaker, the people at Beauval do not find that their activities are frustrating. That they are not desperate and that they do not find DNS overbearing.

Liberals opposite criticize our northern housing program and again it is understandable that they should criticize in an attempt to draw a smokescreen over their pitiful housing program when they were in power.

SOME HON. MEMBERS: Hear, hear!

MR. BOWERMAN: — An average annual commitment of 35 measly homes per year, in the seven years that you people were in Government. Thirty-five houses per year. No basements, built on a cement foundation, built without sufficient — yes, without sufficient room, and without sufficient ventilation, therefore the houses would become over heated and begin to have frost coming through under the inside of the homes.

Over the next five years 625 new homes will be built for northern residents. This is an average of 125 houses per year. That represents a 300 per cent increase in housing starts compared with any year the Liberals were in power.

SOME HON. MEMBERS: Hear, hear!

MR. BOWERMAN: — Mr. Speaker, that may not be enough houses to meet the demand but I suggest to you that that is as much as we can foresee being our ability to construct, using northern native people as the constructors of those homes.

Mr. Sneaker, I should like now to refer to the staff housing in La Ronge, this much maligned and misrepresented program in northern Saskatchewan.

Liberals and other lesser political critics have attempted to portray that for La Ronge to be the benefactor of government decentralization to the tune of 100 new homes, suites or other housing accommodations for employees is somehow a disaster to be shunned by any and all Saskatchewan towns.

Tell me of any small urban centre or city in Saskatchewan that would not welcome government decentralization with not 100, with not 50, but with even five new homes and occupants. And I suggest to you, Mr. Speaker, that this kind of development is a boon to northern Saskatchewan, in particular — La Ronge.

SOME HON. MEMBERS: Hear, hear!

MR. BOWERMAN: — This Government's commitment to decentralize the Department necessitated action on a housing program for staff members who were to be located in La Ronge. Mr. Speaker, there were two alternatives based on the immediate need we had for 87 housing units.

The first alternative was that we could have launched a capital expansion program through the Department of Government Services with open tenders for construction, which would have attracted bids from normal southern home construction contractors and the Government would have owned those homes. Or, Mr. Speaker, we could have taken the second alternative. We could invite northern residents to get involved in this program by making it possible by a northern group or an individual to construct the various units privately and then to lease his or their units to the Government.

It was our choice that we took the latter method. After making that choice, Mr. Speaker, invitations were extended to a number of people who had expressed an interest in building private apartments and houses and subsequently leasing them to our Department. We extended invitations to all those who had expressed an interest in this venture. And between the dates of February 12th and February 21st, we sent out invitations to eight different and various people, particularly those living in northern Saskatchewan. February 12th we sent an invitation to Delta holdings in La Ronge. On the 13th, Romeo Souchette, from Saskatoon, a representative from Nelson Homes; Jim Moore, Prince Albert and La Ronge; Len Lusk from La Ronge, Ben Tralenburg, general manager from the Hudson's Bay Company in La Ronge; Harold Duncan, Mobile Homes in Prince Albert; Bill Ryhorchuk from La Ronge; and Vic Hafichuk from Prince Albert who is the manager of 70's Mobile Homes, Canada Limited. And on March the 19th, Mr. Speaker, Scheuer Construction of Saskatoon was sent an invitation as well.

As a result of the invitations to nine firms or individuals, three bids were received.

Delta Holdings offered to provide for all the Department's needs — that was up to 87 units.

Mr. Moore offered to provide 48 — one and two bedroom suites only. Scheuer Construction offered to provide 30 houses only. And the offers for the rental were as follows, Mr. Speaker: One bedroom apartments: Delta Holdings — \$2.95 per square foot or \$156 per month; Moore: \$4.46 per square foot — \$200 per month or a difference of \$1.51 per square or \$44 a

month between the one bedroom suites.

Two bedroom apartments: Delta — \$2.71 per square foot or \$219 per month; Moore — \$3.79 per square foot or \$230 per month, a difference of \$1.08 per square foot or \$11 per month.

Housing units: Scheuer Construction: Scheuer Construction's bid was to build houses and rent them to the Government, houses of 1,074 square feet at \$270 per month. Delta offered to build homes and rent them to the Government — 1,076 square feet for \$256 per month. A difference of \$168 per year per house or \$5,040 per year for 30 houses.

In each case, Mr. Speaker, Delta was the low bidder. We entered into an agreement with Delta Holdings to lease 30 houses for 10 years and a minimum of 65 per cent of the apartment units for 12 years, at the rates indicated in the bids.

I reiterate once again, the fact that as Delta Holdings was the low bidder in each instance that is the reason we have an agreement with them for the rental space for our housing accommodation.

SOME HON. MEMBERS: Hear, hear!

MR. BOWERMAN: — Some people in the public and particularly those Members opposite will be saddened to hear the truth about it. I trust that when they leave here they will be able to use the correct facts in their conversations with the public of Saskatchewan.

Some will say that we got cheap housing, in fact the words of the Leader of the Opposition was that it was 'shoddy construction'. Mr. Steuart used the word shoddy construction as being the kind of construction methods used in the housing at La Ronge. Other words used were, 'rake-off', 'pork barrel tactics', 'under the table deals', these were the kinds of words referring to the operations in La Ronge in respect to the housing.

Mr. Speaker, we had an independent appraisal done by a Regina realtor of the private housing accommodations of Delta Holdings which the Department of Northern Saskatchewan has an agreement to rent.

We were interested — I am glad that the Leader of the Opposition has returned — we were interested in the standard of construction and the relativity of the rental rates for which we had signed 10 and 12 year agreements.

May I quote the independent appraisal of the Regina realtor:

MR. STEUART: — Who was it?

MR. BOWERMAN: — Can't you tell by the color of the paper? Frances Olson Real Estate, Regina. Let me quote from a letter dated November 16, 1973:

With regard to new construction by Delta Holdings Limited we inspected both the houses and the

apartment blocks from the standpoint of building standards and quality. These units were built with quality materials and to standards equal to first class housing in any other major cities.

SOME HON. MEMBERS: Hear, hear!

MR. BOWERMAN: — Mr. Speaker, in addition they filed with us a report with respect to the rental of these facilities. I want to quote again from that report on Delta Holdings new housing project:

Our impression and professional opinion of the general type of construction and finishing of these units after a thorough inspection of all facets of the project to the interior decorating was a favorable one. We have enclosed a brochure from Beaver Homes describing the materials incorporated in their package which Delta have used. It is on a par with our custom building Castle Homes and superior to the project homes presently being constructed in Regina.

SOME HON. MEMBERS: Hear, hear!

MR. BOWERMAN: — With respect to the 24 suite, 2 apartment, 3 storey walk-up apartments in La Ronge, I want to quote again the comments of the independent realtor:

Our inspection of the two apartment blocks still under construction was also good. The apartments are very spacious with many luxury features such as plush carpets in every room including the bath, molded tub units and vanities. And they are far more spacious than the comparable suites we have listed in our southern cities.

Mr. Speaker, hear this. This is an independent appraisal of the kind of facilities that are being constructed in La Ronge for which the Department has an agreement to rent. And may I suggest to you that the rental which was suggested by the independent realtor suggests rental for the houses of one per cent of the market value which approximates \$25,000. If the Leader of the Opposition had been in his seat a few moments ago, you will remember that the houses which will be rented on the basis of the agreement will be rented to the Government or to the Department of Northern Saskatchewan at \$256 a month.

Mr. Speaker, again with respect to the rental recommended in the independent appraisal with regard to the apartment blocks, a minimum of \$190 a month has been recommended. And if the Member had been in his seat a few moments ago, he would have realized that these kinds of rates were indeed relative to the rates that we have made agreement to pay in the years ahead.

Mr. Speaker, I do not fear from any investigation. The Department of Northern Saskatchewan doesn't fear an investigation from any source. Nor does this Government need to fear any investigation of its activities in northern Saskatchewan. But to have been criticized by people like those which were in power from 1964 to 1971, and by an Opposition who themselves

have been unable to lay anything credible in terms of constructive criticism before this Legislature or before the public, is evidence of their complete insincerity and pure political motivation. Mr. Speaker, northern Saskatchewan and its people deserve the best that this province has to offer. I wish to commend this Government for having taken the initiative and having extended that initiative in this Throne Speech to do exactly that. Mr. Speaker, I support the motion.

SOME HON. MEMBERS: Hear, hear!

HON. R. ROMANOW: (Attorney General) — It gives me a great deal of pleasure to enter this debate, Mr. Speaker, the last day of the debate on the Speech from the Throne. May I at the outset congratulate the mover and the seconder, the Member from Saltcoats (Mr. Kaeding) and the Member for Watrous (Mr. Cody) for a job, acknowledged by all Members or, all sides of the House, to be a very excellent job indeed, one of the best in moving it.

My congratulations also to the newly elected Member from Regina Lakeview (Mr. Malone).

Mr. Speaker, we have just finished hearing a 30-minute to 40-minute defence and explanation of the Department of Northern Saskatchewan run by its very able Minister, Ted Bowerman.

SOME HON. MEMBERS: Hear, hear!

MR. ROMANOW: — Mr. Speaker, the Minister of Northern Saskatchewan has taken on probably one of the most difficult tasks that this new Government in its short two and one-half years has had to give to any Minister in any portfolio. He has carried out that task with foresight and wisdom and courage to tackle the long-standing problems of years and years in northern Saskatchewan. We are trying to come to grips here with social and economic problems which weren't created four years ago or ten years ago or fifteen years ago, but have been there for decades. Problems that have been ignored by the people of the Province of Saskatchewan regardless of political party in the past. Now in 1971 with the election of the new government, we decided to do something about changing that neglect of the North. We didn't tell the people of Saskatchewan that there would be solutions over night. No one told the people of Saskatchewan that they would get out of the economic doldrums and the social miseries of northern Saskatchewan in two and one-half years. No one made those promises. But we did promise to the people of Saskatchewan and to the northern residents of this province that we would do our best to reverse this trend of economic and social backwardness that has been happening to them, to get them back on the equal standard of living that exists for the rest of the province, for the rest of the people of the Province of Saskatchewan.

SOME HON. MEMBERS: Hear, hear!

MR. ROMANOW: — We set an ideal, an objective for the improvement of all people, Métis and Indian and white northerners. We set an objective for all people of the Province of Saskatchewan to rally behind.

What have we seen instead by the Members opposite? We have seen the Liberal Party revert again, to its traditional position of political criticism, political sniping, muckraking, innuendoes, half-truths and accusations because they did not have the courage to change something in the North. They don't have the courage to tackle this idea and this objective. Mr. Speaker, Members opposite have called for an investigation of the Department of Northern Saskatchewan. As the Minister of Northern Saskatchewan says, and I want to support him, no one on this side of the House is afraid of a judicial investigation. But I will tell you something, Mr. Speaker. The taxpayers of this province are fed up with the ideas of a judicial investigation that the Liberals are bound and determined to turn into a political circus, as they have been doing throughout northern Saskatchewan.

Mr. Speaker, the Liberals have been irresponsible with respect to the Department of Northern Saskatchewan. They have embarked on a highly vicious attack. First of all, this so-called trip to investigate the Department that the Minister of Northern Saskatchewan talked about. We hear in this Legislature about the arrogance, so-called of this Government. I want to tell you, Mr. Speaker, that there was no more arrogant a government, no more arrogant a Minister than the present Leader of the Opposition when he was sitting on this side. I want to tell you also, Mr. Speaker, that his arrogance still maintains itself today because when he said he was going up to northern Saskatchewan nothing was going to stand in his way. He was going to use physical violence. He was going to push around civil servants. He was going to break down doors, in arrogance, Mr. Speaker.

We saw in question period today, the arrogance of the old Liberal Party and the old Liberal Leader riding at the highest level when he just stood on his feet contrary to your demands, stood on his feet denying the Member from Saskatoon-University a fair opportunity to be heard. This is the Member who gets up and says, now, that the activities of the Department of Northern Saskatchewan have to be investigated. So he sends those experts of the North. He sends the northern Member from Cannington, just a few miles north of the United States border. He sends the northern expert from Moosomin, just another few miles north of the United States border. Then he really gets up into the North. He sends the Member from — is it Athabasca or Rosthern I am not quite sure about those two because they are sort of — I hope the Member from Rosthern doesn't take offense but I think there is some political partner swapping going on. But in any event he sends the Member from Rosthern to take a look at the Department of Northern Saskatchewan. They come back after 48 hours and try to tell the people of the Province of Saskatchewan that this is a proper investigation. Mr. Speaker, I think that that type of conduct has been adequately answered by the Minister of Northern Saskatchewan today. I don't think anyone in the Province of Saskatchewan is going to be fooled by that type of political buffoonery by the Members opposite. Not one iota. This is not 1964 when bluster and bluff by the Liberals could carry the day for a few years. This is 1973 where people decide issues on rational arguments before them.

Now, Mr. Speaker, I think the answer can best be summed up by people who live and work in the North and work with the

Department of the North. November 30th, finally DNS employees couldn't take the continual sniping by the Liberal Members opposite. The Star-Phoenix article of November 30th I think covers this very accurately.

A group of Department of Northern Saskatchewan social workers say they are tired of being used as a political football by the Métis Society and the Liberal Opposition.

This is about this investigation. The statement calls the Liberal MLAs' request for a judicial enquiry into the Department as being hypocritical. It states one Member of the Liberals investigating the North told the people, northern people did not want the same things as southern residents because, this is a Liberal speaking, "He didn't even know what color television is."

This same individual now states he has talked to the people of the area and the statement in the Saskatoon Star-Phoenix says:

Now he knows their wishes, that he knows their demands, now he asks for a judicial enquiry in DNS.

Mr. Speaker, these workers, these people who live in the North described it accurately when they said in the Star-Phoenix:

This appears to us as being nothing but sheer hypocrisy. Everybody agrees with that.

SOME HON. MEMBERS: Hear, hear!

MR. ROMANOW: — Mr. Speaker, I say to the Leader of the Opposition and to all the Liberals opposite, stop your bickering. I say to the Liberal opposite that your credibility is fast sinking. People now don't believe you because you have no alternatives.

MR. C.P. MacDONALD: — What about Lakeview?

MR. ROMANOW: — Well, they won Lakeview, yes, Mr. Speaker, they won Lakeview, on less than 65 per cent of the popular vote. They won Lakeview, a seat that they have never ever lost. Mr. Speaker, they won Lakeview on the basis of boundary lines that were drawn by the Member for Milestone and the Leader of the Opposition and the Member for Athabasca.

SOME HON. MEMBERS: Hear, hear!

MR. ROMANOW: — They won Lakeview, Mr. Speaker, on a gerrymandered constituency, make no mistake about that. That was part of their grand scheme in 1971. Oh, the Member from Lakeview wasn't here at the time. He should have been here when the boys were sitting on this side, the then Premier of the day, the Treasurer and the Member for Milestone, the Member for Athabasca, these were the boys who were drawing up the boundaries.

AN HON. MEMBER: — We won every poll!

MR. ROMANOW: — You weren't here. They drew Lakeview purposely, Member for Lakeview, to make sure that a Liberal could get elected.

MR. SPEAKER: — Order, order! I would ask a little less interruption.

MR. ROMANOW: — Mr. Speaker, I was talking a few minutes ago about arrogance of the Liberal Party and here we see another example of arrogance, Mr. Speaker.

SOME HON. MEMBERS: Hear, hear!

MR. ROMANOW: — How many times did you call the Member for Milestone (Mr. MacDonald) to order and he wouldn't follow.

Mr. Speaker, all I want to say to the Liberal Party is to stop your name calling and your yelling and your muck-raking and join us on the highroad of trying to build something new for northern Saskatchewan. We are asking you to join us in the task of changing the economic problems of those people. We are asking you to work hard for solutions for the people to overcome years of indifference and colonialist attitudes by all parties, a neglect of the North. We are asking you to join with the Department of Northern Saskatchewan and this Government in building this great hope for the Province of Saskatchewan as I am sure it will happen.

SOME HON. MEMBERS: Hear, hear!

MR. ROMANOW: — Well, Mr. Speaker, we have been waiting now for one year since the last Speech from the Throne to see if the Liberal Party in this Speech from the Throne had anything new to say, if they had any new ideas, if they had any new policies, rather than their typical negative and gloom and doom approach policies. The wrecking crew to your left, Mr. Speaker, always criticize, always negative, always predict disaster but don't ever produce new alternatives or new ideas. As the Premier says, don't tell me what we are doing wrong. Tell me what you would do better. Liberals can't tell the Province of Saskatchewan what they would do or how they could do it to have it better. No sir. We have been waiting for those new ideas. We are waiting like in the play, "Waiting for Godot", Mr. Speaker. The Liberal Party is just incapable of new ideas.

I looked at the Liberal convention, Mr. Speaker, to see if in fact there was something new coming from the convention. I looked in vain, I see Ed Owen in the Leader-Post describing the convention which was a totally dull convention, he said something like this. I quote:

The speech of Mr. Steuart was an attempt to inject some enthusiasm into what some party officials have admitted was a dull and quiet convention.

There are all sorts of reports about the dull convention, the lack of new ideas, the lack of new policy. Then I kept on reading the newspaper reports. I finally found out, Mr. Speaker, why I think the Liberals haven't been able to think up new ideas for the people of Saskatchewan. Because the Leader of the

Opposition has been worried about this lack of new ideas and policies himself. Finally he found the solution, addressing the convention to this problem he said to his party, “You know boys, I believe this, you sit on your brains, get up and start thinking new ideas.”

Well, Mr. Speaker, here we thought that the Liberals communicated face to face, but they got their anatomy mixed up. Watching some of the Members opposite I would think they would have lots of ideas if they leave their seats. No ideas from the head, no ideas from the seats, no ideas period! That’s the Liberal Party in the Province of Saskatchewan, Mr. Speaker.

SOME HON. MEMBERS: Hear, hear!

MR. ROMANOW: — I guess it was a pretty disastrous convention. George Smellie, the Ottawa reporter, said that Dave Steuart’s oratory, “is virtually the only fire-starter the party has going for it at the moment”. The rest of the convention was quiet and uninspired. Now I don’t know if he said fire-starter or back-firer, but certainly that is the only thing that the Liberals have going for them is Dave Steuart.

This was supposed to be a policy convention, Mr. Speaker. But the Liberals apparently did something new. They handed out ballots to everybody, delegates, visitors, people who happened to walk in, NDPers perhaps, if they showed up. I don’t think any NDPer would be foolish enough to show up at a Liberal convention. Everybody and anybody got a ballot, Mr. Speaker, that’s democracy Liberal style for you. Little wonder that the rapeseed vote is a little bit confused when you get ballots like this. George Smellie writes that even stacks of ballots were left on the Press table for the Press to pick up and to vote on. I knew that the Star-Phoenix and the Leader-Post were almost like the Liberal Party one and one, but handing out ballots, it is almost like the way they hand out Liberal membership cards in the Province of Saskatchewan, Mr. Speaker.

