

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

Thursday, December 5, 1974.

The Assembly met at 2:30 o'clock p.m.
On the Orders of the Day.

INTRODUCTION OF GUESTS

MR. A. B. BLAKENEY (Premier): — Before the Orders of the Day I wonder if I might introduce to the House a number of distinguished visitors. We have with us three visitors from the provinces of British Columbia and Ontario. There has been a Manpower Conference in Regina, an Interprovincial Manpower Conference, and as a result thereof Ministers from other provinces have been in attendance and we have with us today the Deputy Premier and Minister of Education of the Province of British Columbia, the Hon Eileen Dailly.

HON. MEMBERS: — Hear, hear!

MR. BLAKENEY: — The Minister of Labour of the Province of British Columbia, the Hon. Bill King...

HON. MEMBERS: — Hear, hear!

MR. BLAKENEY: — ... and the Minister of Manpower of the Province of Ontario, the Hon. Jack NcNie.

HON. MEMBERS: — Hear, hear!

MR. BLAKENEY: — Other members of the respective provincial delegations who were in attendance at the Conference, some of them are seated in the Speaker's Gallery.

HON. MEMBERS: — Hear, hear!

MR. D.G. STEUART (Leader of the Opposition): — Mr. Speaker, I should like to join with the Premier in welcoming these visitors and just say a word of explanation. There are not many of us on this side of the House, by popular consent of the public in 1971, unfortunately.

HON. MEMBERS: — Hear, hear!

MR. STEUART: — However, the reason the rest of them are away is that there are hundreds of Liberals gathered at a great convention in Regina and they are down there...

SOME HON. MEMBERS: — Hear, hear!

AN HON. MEMBER: — How many!

MR. STEUART: — There are 702 at the last count but there should be a thousand.

ANNOUNCEMENT

LOREBURN HIGH SCHOOL FOOTBALL TEAM

MR. D. L. FARIS (Arm River): — Mr. Speaker, today I would like to announce to the House that once again the Loreburn Central High School football team has won the provincial championship. This team won the championship despite several injuries to key players in the playoff games. The teams they defeated in hard-fought battles were the teams from Caronport and Montmartre.

HON. MEMBERS: — Hear, hear!

QUESTIONS

QUERIES RE PATIENTS' AND INSTITUTIONAL WORKERS' RIGHTS

MR. J. G. RICHARDS (Saskatoon University): — Before the Orders of the Day, Mr. Speaker, I should like to address a question to the Minister of Health (Mr. Smishek). I have had representations made to me by the Saskatchewan Human Rights Association and other organizations, as have other Members of the Assembly, and the question I should like to pose to the Minister is; What plans does he have under way to try and address himself to the queries made by the Human Rights Association concerning (1) the rights of patients, (2) the rights of health workers; and (3) the question of accountability of corporate health institutions such as hospitals?

HON. W. E. SMISHEK (Minister of Health): — Mr. Speaker, I have had representations as the Hon. Member has mentioned from the Human Rights Association as well other groups to look into the question of patients' rights, the rights of doctors and other health workers in institutions and the accountability of institutions to the public. I have concluded that there is need for a public committee to be established to investigate and to study the areas of complaint and questions that have been raised. For the last several months I have been trying to establish a representative committee. I have invited the Saskatchewan Hospital Association, the Saskatchewan Nursing Home and Special Care Home Associations, the College of Physicians and Surgeons, as well as the Human Rights Association and the Saskatchewan Federation of Labour to give me a panel of names and also to suggest possible terms of reference. That committee is in the process of being established. I am hopeful that before the end of the year I'll be able to announce the makeup of the committee to look into this whole area. There are other jurisdictions that have been discussing the problems that are being posed in institutional care and particularly of patients' rights and rights of people in institutions. May I assure the Hon. Member that the matter is under active consideration and very soon we shall be announcing a public committee to look into this whole matter.