Then they had their Federal patron saint, the Minister of Justice, to give them a sterling speech. The reporter said:

They stood to applaud him when he finished, but what else could they do, they remained standing and applauding long enough to avoid being disrespectful.

You know, Mr. Speaker, we also had some changes at the Liberal convention, some seat changes. I have made some mention of this already. At the convention the Leader of the Opposition told the Member from Meadow Lake (Mr. Coupland) and the Member for Athabasca (Mr. Guy) to leave their ridings and go south young men, go south. Yes south, my friend soon to be defeated MLAs. It might be a little warmer there for you. The climate north gets a bit cold. Would it surprise you, Mr. Speaker? The two Members agreed. They would go south. They would go to seek safer constituencies. Why?

MR. GUY: — Riversdale!

MR. ROMANOW: — Yes, Riversdale, anywhere, safer constituencies south of the line you are running in, Mr. Member for Athabasca.

Why do they seek a safer seat? Because those Members know that if they run in their present seats with the way the DNS is functioning and the programs of the Government, they don't stand a chance come next election.

SOME HON. MEMBERS: Hear, hear!

MR. ROMANOW: — So the Member from Athabasca runs to Rosthern. The Member for Rosthern he may run back to Athabasca. Here is what we have what I call political partner swapping, the joint Members of Athabasca and Rosthern. You know, Mr. Member from Athabasca in the old days — you know this very well — the Liberals used to move electoral boundaries to avoid defeat like they did in Lakeview - now they have to move themselves to avoid defeat.

SOME HON. MEMBERS: Hear, hear!

MR. ROMANOW: — But I can tell you it ain't going to work boys, because your time is up.

MR. GUY: — I'm going to run in Riversdale!

MR. ROMANOW: — Mr. Speaker, I welcome the Member to run in Riversdale.

SOME HON. MEMBERS: Hear, hear!

MR. ROMANOW: — I even invite the Member for Athabasca-Rosthern or is it Rosthern-Athabasca, surrogate Member for Rosthern to run anywhere in Saskatoon in the next election, because he isn't going to get elected anywhere in the Province of Saskatchewan.

Mr. Speaker, about five months ago, the four western provinces and the Federal Government met in Calgary to re-examine western Canada's future role in Confederation. This was the so-called Western Economic Opportunities Conference or WEOC for short. It was billed by the Trudeau Government as a first step to a new national policy. The old national policy, Mr. Speaker, of Sir John A. MacDonald was rooted in a particular vision of an industrialized central Canada with an agricultural and resource hinterland in the West. Mr. Speaker, western Canada is no longer content to being merely a hinterland to serving eastern and central Canada. Oil, potash, technology, new markets in the Pacific Rim, communications, have long ago rendered that old national policy of Sir John A. obsolete, if it ever was relevant. Clearly the time has come for a new national policy as promised at Calgary. To quote the Prime Minister Pierre Elliott Trudeau at Calgary:

What the West now asks of us is not subsidies to survive. It is not a charter to go on its own regardless of the national good. Rather what the West wants is a fair deal, a fair chance to build a West which will be an integral part of a stronger and more progressive part of Canada.

Well, Mr. Speaker, we in Saskatchewan took up that challenge. At the Conference, Saskatchewan proposed fundamental changes as a step toward that fair deal. Firstly, we said there must be a fundamental change to the National Transportation Act, in order to eliminate discriminatory freight rates in the Province of Saskatchewan. Mr. Speaker, Ottawa summarily rejected that proposition out of hand at Calgary.

Secondly we said there must be a fundamental change in federal agriculture policy. There must be a fundamental change that recognizes the need properly to stabilize agricultural income to diversify agriculture, to preserve rural Saskatchewan. Ottawa summarily rejected this stabilization proposal at Calgary.

Apart from a few concessions on banking, the location of some Federal departments, of research centres, the West saw no basic changes in policies at Calgary which could have been the start of this "new West" talked about by the Prime Minister. The Federal Government responded with a series of ad hoc changes to existing programs. In fact, since WEOC, Ottawa's policies have continued to reflect that old national policy of Sir John A. MacDonald. The old national policy which keeps Saskatchewan and the West a hinterland. Discriminatory freight rates keep us as this hinterland serving the eastern parts of Canada. Since Calgary, not only have we not seen any changes for the NTA but since Calgary we have seen freight rates even further increased.

In the field of agriculture the recently announced feed grains policy works against the very interests of Saskatchewan. The new national feed grains policy works against any economic natural advantage we have in the in the province. It works against diversification of western Canadian agriculture. It will only increase instability in the agricultural industry resulting in further depopulation. Now, Mr. Speaker, no one expects that a new national policy can be written in four months or five months. We are not saying that. But what we do expect at the very least is that there will not be a worsening of the condition and the situation as it effects western Canada. We as Canadians, expect that from Ottawa at the very least. But there is no sign that we are going to get at least that very basic minimum. I could give you many examples. Every responsible farm organization, every western province said at Calgary and since Calgary that the new feed grains policy is a body blow to western Canada and western Canadian interest. Why should our speakers, our farmers and our related industry give up our natural economic advantage in feed grain for the interest of eastern Canada? Why should our farmers be asked to give up on the principle of orderly marketing, be asked to give up on the Canadian Wheat Board to satisfy central Canada? Why should our farmers accept the grains stabilization bill which would stabilize perhaps their income, but leave them at the mercy of their suppliers and their increasing costs, again to satisfy central Canada? Why should our farmers and our laborers accept an energy policy which now allows national and multinational corporations to play foot loose and fancy free with our precious non-renewable Saskatchewan resources, again to satisfy central Canada? Why should our shippers and our manufacturers have to pay more to ship their products to market, again to satisfy central Canada? Mr. Speaker, why should we be asked?

The answer is we shouldn't be asked to do these things. Yet, last Tuesday in this House, in this debate, the Leader of the Opposition, the Leader of the Liberal Party opposite stood side by side with the Federal Liberal Government in its defence of central Canada, in its defence of these programs which help central Canada to the detriment of the West. The Leader of the Opposition stoutly defended the feed grains policy. Not once did he speak up to the interests for Saskatchewan farmers, not once did he speak up for the Canadian Wheat Board. He spoke out for the national feed grains policy and he spoke out for eastern and central Canada. The Leader of the Opposition last Tuesday stoutly defended the old Land Stabilization Bill, a Bill which would have left our farmers helpless to increased costs. The Leader of the Opposition last Tuesday criticized the Government for complaining, the fact that we complained about the railways, the CP and the CN increasing their freight rates. Imagine, Mr. Deputy Speaker, in the Saskatchewan Legislature, the Liberal Party standing up for the Canadian Pacific and the Canadian National and criticizing this Government because we dared to take on those two railway companies and criticize them for their freight rate increases. That's what we saw last Tuesday in this House.

Imagine, Mr. Speaker, the Leader of the Opposition being totally silent in this debate, outside this debate, when the Federal Government joined with Central Canada Potash of Toronto and attacked by law suit this province's right to control our own natural resources for our own people in Saskatchewan. The Leader of the Opposition was totally silent on Otto Lang's entry into this law case. The Minister of Justice, may I remind you, Mr. Deputy Speaker, the only federal MP from Saskatchewan supposedly representing the interests of Saskatchewan in the Cabinet, the Leader of the Opposition was totally silent on Mr. Lang's entry into this law case siding with an eastern corporation from Toronto without one bit of notice to us, against regulations passed by his own very government over three years ago. He doesn't speak up for the defence of natural resources for Saskatchewan people. He sides with Central Canada Potash of Toronto. That's what the Leader of the Opposition does. That's what we heard last Tuesday from Liberals in Saskatchewan. A defence of the old national economic policy which seeks to keep Saskatchewan a hinterland for central Canadian corporations.

Mr. Speaker, you know when the energy Bill is debated in this House tomorrow or within the next few days I predict that the Saskatchewan Liberals will once again side with those who would exploit Saskatchewan resources and Saskatchewan people. Mr. Speaker, I never thought that I would see the day when the Saskatchewan Legislature would hear the voices of eastern Canadian corporations, of big business in central Canada and the voice of the Liberal Party on the floor of this House, rather than the interests of Saskatchewan and the western Canadians. Mr. Speaker, what the Liberals have done is to turn their back on the principle of the fair deal. Those are the words of the Prime Minister for the West and by their total defence of Mr. Lang and Mr. Trudeau and the Federal Liberals who put the interest of the Liberal Party at the top of their priorities. I have said it before and I say it again. If there was anybody fooled by the charade of a couple of years ago, that pretence is now over. Liberal parties always stick together. A Federal Liberal is the same as a Saskatchewan Liberal is the

same as a Lang Liberal or a Steuart Liberal, they are Liberals all and the speech Tuesday last proves that they have not the concern of western Canada or Saskatchewan at heart.

Well, Mr. Speaker, Saskatchewan wants a party that places the interests of this province above the interests of any political machine and come the next federal election I think that the Minister of Justice and the Leader of the Opposition and all the Members opposite will learn what Saskatchewan wants very clearly indeed.

Now, Mr. Speaker, some might say that concern for a fair deal for Saskatchewan places confederation in jeopardy. They might say that that is not being Canadian. Well I say that is not so. We on this side and I personally, we are Canadians first, but as a Canadian . . .

MR. McISAAC: — Not lately Roy.

MR. ROMANOW: — . . . I say to the Member from Wilkie, not only do I have a responsibility to my fellow Canadians everywhere but I have some rights in common with Canadians everywhere. I have a right to see rural Saskatchewan live. I have a right to see industries come to Saskatchewan and prosper. I have a right to see young men and women work and live and raise their families in Saskatchewan. I have a right to develop the potential for growth in this western Canadian region as the potential for growth was developed in eastern and central Canada as their rights as Canadians. When you remind me, Mr. Member from Wilkie, about my responsibility as a Canadian, I ask what will you do to help me realize my rights as a Canadian, to realize the full potential, the economic benefits and to eliminate the disadvantages we have been working against. We ask all political parties and all organizations to join with the Government in making those rights a reality and thereby to build an even greater Canada. I say to this House and I say to Mr. Trudeau when someone asks us about WEOC, when they ask us what do we want, I say this: What the West asks for is not subsidies to survive, we do not want a charter to go on our corn regardless of the national good, what we want is a fair deal.

Mr. Speaker, I will be supporting the main motion because that is exactly what the Speech from the Throne does, ensures a fair deal for all of Saskatchewan and Canadian people.

SOME HON. MEMBERS: Hear, hear!

HON. N.E. BYERS: (Minister of Environment) — Mr. Speaker, before I launch into my remarks today I want to congratulate both the Member for Saltcoats (Mr. Kaeding) and the Member for Watrous (Mr. Cody), the mover and seconder to the Address-in-Reply. Their analysis of existing Government programs and their understanding of problems waiting to be tackled, as demonstrated in their speeches, is typical of the daily contribution they offer to the Blakeney Government.

Their performance is typical of the sincere and dedicated manner that they deal with the problems of their constituents and of their constituency. As they are informed, and concerned and articulate spokesmen on a variety of subjects, they can anticipate serving for many years in the public life and service of this province.

SOME HON. MEMBERS: Hear, hear!

MR. BYERS: — Mr. Speaker, I also want to offer my congratulations to the newly elected Member for Lakeview (Mr. Malone). To win a by-election in Saskatchewan is no small undertaking. Now that he has the endorsement of the voters in Lakeview, I invite him to participate fully in the debates and committee work of this House. As a newly elected Member I am certain that all Ministers, in particular, are prepared to assist him so that his constituents and his constituency can derive maximum benefits from all Government programs.

Mr. Speaker, one of the major achievements of this Government is its determined effort to ensure that government is more responsive and more accessible to people. I think it is essential in modern day government that Ministers' offices follow what I often call "an open-door policy". I think that this Government has followed that policy. As we recognize that decisions that affect people will be better decisions if the people for whom the decisions are made have had an opportunity to put in their two-bits worth and are given some responsibility to carry out the decisions. I believe that the majority of Saskatchewan people recognize that the open-door policy based on consultation has resulted in the development of better programs for Saskatchewan under this Government and in ensuring that these programs are available and delivered, particularly to rural Saskatchewan. I think it is fair to say, Mr. Speaker, that since we have become the Government that dozens of delegations have descended monthly upon the offices of Ministers. I want to say that the practice of local governments and individuals and groups, seeking direction and information, as well as seeking assistance and offering advice, so as to launch new Government programs in their communities, because they also desire to improve the quality of life in their communities, is a common daily occurrence. I think that this practice had all but died off under the former government, Mr. Speaker, but it is being revived. I think that Saskatchewan communities are reaping the benefits of that revival.

Mr. Speaker, the appointment of several advisory groups or councils, who are given a free hand to analyze and submit proposals on existing Government programs, is a valuable source of knowledge to any government. This Government has recognized that there is a wealth of talent and ideas to be tapped amongst the specialists and the professions and ordinary people of this province. Our experience is that persons who have been asked to serve on advisory councils are both eager and anxious to share their knowledge and ideas so as to improve the delivery of Government programs. We do not regard the inner sanctums of the civil service or the Cabinet chamber as the sole repository of all wisdom. We regard these advisory councils as a very effective means to obtain views from the public in regard to program development.

Mr. Speaker, the people in rural Saskatchewan appreciate the genuine effort made by this Government to locate Government offices and staff in rural Saskatchewan. The establishment of regional and sub-regional FarmStart offices, as well as the business rep offices in rural Saskatchewan brings the services of these programs to the doorsteps of our farmers and businessmen in this province. The next time that the leader and the

Opposition Members mount an attack on the increased number of civil servants working for this Government, I invite them to do so in a community that is served by a new FarmStart Rep. or a new Business Rep. I invite them to go there and tell the farmers and businessmen that the Liberal Party is opposed to FarmStart Reps. and Business Reps. This Government makes no apologies for hiring Business Reps. and FarmStart Representatives and stationing them out in rural Saskatchewan to assist both young and marginal income farmers and businessmen to expand their earning potential.

Mr. Speaker, to the citizen who is confronted with a problem and baffled as to which Government department or agency can assist him, the hot line is the toll-free connection between his living room and every department of government. The Inquiry Centre, handling between 2,000 and 3,000 calls per month deals with citizens' concerns, that if left unanswered and unsolved would allow feelings of frustration and alienation to develop between the citizen and his government. We regard the hot line, promised and delivered in the New Deal for People, to be an effective and popular system to deal with citizens' concerns.

Now I have outlined only a few methods introduced in recent months to facilitate communications between the citizen and his government. There are many others. The regional Cabinet meetings are both fact-finding missions and forums for ordinary citizens, local governments and local groups to seek solutions to local and regional needs. The introduction of the division system in our two largest cities lays to rest the age old myth that you can't fight city hall. The election of the first local council in northern Saskatchewan this fall will allow our northern people an opportunity to determine their own destiny and plan their own priorities.

Mr. Speaker, this afternoon I should like to spend some time commenting upon the programs and activities of my two Departments, Environment and Co-operatives, particularly within the last year. Mr. Speaker, recently one western based network commentator speaking on national television described environment as the crisis we were worried about before the energy crisis. We are all aware that in today's world of rapid communications there is a plentiful supply of crises for everybody. We appreciate that the media in their unceasing search for reader, listener and viewer attention, must be sensitive to every shift in popular concern. But in this case, Mr. Speaker, I think it is somewhat misleading to depict our energy problem and our environmental problem as something different. The energy problem and the environmental problem are really the same problem.

In recent months the spotlight has merely shifted from one facet of the same danger to another. Regulations and plans and projects for protecting our Saskatchewan environment do not require any massive use of additional energy. We do not need in our province any saw-off between energy and the environment flow. There is no such saw-off conjectured or held in reserve for the future. The answer to our energy problem and our environmental problem is the same answer. Perhaps it is contained in a very old and very wise bit of advice that our forefathers were never allowed to forget, but which too many of us tend to forget today. That advice may be described as 'waste not and want not'. Because nature has provided our generation with energy in abundance, it has allowed us to uncover storehouses of elements which

combined with energy and our trained techniques, has made it possible for most of us to obtain a higher standard of living than any generation has known before.

But nature has not stopped at this point. It has also provided us with its own methods of purifying our air, water and land and of recycling the elements we have torn from the earth. But nature has not given us a licence to over-indulge ourselves at the expense of its energy and raw materials. It has given us no permit to overstrain this purification capacity. Even if we disguise such waste with pretty labels as 'development', or 'growth', or 'opportunity', or 'initiative', it is still waste. We may fool ourselves but we will not fool nature. When we waste, then we will want.

That is one of the reasons why the Department of the Environment has insisted and will continue to insist that before we race madly into any project, public or private, we want to be sure that project is necessary. We want to know all the facts. Not just the glittering facts about how much investment capital will be spent, but also the facts about the long-term social and environmental impact costs as well. Because we intend to protect the resources of the people of Saskatchewan for the people of Saskatchewan and not waste them. We do not want our children to pay tomorrow in order that a favored few may gain today.

Now in addition to the powers and responsibilities that were granted to the Environment Department at its inception, at the last Session of the Legislature, this House gave us authority to request public hearings on major environmental issues. The concept of public hearings on environmental issues is not new. But in all too many cases, Mr. Speaker, such public hearings and the detailed studies needed as a result of concerns expressed at such hearings and subsequent public participation and the implementation of any study recommendation often comes far too late. We are not interested necessarily in studying Saskatchewan's environment after the damage is done and while it is in the process of being damaged.

I want to turn for a minute to our actions with respect to the Qu'Appelle Basin study. When the Qu'Appelle Basin Report was released earlier this year I indicated that our Government was anxious to take early action to implement the major recommendations with respect to improvement of waste treatment facilities in Regina and Moose Jaw, flood protection for communities in the Valley, as well as the control of haphazard development in the Valley. I want to inform the House this afternoon of some actions taken and planned regarding the clean-up of the Qu'Appelle Basin. First I want to pay tribute to the many citizens who participated in the Qu'Appelle Basin study. Let there be no doubt of the extent of public interest in the Qu'Appelle Basin. We received more than 3,000 requests for copies of the Qu'Appelle Basin Study Report as well as requests for 6,000 copies of the special synopsis and questionnaire. I particularly want to thank the media for their comprehensive study of this study at all its stages.

This year several departments and agencies of government have been working up concrete proposals regarding implementation measures. The House can expect to deal with these implementation proposals at this Session. The city of Regina has already

approved over \$3 million towards the estimated cost of recommended tertiary sewage treatment designed to rid its effluent of most of the nutrients which are speeding up the aging process in the downstream lakes. Saskatchewan has already undertaken flood control measures in Lumsden. Concrete proposals for flood control in the Wascana Basin will be before you shortly. Regulations for the control of cottage wastes are in their final stages of preparation. I am informed by my colleagues that road network plans and park expansion plans are well advanced. In the Moose Jaw area steps have already been taken to correct problems caused by industrial waste. The city is now actively co-operating in experiments with the use of effluents for irrigation purposes, a recommended technique which may hopefully reduce the risk of flood-induced pollution from sewage lagoons.

I am also happy to report that the Moose Jaw Armed Forces Base has agreed as recommended to transmit its effluent to Moose Jaw for treatment for discharge, rather than directly discharging upstream from that city. Now we appreciate this act of co-operation by the Federal Government, but we would appreciate it even more, now that the province is ready, now that the municipalities are ready and the people are ready, that the Federal Government would find some appropriate agency by which it could fulfil its part off the tripartite obligation, that Canada, Manitoba and Saskatchewan took on when we worked together on the study and on the implementation proposals.

Mr. Speaker, I should like to turn to another water study that directly affects the jurisdiction of our western neighbors in Alberta that is all ready for implementation. I refer to the problems in the Peace-Athabasca Delta and the water levels of Lake Athabasca created by the unilateral action of B.C. Hydro when they erected the Bennett Dam and virtually cut off downstream flows on the Peace River in 1967. The Peace-Athabasca Delta is one of the largest fresh water deltas in the world and depends on an annual flooding to rejuvenate its plant and animal life. The considerably lower than average water levels existing in the Delta since 1967 have had a very significant effect on the wild life and people in that area. This Delta is the most important waterfowl nesting area in North America. Eighty per cent of the Delta lies within Wood Buffalo National Park, the home of the world's largest herd of free ranging bison. The world's entire wild population of whooping cranes nest in the northern part of the Park. The Delta provides furs and fish for the residents of Fort Chipewyan.

In response to these problems, a federal-provincial task force was established early in 1971 and a study group was set up to assess the situation and to recommend appropriate solutions. The stage was therefore set for a full scale ecological study that extended over two years at a cost of \$1.5 million. This study proposed that a submerged weir be built to re-establish water levels in the Delta and on Lake Athabasca. Now while this dam will be constructed in Alberta, its most direct effects would be felt in Alberta. It does have implications for Saskatchewan. As two-thirds of Lake Athabasca lies within Saskatchewan, any structure, wherever it is constructed, will affect the people in communities such as Camsell Portage, Fond-du-Lac, Stoney Rapids and Uranium City, who depend to a great extent on Lake Athabasca for transportation and food resources. This Government believes that any plan to restore

water levels in the Delta on Lake Athabasca must be designed with the best interests of Saskatchewan people in mind.

Last summer the staff of the Environment Department carried out an assessment of the proposed structure. They looked at the wildlife and the fisheries, recreation, tourism, transportation, mineral resources and mining, flooding problems in the immediate vicinity of Lake Athabasca. I don't want to take the time of the House to report on the details of that assessment. But after a careful assessment, we took the position that Saskatchewan interests were adversely affected. We, therefore, recommended and endorsed the proposed weir that would restore natural water levels in the Delta on Lake Athabasca. I am happy to point out, Mr. Speaker, that Saskatchewan has pledged a fair share of the cost involved to build an underwater weir and other structures within the Peace-Athabasca Delta, even though those remedial measures lie within and will directly affect the waters within Alberta.

At the same time we reiterate our belief that moral and financial responsibility for this irresponsible example of development without environmental concern falls squarely on the shoulders of BC Hydro. We are hopeful that those who can now influence BC Hydro will insist upon it accepting those penalties.

Now, Mr. Speaker, I have covered the Peace-Athabasca situation in some detail because I think it points out some real lessons for governments as environmental managers. It presents a good contrast with the Churchill study. The Bennett Dam was constructed, operations began, before any studies were carried out to determine possible environmental consequences. The environmental studies came after the fact, solutions were proposed after the damage had been done. Now these solutions may not restore the exact conditions as before. Restoration of environmental quality is not as easy as protection. But we are trying to avoid this kind of situation on the Churchill by studying the proposed impacts before any construction is authorized. After the Churchill study we will be in a much better position to determine whether or not construction should be allowed. We will be in a much better position to know whether the residents of the area, in fact, desire and want such a project.

I want to relate to the House some of the other activities of our Department. In the past year we have given considerable emphasis to new programs related to the protection of the Saskatchewan environment. We have experienced some problems in recruiting staff with appropriate training and competence in the discipline of environment protection, but we are gradually solving this problem. Our success in recruiting staff has made it possible to step up our monitoring program. Two new portable air and water pollution laboratories enable us to investigate emergency situations on-the-spot. A permanent system of air quality and water quality monitors is being established. The kind of information needed to identify either deteriorating or improved trends in air or water quality is beginning to flow into our computer. The National Air Surveillance Network now includes 18 permanent stations in larger Saskatchewan communities. In addition, specially missioned inventories have been conducted in six cities. We are conducting water quality surveillance programs on a regular basis. This program is

expanding with special emphasis being placed on the Qu'Appelle System, the North Saskatchewan River and Humboldt Lake.

Mr. Speaker, the co-operation received from over 7,000 beverage vendors in accepting returnable bottles has been most encouraging. However, we have found that consumers returning bottles for a refund have shown a preference for certain outlets. As a result some retailers are accepting more returns than they have sold originally. Therefore, the Government has under active consideration amendments to its policies, which do not necessarily require legislation, designed to establish more equity in this program.

I want to say a few words about air pollution. In connection with air pollution, Mr. Speaker, our Government has acted upon the powers granted by this House at the last session and has established stiff penalties for infractions. These are penalties which cannot be described as mere formalities or as an "inexpensive licence" to pollute. We are now in the process of establishing regulations and additional standards. We are hopeful that these will be ready before the end of the year. But in drawing up these regulations and standards we are constantly aware that the rules of enforcement are very different from the rules of public pressure. Private citizens or organized groups can bring pressure to bear upon their neighbors, on private businessmen, on government, on public agencies without worrying too much about the entrapments and loopholes in the legal process. But governments when called upon to enforce must act upon the basis of regulations that are reasonable, clearly measurable standards and data that can't be challenged. Regulations, standards and data which must withstand any counter action permissible within our court system.

In the meantime, even without these regulations and additional standards we have been getting results. Our mobile lab is monitoring sulphur dioxide levels in an area south of Kisbey where vegetation damage is suspected. We are nearly at the end of a continuous sampling program around the Regina Ipsco Plant. The report will be used as a basis for establishing proper controls on dust emissions from that operation. We've been monitoring and will continue to monitor near the northern petroleum refinery in Kamsack. A similar program outside of Saskatoon's United Chemical Plant shows emissions of sulphur gases. Plant management has been asked to take action necessary to reduce these emissions. Finally, a report on a search for airborne mercury conducted by the federal authority around the Prince Albert Pulp's Chemical Division is now in preparation. In answers to complaints about odors, sampling programs have been conducted around the oil and gas fields of Macklin, Unity, Lloydminster, Frobisher and Kisbey. In general once the pollution problem has been clearly identified we have had good co-operation from the industry in cleaning up the situation.

There has been continuous monitoring around all ten potash mines, all of which have been shown operating within our potash dust fall standards. Following complaints and monitoring, management at Cabri Sodium Sulphate Plant has agreed to install loading operation controls which we believe will prevent large discharges.

This program has strained our resources and our manpower, but constant vigilance is a must. The recent salt fallout

problem in Esterhazy is an example of what can go wrong. Here is a case where surveys showed that at the normal level of production and with corrective equipment operating efficiently standards were being met. Yet a few months later, a substantial increase in production changed the picture entirely. Modifications in the corrective equipment have reduced the fallout. There is an added precaution during the current, heavy production period when we have ordered operations suspended during periods when prevailing winds may concentrate such fallout over the community at the hydro installation.

Mr. Speaker, our Policy Planning and Research Branch, responsible for the final year of the Qu'Appelle Study, has carried on with the task of implementing recommendations that involves co-ordinated action with all other government departments, with the Federal Government and local governments. It has almost completed its work on the Wascana Flood Plain Study. When this report is released we are ready then to carry out an active program of consulting with the public to obtain their views before the implementation of the recommendations of this report.

The Churchill River study finally approved by Ottawa, has required a good deal of attention this past year, particularly before Doctor Walter Kupsch assumed the position of Study Director on August 1, 1973.

Mr. Speaker, permit me to mention a few other programs currently under way.

We are co-ordinating an environmental impact study at Elizabeth Falls. We are compiling an inventory of designated areas and crown lands and their usage. We are compiling an inventory of private, academic and public research activities going on in the province. We are investigating alternative land uses and environmental standards in connection with strip mining, and reclamation in the Estevan area. And we are still awaiting a federal decision for an important area, designated for a comprehensive study, the water-short Souris River Basin. But we are ready, with funds set aside, awaiting a federal decision.

Mr. Speaker, the public of Saskatchewan continues to show a keen interest for information on environmental matters. On the average we are receiving more than 200 requests per month for information and publications. In this connection I want to pay tribute to the teaching profession of the province who have responded magnificently to the call for environmental education. Last spring some 262 teachers, trustees, administrators, students and interested community representatives attended the first four regional environmental education workshops sponsored jointly by the Departments of Education and the Department of the Environment. A report on their recommendations is now available.

But we are particularly grateful to the efforts of the environmental advisory council under the Chairmanship of Doctor Stan Rowe. This fine group of citizens have given enthusiastically of their time and their practical knowledge. They have suggested both short and long term objectives that are both exciting and challenging and we are particularly impressed with their advice that a comprehensive blueprint and policy for Saskatchewan land use be drawn up as quickly as possible.

Mr. Speaker, at the recent Man and Resources Conference in Toronto a serious effort was made to involve grass root citizen participation in environmental protection. Now that is not an easy task, because there has been a traditionally built in resistance on the part of specialists to sharing decision making powers with laymen, a resistance which is not confined to so-called government bureaucrats, but it shows up in private industry and in the academic community as well.

Let there be no mistake, this Government believes in public participation, it will try in all ways and at all times to tear down the walls which now separate the specialist and the citizen. We will continue with a policy of studying the total impact of any proposed project upon the community and upon the environment and we will do everything in our power to ensure that as many citizens as possible, know as much as possible about the advantages and the disadvantages of any proposed project. I have pledged that the objectives of public participation set by the Man and Resources Conference will serve as a blueprint for our Environment Department's efforts here in Saskatchewan. I want to repeat that pledge again here before this House at this time. Let me again assure this House and the citizens of Saskatchewan that no newly discovered by-product of economic wastefulness, such as the much mentioned energy crisis in any way stay our hand or slow down our efforts to preserve and where possible restore Saskatchewan's section of our national and global environment.

I want to turn now to the Department of Co-operatives. Co-operatives in Saskatchewan I think, Mr. Speaker, have developed because of the needs of people and because of sympathetic CCF and NDP governments. This has been accomplished in spite of the depression from 1964 to 1971 under the former Liberal Government which tried to immobilize and stagnate a movement created by and for the people of Saskatchewan. Now co-operatives in this province have been closely identified with provincial growth. They have been a significant force in moulding the history of Saskatchewan, because of their influence on the thinking of participating co-operative members and the effects which co-operatives have had on policies of the people as a whole. And it is perhaps fair to say that no one can understand the history of Saskatchewan without knowing the significance of the co-operative movement. And this our friends opposite learned the hard way, when they tried to curtail co-operatives with the hope that this people's movement would fade away. Contrary to the hatchet men of the Liberal years, Mr. Speaker, co-operatives have been strongly felt in the various segments of the province's economy, chiefly in the agricultural section.

These needs have produced leaders who have not only been outstanding co-operators in their own field, but by their influence and with the support of organizations which they represented have given significant leadership to the entire province. Their influence has often been reflected in policies adopted, yes, even adopted, by the Federal Government, particularly in agriculture, as well as in the consumer and credit field.

The achievements of co-operatives might be classified as to these fields of activity.

1. Marketing and the processing of agricultural products.
2. Consumer co-ops, including wholesale and manufacturing.
3. Credit.
4. Agricultural production.
5. Community services general.

Mr. Speaker, the marketing of agricultural products has been and will continue to be the most important form of co-operative activity in Saskatchewan. From the stand point of the numbers of people affected and of the importance to the province's economy, the marketing of grain is, of course, the most important.

May I, at this time, congratulate the Saskatchewan Wheat Pool in celebrating its fiftieth anniversary. This represents fifty years of co-operative dedication, by farmers with a purpose to rid themselves of the dominance of the grain merchants and the speculators, the Winnipeg Grain Exchange and the railways. By the end of the 1973 season the Pool's business was in excess of \$865 million, over 90 per cent of which represents payments to producers for grain and livestock marketed through the Pool.

Many other areas of co-operative marketing is evident throughout this province. The livestock industry, egg and poultry marketing and in the production and sale of handicrafts.

From the earliest days of settlement on the prairies and particularly in Saskatchewan, farmers felt the need for making savings in the purchase of farm supplies, most of which were manufactured elsewhere. Just last week I attended the opening of a new Co-op Implements Sales and Service Depot in Shaunavon. Gross sales of Co-op implements have more than doubled in the last two years, going from \$9.5 million in 1970 to \$22.1 million in 1972. The amazing fact is during the first eleven months of this year gross sales are at a record \$35 million which is a 70 per cent increase over last year.

Mr. Speaker, other types of consumer co-operatives are flourishing and helping the people of this province to control their economic destiny. We have Federated Co-ops Limited, Co-op Refinery, hundreds of retail co-ops, just to name a few. All because people wanted to have a say how they were going to live.

The Depression of the 1930s resulting in the closing of local branches of chartered banks, sharp restrictions in lending operations by the banks, virtual termination of mortgage lending, the fact that thousands of families were either on relief or in straitened circumstances, together with the unemployment in the city showed that some new form of organization was needed to encourage savings and to provide credit at cost, to those who were not in a position to secure credit from other lending agencies. And thus, in the late 1930s credit unions were introduced in the Province of Saskatchewan.

Today, the credit union movement in Saskatchewan has accumulated a record total of over \$725 million in assets. And this money does not belong to shareholders in Europe, Asia or

the United States, but it belongs to more than 360,000 members here in Saskatchewan and represents an average savings per member of \$1,902. This year membership increased by 17,000 and total assets were up 31 per cent from last year.

Today we also have the Co-op Credit Society which functions as a central bank for member credit unions and co-operatives. We have the Co-operative Trust Company and the Co-operative Insurance Services which provide varied financial services to the people of this province.

There are now more than 300 co-operative associations engaged in various types of agricultural production. Of these about 40 per cent are grazing or pasture co-operatives. Small farmers have found ways to maintain their position by co-operating with their neighbors in forming machinery co-operatives. Fifteen new machinery co-operatives have been organized over the last number of months. With machinery costs running as high as 25 per cent of the total cost of grain production, the establishment of machinery co-operatives probably serves as the single feature of grain farming where costs can actually be cut.

There have been over fifteen new agricultural production co-operatives organized in this province since the beginning of the year. These have included grazing co-operatives, co-operative farms, watershed co-operatives and sheep production co-operatives.

But the provision of certain services to help rural communities to function through the establishment and operation of community facilities on a co-operative basis has been a feature of Saskatchewan co-operative development since the early 1920s. There are now hundreds of these organizations throughout the province, including skating rinks, curling rinks and community halls, community sports grounds and various types of community centres. And while there are service organizations with limited objectives, the fact that the co-operative form of organization is used assists these groups to provide a service at cost and to provide a useful training ground for improved community relations.

Mr. Speaker, we of the Government of Saskatchewan firmly believe that co-operative development is an important part of both the rural and urban life of Saskatchewan. At our recent co-operative conference were representatives of major Saskatchewan co-operatives, five departments of the Government of Saskatchewan, met to discuss the avenues of co-operative development. Premier Blakeney opened the proceedings by stating:

Today it is clear that co-operatives offer us the best defence against ubiquitous takeover of domestic and local enterprises by international multinational corporations.

He went on to say:

Co-operatives provide almost the only way that a province like Saskatchewan can own and continue to own the major economic units that are not in government hands.

Now we recognize that the people of this province possess the desire and the know how to tackle many of their social and

economic problems through co-operative action. Many of the characteristics of contemporary Saskatchewan, Canadian and North American society present us with social, political and economic realities which provide the need for the rise of co-operatives as an alternative to the present system, because, more than ever before, our North American society is dominated by an all-powerful corporate business structure. This corporate power structure has tremendous influence and can affect and control the destiny of national and international economics.

The quality of life for our individuals in our economic and social system is deteriorating. Individuals are constantly manipulated by a complex process of national and international corporate economics which they can neither control nor understand. Cost of living increases, inflationary pressures, fit neatly into this picture of corporate economic domination.

In a very real sense we are alienated from and dominated by the economic system which we, as citizens of the system, ought to control. This is where co-operatives can offer much for the restoration of power and control to the people. By linking economics and business with a social purpose, co-operatives are capable of supplying members with superior benefits through their owner-controlled relationship with their co-operative organizations.

Now we believe that the potential for the organization and development and operation of co-operatives in this province is almost limitless. Our belief is that we as a Government have a responsibility to provide leadership and guidance, the forming and developing of co-operatives in Saskatchewan which is diametrically opposite to what our Liberal friends believe. A good part of our reason for being involved in co-operative development relates to our knowledge that as co-operatives build — Saskatchewan builds.

Now to put our belief into practice we have recently reorganized the Department of Co-ops to place more emphasis on the expansion of new co-operative activity. The four newly organized branches, Research, Information, Information Development and Operations, will foster and hasten the development of a variation of co-operatives throughout the Province of Saskatchewan. A Research Branch will develop new avenues of co-op activity to determine the social economic benefits which such new co-operatives could provide to the people of this province. Our Information Branch will create a new fresh public awareness of the department and of the co-operative movement in general. This branch will be responsible for providing information to other government departments, the media and other agencies, because educating the general public to understand and to visualize the possibilities and the value of co-operative action is the key to potential development. The role and the function of the Information Branch will be critical in promoting the future success of co-operative development within this province.

With the co-operation of the Department of Education, our Information Branch in the last year has assembled a teachers' kit which has been distributed to over 130 Grade 11 and Grade 12 economics teachers in this province. This material will be appraised by a committee consisting of teacher and student representatives from the co-op movement, the Department of

Education and our own Department.

The Development Branch, the former Extension Branch has abandoned its passive role of recent years and will now reach out to acquaint the general public. The staff of this branch are the resource people who will be assisting the public in exploring new areas of co-operative activity. Such fields as production co-ops, day care co-ops, handicraft co-operatives, and other such co-operatives which people feel a just and genuine need for. In addition, the Operations Branch will continue to assist groups in the management of their association and will continue to carry out legislation in regard to inspections and supervision of the co-operative associations and credit unions.

Mr. Speaker, we have rejuvenated the Department of Co-operatives so that we may again provide facilities which we feel are important in encouraging, promoting and assisting the co-operative movement in Saskatchewan. This was denied the people of this province by the unco-operative Members opposite who apparently did not want the people of Saskatchewan to be the owner-user-controllers of their futures.