MR. RICHARDS: — A supplementary, Mr. Speaker, there has been a particular inquest into that with respect to a death at the City Hospital and there has been concern as to the breadth of the definition of the terms of reference of your committee. Do I have the assurance of the Minister that you are wanting to define this problem broadly to cover all areas on which submissions and

representations have been made?

MR. SMISHEK: — Yes, Mr. Speaker, it is the intent of that committee to hold public hearings to get the broadest input of the people from Saskatchewan into this whole area and no doubt the committee will like to interview individuals - some particular people who have special skills and interests in the area.

BURNS & COMPANY LAYING OFF EMPLOYEES IN PRINCE ALBERT

MR. D. G. STEUART (Leader of the Opposition): — Mr. Speaker, I would like to direct a question to the Premier. Is he aware that Burns and Company have announced today the laying off of 240 of their employees in the Prince Albert Plant in March of next year? Is he aware of this and what action, if any, has he taken or has his Department of Industry or his Government taken to try and forestall this, to try and work with this Company to avoid this very, very serious layoff that is almost 50 per cent of the staff.

HON. A. E. BLAKENEY (Premier): — Mr. Speaker, a member of the Press indicated this to me about a half hour ago. I am not aware of any previous notice of this impending event or report of an impending event. I am not aware of any notice which the Company may have given to the Government. We will certainly be considering the report and attempting to ascertain its accuracy or otherwise and if it proves to be an accurate report of what the Company proposes to do, we will certainly consult with them immediately to see whether or not appropriate steps could be taken to forestall the proposed layoff or otherwise to deal with the situation.

MR. STEUART: — Mr. Speaker, I am rather amazed to hear the Premier say that he had just heard of this some hours ago. I am informed by the President of the Company that the Department of Labour and the Government of Saskatchewan was informed many weeks ago. Now this is the second time in this short Session that I have asked the Premier about something and he professes ignorance of what is going on. Surely his Department of Labour would inform him. My question is, what kind of a Government is he running when his own Department of Labour won't inform him or doesn't take the trouble to inform the Premier there is going to be a layoff of 240 people in an industry in the Province of Saskatchewan?

Mr. Speaker, I have asked the Premier a question. Is he going to sit there arrogantly and ignore it. I want to know and the people of this province and in Prince Albert want to know if the Department of Labour hasn't even had the courtesy or if there is that lack of communication and they haven't even informed him of this very, very serious situation that is happening in the city of Prince Albert to this industry.

MR. BLAKENEY: — Mr. Speaker, I think we have had a repetition of this, time after time in this House and the previous House, of the Member for Prince Albert West giving his version of the facts and then making a declamatory statement on them. I don't propose to make declamatory statements as he does on alleged facts. When I look at the facts and find out what they are I will answer

December 5, 1974

the question.

MR. SPEAKER: — Order, order!

SASKATCHEWAN CONTROL OF NATURAL RESOURCES

MR. H. H. ROLFES (Saskatoon Nutana South): — Mr. Speaker, I should like to direct a question to the Attorney General (Mr. Romanow). I should like to know if the Attorney General has read the December 3rd story in the Leader-Post, which says and I quote: —

The Federal Government intends to join an oil company in challenging the legislation passed by the Saskatchewan Legislature, Justice Minister Otto Lang said Monday.

And if so, what is Saskatchewan's response to the latest attack by the Federal Government and a Federal Minister from Saskatchewan on the right of Saskatchewan to control its own natural

HON. R. ROMANOW (Attorney General): — Mr. Speaker, I have indeed read the story and I must say I read it with disappointment but no great surprise. Because this confirms the pattern of the Federal Government, they adopted when they intervened on the side of Central Canada Potash against the Government of Saskatchewan and the case is still pending before the Courts. We continue to worry about this insistence or appearance of insistence by the Federal Government to attack Saskatchewan's right to ownership and control of our natural resources. I can assure the House and the people of the Province of Saskatchewan that we will defend this action legally every step of the way.

SOME HON. MEMBERS: — Hear, hear!