But, our policy is abundantly clear. In tune with the needs of the people of this province to provide legislation of the type that is necessary for the development of co-ops as quickly as there is a need;

1. to provide information and research services to interested co-operatives,
2. to protect the vested interests of the members of the co-operative movement,
3. to assist people in approaching economic and social development in the co-operative way,
4. to develop the full potential of the co-operative movement throughout the Province of Saskatchewan.

We will vigorously pursue these goals because we believe that through co-operatives the Province of Saskatchewan will remain in the ownership and control of the people of Saskatchewan. This, Mr. Speaker, is truly the decade of co-operative development.

Mr. Speaker, there are many other things I could say about the departments and the programs of this Government, passed and planned in the Speech from the Throne. I indicate that I will be supporting the motion.

SOME HON. MEMBERS: Hear, hear!

MR. I.W. CARLSON: (Yorkton) — Mr. Speaker, it is indeed a pleasure to enter in this Throne Speech Debate.

I should like to begin my remarks by congratulating my colleagues who moved and seconded the motion. My colleague from Saltcoats (Mr. Kaeding) has done a superb job. As everyone in this House knows, he won the Saltcoats constituency against heavy odds in 1971. No one could have predicted with any certainty that we could win that seat. I believe it was

not one of those seats that we won because of the NDP sweep, it was won, to a large extent, by Edgar Kaeding. Let me also say that I for one will now predict that Edgar Kaeding will win that seat again in 1975.

SOME HON. MEMBERS: Hear, hear!

MR. CARLSON: — I understand the Leader of the Opposition (Mr. Steuart) is out to Saltcoats tonight to help nominate, I believe he said, Bill Peasley as a candidate. He said that they were expecting a nominating convention, but by his comments it sounds to me as if the decision was made in Regina some weeks ago.

The Member for Watrous (Mr. Cody) also did a commendable job in his remarks. He, too, won a seat that was by no means a cinch for us to win in the 1971 campaign. However, Mr. Speaker, due to circumstances I cannot predict that our friend from Watrous will win that seat for us again, but I'm sure wherever he does decide to run that he will meet with success.

SOME HON. MEMBERS: Hear, hear!

MR. CARLSON: — I should like also at this time, to welcome the new Member to the Legislature, the Member who won the by-election for Regina Lakeview (Mr. Malone). I am sure the Members opposite will appreciate the much needed support that their new colleague will provide to their caucus. In fact, they were so desperate for moral support that last week they even brought in a picture to help boost their spirits. I think that's a good indication, Mr. Speaker, that the Liberal Party is at such a low ebb that almost anything could help.

I don't know offhand which one of the Members opposite is the critic for the Attorney General's Department, but I'm sure that with 20 per cent of the Members being lawyers the Attorney General (Mr. Romanow) will be under good scrutiny.

MR. ROMANOW: — Liberal lawyers.

MR. CARLSON: — Pardon me, Liberal lawyers. Right, 20 per cent Liberal lawyers and I'm sure that . . .

MR. ROMANOW: — Eastern corporation lawyers.

MR. CARLSON: — All right, eastern corporation lawyers so they say. I'm sure that the Attorney General will be well scrutinized.

I also imagine that we can expect some enthusiastic support for our legal aid program from the Liberal lawyers. I am sure that it's a kind of a program that any lawyer would like to support.

I should like now to make a few comments about some of the health programs of this Government. Saskatchewan, under the NDP Government continues to lead Canada in the field of health services. The former CCF Government pioneered in the field of hospitalization and medicare. We have continued to pioneer in health programs. The Government saw fit, this fall, to abolish

the premiums for medical care and hospitalization. This may not seem a significant saving to people on above average incomes. However, those who are on low incomes certainly appreciate being relieved of this premium, at this time of ever-increasing costs of living.

SOME HON. MEMBERS: Hear, hear!

MR. CARLSON: — Another health program that is being pioneered in Saskatchewan is our dental care program. I have had many inquiries over the past few months as to when the program will become operative. Everyone knows it is coming because it was promised in the New Deal for People, and they know that New Democrats keep their promises.

SOME HON. MEMBERS: Hear, hear!

MR. CARLSON: — Dental costs certainly can be a financial burden, especially for larger families on low incomes. This certainly is a welcomed program and I should like to congratulate the Minister of Health (Mr. Smishek) for a job well done in getting it put together, hiring staff and beginning the training of personnel in a relatively short period. We certainly look forward to it becoming a reality in the fall of 1974.

I should like to now spend a few moments talking about some of the commitments in the Throne Speech for our urban governments and our housing programs.

The record of this Government in the field of housing has been an impressive one. Probably the most popular program is the Senior Citizens' Home Repair Grants. I have had dozens of calls enquiring about these grants. The senior citizens certainly appreciate the help they are receiving to improve their homes. The important thing, I think, is that the regulations are broad enough to include almost any improvement necessary to a house. Improvements such as plumbing, heating, repairing or replacing a furnace, water heater, or water softener. In fact, just this morning I had a phone call and a chap was enquiring whether a well and a septic tank could be included in the grants. I phoned the Housing Corporation and checked and they said, "Yes, it certainly can," and this farmer, when I phoned him back, was more than pleased to hear that he could go ahead with his plans to dig a well and put running water in his house and have it qualify under the Senior Citizens' Home Improvement Grants.

The House Building Assistance Grant has been another popular program, giving some incentive to people on low and mid-incomes to build new homes. The most recent program, administered by the Saskatchewan Housing Corporation, the Residential Rehabilitation Program, is a most comprehensive and useful one. It provides a combination of loans and grants for house improvements and construction.

I think one of the important features about these programs is that they do not discriminate against people who live in rural communities or small towns and villages.

With all these programs being offered and administered by

the Department of Municipal Affairs and the Saskatchewan Housing Corporation, a heavy burden is placed on the staff for screening the thousands of applications. I would suggest that the Department of Municipal Affairs Minister follow the example of the Department of Agriculture and establish regional offices. We already have regional offices for the Municipal Assessment Branch. I would suggest that one more person in each of these offices, to handle the initial screening of the applications and make recommendations to the head office would alleviate the burden on the staff here in Regina and speed up the process considerably. Even more important than that, it would provide much needed service to the applicants out in the country. There are continually people enquiring of me where they can pick up application forms or make direct enquiries. Just this morning I received a letter addressed to myself at the Legislature, asking whether they could meet me on the weekend and discuss some of the housing programs. A young farm couple whom I know quite well who are wanting to build a new house. I appreciate them contacting me. I don't mind spending time with them, but it is difficult to be available at all times to meet these requirements. I do seriously ask the Minister of the Department to look at the possibility of having regional people out in the field to help with these very good housing programs.

A lot of people are also enquiring at municipal offices, city halls and so on, and certainly they can pick up application forms at most of these offices, but they do not get the kind of counselling I think is necessary. I believe it to be a logical follow-up to establish regional offices to bring these programs closer to the people.

During the first two years in office, we as a government, directed most of our energy and efforts and funds to revitalize rural Saskatchewan. I believe this was a wise decision. The farmers have been and will continue to be our main concern in Saskatchewan. We must have a buoyant rural economy in order to have a viable provincial economy. Our agriculture programs initiated over the past two years, along with increased demands for farm products, have revitalized rural Saskatchewan.

We must now turn more of our attention to urban areas. The Throne Speech indicated our intention to provide more assistance to these urban governments. One of our commitments is for urban recreation. The former CCF Government initiated the regional park program which has met with tremendous success throughout Saskatchewan. We also have a number of beautiful provincial parks. These facilities; are much appreciated and used by many people. However, they do not meet the entire needs of our citizens. There are many people who do not have an opportunity to use these facilities because they are too far from a provincial park or a regional park, or their employment is such that they can't get a week off to go to one of the provincial parks to spend some time in the summer. I believe that it is time that we now act to provide more facilities in our urban centres.

For example, in my own constituency in the city of Yorkton, we do not have an outdoor swimming pool. We have a man-made beach on the edge of town and a couple of miles sway York Lake. But these are not easily accessible for youngsters who have to bike or hitch hike out and I think that it is time that we look towards establishing a swimming pool in the city of Yorkton. I think with some provincial financial support and some leadership

I hope that this will soon become a reality.

Another commitment of the Government is to provide more assistance for urban transportation. This is another very timely program. In these days of urbanization and fuel shortages it is logical to support the public transit systems. The city of Yorkton, in recent years, has established a city bus service. There are continually demands being made to City Council to increase the routes, increase the service to help more of the citizens of the city. This is a very worthwhile program and I believe should be extended.

The senior citizens appear to be the main beneficiaries of public transit at least in a city like Yorkton and these are the people who either cannot afford a car or cannot drive and they depend largely on the public transit systems to get up town to do their shopping, visit the doctor and so on.

I should like now to turn my attention to the energy situation. This has been debated at quite some length over the past few days and I just want to add a few comments.

Energy is one subject that has largely been taken for granted in the past but suddenly it is of great concern to everyone, even the Federal Liberals are acting. I am not sure if they are acting because they want to protect Canadians from the manipulation of the multinational oil corporations or if it is because their political existence depends on their action. I submit, Mr. Speaker, that the policy we heard our Prime Minister announce last week, was a policy implemented by the New Democrats in Ottawa. It appears to be more than a coincidence that the three major policies outlined were the same as what David Lewis had demanded as a condition of support for the Government.

The David Lewis proposals, which are now apparently Government policy, will go a long way in solving our future problems. The National Petroleum Corporation, if properly managed and given enough scope, will certainly encourage exploration and development. The price freeze for the rest of this winter will give some protection to the consumers of eastern Canada, and also prevent a further unwarranted rip-off by the oil companies.

The pipeline extension to Montreal is another logical step that surely no one would argue against. Saskatchewan has also suffered from a lack of a government Petroleum policy.

The only policy we have had is one developed by the oil corporations, for the oil corporations. It is a simple policy based on the principle of maximizing profits. In fact, it is a good policy, good for the multinational oil corporations. But what is good for the oil corporations is not necessarily good for the citizens of Saskatchewan or of Canada as a whole. I don't particularly blame the oil companies. They are responsible to their shareholders and have, indeed, done a superb job. However, we are responsible to the people of Saskatchewan. It is about time that we, as Legislators, accept this responsibility.

Last session we made the first move in establishing Saskoil which has the necessary authority to play a meaningful role in future developments. This year we are taking further steps in the development of a petroleum policy for the people of Saskatchewan.

I believe there are three main issues that must be dealt with immediately:

1. We, as a Government, representing each and every citizen in the province, must have control of all our energy resources. This is necessary to ensure that they are used to maximize the benefit for the rightful owners, the Saskatchewan citizens.
2. We must ensure that the profits are shared fairly with the Saskatchewan people. It is not right that foreign based corporations should reap all the benefits of our resources.
3. Exploration and development must be encouraged, to assure adequate supplies for the future.

These objectives have been foremost in our minds. I am, indeed, pleased that we are taking action that will meet these demands.

These are important steps that are being taken. However, I am not so naive as to think that all our energy problems are solved. This is just the beginning. I maintain that Saskoil must be developed to play a meaningful role in Saskatchewan. Our objective must be to develop our own resources for our own people. We should consider Saskoil in the same light as we consider the Saskatchewan Power Corporation, a public utility designed to meet the needs of the entire province.

In conclusion, Mr. Speaker, let me say that the Throne Speech outlines an imaginative legislative program. This program will complement the policies initiated in our first two and a half years in office. This Session will practically complete our 1971 election commitments to the people of Saskatchewan. The voters endorsed a New Deal for People and they are now endorsing the resulting legislation.

Mr. Speaker, it is indeed a pleasure to join my colleagues on this side of the House in support of the motion.

SOME HON. MEMBERS: Hear, hear!

MR. J. WIEBE: (Morse) — Mr. Speaker . . .

MR. SPEAKER: — Before the Hon. Member starts I should like to call it 5:30.

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

MR. WIEBE: — Mr. Speaker, it is not very often that someone is afforded the opportunity to speak twice on the Throne Speech Debate. I was amused by some of the comments on the way down to dinner that they enjoyed very much my remarks prior to the calling it 5:30. They were brief and I can assure the Members opposite that they will now be just as brief. I managed to acquire quite a cold. The Throne Speech Debate has been very conducive to cold. The air conditioning is quite good in the building and the hot air coming across the floor, from that side of the House, has created the draft that has caused this cold.

It is customary in Throne Speech Debates to offer congratulations. I, in turn, would like to offer my congratulations to Mr. Ted Malone, the new Member for Lakeview.

SOME HON. MEMBERS: Hear, hear!

MR. WIEBE: — It gives me, Mr. Speaker, a great deal of satisfaction that Mr. Malone is sitting in this House because I was involved in that campaign.

SOME HON. MEMBERS: Hear, hear!

MR. WIEBE: — I must say that I hesitantly give up my position in this House as being the junior Member, but I am quite pleased to hand it over to Mr. Malone, who is quite capable of accepting that responsibility.

I was quite amused this afternoon when the Attorney General (Mr. Romanow) blamed the loss of the by-election on the redistribution that took place a few years ago. I should just like to say, Mr. Attorney General, I wish that we could have fought this by-election on the new boundaries as we would have won by 3,700 votes instead of 1,700.

SOME HON. MEMBERS: Hear, hear!

MR. WIEBE: — It seems strange that every NDP poll in that constituency, with the exception of four, fell just like toothpicks under the hands of Mr. Malone and the Saskatchewan Liberal Party. As well what seemed gratifying to me was one poll that we were particularly worried about — this was a poll that the NDP had won by 27 votes in 1971, and they had won by about 17 votes in 1967. What made me concerned about this poll was the fact that the Premier had spent Wednesday evening with his little clipboard going door to door. After that he spent an entire Saturday in that poll going door to door, talking to the people. We were quite concerned. The Premier of the province door knocking will have quite an effect on the voters within that poll. And yet our concern was all in vain, Mr. Speaker, when the results came in, instead of losing that poll by 27 votes, we won it by 12 votes.

SOME HON. MEMBERS: Hear, hear!

MR. WIEBE: — When the next provincial election comes along, Mr. Speaker, I should like to invite the Premier and his Cabinet to come out and campaign in the new Morse constituency because that help that they will give me will be very well appreciated. I'd love to go on and talk about the Lakeview by-election, but I think I'll be kind to the Members opposite and use the same words that the Member for Saltcoats (Mr. Kaeding) used during his address to this House. I will just change the odd word. He said that he wished to be kind to the Members opposite because their capability to destroy their own credibility in the Lakeview by-election has been so clearly demonstrated that I do not have the heart to add to their burden. Being a nice fellow and a nice guy, Mr. Speaker, I shall refrain from talking any longer about the Lakeview by-election.

I should like, as well, to offer congratulations to the mover and the seconder of the Throne Speech Debate. Not only is it an honor to be chosen for such a privilege in this house, but one must look at the content of their speeches. I think their speeches, Mr. Speaker, set the entire tone of the Debate that has taken place in the last six days. I doubt, very much, whether more than 15 minutes has been spent in total by all Members on that side, talking about what was in that Throne Speech. Part of the reason is because there was nothing in that Throne Speech in which they could be proud of and which they could talk about.

The Attorney General (Mr. Romanow) and the Minister Agriculture (Mr. Messer) mentioned how void this side of the House was of ideas, all one has to do is to look at that Throne Speech Debate and you can find out who is void of ideas in this House.

The Member for Yorkton (Mr. Carlson) made some comments this afternoon about the picture that was placed on this side of the House after the by-election, mentioning that it certainly added to an increase in the spirits on this side of the House. I can say, Mr. Speaker, it certainly did that. As well, it increased the spirits of all people throughout the province. I don't know though, Mr. Speaker, whether it was that picture or whether it was the Throne Speech that deflated the spirits on that side of the House during the past week.

As well, Mr. Speaker, I must congratulate Mr. Richards for having the courage of his convictions to come over to this side of the House and sit in Opposition. I think that he realizes, as well as many on that side of the House realize, that it was political suicide which he foisted upon himself. The only thing that makes me wonder is when some of the other Members on that side of the House are going to have the courage of their convictions as well and join Mr. Richards on this side of the House.

As well, Mr. Speaker, I must congratulate the Minister of Agriculture on the excellent job he made last night of misusing the facts. He spent the entire three-quarters of an hour accusing us of misusing the facts. He talked about the Winnipeg Commodity Exchange and the amount of money which they were spending on the rapeseed vote. As far as I am concerned, Mr. Speaker, fine and dandy. I think that it is a good sign that the Winnipeg Commodity Exchange is spending that money on the rapeseed vote. As well, I say that it is just as good a sign that Saskatchewan Wheat Pool in this province is spending two and one-half times as much as the Winnipeg Commodity Exchange on expressing their point of view. And this, Mr. Speaker, is the type and kind of commentary that should take place in this province. You have one group that is in favor of rapeseed coming under the Wheat -Board and you have another group who are opposed to it. They are fighting, and the farmers in turn can judge in their own mind. The fact that Members opposite have decided to make political hay and drag politics into the rapeseed vote, I think is very discouraging and is not the type of practice which I should like to see or actually expect from Members on that side of the House.

As well, Mr. Speaker, he talked about the Wheat Board and what was going to be happening to the Wheat Board. Long after this House is adjourned, long after the feed grains issue and

the rapeseed vote and all this is completed, we are still going to have a Wheat Board in Canada and that Wheat Board will still be doing the job it is doing today for the farmers of Saskatchewan.

SOME HON. MEMBERS: Hear, hear!

MR. WIEBE: — Regardless of how much Mr. Messer and Mr. Romanow want to stir up and muddy the waters, we are still going to maintain that Wheat Board and it is going to work to the benefit of all producers in this province.

Mr. Messer, as well, talked about hog marketing in this province. He talked about the amount of hog sales, but he neglected to talk about production. What is going to happen to the production of hogs in this province in the next six months? What will statistics show after the end of December, stating the number of sows that are bred in this province? The amount of hogs on hand, the amount of hogs that we are going to be selling six months from now? That Mr. Speaker, will be a true indication of the livestock industry in this province.

Now that I have mentioned hogs, Mr. Speaker, I might take the opportunity to mention a little story which happened to me, or I must say which happened to the chap who hauls my hogs into Regina. We have talked about the loss of industry in this province; we have talked about the problems which Burns is having in Regina; the cancellation of their expansion and the talk that Burns may be closing down. This individual, who was trucking the hogs in — (he had 15 hogs that he wanted to bring into Regina) — phoned the Saskatchewan Hog Marketing Commission, which is mandatory before you take hogs in — asked them if it was possible for him to deliver 15 hogs to Regina. A lovely voice on the other end of the line said, “Certainly it is quite all right, when are you bringing them in?” “I’ll bring them in this afternoon,” and he said he would like to take them to Burns. The lovely voice on the other end of the line said, “I am sorry, Burns is filled up for today (this was Thursday) filled up for tomorrow, and they won’t be able to kill your animals until sometime next week.” So, fine and dandy, the only other alternative was Intercontinental Packers.

While driving in he thought, well, I am going to try Burns anyway. He said Burns has got much better unloading facilities. They have much better facilities to wash and clean their trucks afterwards and as it was early in the afternoon he thought that he would try them first. So he pulled into Burns, he asked them whether they could take his hogs and that he had 15 of them. They said, “Certainly, we would love to have your hogs.” He asked them when they would be killed and they said that they would be killed the first thing tomorrow morning.

Mr. Speaker, I don’t think, at least I hope, that it is not this Government’s intention to divert hogs from Burns over to Intercontinental Packers. I would ask if the Minister of Agriculture would talk to the chairman of the Hog Marketing Commission and point out to him, or point out to the lovely gal on the other end of the phone, that at that particular day Burns could have taken hogs.

MR. MESSER: — What day was that?

MR. WIEBE: — It was last Thursday. The hogs were brought in that afternoon and Burns killed them Friday morning. The advice that this trucker was given Thursday morning was that the hogs, if brought to Burns, would not be killed until sometime next week, that is sometime this week. I am just bringing this up, Mr. Speaker, and Mr. Minister with the hope that you will convey this message to the chairman of the Hog Marketing Commission and hopefully correct any problems that may be arising in that regard.

As I said earlier I was going to try and keep my remarks brief but I see my voice is hanging on better than I had anticipated.

SOME HON. MEMBERS: Hear, hear!

MR. WIEBE: — I should like to talk, Mr. Speaker, for a few minutes on something that was left out entirely in the Throne Speech, it has been left out of any comment from any of the front benchers on that side of the House or any of the back benchers on that side of the House. It is a subject that politicians on the Government side don't seem to be concerned about in this province, and yet, Mr. Speaker, it is of great concern to me. This concern, Mr. Speaker, is the loss of our greatest resources in this province. And as far as I am concerned, Mr. Speaker, people are one of the greatest resources we have got in Saskatchewan.

SOME HON. MEMBERS: Hear, hear!

MR. WIEBE: — The Premier of this province likes to get up and say that we have lost only 7 to 8,000 people in this province, why doesn't he come out and tell the exact figure, we lost 19,226 people from Saskatchewan. I know that it is difficult for the Members opposite to understand that arithmetic but he must remember that there are over 15,000 births in this province, with only 7,000 deaths and about 1,511 immigrants into this province. What these people would want to do coming into this province I don't know, but I am sure that these are the ones, the civil servants which the Government has been hiring because the 1,500 figure agrees with the figures that we have received. This makes a natural increase, Mr. Speaker, of 9,284 people. Compare that with the net loss and you have got 19,226 people who have left this province.

But, Mr. Speaker, what we must look at is that these 19,000 people who left this province are our young people. They are between the ages of 18 to 26. The future of this province depends on those young people. But what is even more surprising while we may be able to brag that for the last three months we have had the lowest unemployment rate of any province in Canada, let's look at our neighboring provinces. I suppose Members on that side of the House would be able to name on both hands the amount of young people from their own communities who have left those communities and have gone to Alberta to find jobs. But what is really surprising is that Alberta is able to absorb the 19,000 people, accept them into their society and provide them with jobs and up until July had a lower unemployment rate than Saskatchewan ever had.

SOME HON. MEMBERS: Hear, hear!

MR. WIEBE: — As well, Mr. Speaker, the Members opposite have bragged about the additional 2,000 jobs which have been created in this province. Those 2,000 jobs did not look after the 18, the 19 and the 20 year olds that this province produced 18 years ago. A lot of these people had to leave this province in order to find jobs.

I was very interested, Mr. Speaker, in the remarks of the Minister of Municipal Affairs made in Swift Current during the month of September and early part of October. He was trying to explain the loss of this population to his own executive in the city of Swift Current. And the newspaper reported that Mr. Wood had said and I'll paraphrase it,

It is not the Government's fault. It is not our fault these people are leaving. It is those big bad farmers, they are the ones that are at fault.

The farmers like Mr. Messer are getting bigger and bigger and forcing all our young people off the land. And yet in this province, Mr. Speaker, we have had the Land Bank for two years. We have had FarmStart for one year. And the Members opposite say what a tremendous job that the Land Bank and FarmStart is doing to keep our young people on the farms and to keep them in this province. And yet if they are doing such a good job, then why in the world was there 12,420 fewer people in our rural municipalities last year than there was the year before?

I think this is a clear indication of what success the Land Bank is having throughout Saskatchewan.

But the Government doesn't seem to realize, like the Minister of Municipal Affairs (Mr. Wood) says, it is not our fault, it is those big bad farmers. And yet the Government went and cancelled the pulp mill. They went and cancelled the iron ore mine. They did nothing to keep the petroleum industries in this province. Succession duties were brought in. This forced people out of this province. In effect, Mr. Speaker, they have cancelled enough industries in their three years of government to create another city in Saskatchewan, the size of Swift Current.

SOME HON. MEMBERS: Hear, hear!

MR. WOOD: — May I address a question to the Member opposite? I was wondering if he could let me know just what speech or what article that he is quoting?

MR. WIEBE: — Mr. Speaker, it is an article that appeared in the Swift Current Sun, I believe the first week in October and it was the comments that you had made to the NDP meeting in the city of Swift Current. I believe it was held in the basement of the Pioneer Credit Union. I have a copy of that and I will indeed give it to you if you haven't got it.

As well, Mr. Speaker, I should like to discuss for a few minutes the regional park program in the Province of Saskatchewan. And I must say that this is one part of the Throne Speech

which I can find agreement in, the emphasis that this Government is placing on tourism in this province. I think what we should be doing is taking a closer look at our regional park program in this province. I must go along with the Member for Yorkton (Mr. Carlson) and say what this Government is doing now in this regard is not enough. I am sorry that the Minister of natural Resources is not here. I realize that he is too busy trying to solve the problems in the North. I hope that he will take a look at the regional park program in Saskatchewan. Certainly there is a 60-40 per cent share in capital grants. But the amount of money that is being spent by the Provincial Government on maintenance and upkeep of these regional parks is a pittance. The burden for the maintenance and upkeep of these parks is left to rural municipalities and the towns that are involved in these parks. These parks are becoming more and more popular throughout the province, more and more of our tourists are using these regional parks. And it is becoming more and more difficult for the regional park boards to hire the staff to look after the repairs of the buildings and facilities in order to make them attractive places for our tourists. I hope that when the Budget Speech is presented that there will be an increase in the amount of grants that will be made available to regional parks for maintenance and for upkeep.

If go on much longer, Mr. Speaker, I don't think I will have any voice left. I am sure that you can judge by my remarks that I will not be supporting the Throne Speech.

SOME HON. MEMBERS: Hear, hear!

MR. D.L. FARIS: (Arm River) — Mr. Speaker, it is with pleasure that I enter this Throne Speech Debate. I should first of all like to congratulate the mover and the seconder of the Address-in-Reply. They both did an excellent job and I am very pleased to have the Member for Watrous (Mr. Cody) as my very enthusiastic desk mate.

I want to congratulate the Member for Lakeview (Mr. Malone) on his election in the by-election. I should also like to congratulate the Member for Morse (Mr. Wiebe) on his comments. He said when he started that he was going to say as much after, dinner as he did before and he kept that promise.

SOME HON. MEMBERS: Hear, hear!

MR. FARIS: — He complained earlier of having a cold in his throat. I think the explanation for his inability to talk is that the cold in his throat moved to his head.

I want to say that I am very pleased that in the last year we have had considerable action in Arm River constituency from the Department of Highways. We have had considerable construction along Highway No. 2 and just recently the work has been extended with the calling for tenders for construction of No.2 up to Liberty. In addition, No. 15 has been completely graded from one end to the other and ten miles of it has been hard surfaced. It is interesting that in the seven years of Liberal rule not one inch of that cow path was rebuilt.

One other program which: I think is very significant is the new program of highway signs. This is quite significant. to the towns along Highway No. 11. With the very high speed traffic

the previous signs were very inadequate. I think that people who have travelled in other provinces will be aware that our Provincial Department of highways is providing the best highway sign program in Canada.

SOME HON. MEMBERS: Hear, hear!

MR. FARIS: — I also should like to repeat a concern I have, and that that for the addition of bus service along Highway No. 2 and I should hope along Highway No. 19. The last time this had service was under the Liberals, in 1967. I understand they started the bus service up that route for a few months before the election. Strangely enough it was cut out several weeks after the election. That is not the kind of bus service we have in mind, we would like bus service year round. This is of considerable concern, particularly to the older people in rural Saskatchewan.

I want to turn now to a subject of concern to me and a number of other Members in the House, and that is the area of alcohol control policies.

The study of the history of the control of alcohol in our society is a very interesting study. It is an area where the truth is hard to come by. What one author said about prohibition could be said about many aspects of the subject.

The dries lied to make it look good; the wets lied to make it look bad; the government officials lied to make themselves look good; and the politicians lied through the force of habit.

I will attempt to break the force of habit and tell it like it is. When modern politicians attempt to formulate an alcohol control policy they usually receive advice from modern day wets, dries and government officials. The basic question to be answered is, "Whom do you listen to?"

The Liquor Committee of the Saskatchewan Legislature advertised public hearings. At those hearings the committee heard 74 oral briefs and received another 90 written briefs and 40 letters. After the report was made public, as chairman of the committee, I received several hundred letters, petitions and resolutions.

There was an interesting difference between the presentations to the committee and the later reactions to the report. By the way, all 5,000 copies of the report which were printed were distributed as of June. At least 75 per cent of the presentations to the committee favored further liberalization of the liquor laws. At least 90 per cent of the later reactions to the report were opposed to further liberalization of liquor laws.

There was an interesting difference between the source of the presentations to the committee and the source of the reactions to the report. The vast majority off the 75 per cent of the presentations to the committee which favored further liberalization were from groups or individuals with an economic interest. On the other hand, nearly all of the groups or individuals who opposed further liberalization expressed religious or ethical concerns. At all times it was clear that

there were wide differences of opinion among the public. These differences were also clearly present in the committee. The result is a report which is almost two reports. For those who have not read the report, I will enumerate in point form some of its major recommendations.

1. A pricing policy to control consumption.
2. Attitude changing education at an early level.
3. Abolition of commercial liquor advertising.
4. Large scale public education program using mass media.
5. Regional alcoholism counsellors in each health region to initiate community alcoholism programs.
6. Massive industrial alcoholism programs beginning with the government departments.
7. Expanded and upgraded native alcoholism program.
8. Reduction of the .08 blood alcohol level for drinking offences to .06.
9. Education and rehabilitation programs for convicted drinking drivers.
10. The Liquor Board, Liquor licensing Commission and the Alcoholism Commission all be responsible to the same Minister.

These recommendations were followed by some 30 others which could be considered as liberalizing or increasing access to alcohol. For example the last chapter recommended that permission be given for passengers to consume liquor in a vehicle, that low alcohol content beer and wine be available in grocery stores in pilot areas of the province, that liquor licences be granted on university campuses, in nursing homes, at sporting events, and that people be allowed to consume in private offices, or at picnic and camping sites.

I have mentioned that the report was almost two reports. There is clearly some conflict between the recommendations which suggest the desirability of controlling consumption and the 30 or more recommendations which would tend to increase alcohol consumption.

Perhaps the most important influence on the formulation and implementation of alcohol control programs are economic — political interest groups. I have already mentioned that some 75 per cent of the presentations to our committee were from groups or individuals with an economic interest. By far the most exhaustive, intensive, attractive and costly briefs were those from the brewers and distillers. These economic interest groups are highly organized and very well financed. They not only presented well organized briefs backed up by 'expert' witnesses, but followed up with supplementary briefs and letters to both the committee and the Minister in charge of the Liquor Board, who in our province happens to be the Premier. To give you an idea of the strength of these organizations, the Toronto Globe and Mail reported that the Canadian Brewers' Association has an annual budget of three quarters of a million dollars.

Not surprisingly, the briefs presented by the various parts of the liquor industry supported policies which were in the economic interest of that part of the industry. As these associations are in fact charged with the responsibility of lobbying on behalf of their members — it is not surprising that they do so. As these various organizations are permanent with full time staffs, they lobby all year round. It is not insignificant that the brewers and distillers meet regularly with the government while those who are concerned about the social cost of increasing alcohol consumption and alcohol abuse, meet very rarely. It is not insignificant that the Minister in charge of the Liquor Board in many provinces is the Premier, the Attorney General or the Minister of Finance. These are senior Cabinet positions and they reflect the importance the Government places on the revenues from alcohol sales. There is a very close relationship between governments and the liquor industry. They both profit very handsomely from the large scale consumption of this legalized drug and they are, therefore, bound very closely in their economic interest.

The total value of liquor sales in Canada exceeds \$2 billion the same size as the national defence budget! The Federal Government takes about \$500 million of that as profits and the provinces take about \$600 million. As Canada's largest drug pushers, the Federal and Provincial Governments have a vested interest to keeping these drug sales high. They spend only some two per cent of their profits on alcohol education, research and rehabilitation so that leaves them with over a billion dollars to spend on highways, schools and various welfare programs which are considered more likely to attract votes.

We must remember that alcoholics are not very popular people, and politicians are attracted by popular causes, not unpopular ones. This fact, the government-industrial vested interest explains that very uneasy political reception given to proposals in regard to the prevention of alcoholism. Some of them were

1. Pricing policy to control consumption.
2. Attitude changing education at an early level.
3. Abolition of commercial liquor advertising.
4. Large scale public education program using mass media.

I might add at this point that the 1972 Erroll Committee reviewing liquor licensing in Britain expressed concern about these same areas. For example, it declared that,

since changes in personality factors are hardly capable of outside regulation, the only remaining matters susceptible to manipulation are the education of public opinion and the level of taxation on drink.

The Committee accepted the findings, the Erroll Committee, that is, of Lederman in France and De Lindt and Schmidt in Canada, which indicated that any overall increase in consumption would tend to produce more heavy drinkers. The Committee felt that licensing regulations were not as effective a control on overall consumption as were education and pricing policy. I quote:

We find it difficult to avoid taking the view that the decisive influence in consumption rates since the early years of this century (they are talking about actual historical experience in Britain) has been the economic climate prevailing at any particular time. This is hardly a startling conclusion but it needs to be emphasized, if only to avoid the impression that might otherwise be obtained that licensing law has throughout been a decisive or controlling factor. The fluctuations in consumption during the depression and during the 30s, the fall in consumption and drunkenness rates during the two world wars and increase in consumption in the relatively more affluent post-war period tend to reflect in our view predominant influence of purely economic factors, including variations in real income and different levels of taxation on intoxicating liquor.

It is not surprising that the Erroll Committee should recognize the role of pricing policy in controlling alcohol consumption and thereby controlling alcohol abuse. There is a long British tradition of control through pricing going back as far as attempts to control the cheap gin trade of the 18th Century. Some 50 years ago pricing policy was recommended as a result of experience during and after World War I.

The question which must be raised is why pricing policy to control consumption levels has been so largely ignored in government policy in North America. Perhaps the answer is hinted at in the book "Alcohol Problems — a Report of the Nation" prepared by the Co-operative Commission on the Study of Alcoholism in the United States in 1966. Although the report itself very largely overlooked the distribution of consumption view as is common in the American literature on this subject, it did give an interesting insight into why this view fails to gain recognition at the level of government policy. It declared:

The lack of a consensus for national alcohol policy has greatly handicapped efforts to cope with alcohol problems. For example in some states the revenue obtained from liquor taxes and the sale of liquor in state stores is so great that it creates a feeling of reluctance to do anything that might reduce alcohol consumption.

Educational campaigns against drunken driving may be muted by fear of arousing general anti-alcohol sentiment and seeming to increase pressure on states to reduce their involvement in the alcohol business. Communities concerned about public drunkenness particularly in skid-row areas rarely try to reduce the availability of low cost wines in such areas.

There is no doubt that the governments which reap such large amounts of revenue from alcohol are hesitant to undertake policies which would reduce consumption, they are only part of the problem. The liquor industry itself is a multi-billion dollar complex in North America. The industry has made a great deal of money for its owners, employs millions of people in the manufacture and the distribution of alcohol in North America. Incidentally while total annual alcohol sales in Canada are \$2 billion, in the United States they are over \$25 billion.

The mass media are involved in commercial advertising running into hundreds of millions. Even the Trade Union Movement, which at one time in history could have been expected to express concern for the exploitation of the poor through alcohol abuse will now often express concern for cheap beer for the workers. The point I am making is, that if there can be said to be a military industrial complex which benefits from war, there is certainly government industrial complex which benefits from the continuing liberalization of liquor laws and the resulting increase in consumption. I am asserting that we have entered into an era of economic alcoholism in North America. By economic alcoholism I am referring to the same phenomena which E. M. Jellinek discussed in his book "The Disease Concept of Alcoholism" around the term 'economic origin' of alcoholism. He pointed out that the economic factor is really more marked in relation to the control of alcoholism rather than its origin. The vested economic interests are a powerful influence against programs to reduce consumption, to limit advertising or even to undertake any meaningful educational programs or campaigns. These economic vested interests which include the government itself are nowhere any stronger than in France but even there recent events have shown some indication that they can be overcome. The rather pathetic efforts made to control excessive use of tobacco in North America indicate at once that some steps may be taken against vested interests but that really effective action is very difficult to achieve.

At this time governments seem to be willing to undertake token campaigns of alcohol education and rehabilitation, however, really significant massive educational programs and consumption control through pricing is not readily undertaken. I have some reason to hope that our Government in Saskatchewan may take such steps. But as Jellinek pointed out:

Large vested interests have their effects on public opinion and acceptance. There are definite interactions between the two; where there is a certain readiness to accept large individual consumption the pressure from vested interests may reinforce the public attitude to a high degree. Or on the other hand the public attitude may greatly facilitate assumption of power on the part of the vested interests. This is a complex question that merits thorough sociological and economic analysis and cannot be ignored by the student of alcoholism.

I am afraid that "students of alcoholism" have not heeded Jellinek's advice to study the role of the social and economic vested interests in influencing alcohol control policy. In North America we see steadily increasing alcohol consumption combined with increasingly large and powerful vested interests. In order to be effective alcohol control policies must be acceptable to the public. However, when alcohol control policies must first of all be acceptable to the vested interests of the government industrial complex, it is no wonder that they are so often so weak and so ineffective. The government industrial complex is North America's largest drug pusher. Only massive public pressure can force the politicians to take corrective action.

What the public should demand are national alcohol, programs corresponding in size to the increasing national problem. At

present the Federal Government is very neatly avoiding its responsibility for alcohol programs. It is leaving the major initiatives in this touchy political area to the provinces. The provinces are responding in a very spotty and unco-ordinated manner. No province is doing enough but even those things that they are doing well are not being shared among them.