ADJOURNED DEBATES

ADDRESS-IN-REPLY

The Assembly resumed the adjourned debate on the proposed motion by Mr. J. K. Comer (Nipawin) and the amendment thereto by Mr. Steuart (Leader of the Opposition).

MR. A. R. GUY (Athabasca): — Mr. Speaker, so there will be no misunderstanding at the end of my remarks I would note that there have been three minutes taken by the Member from Saskatoon and the Attorney General by asking and answering questions of their own. I have been allotted 25 minutes and I intend to take not more than 25 and perhaps I might even take less.

I should also like to welcome those people from out of town, particularly from British Columbia, another socialist province, and hope that perhaps they will have some ideas to give to the Government of Saskatchewan on how they can provide people for local people so that we don't have to go to Spain and other European countries in order to bring people into our province to fill vacant jobs.

As I mentioned yesterday it is a privilege to rise and

speak in this last Throne Speech Debate before the next provincial election. At least we expect it to be the last Throne Speech before a provincial election, although after you listen to it one wonders whether the democratic process will continue in this province because I'll tell you I would hate to take what's in this Throne Speech to the people of the Province of Saskatchewan and expect to be re-elected on it. After one reads this Throne Speech with its barren substance, it becomes hard to believe that a responsible government could neglect to mention, much less put forward, proposals to combat the two major problems facing Canada and the world today - inflation and shortages of food, and natural resources.

Yet in ten pages of the Throne Speech the word inflation was not mentioned. In two hours of speech making by the mover and seconder the word inflation was not mentioned. Perhaps worst of all the Premier of Saskatchewan spoke for 45 minutes Tuesday afternoon and an hour and a half yesterday and not once did he mention the word inflation.

One recalls it was only a year ago that the NDP both federally and provincially, could speak of nothing else but inflation. Resolutions appeared on the Order Paper from Government Members asking for inquiries into food prices and farm machinery prices. Every speech referred to it as eating away at the very heart of our citizens. Tears were shed for the people on fixed income, for employees whose latest salary raises were being eaten away, and for all citizens who saw the cost of living increases every month destroying their purchasing power.

With this concern being shown less than 12 months ago, why is it not being mentioned by the Blakeney Government today? Why is it a No! No! in this year's Throne Speech Debate? Has inflation subsided? Ask the man on the street and he will say No! Check the statistics and you will find he is right, it is still Canada's and the world's biggest challenge.

Why then is this silence opposite? I'll tell you why. Premier Blakeney and his Government are not prepared to put their money where their mouth was 12 months ago. Although their revenues are greater than ever before, they are not prepared to assist in the fight against inflation. They said last year people on fixed income need additional help, but this year when the senior citizens of our province asked for additional assistance, the Finance Minister said we can't afford to help you and they were turned away.

Last year they said salaried people should be protected against inflation, but now that their own Public Service Union are asking for this protection and are being forced to strike to gain the attention of this Government, Mr. Blakeney says, "Tough luck, boys, your agreement doesn't come up for negotiation until next October."

Last spring after subsidizing the breweries, the Blakeney Government was forced into subsidizing milk by five cents a quart. Now they hope that the public have forgotten the beer subsidy, so they have eliminated the milk subsidy with the result milk went up five cents in October and is going up two cents more in January.

Last session the Blakeney Government said meat costs are too high, and we all agreed. But he had an opportunity to bring them down through Intercontinental, which he owns or partly owns.

Have you noticed that Intercon products are lower than other packing houses? Of course not, Blakeney is taking his pound of flesh along with everyone else. Put these all together with increased Government spending, and the waste and inefficiency of this Government, and you see why inflation was not mentioned in the Throne Speech by Members opposite.

In fact, when you try to recall what the Throne Speech and its mover and seconder did mention, three things come out very early. (1) More time is spent in reliving the past four years than preparing for the next four. (2) A more than usual attempt to blame Ottawa for the ills besetting the NDP Government of Saskatchewan today. (3) A departure from the last three years of depicting the Government as the NDP team to one of depicting it as the "Blakeney" Government. From this one must assume that the team made so many mistakes that together they will never reach the goal line.