There should be a large scale funding of programs of research, education, prevention and rehabilitation. The Saskatchewan Committee explicitly recommended that the Federal Government should recognize the world leading basic research being done by the Ontario Addiction Research Foundation. We believe the Ontario ARF should become acknowledged as a national basic research institute. This would avoid provincial chauvinists each squabbling over where this institute should be located. We should also avoid the unnecessary costly delay and duplication which a separate federal institute would create.

We should also demand a nation-wide educational program in regard to alcohol similar to that in regard to tobacco. The mass media should be used for social purposes. The mass media anti-smoking campaign has however not been effective in reducing per capita cigarette consumption but it has had an effect on the public awareness of the problem. It has firmly established in the public mind the link between cigarette smoking and cancer, it is no longer a matter of public debate. We should go even further than that. All commercial advertising of cigarettes should be banned. If we are really serious about the matter of reducing cigarette consumption, then there should be a national cigarette pricing policy. Research has shown that the log normal consumption distribution curve which exists for alcohol also exists for nicotine. If we wish to reduce the number of people smoking at levels which dramatically injure their health and the latest figures I have is that some 13,000 Canadians die each year from lung cancer, emphysema and related tobacco diseases, then our society has a weapon to bring about this reduction in overall consumption through cigarette pricing. The relative price of cigarettes has steadily declined over the years. If the public would bring about enough pressure on the politicians we could therefore in all likelihood reduce death through lung cancer and these other diseases.

That brings me to the last and most important point. As well as massive education programs and the banning of commercial liquor advertising we need a national pricing policy for alcohol. The Ontario Addiction Research Foundation has presented a challenge to all of the governments of Canada but I must say, most particularly to the national government. The research has clearly indicated that the pricing of alcoholic beverages has a direct relationship to overall consumption. They have shown that the relative price of alcohol relative to disposable income has steadily declined; as the relative price has declined general consumption has increased and so have alcohol problems. Their research from around the world leads them to believe that if the relative price were increased this would lead to a general decrease in consumption and therefore a general decrease in alcohol problems. They conclude that in the manipulation of the relative price of alcohol governments have at their disposal a powerful instrument to control the prevalence of excessive drinking and alcohol problems.

They recommend that the prices of alcohol beverages should be such that the average price of alcohol is the same regardless of the class of beverage. If this isn't done there will simply be shifts in consumption from one beverage to another. The average price of alcohol should be tied to the average disposable income so that if disposable income increases in a year, the price of alcohol would increase correspondingly. Then the Government should aim over a period of years to raise the relative price of a gallon of alcohol.

These arguments present a serious moral challenge to the politicians. Do they have the courage to accept these changes? On the face of it they will find opposition coming from the liquor manufacturers, the advertising industry, the mass media and that part of the public who value cheap booze more than they do human life.

The only hope for the success of these programs is concerted national effort to educate the public. Once this is done, the pricing policy must then be implemented on a national level to assure that they are not provincial tax havens to encourage bootlegging. Will politicians dare to implement such policies? What I am proposing isn't a return to prohibition but a social policy in regard to alcohol that recognizes it for what it is, Canada's number one drug problem.

Let me quote from something said by the Ontario ARF:

As long as we looked upon alcoholics and social drinkers as two entirely separate groups it was reasonable for us to ignore drinking in general to concentrate on rehabilitation of alcoholics. But now our studies have shown that these groups are not separate populations and that as per capita consumption of alcohol increases there is a proportionately higher number of alcoholics.

Therefore, we have been forced to realize that there is no great hope of reducing the number of alcoholics or those who drink at levels hazardous to their health without rolling back the overall consumption of alcohol throughout our society.

Ever since the repeal of prohibition governments across North America have taken very confused attitudes and positions toward the control of alcohol. These attitudes are well illustrated by a letter written by North Carolina Senator Jack Fogbound. He had received a letter from Frank Cooper, c/o General Delivery, Skunk Hollow. Mr. Cooper asked for Senator Fogbound's views on whiskey. The Senator's difficulty was that there were two Frank Coopers in Skunk Hollow. One was a Baptist Minister and the other was a bootlegger.

This was Senator Fogbound's reply.

Dear Mr. Cooper:

I had not intended to discuss the controversial subject at this particular time. However, I want you to know that I do not shun controversy. On the contrary, I will take a stand on any issue at any time, regardless of how fraught with controversy it may be. You have asked me how I feel about whiskey. Here is how I stand

on this question.

If when you say whiskey, you mean the devil's brew, the poison scourge, the bloody monster that defiles the innocent, de-thrones reason, destroys the home, creates misery and poverty — yes, literally takes the bread from the mouths of little children. If you mean the evil drink that topples the Christian man and woman from the pinnacles of righteous and gracious living into the bottomless pit of degradation, despair, shame and helplessness, then certainly I am against it with all my power.

But if when you say whiskey, you mean the oil of conversation, the philosophic wine, the ale that is consumed when good fellows get together, that puts a song in their hearts and laughter on their lips and a warm glow of contentment in their eyes; if you mean Christmas cheer, if you mean the stimulating drink that puts the spring in an old gentleman's step on a frosty morning, if you mean that drink of which the sales pour millions of dollars into our treasury, which are used to provide tender care for our little crippled children, our blind, our deaf and dumb, our pitiful aged and infirmed, to build good highways, hospitals and schools, then certainly I am for it.

This is my stand — I will not compromise.

Signed, Senator Fogbound.

Mr. Speaker, I was pleased to hear that our Government intends to increase spending on the Alcoholism Commission by what I assume is something close to \$1 million. Over the past four or five years Saskatchewan has been falling behind the work being done in several of our neighboring provinces. Saskatchewan's Commission at present has only 15 in-patient beds in rehabilitation centres, Alberta's has over 60. Saskatchewan's Commission has a staff of nearly 50, Alberta has nearly 300. Saskatchewan at present is spending approximately \$1 million to fight alcoholism, Alberta is spending closer to \$3 million. Saskatchewan has only two alcoholism co-ordinators in the entire province. In the past two and one-half years we have only gone so far as to advertise for one more counsellor. If we continue at this rate it will take another 25 years before each region has an alcoholism counsellor and this is clearly not good enough. Nothing less than the addition of an alcoholism counsellor in each health region this year will be a minimum goal.

I am sorry the Speech from the Throne didn't outline in detail some of the action which is going to be taken to overcome these obvious inadequacies. Perhaps this lack of detail stems from the seven-month delay in the appointment of a Director to the Alcoholism Commission. This unnecessary delay has undoubtedly stalled some of the staffing and planning that should have taken place over the summer. Nonetheless, this announcement of \$1 million program in the coming year is encouraging.

There is one policy decision which apparently has been made and for which the Government deserves the highest

commendation. That is the decision not to allow commercial alcohol advertising, but rather to proceed with a government alcohol education program utilizing the mass media. This is in happy contrast with Alberta where this fall that government allowed commercial liquor advertising. I may tell you it caused considerable concern among those people spending their lives trying to fight alcoholism in that province.

I am pleased to see that there will be some experimental alcohol education programs. I would caution the Government about the failure of so-called drug education programs in the United States. These programs have been found to operate at a very superficial level. By increasing drug knowledge they produced a large number of junior psychopharmacologists. They have had very little effect on the attitudes or behavior of these young people. Indeed some so-called drug education programs in the States have been found to increase drug use or merely to shift drug use from illegal drugs to the more acceptable but equally dangerous alcohol. The results of these programs are so poor that the United States Government called for a nine month moratorium on the production of drug education materials. It is unfortunate this moratorium was not extended by the Canadian Federal Government.

With the last family allowance cheque that we received in our home the Federal Government sent out a little pamphlet and I have it here. It is called, 'Let's Face It'. Some other Members in this House may have received it. The pamphlet begins,

Let's face it, drug abuse is the persistent and usually excessive use of any drug (including alcohol) for non-medical purposes which results in mental, physical or social harm.

Well I want to give them credit for admitting publicly that alcohol is a drug. It is interesting that in the United States the Shaffer Committee, which is their counterpart to the LeDain Committee, tested in a wide public opinion survey and found that 65 per cent of the American people did not acknowledge alcohol to be a drug. But it says in here that it's a drug. Then down at the bottom it says:

Health and Welfare Canada hopes parents will discuss use of drugs with their children. This mini-pamphlet has been prepared as a brief, factual starting point for discussion about some of the most commonly abused drugs.

And then when you open it up what do you find? The drug description, effects and dangers, marijuana, LSD, barbiturates, speed, cocaine, heroin and solvents. What's missing? The two drugs which every expert says are the most widely abused drugs in Canada, LeDain said it, the Shaffer Committee said it in the United States — alcohol and tobacco. They are not here and this is extremely important. This is very similar to the kind of drug education in United States and it simply has not worked. It's dishonest and young people when they see this kind of thing think that the adult generation is made up either of fools or hypocrites. I would suggest that the Minister of Health in our province should strongly protest to the National Government for having such shabby drug education material sent out to families in our province.

Mr. Speaker, I am pleased to see that this Government is taking firm action to ensure that the people of Saskatchewan receive a fair share in return for our petroleum resources. The international oil cartel has been exploiting us long enough. They have not only been exploiting the people of the oil producing areas of the world by not giving them a fair return on these unrenovable resources, that have also exploited the consumer by selling cheap oil at high prices.

I want to bring to the attention of this Assembly that they have also dealt very harshly with the service station operators whom they bind with unfair contracts. I think it is time that we had a Bill of Rights for service station operators in Saskatchewan. Such an Act was suggested by the McKenzie Report in Alberta in 1968. This report, two and a half years in completion, 740 pages in length, documents the exploitation of service station operators by the major oil companies. The McKenzie Report outlines some of the problems as follows:

This 'independent businessman', the service station operator,

- (a) will purchase merchandise like sweat shirts or charcoal that he doesn't think he can sell and doesn't want to handle, because the oil company 'suggests' it;
- (b) he will knowingly incur losses by staying open during hours when he doesn't want to be open, because the oil company 'suggests' it;
- (c) he will surrender a lease at a lower rental and 'agree' to the substitution of a new lease at a higher rental, because the oil company 'suggests' it;
- (d) he will spend his money for oil company promotions that he doesn't want to participate in, not because he believes they increase his particular business, but because the oil company 'suggests' it.

Mr. Speaker, a Bill of Rights for service station operators would protect the right of tenants in regard to security of tenure and would protect them therefore from the oil companies' 'suggestions'. It would also protect all retailers in regard to their rights to buy, sell or use any petroleum product they should choose. Such a Bill should be drawn up after consultation with service station operators. The pressures of the artificially created energy crisis, and of unnecessarily inflated prices must not be expected to be borne by service station operators and small businesses.

Mr. Speaker, I should like to turn now to some of the agricultural topics which are of concern to people in my constituency. One of them is something that we haven't heard Members of the Opposition talk much about. It is a Federal Government program that is having its most profound effect at this time and that's Operation LIFT. You'll recognize that Operation LIFT if it was fully successful, as the Government claimed at that time it was, it would have reduced wheat production by some 300 million bushels. Even taking it that it wasn't fully successful it only reduced wheat production by some 200 million bushels. We have seen the effects of this now.

This program, the Lower Inventory For Tomorrow, applies today, because today is that Tomorrow. If you take the price that the Members opposite have been proud to talk about, the \$5 price for wheat, and apply it to these reductions, then if it did in fact reduce production by 300 million bushels, that cost the producers of Saskatchewan \$1.5 billion. If it only reduced production by 200 million bushels then that only cost the farmers of Saskatchewan \$1 billion. What's a billion?

There is one other program that is of considerable concern to farmers and that is the feed grains program. I have in my hands an interesting article that appeared in the Star-Phoenix entitled "Grain Plan Favors East". I was very interested in this article because the young agricultural economist, Professor Garry Storey at the University of Saskatchewan, Saskatoon Campus, happens to come from my constituency. In fact the Storey family are in the Girvin area. Here is what he had to say, and this is a young man who comes from a family, who to my knowledge have never held an NDP membership. This is a young man who is known by people at the University not to have any connection with any political party and here is what he said about the feed grains policy of the Federal Government:

It appeared that the new policy may have knuckled under to pressure from eastern Canadian interests.

It goes on to say:

The feed freight subsidy has not been removed and this works to the advantage of livestock producers and feeders in eastern Canada who will always have to buy feed grains in the West at off board prices, to import feeder cattle and process them in the East to support the packing industry in that region. It is ridiculous in this country to transport our feeders into Ontario to support the development of more industry there.

Later on he raised the point that:

There is some possibility that the elevator system in the country could be congested because if the APD starts to buy grain off quota it will seriously affect the ability of the Wheat Board to move grain.

The article concludes:

There is a lot wrong with the Federal program.

I would add that there is a lot wrong with the Liberal Party.

SOME HON. MEMBERS: Hear, hear!

MR. FARIS: — Mr. Speaker, I want to turn to one further subject and it is one which I think is probably the most important included in the Speech from the Throne. That's the question of the Government's action in regard to the petroleum resources of this province. It is interesting that when the Leader of the Opposition and other Members of the Opposition were interviewed by the Press after having first heard the Speech from the Throne, they said there was nothing in it. It was all unimportant, it was all trivial. Well, I think after having said that, the Leader of the Opposition (Mr. Steuart) must have received a

phone call from the oil industry and I think it must have gone something like this: “Davey, what do you mean there is nothing in it, we’re being raped. Oh yes, this is going to confiscate hundreds of millions of dollars from our oil cartel and turn them over to the people of Saskatchewan.” “Oh, this is bad indeed,” says Mr. Steuart, “we’ll have to form a joint corporation, the oil companies and the Liberal Party. We’ll call it Pan Liberal Oil, or Liberal Oil Pan.” Now this Pan Liberal Oil won’t do much drilling but there will be lots of boring, mainly speeches. These speeches will get less and less refined and more and more crude as we get closer to the election. I am sorry that some of the Members of the Corporation have left the Assembly at this time, ‘Gusher’ MacDonald is not in his seat, ‘Light Distillate’ MacLeod is absent, ‘Heavy Distillate’ Guy is out of the room as is his seatmate in Rosthern, ‘Dry Hole’ Boldt.

SOME HON. MEMBERS: Hear, hear!

MR. FARIS: — Mr. Speaker, the attitude taken in this Assembly towards the Petroleum Bill is going to separate the men and the boys in this Assembly. I want to say to the Members of the Opposition, “Boys’ I am sure you will oppose it but when it comes to the next election the people of this province will remember that you wanted those hundreds of millions of dollars to go to the corporations and not to the people of this province.”

SOME HON. MEMBERS: Hear, hear!

MR. FARIS: — Mr. Speaker, I will be very pleased to support the Speech from the Throne.

HON. J.E. BROCKELBANK: (Minister of Government Services) — Mr. Deputy Speaker, I might properly begin my remarks this evening by saying I hadn’t planned to take part in this debate, however, I feel that some of the remarks that have been made earlier in the debate require rebuttal of some type or other.

I would like to be able to say as a preface to my remarks that I enjoyed the comments of the mover and seconder of the Address-in-Reply. Unfortunately I was not in Saskatchewan at that time. I heard good reports about their moving and seconding of the Address-in-Reply and I am sure they acquitted themselves quite well in this Legislature.

The reason that I was out of the province at the time, Mr. Deputy Speaker, was that I was in Ottawa at a Federal-Provincial Minister’s Conference on Communications. The reason for that conference in Ottawa was that the Federal Government doesn’t have a policy on communications and consequently they have called the provincial governments together to attempt to rationalize their position in some way or other. Perhaps I am being unfair when I say that the Federal Government doesn’t have a policy in communications. They have a policy in communications which was possibly current 15 to 20 years ago, however, it is not applicable to the current situation. They have found themselves more or less backing into the 60s and 70s with a communications policy which was formulated many, many years ago. The outcome of the discussions about communications

policy in Canada may affect Saskatchewan severely. Saskatchewan has taken a fairly strong position at the Communications Conference with regard to the economic viability of her own SaskTel communications. Our policy is supported in full by our sister provinces on either side of us. It remains to be seen at this point what position the Federal Government will take with regard to the communications policy, however, I can assure the people of Saskatchewan that we will do everything within our power to maintain the viability of the communications system we have built up over many, many years in the Province of Saskatchewan.

I have listened with a certain amount of care, Mr. Speaker, to the comments that have been emanating from across the way and I have yet to be impressed with anything that would make a suitable headline. Lacking anything of a suitable nature for a headline the Press has been put to a real test to find something to put in their headlines about the people who sit to your left, Mr. Speaker.

I noticed, in leading up to the Session, the Leader of the Opposition (Mr. Steuart) was attempting to get before the public in some way or other. For instance, there was a Liberal Convention as well as a number of other minor things which he attempted to dramatize in order to get his news headline in the Press. I came across one here that was particularly interesting to me, in the Star-Phoenix, October 20th: "Steuart Rejects New Offices". It happens that my Department, the Department of Government Services was in the process of finding more space for MLAs in this building as is befitting the situation. It happened that we were converting a ladies' washroom into space for MLAs. Mr. Steuart was in high dudgeon about this. He called up the Press and he took them down to Room 144. He stood outside and waited. However, the place was occupied and he couldn't get in. He was too much of a gentleman to just barge in and he waited outside and eventually . . .

MR. COWLEY: — Did he kick the door in?

MR. BROCKELBANK: — He made no attempt to kick on the door.

MR. GUY: — When are you going to get to the reply?

MR. BROCKELBANK: — I'm going to get to the reply, you just stick in your seat, because I've got something for you.

SOME HON. MEMBERS: Hear, hear!

MR. BROCKELBANK: — Don't you leave this room for anything, not even to go to the ladies' washroom. Mr. Steuart ended his comments to the Press by saying: "I'm going to refuse these facilities," for his MLAs. I was immediately alerted to the situation when I saw it in the Press. I immediately sent a memo down through my Department and I said, "Regardless of the protest this Department should continue to locate clients in space which is complementary, as much as possible, to their needs and requirements." I want to report to you today, Mr. Speaker, that Messrs Coupland, Wiebe, MacDonald (Moose Jaw), Weatherald, Gardner and MacLeod are comfortably situated in Room 144 in "the

most complementary space I could find for their needs and requirements". So much for Mr. Steuart's headline.

Mr. Steuart has some other headlines. He has the ability to be able to see a little bit ahead and he could see what was happening in northern Saskatchewan. He could see that the people up in northern Saskatchewan were taking a hold of things, they were being involved in community affairs, they were being involved in elections, they were having to make decisions for themselves. Some of the decisions may have been unusual from our position in the South, however, they were making decisions for themselves. Since the people in the North were starting to make decisions for themselves, the Leader of the Opposition thought to himself, well, if they are starting to make thoughtful decisions for themselves and are speaking up more than they did before, what's going to happen when the next election comes. He thought, we've got two MLAs up there that just aren't credible, we've got to do something, withdraw them from that situation, get as much publicity out of the situation as possible. So the grand design was that, "Messrs Guy and Coupland, Make it Official", as the headline reads in the Leader-Post, November 20th.

MR. COMER: — Did they get married?

MR. BROCKELBANK: — No. "Guy and Coupland Make it Official", they are not going to run in the North, they are going to leave that region open for native candidates. Now that's a pretty neat withdrawal from a bad situation, where they grab a headline and make themselves look like good fellows opting out of the picture to let native candidates run. Mr. Speaker, it has nothing whatsoever to do with native candidates running in northern Saskatchewan, it has to do with the hides of two old candidates who have run in northern Saskatchewan. The old hucksters, Mr. Speaker, always prefer to have a shill in the audience and the Liberal Party is no exception. At the convention in Saskatoon, Mr. Speaker, the Member for Rosthern (Mr. Boldt) made some statement about women in our society today. I don't know at this point whether that was his actual, heartfelt feeling about women in our society or whether in fact he was a shill for the Leader of the Opposition so he could grab another headline. The headline was, "Boldt's view of Women Unrealistic, Ridiculous, Liberal Leader Dave Steuart said". There's another headline grabber for the Liberal Party.

Mr. Speaker, I said I wanted to say something about the Hon. Member from Athabasca and I certainly do want to.

Unfortunately, I missed his remarks in the House yesterday or whenever he spoke.

MR. GUY: — You were on a trip.

MR. BROCKELBANK: — I'll talk about the trips too, because I want you here when I'm talking about trips. Including trips at Fort San.

My first experience with the Hon. Member from Athabasca was when I was elected to this House in 1964. The Member of Athabasca, in that first session in 1965 sat over here somewhere and was part of the Government that was newly elected. His main exercise of that 1965 session was a sort of garbage searching

episode by the Member from Athabasca.

AN HON. MEMBER: — He never was able to break that habit either.

SOME HON. MEMBERS: Hear, hear!

MR. BROCKELBANK: — He put himself in the public position with his head and shoulders down in the garbage can and his posterior aimed skywards, reporting to the people of Saskatchewan on what he found in the garbage can. He protested an awful lot as you will probably be quite aware of. I thought to myself, there's a line from Shakespeare that applies here. The line is this, 'The lady doth protest too much, methinks'. That aptly describes the Member for Athabasca and I'll get around to the evidence later on.

Now with regard to the remark that was brought up yesterday, with regard to Fort San. I want to deal with that. I was suspicious when the Member for Athabasca asked a question recently, question No. 54. Did the Department of Government Services rent all or any part of the Fort San property during the month of October for a conference, convention or meeting other than the Government Departments or Agencies, (i) if so, what were the names of the organizations, (ii) who were the person or persons making the applications, (iii) what was the amount of rent paid? The answer follows.

I want to report to the House that one of the clients who rented the quarters was the Northern Institute for Psychotronic Research.

Yes, and I want to report to you at this time, although you alluded to the fact that this association, I know not what it is, had received grants from the Provincial Government. I want to report at this time since this organization was registered with the Provincial Secretary under the Societies Act in September 12, 1972 they have received no grants from the Province of Saskatchewan.

SOME HON. MEMBERS: Hear, hear!

MR. BROCKELBANK: I want to deal further with that.

First comment. The Department of Government Services is not a law enforcement agency and surely you are not suggesting, seriously that I, as the Minister know what type of activities take place when Fort San is rented by certain associations. Surely the Member for Athabasca is not suggesting that I, as a Minister, should conduct a detailed investigation of the program and objectives of other groups who rented the facilities in the same month such as the Hillsdale Baptist Church. I didn't bother looking into the Hillsdale Baptist Church and I didn't bother checking into Our Lady of Sorrows, Roman Catholic Church from Fort Qu'Appelle on their Marriage Encounter Clinic. I didn't bother checking into the Saskatchewan Institute of Chartered Accountants and what they would be doing out at Fort San.

I am suggesting to the Member from Athabasca that he is surely not seriously suggesting to me that the RCMP receive

instructions from the Attorney General's Department to overlook any particular conference. I find it difficult to believe that the Member from Athabasca would make such a groundless attack on the integrity of the RCMP.

The second thing I want to comment on. Mr. Duncan Blewett, being involved with the Association of Northern Psychotronic institute, has absolutely nothing to do with the New Democratic Party or its supporters. The charges of the Member for Athabasca regarding Mr. Blewett's close association with the New Democratic Party are based on Liberal rumors and hearsay.

SOME HON. MEMBERS: Hear, hear!

MR. BROCKELBANK: — Blewett is not now nor has he ever been a member of the Saskatchewan New Democratic Party Executive.

Now I have said that we didn't give them money. I just happened to have checked a little farther to find out who did give them money. The person who gave them the money, who gave them a grant to hold that, as you phrased it 'pot party' at Fort San, was Otto Lang.

SOME HON. MEMBERS: Hear, hear!

MR. BROCKELBANK: — Now, I say Otto Lang because we really have no other Federal Liberal in Saskatchewan. he's our only connection into the Federal Government Cabinet. He's the Ottawa connection, he's the one who gave a grant to your so called 'pot party' at Fort San.

SOME HON. MEMBERS: Hear, hear!

MR. BROCKELBANK: — From what Federal Program was that grant given to them. I'm sure you can find out from Mr. Lang what programs he's funding in Saskatchewan. It should be relatively easy and ;since it was such a swinging affair, I'm sure that he'll quite well remember the situation.

Yes, Mr. Speaker, I'm concerned about some things that go on in Saskatchewan and I can do no better than quote the Member from Athabasca in his speech. I want to quote him directly:

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.

Yes, Mr. Speaker, I think the people of Saskatchewan would be dismayed and shocked. For example, if they knew what was going on behind the doors of room 265 in the Legislative Building (the office of the Member from Athabasca) because this is where he churns out these little plots, where he is trying by innuendo, half-truths and total distortion to smear organizations in the Province of Saskatchewan, the Government of Saskatchewan, anybody who stands in his way. I'm concerned about what's happening behind door 265. I'm sure the people of Saskatchewan are concerned.

SOME HON. MEMBERS: Hear, hear!

MR. BROCKELBANK: — Now, I said before . . . I'm sure you will be able to get the minutes from Otto.

SOME HON. MEMBERS: Hear, hear!

MR. BROCKELBANK: — I said before, Mr. Speaker, that in 1965 I thought the Liberal Party was protesting too much when they were newly in Government and I quoted Shakespeare to show it. When we arrived back here on this side of the House, I decided to do come checking on my own.

I had been given the responsibility for the Purchasing Agency in the Government of Saskatchewan. The Members opposite are quite aware of what happened in the Purchasing Agency because I brought it before the House before. The previous Liberal Government had completely destroyed the tendering process and a good part of the Purchasing Agency in the Province of Saskatchewan. I thought at that time they were protesting too much about what we were doing and I looked into the Purchasing Agency and I found that, in fact, they had ignored low bids, that they had taken high bids and split them. They had awarded some to the low bidder, some to the medium bidder and some to the high bidder. All types of shenanigans went on in the Purchasing Agency under the previous Liberal Government.

I thought to myself these same Liberals doth protect too much about northern Saskatchewan. I thought why don't I have a look at what happened in northern Saskatchewan when they were in power. It's very interesting indeed that one of the main protesters is the Member from Athabasca who at that time was the Minister of Public Works in the Liberal Government.

Now, I suppose, Mr. Speaker, that some of the Members here may have seen the movie called, 'Summer of '42'. This is a story where an older woman, I am told, teaches a young man about the ways of the adult world, therefore, this evening I should like to speak briefly about the summer of '69, when the former Minister of Public Works introduced a couple of his contractor friends to Liberal style government. When I talk about the former Minister of Public Works I mean the Member for Athabasca, who has refused to run in northern Saskatchewan in the next election.

Let me set the scene.

SOME HON. MEMBERS: Hear, hear!

MR. BROCKELBANK: — No, he's cunning, I'll give him credit for that.

Let me set the scene at Cumberland House, one of the oldest communities in this province. The Minister of Public Works, the Member for Athabasca, in a letter to the architect at Prince Albert, dated September 25, 1968 said as follows:

Gentlemen; It is our intention to offer you a commission for professional services relating to a proposed construction of a gymnasium auditorium, an addition to school at Cumberland House, Saskatchewan, with a total construction cost estimated at \$212,000.

The contract was awarded after consideration of invitational tenders received from Parkland Builders and Simpson Construction. On June 6, 1969 the former Minister of Public Works, the present Member for Athabasca advised Simpson Construction that their tender had been accepted.

SOME HON. MEMBERS: Hear, hear!

MR. BROCKELBANK: — They were due for a few more experiences, I'll tell you.

The project, tendered in May, 1969, awarded in June of 1969 with a specified completion date of 77 days was completed and occupied, not at the beginning of the school term, but on December 30, 1969, almost 130 days later.

AN HON. MEMBER: — Where were they going to school eh?

MR. BROCKELBANK: — Yes, that reminds me of another situation in the North, I've heard the Members protesting too loudly about.

Now, what about the Stanley Mission School project. This project is described in a letter to the architect at Prince Albert, dated December 24, 1968.

Gentlemen; Following negotiations between the Minister and the Deputy Minister of Public Works and representatives of Simpson Construction Limited, Nipawin, and in accordance with the terms of reference discussed at our meeting on Monday, December 16, 1968, a contract figure in the amount of \$113,500 has been arrived at for the addition of four classrooms, with corridor, storage room and furnace room.

AN HON. MEMBER: — Hear, hear!

MR. BROCKELBANK: — Well, I don't know I can go back and have another look at that.

SOME HON. MEMBERS: Hear, hear!

MR. BROCKELBANK: — The Department of Public Works has no records of this project being tendered, either publicly or by invitation. Simpson Construction apparently made an offer that could not be refused.

SOME HON. MEMBERS: Hear, hear!

MR. BROCKELBANK: — Although the architect at Prince Albert was advised that Simpson Construction had been awarded the contract in a letter dated December 24, 1968, Simpson Construction's so-called bid on the project was not received by the Department of Public Works until December 30, 1968. One week later.

AN HON. MEMBER: — Christmas rush.

MR. BROCKELBANK: — I guess it must have been the federal mails that did it. The very next day, December 31, 1968 the former Minister of Public Works, the Member for Athabasca, advised Simpson Construction that its lump sum tender had been accepted, so to speak.

Although work was to be completed by the end of March, 1969 the Department's records indicate the work dragged on until August 20, 1969, 140 days late.

AN HON. MEMBER: — . . . they didn't need it until September.

MR. BROCKELBANK: — Still in there ahead of the bell eh.

All right, lets go over to Black Lake, just to show that they were equally consistent all over the North.

SOME HON. MEMBERS: Hear, hear!

MR. BROCKELBANK: — The Black Lake School addition is an interesting project. The requirement report, dated November 11, 1969, indicates that the estimated total project cost would be \$129,500. On December 23, 1969, specific written directions were given that the project was not to go to public tender, but would be tendered on an invitational basis and further that the firm called Simpson Construction was to have the contract.

February 6, 1970, Simpson Construction, the only firm invited to bid according to the records, submitted a bid on the project in the total of \$177,500 and promptly on February 9, 1970, Simpson was advised by the present Member from Athabasca, the former Minister of Public Works that the tender had been accepted.

Let me deal with Patuanak School project. January 16, 1969, Parkland Builders submitted a tender for the construction of a two room school at Patuanak. This tender was apparently another offer that could not be refused and was accepted the very next day. Department records indicate that this project was not put up for either public or invitational tender. However, a letter on file dated January 28, 1969 shed some light on the deals concerning Patuanak and Stanley Mission Schools and I quote:

This will confirm discussions and agreements of January 24, 1969 regarding the supply of school facilities and teacherages at Patuanak and Stanley Mission. It was agreed that the requirements at Patuanak would be met by contracting with Parkland Builders Contracting Limited of Prince Albert for the construction of a two room school and three bedroom teacherage with all materials on site before the spring break-up of 1969.

In the case of Stanley Mission requirements it was agreed that the Department would contract with Simpson Construction to construct a four room addition to the school with units being prefabricated at Nipawin and transported to Stanley Mission before the spring break-up of 1969.

Site work and sewer and water could be proceeded with after spring break-up, with completion not later than September 1, 1969.

The contract was accordingly signed and sealed by the Hon. Member for Athabasca on behalf of the Liberal Government with Parkland Builders on January 17, 1969, calling for construction to be completed by August 15, 1969. However, on November 26, 1969, several months later the Department of Public Works advised Parkland Builders that, I quote:

Prior to payment of any further monies in regard to these contracts, audited statements should be supplied by your firm to this office.

Finally, almost one year afterwards, the Department of Public Works advised Parkland that unless certain deficiencies were rectified by October 16, 1970 then the Department would take the next necessary action to have the work carried out commencing on October 19. The last chapter in this sorry episode, was written on October 28, 1970 when Parkland was advised that the Department would finish the contract itself and charges would be made on the balance outstanding in their account.

Now, here is an interesting one, here is one you don't want to miss, Mr. former Minister of Public Works (Mr. Guy). The summer of 1970 brought a new twist to what was becoming an old story in the North. The contract for the addition to Wollaston Lake School was advertised on July 17, 1970 with tender opening on August 7, 1970. Three firms bid — Gall's Lumber; McNiven Construction and Simpson Construction. The low bid was by Gall's and they said they would complete the project in 60 days; McNiven said they would complete it in 40 days (they had the second highest bid) and the highest bid was Simpson Construction who said they would complete in 60 days.

AN HON. MEMBER: — What happened?

MR. BROCKELBANK: — Guess who got it? On August 18, 1970 Gall's Lumber and Simpson Construction were advised that their tenders had been rejected because their completion time had been listed at 60 days, which was in excess of the specified completion date of September 18. McNiven was advised that their tender was unsuccessful for technical reasons. One might ask — why the children at Wollaston Lake, who urgently needed that additional classroom were to be denied of the facility for these flimsy reasons? But, as noted in the Department record, the answer was swift in coming. On the very same day, August 18, 1970, the old friend Simpson Construction, was sent a letter advising them that their tender had been rejected but on the very same day, August 18, Simpson Construction was sent a letter which reads as follows:

This will confirm our verbal discussion of August 18, 1970 during which I advised that all tenders on the above projects submitted on the tender call of August 7 have been rejected as not having met specifications prescribed in the tender documents. We are interested in completing this school addition at the earliest possible date since school will be starting in September, and there is little doubt that the extremely crowded

conditions will prevail until the additional room is available. We are interested, therefore, in negotiating with your firm to complete the addition since you are presently constructing facilities at the location.

This will confirm that the Department is prepared to accept your invitational tender of \$28,450 for the construction of the facility as outlined in the drawing specification provided in the tender of August 7.

Mr. Speaker, the tender of August 7 which they had already cancelled was therefore accepted at \$50 less than their high tender.

AN HON. MEMBER: — How long did it take?

MR. BROCKELBANK: — How long did it take — by golly — incredible as it may appear we are led to believe that all tenders were rejected because speed was of the essence. Yet, the records show that construction was not completed until the end of October — 15 days later than had been specified by the low bidder, Gall Lumber of Rose Valley.

SOME HON. MEMBERS: Hear, hear!

MR. BROCKELBANK: — Mr. Speaker, time does not permit me to read these other cases that could be cited and I am sure the Opposition is not now quite so anxious to debate this subject any longer. However, I want to take a moment to emphasize the moral of this story.

The Liberal Opposition are clearly hypocrites and political opportunists when they scream about Delta Holdings receiving a contract when, in fact, (a) Delta was the low bidder, (b) invitational tenders were widely distributed to interested northern residents.

This case stands in stark contrast to the Liberal style of contracts conceived in the dark of night, usually between two consenting partners, the Liberals and the contractors.

Who are the contractor friends? Well, Ross Ducommen was the heart and soul of Parkland Builders. I say was, because in fact he went broke even with Government handouts. It is ironic that such a staunch supporter of free enterprise systems was himself a victim of it. In any case, Ross is, and has been for some time, the hatchet man for the Liberals in Prince Albert. He is one of the boys who pulls the strings for the former Deputy Premier, the present Leader of the Opposition (Mr. Steuart) and the present Member for Athabasca (Mr. Guy).

MR. GUY: — Is he still there?

MR. BROCKELBANK: — Well, I don't know where the gentleman is right now.

Mr. Speaker, this has been an unpleasant duty that had to be performed.

SOME HON. MEMBERS: Hear, hear!

MR. BROCKELBANK: — The pleasant part of my time this evening is getting to the end of my remarks where I can say that it is indeed a pleasure to be here and to be able to support this motion, which for the people of Saskatchewan has concrete, sound policies where we are moving ahead on in the North, in energy, in industry and any other number of areas you wish to mention. It will be a pleasure for me, Mr. Speaker, to support this motion.

SOME HON. MEMBERS: Hear, hear!

MR. C.P. MacDONALD: (Milestone) — Mr. Speaker, before I start my comments, I have a couple of things I should like to say about the last two speakers.

First of all, I want to tell the Minister of Government Services the only unpleasant duty was the fact that we had to sit here and listen to him.

SOME HON. MEMBERS: Hear, hear!

MR. MacDONALD: And I want to make a couple more comments.

I want to start off with the Member for Arm River (Mr. Faris). You know he gave a very . . . I have a little respect for the Member for Arm River. He is the man who was the Chairman of the Liquor Committee. I think he was conscientious, but I think he did a real disservice to the people of Saskatchewan, to the members of the Liquor Committee, when he stood up in this House — the man that was the spirit, the driving force behind the pricing policy, the man that was the core and the spirit — and then he didn't mention the fact that this Government is deliberately denied the very recommendations of that committee. In fact, the Premier of the Province turned around and offered to hand a million two hundred thousand dollars to the breweries to do the exact opposite to what the Member for Arm River has recommended. One million two hundred thousand dollars. He never ever bothered. Why the pricing policy? Not a policy to help out milk, or gas or anything else, or bread — a policy to help out those breweries that the Member for Arm River thinks is just terrible.

It is also rather interesting that the Minister of Government Services didn't mention where the grant came from that helped in the little incident, that one in the Qu'Appelle Valley. The reason is that it came from the Opportunities for Youth Program. But you know why he didn't recommend it? Because those grants were recommended and approved by the Department of Youth for the Province of Saskatchewan. That's the reason. Oh, he's a little quiet, he doesn't like to say where they came from. He is the Government, the NDP, they are the ones who recommended it, they are the ones who approved it and the Federal Government in Ottawa permitted the grant for that reason only.