For the balance of my time, I should like to look at these three trends as shown by the Throne Speech. Little time needs to be spent in reference to the NDP Government reliving the past, as this is natural from a party that is bankrupt of ideas and imagination. It is not a serious problem because the people of Saskatchewan will soon have an opportunity to replace this tired, worn-out regime with a government alive to the challenges of today.

However, the other two trends have far more serious consequences for the people of our province. For the first three years of this Government it was quite noticeable that Premier Blakeney stayed securely in the background, particularly when controversial legislation was presented. We all remember how it was Messer's Foreign Ownership Bill which had to be withdrawn because of opposition to it. It was Messer's Land Bank and Hog Commission which raised the ire of so many farmers. It was Kim Thorson's Bill 42 that destroyed the oil industry and which got the Minister in so much trouble that they had to bring in a program of compensation for the oil service industry in the Estevan area, which he represents, to try and save his seat in the next provincial election. It was Smishek's Fluoridation Bill that had to be withdrawn. It was Romanow who was left to face the flak on the abortion issue, and it was Romanow's Privacy Act that muzzled the Press. It was Bowerman who took blame for DNS and he was joined by MacMurchy as the Bobbsy Twins who destroyed the Human Resources Development Agency. It was Cody who was sacrificed for the most unfair payments of flood damage last spring. It was Kramer who destroyed the road system in Saskatchewan. It was Byers left to explain the unworkable Litter Act, and the lack of preparation for last spring's flood. It was Wood who forced the ward system on the cities of Saskatoon and Regina. It was Cowley who raised the income tax twice, it was MacMurchy who broke up the University, it was Snyder who weakened the position of union members and it was Tchorzewski who could close down a business for five days. Never once did the Premier let his name become associated with these restrictive and undesirable actions.

Today, however, as we prepare for an election, these Ministers are not mentioned in the hope their mistakes and ill-conceived actions will be forgotten. It is obviously the hope of the Government that the gross inefficiency and ineptitude of the Premier's 18 ministers, deputies and assistants, which are costing the taxpayers \$2.4 millions per year, will be

forgotten and in their collective places will be the golden image of a Premier untarnished by the actions of his Ministers.

What those strategists who are trying to present this image forget is that the Premier as he stands front and centre to take his bows today, must also be recognized as standing front and centre since the day he was sworn in as Premier. He is the First Minister, and as such he is responsible for every action and every piece of legislation produced by his Government.

It is not good enough for him to hide for three years while the people of Saskatchewan were sold into bondage by his Ministers' restrictive legislation, and then come out of his hole in the woodwork when an election is in the offing. He forfeits his right to be called Premier unless he is prepared to stand up and take the responsibility of all the actions of his Ministers since they became the Government of the day, back in 1971.

When one looks at the Premier's image on this basis, the Blakeney Government's record becomes a sorry one and one not worthy of future support. I could take all afternoon giving examples to prove this contention, but because my time is limited, I will use only several of the most glaring reasons why Mr. Blakeney's leadership must be questioned by the people of Saskatchewan.

The first must be the Throne Speech itself, which he as Premier is responsible for. It takes only to the second paragraph for the Premier to admit that in spite of the most buoyant economy, Saskatchewan has witnessed in her history, through no action of his Government, but rather as a result of the Good Lord providing our agricultural crops and the Federal Government selling it at a good price, Saskatchewan is in trouble. He refers to a renewed sense of urgency and to warning clouds on the horizon. This is strange coming from a government that brags that 133 of 139 promises of the New Deal for People was not the answer to our prayers if it has got us in trouble in three and one half years, when the agricultural economy was at its peak, federal payments to Saskatchewan were at an all-time high, and there was an ever-growing market and demand for our natural resources.

Just think of the chaos that would be prevalent today if the New Deal for People had to cope with the economic problems that faced the Liberal Government in its last three and one half years in office.