Mr. Speaker, it is rather interesting that the whole core of this debate seems to be that every Member who has stood up has had to defend the Member or the Minister for Northern Saskatchewan (Mr. Bowerman). In fact, what did the Attorney General (Mr. Romanow) say this afternoon. He said: Join us in the highroad to build something new in northern Saskatchewan. Join us in the highroad. Well, I want to tell you something,

we have something new. We've got a new Minister; we've got new waste; we've got new controls; we've got new rip-offs; we've got new patronage. It is rather interesting, isn't it, that the Minister of Government Services got up and talked about invitational bids, poor construction, vague construction projects in an attempt to hide the public scandal of political patronage handed out by the Minister of Northern Saskatchewan to a bunch of NDP supporters in the city of Prince Albert, his friend Leo Lamontagne. The corruption — here they had no money, \$1.4 million. There is a rather interesting comment in the True North. You know I don't usually agree with my friend John Richards, but here is what it says:

The procedure around the calling of tenders for the province in the housing were unorthodox. Tenders were not advertised as is usually the case, but according to Wilf Churchman, Deputy Minister of DNS, interested parties were invited.

Interested political parties.

You know what the Minister gave to his friends. The contract between Delta and DNS, gives Delta 100 per cent occupancy of the houses for ten years at monthly rates of \$256 each, 67 per cent occupancy; 100 per cent occupancy of the apartments for 12 years at an average rental of approximately \$200 per unit. Mr. Speaker, they talk about a rip-off.

They talk about corruption; they talk about scandal; they talk about sweetheart deals, Delta Holdings, and you know the Minister said he was going to stand on his feet and talk about Delta Holdings. He was strangely silent this afternoon and with good reason. All the people stand over there and say, "Why the Liberals — the dirty Liberals talk about DNS, trying to discredit the Department." The other day there were some people from northern Saskatchewan who camped outside these doors for three days protesting the waste, the extravagance, the inefficiency, the fact that the Government were not doing a job and pointing at the Minister of Northern Saskatchewan. They were the native people of northern Saskatchewan.

The Minister made one little mistake this afternoon. He put on our desks an annual report 1972-73 for the Department of Northern Saskatchewan and while the Pages were distributing them up and down the rows to all the Members, he was telling us all about the great jobs, the new efforts, the new projects and if you turn to page 19, it has Public Assistance Caseloads and Payments. You know, in the first five months public assistance in northern Saskatchewan went up 20 per cent. If you project that over a year — 40 per cent. Is it any wonder that those native people came into this House, came into this Legislature holding signs, "Jobs not Welfare" and "We want a Fair Chance" . . .

AN HON. MEMBER: — We want Bowerman.

MR. MacDONALD: — "We want Bowerman", that's right. That's what they really want.

AN HON. MEMBER: — There's enough of him.

MR. MacDONALD: — That's right, there was enough for all of them.

Now, Mr. Speaker, there is one other thing that has been brought up in this House, by the Attorney General — the great, great . . . he talked about the by-election and the gerrymander this afternoon.

Well, I want to tell you something. There was a by-election. I only want to pass a few comments because the rest of my colleagues have done so. There was a massive vote in Lakeview against the NDP. That is the significant thing. He talked about a gerrymander — I don't care if they had held it in the whole city of Regina. The NDP only won three polls in that whole by-election; one by 2; one by 3 and one by 5, and they tied another one. If that was a gerrymander I should like to know what it is. This is a strange thing because the times were good; the economy was good; times were booming, jobs were up. In fact, the only issue of that by-election was the Government. Despite what my friends in the Press Gallery say — they said it was quiet, there was no issue. For example, in Prince Albert there was an issue in 1967 and my friend the Leader of the Opposition (Mr. Steuart) won by 2,700 votes. Two years later he won by about 50. I remember in Weyburn there was an issue and they won by about 1,500 votes and lost a year later. If there had been an issue there would have been no NDP people and I would suggest to my friends in the Press Gallery to examine that a little bit more.

I want to tell you what the issue was. It was the Government of Saskatchewan and the people of Lakeview expressed their opinion. You had better get that message, we are fed up with the control and the arrogance — the arrogance of the Attorney General. He stood up this afternoon and he said; . . . You know what they call you in the country . . . they don't call you Romanow, they call you Romanoff, Romanoff the Dictator. You know what kind of controls I mean . . . the people of Lakeview gave you a message, fellows, a message, and it was rather important. They said, "We don't want any ward system rammed down our throats, we don't want any control by the Provincial Government of the zoning by-laws. We've had enough of that; we don't want any teacher trustee bargaining rammed down the throat of local government; we don't want any control of our hospitals; we don't want any control over urban assistance; we don't want any control of the land; of the industry." They were trying to tell you something that they feel that they can run their own business better than you can and they hope that you would get that message, and to listen to the Attorney General and the Members opposite since they came in this House, they haven't repented and I hope you don't because I want to tell you something. The Liberal victory parade has started. It started in Morse, it started in Athabasca; it started in Lakeview and let me tell you it's going to continue in 1975 and you fellows are the people that are going to accept it.

Another thing about this particular Throne Speech. For some strange reason we expected that the Minister of Agriculture (Mr. Messer) would come in here and defend some of his policies. We expected that he would come in here and talk about some of the things, some of the criticisms that have been over rampant in the Province of Saskatchewan. The Minister of Agriculture didn't come in here and mention one provincial program. You know why, because he was ashamed. Because if he walks out

in the country and listens to farmers of this province, they are sick and tired of Jack Messer telling them how to run their business. Every single piece of legislation that that Minister has implemented and initiated in this particular Legislature has to do with the control of the lives of the farmers, to tell them exactly what they are to do, that is exactly what his speech did last night.

Let us look at the agriculture picture. Saskatchewan today has an unprecedented agricultural boom — \$5 wheat; \$2.25 barley; \$10 flax; \$100 hogs. The cattle industry isn't in quite as good shape as it should be. That wealth has been transferred to every area of the Saskatchewan economy. When the farmer prospers so does the hardware merchant, so does the storekeeper; so does the implement dealer, so does the garage-man. But you know something, despite that prosperity, Jack Messer can't talk about his policies because there is a resentment building up in rural Saskatchewan that will tear the NDP apart in every constituency in this province.

SOME HON. MEMBERS: Hear, hear!

MR. MacDONALD: — Let's look at their program. The Land Bank, which is there to control the very land and make these people of the Land Bank tenant farmers or sharecroppers. Despite the Land Bank over 12,000 farmers have left their farms in two years. The Government tried to implement a Foreign Ownership Bill which stated that if a farmer was born and raised in Saskatchewan and farmed for 50 years, went to Victoria to retire, he was a foreigner in the Province of Saskatchewan. They implemented another one. They called it the Bill 50. They told the farmer where he could deliver his hogs as my friend from Morse (Mr. Wiebe) indicates. They told him what day he could deliver them; what trucker he was going to use and they have even got power to license it. Despite what my friend Mr. Messer says about three per cent, here are the latest statistics on the hog slaughtering in Saskatchewan and they are down 38 per cent in the last year. Almost 40 per cent in one year and you can go to any auction mart, sows are going in there bred, almost ready to farrow, farmers are getting out of the hog business in Saskatchewan like never before. And it isn't because of the price of grain. In cattle — the cattlemen in this province are in trouble because of the price of feed grain, but there is still a good market in the production of hogs and you can ask any farmer over there that produces hogs knows it. There is still a good margin of profit. They just don't want anything to do with the dictatorial attitude of Jack Messer telling them how to run their own business.

Then they turn around and they bought Intercontinental. Not only do they want to tell them how to produce, not only do they want to own their land, not only do they want to tell you who can own land in Saskatchewan, they want to tell you where you can sell your hogs, whether it will be processed and so they bought Intercontinental which is a provincial financial scandal.

But I want to tell you something — just wait, just wait until we send to every farmer in Saskatchewan, clause 28 of Bill No. 42. That clause 28 of Bill 42 states that the Provincial Government can instruct the Land Title's Office to change the title for anyone in the Province of Saskatchewan to

the Crown, without advisement, without negotiation, without anything. That is what they are doing to the oil companies. And then they will write a letter and tell the owner of that title that he must forward the duplicate copy. I wonder what the farmers of Saskatchewan are going to say.

Now, Mr. Speaker, what about the rapeseed vote that the Minister of Agriculture (Mr. Messer) and so many Members have talked about. I have only one comment. The comment is that Mr. Jack Messer doesn't believe in a vote. He didn't believe in one in the Ward System, he didn't believe in one in Bill No. 50, and he doesn't believe in one in the rapeseed question. He doesn't believe that the farmers of Saskatchewan have enough intelligence to make their own decisions. If he were the Minister it would be under the Canadian Wheat Board. He doesn't believe in a vote by the farmers and that is the reason that he is objecting and that is the only reason why he made this speech.

Now, Mr. Speaker, I want to talk for one minute on family allowances. You know the Minister came in the other day and deliberately deceived the Members of the Legislature. Every Member of the Legislature has this copy of the new allowance rates. It starts off the allowance rates for the Saskatchewan Assistance Plan in May, in August and in January. But you know for some strange reason he left off the allowance rates for November. I wonder what my friend the Member from Hanley (Mr. Mostoway) says. And do you know why they left it off? Because they turned around and there was no increase in January, in fact, the majority of people, the majority of mothers with children, lost money from January to November. Because there wasn't a 17 per cent increase in November and a 10 per cent increase in January. In fact, in some cases it was a 5 per cent increase between the two of them. For example, a mother and father with seven children, \$350 in August, \$380 in January. That is less than 5 per cent. Do you know the reason? Because the Minister came in here a year ago and said that they were going to deduct the family allowance and calculate it as income.

Do you know that the only mothers in Saskatchewan, and perhaps the only mothers in Canada, who are not receiving the benefit off the Federal allowance program, are the mothers on welfare in Saskatchewan who need it the most.

You know if you happen to have a husband that has a job and he makes \$100,000, you get it. If you are a Cabinet Minister and you have children your wife gets it. If you happen to own a business worth the assets of one million and a half, you get it. But the welfare mother, she doesn't get it. It deliberately frustrates the family allowance program of the Federal Government and I suggest that this is the only government that shows that it is the most disgraceful thing that the Blakeney Government has done since they have been in office.

I also happen to have in my hand a copy of the real rates. It indicates the rates of October 31st, it indicates the rates November 1st and it indicates the rates of January 1st. But you know when the Minister put it out he didn't bother with that. I will give you an example: A single mother with six children on November 1st got \$298.05. But you know they had the big increase on January 1st and now she gets exactly \$300, and increase of \$1.95. Why? Because they took her \$140 family allowance and deducted it from welfare.

There is one thing that I should like to say to the Minister of Education (Mr. MacMurchy). I made a Press release and I said that the Government of Saskatchewan was making a farce out of Teachers' Collective Bargaining. I said that the Government of Saskatchewan had dictated the terms whereby the trustees and the government team would make the settlement to the teachers. And so what happened? I will tell you exactly what happened.

The trustees and the Government Members met and they had a little disagreement as to what the counter proposal would be for the teachers. But do you know what the Government did? The Government Members of that team said, "Look we will make a compromise, we will have a meeting the next day." When they arrived the Government Members came in and threw a different piece of paper on the table, directly contrary to the agreement that they had had the night before.

Here is what the trustees had to say about it.

The heavy hand of the Government has been brought into prominence in our joint committee for the first time. A difference of opinion arose between the Government and the school board representatives as to the salary grids to be included in the counter proposals. This difference was resolved by a compromise on October 23rd, but two days later the Government representatives returned to their original position, they returned without consultation and without information.

I say that Mr. MacMurchy is not telling the people of Saskatchewan the truth. I want to tell the Member for Saskatoon-Nutana (Mr. Rolfes) that it is a time bomb. That one more effort by the Minister of Education like that and there will be no more trustees on the trustee boards because they don't trust him, they don't want to be there, they are now biding time hoping that that will be the last time that the Minister of Education will dictate the terms from above of a supposed to be combined trustee-teacher board.

Mr. Speaker, I want to make a few comments on energy. First of all thank God for energy in this particular debate, because the NDP had absolutely nothing to offer and then a mid-East crisis came along and gave them an opportunity for something to dominate this debate because it was the poorest Throne Speech, the most barren, dull, bankrupt of any new ideas that I have ever seen. 'What did they do?

They started off with a vicious attack on the oil industry, a very vicious attack. They demonstrated all their hate, all their animosity and all their viciousness against the business community. Why, Mr. Speaker? To do two things; to hide their own lack of policy and to provide justification for confiscation and expropriation.

Let me quote Premier Blakeney in his Throne Speech address:

We believe that oil reserves are not the property of the international oil companies to be exploited only for profit.

I agree with you, but I should like to ask you who is responsible, who gave those rights? Who set the royalties? Who

begged them to come to Saskatchewan? Was it Dave Steuart? Was it the Liberal Party in Ottawa? Was it Don MacDonald? No, they were people by the names of Tommy Douglas and Clarence Fines, that's who they were. They begged those dirty Americans to come into the Province of Saskatchewan; they begged those dirty Americans to invest their money. I hear the Minister of Northern Saskatchewan talking about those dirty Americans. Do you know what they did, Mr. Fines and Mr. Douglas? They didn't give 20,000 acres. There are something like 20 millions of mineral acreage in the Province of Saskatchewan. Three companies own 8.5 million or 40 per cent — three companies — given by the NDP, by Clarence Fines, Tommy Douglas and Allan Blakeney. Another 10 companies own 15 per cent of that acreage.

I wonder how many of you Members know that in 1964 when we became the Government . . .

AN HON. MEMBER: — Who gave it . . .

MR. MacDONALD: — For example, how many of the Members know that there was a line in Saskatchewan called the AB line and that any oil company that went beyond that AB line didn't have to pay anything, until 1964. When you talk about corporate rip-off, the NDP are the originators of the rip-off of the oil industry in Saskatchewan, when they permitted land men to go around the Province of Saskatchewan and buy land acreage mineral rights for 10 cents an acre from farmers, and re-steal it from farmers and resell it for \$1 or \$2 to big oil companies, they made themselves millionaires overnight. That is where the corporate rip-off came. You originated it!

Mr. Speaker, the only Government in Saskatchewan or in Canada that hasn't done absolutely nothing about energy in the last two and one-half years is the NDP in Saskatchewan. Look what Premier Reagan has done in Nova Scotia with his deep port, his refinery policy. Look at Manitoba even — incentives, cash grants, first time they got exploration. Look at what the NDP did in British Columbia — opening it up, double the well-head price. Look at what they did in Alberta — Lougheed, from the day that he became the Premier, has been renegotiating with the oil companies to get more for the resources of the Province of Alberta. He has been trying to develop an oil policy. The only vacuum in the Dominion of Canada is in the Province of Saskatchewan. That is the only vacuum.

What happened when the oil price went up 95 cents a barrel? Who had to move in? The only man who had to move in was a man by the name of Don MacDonald from the Federal Liberal Government because Allan Blakeney refused to do anything and Kim Thorson sat on his behind. What policy made the corporate rip-off? How many millions of dollars would have gone to the United States already had it not been for Donald MacDonald and his export tax? What particular policies have you done?

The only province in Canada, Saskatchewan, that has had a vacuum in oil policy. The only province that has never said anything, the number two producer.

The second thing, Mr. Speaker, I want to say about the policies of Mr. Blakeney. I listened to him on radio tonight and you know I think it was the 'first' for a Canadian Premier. Never before have we heard amore non-Canadian, antinational,

narrow Saskatchewan first, Saskatchewan only, bigoted speech on oil or natural resources than came from the Premier tonight.

SOME HON. MEMBERS: Hear, hear!

MR. MacDONALD: — He said we want Saskatchewan oil for Saskatchewan farmers in 1990. Canada can go to Hades. You know he said we would co-operate with the Federal Government but only if they co-operate under our terms. I say that the people of Saskatchewan will not stand for that kind of a policy.

Mr. Speaker, do you know that if in 20 years from now we are not successful in finding oil and Saskatchewan is out of oil, I wonder if Alberta will treat us like that. For example, do you know that we utilize about 20 million barrels a year, as the Premier indicated, and almost all of that comes from Alberta. Why? Because the oil in the Province of Saskatchewan is heavy and medium oil and we do not even use it and we can't even refine it. We buy our oil from Alberta and yet the Premier says, we want Saskatchewan oil for Saskatchewan people. What about the poor people in Manitoba, are they going to turn off their lights and turn off their heat? Is that what you want? And you think that Saskatchewan can win; no iron from Quebec for Saskatchewan for IPSCO; no nickel from Ontario; no copper from British Columbia.

I suggest that the Premier had better recognize that he can't put a wall around Saskatchewan and balkanize his program. I also suggest to him that he open his eyes and recognize that the oil and energy crisis is a national crisis. In fact, it is an international crisis.

I should also like to tell him, but I am afraid I don't have the time, I am against oil nationalization and Saskoil and Canoil. I should like to tell you why.

MR. BLAKENEY: — Tell that to Trudeau.

MR. MacDONALD: — I will, don't ever worry. For example, have you any idea how much was spent in exploration in Canada last year? \$690 million, another \$420 million in development for over one billion. And do you know what our oil reserves were for that year? Three hundred and twelve million less than there was at the beginning of the year. Do you know how much we have spent in Saskatchewan in oil exploration and development in the last 10 years without one major find? Over \$700 million in both development and exploration, without a major find. All the good land is gone. And you are suggesting that the taxpayers do that? Do you know how the price of development has gone up in the Province of Saskatchewan? Three dollars and thirty-four cents was the replacement cost of a barrel of oil in Canada in 1968. Do you know what the cost of replacement oil in Canada is in 1972? Fourteen dollars and eighteen cents, for the same amount of exploration. It will probably cost \$2 billion and no guarantee that we get one well, no guarantee that we would get one single barrel of oil. The Premier's policy is going to drive every oil company out of the Province of Saskatchewan as sure as you are sitting on that side of the House.

Mr. Speaker, interrupted the debate, and the question being put, on the motion, it was agreed to on the following recorded division:

YEAS — 40

Messieurs

Blakeney
Dyck
Meakes
Wood
Smishek
Romanow
Messer
Snyder
Bowerman
Kramer
Thibault
Larson
Baker
Brockelbank

MacMurchy
Pepper
Michayluk
Byers
Thorson
Whelan
Kwasnica
Carlson
Engel
Owens
Robbins
Tchorzewski
Cowley

Matsalla
Faris
Cody
Mostoway
Gross
Feduniak
Comer
Rolfes
Hanson
Oliver
Feschuk
Kaeding
Flasch

NAYS — 13

Messieurs

Coupland
Loken
Guy
Boldt
Grant

MacDonald (Milestone)
McIsaac
Gardner
Weatherald

MacLeod
Lane
Wiebe
Malone

HON. R. ROMANOW: (Attorney General) — Mr. Speaker, I move seconded by the Premier (Mr. Blakeney).

That the said Address be engrossed and presented to His Honour the Lieutenant-Governor by such Members of the Assembly as are of the Executive Council.

Motion agreed to.

The Assembly adjourned at 9:06 o'clock p.m.