No, Mr. Speaker, the New Deal for People has not been a good deal for Saskatchewan and all the arguments put forth by Members opposite in support of it will not make it so. Whenever a shortcoming of the New Deal is pointed out to the public of Saskatchewan the Blakeney Government's cry is always the same "It is Ottawa's fault."

Never in the history of Saskatchewan has any government received the co-operation, shared programs and financial support from the Federal Government that the NDP has in the last four years. They have received more in the last year than the Liberal Government received in its whole last term of office. And yet it is not enough! Not a day goes by that the Premier or one of his Ministers is not crying to Ottawa for more assistance for one program or another. Programs started in haste

December 5, 1974

by the NDP for political purposes have had to be bailed out by Ottawa. Programs which were promised by the NDP have not started because Ottawa won't participate. Programs started cannot be improved by the NDP until they press Ottawa for more assistance. Press clipping after press clipping by Minister after Minister apologizing for their inaction but they all end the same way by saying we will ask Ottawa for more assistance.

The Minister of Social Services (Mr. Taylor) can't provide more help to senior citizens because the Federal Government won't provide more money.

The Minister of Housing can't start new programs on his own unless Ottawa pays at least half the cost. There is not one new industry or plant started in Saskatchewan since 1971 that didn't receive a DREE grant, but the Minister of Industry (Mr. Thorson) says it's not enough.

The Attorney General (Mr. Romanow) couldn't start a native constable program without Ottawa's blessing.

The Minister of the Environment (Mr. Byers) couldn't move on the recommendation of the Qu'Appelle Study without federal assistance. The Minister of Health (Mr. Smishek), Agriculture Mr. Messer), Natural Resources (Mr. Kowalchuk) and Municipal Affairs (Mr. Wood) have all asked for more money and have all received more. Yet it is never enough.

The most ridiculous case of all has to be the Minister of Highways (Mr. Kramer), and I am sorry he is not in his seat, who has let the Saskatchewan highway system become a shambles. Two years ago he asked the Federal Government to let the military build his roads because he couldn't cope with the problem. Now a few days ago he wanted the Federal Government to fly workers back and forth from the Maritimes to Saskatchewan to build his highways for him. In spite of this irresponsible Minister, the Federal Government came through again with \$21.2 million in assistance to upgrade Saskatchewan highways.

When you listen to the Premier and his Ministers cry to Ottawa one would almost forget that the NDP were elected to govern this province. They have accepted limited responsibility content to be the middleman between Ottawa and the people of Saskatchewan. Saskatchewan citizens are rightfully asking, "Whom did we elect as a government in 1971, the NDP or the Liberals in Ottawa?" More important they are saying if the Government can't show some imagination and initiative on their own in coping with problems which are basically the responsibility of a provincial government, then they should be replaced by a government which can.

SOME HON. MEMBERS: — Hear, hear!

MR. GUY: — In spite of this tremendous financial assistance that Saskatchewan has received from Ottawa, Member after Member complains bitterly and tries to blame Ottawa for their own negligence and incompetence.

The Premier is so ashamed of his own record of achievement he is trying to make his relationship with Ottawa the main issue in the coming provincial election. But I can tell him it won't work. People in Canada know the difference between federal and

provincial politics. They know that every four or five years they have the opportunity to pass judgement on the Federal Government and every four or five years they have a similar opportunity to pass judgement on the Provincial Government. They know that it is only fair and, just to judge each government on its own actions and not confuse federal and provincial politics.

In case Mr. Blakeney has forgotten, this occurred less than six months ago. The people of Canada and Saskatchewan were called upon to judge the federal political parties and they judged that Prime Minister Trudeau and the Liberal Party should have a majority government.

In Saskatchewan, after watching the provincial NDP try to inject provincial policies into the federal campaign because they had no federal issues after David Lewis and the NDP supported Trudeau for two and a half years, the people of Saskatchewan didn't appreciate this deception and the number of NDP MPs was reduced from five to two and the Liberals increased from one to three. I suggest that if Premier Blakeney tries to inject federal politics into the provincial campaign, the result will be the same. Regardless of how well or how poorly the Federal Government is treating Saskatchewan today, the Saskatchewan people know their opportunity will come to pass judgement on them, the same way they will pass judgement on the NDP provincial policies this coming June.

SOME HON. MEMBERS: — Hear, hear!

MR. GUY: — One is not surprised, however that Premier Blakeney cannot get the Federal Government off his mind. His greatest failure as Premier has been in his relationship with Ottawa. By his own words uttered one day before this Throne Speech was read, he stood condemned before the people of his province when he said, "Federal-provincial relations are at the lowest ebb he can recall in 14 or 15 years of public life." This confession comes from the same man who when Opposition Leader said, "Make me Premier and this fighting with Ottawa will cease. We will negotiate instead of constant confrontation."

Now today, four years later, he confesses he has failed miserably and Saskatchewan is embroiled in confrontation the like that this province has never seen. The Premier is prepared to destroy Canada and Saskatchewan if he thinks it will help him in the next election by taking the people's mind off his provincial record of dismal failure.

We had an example yesterday. Mr. Blakeney finally admitted under duress, that the agreement with the Prime Minister wasn't what he has been saying for the last two weeks. He had been saying that 100 per cent of oil revenues would be excluded from equalization payments but yesterday he admitted, he admitted publicly in this House, that maybe he had made a mistake. That perhaps it was true that some of the revenues would be included in the equalization process. Now if he will deliberately mislead the people of Saskatchewan on one issue how can we trust him not to mislead them on other issues that are in front of the public today as far as Ottawa and Saskatchewan are concerned. I think we need a more forthright Premier whose concern is with Saskatchewan rather than his own political fortunes.

As a result of Premier Blakeney's leadership and policies,

I have found more concern, unrest and uneasiness in Saskatchewan today than at any time since 1944. The people don't trust Blakeney and his boys any more. They finally realize that the NDP of today are not the CCF of the '40s and '50s. Even good NDP supporters are worried by the Government's grab for power and their trampling of the rights of the individual. No Socialist Government in the western world and few east of the Iron Curtain have attempted as successfully to socialize a Country, state or province to the extent that the Blakeney Government has done during the last four years. No area of society has been left untouched, with disastrous effects on the economy, our institutions and the individual.

For nearly 40 years the CCF-NDP stated their goal of owning and controlling the means of production and distribution but it lay dormant. True, the old CCF made several abortive attempts to establish Crown corporations, but these soon went by the wayside. Then under the Blakeney Government the lion awoke. Within four years the threat of the state controlling the land and resources of Saskatchewan has become a real issue in Saskatchewan today.

Farmers are becoming tenants rather than owners as the Land Bank gobbles up their land at every opportunity. The purchase of the Matador Co-op farm was the first in a series of state farms. The other day a new dimension was added under the thinly veiled disguise of developing more irrigation land. The government is now prepared to buy land and lease, not sell it to farmers interested in irrigation. This is just another way of gaining government control of more privately owned land. The Foreign Ownership Bill which made foreigners of Canadian people, The Succession Duty and Gift Tax Act have all threatened the ownership of Saskatchewan farm land by individual farmers. Premier Blakeney says this is a good policy, but we say it will cost the Government every rural seat in the province, including one presently represented by the Minister of Agriculture.

SOME HON. MEMBERS: — Hear, hear!

MR. GUY: — Forest companies saw contracts broken and the Government taking over direct control of the forest industry with no compassion for individual producers. I was surprised yesterday that the Premier didn't reply to the accusation made by the Leader of the Opposition regarding Springate. I tell you that United States have a Watergate but we have a worse problem in Saskatchewan with Springate. There is a bigger conflict of interest here in Saskatchewan, today, by giving Springate the right to make the studies and then carrying out those studies on the basis that Springate gets all the control of the forest developments and input into the development of these resources. We saw what happened in Manitoba under Churchill Forest Industries. I'll tell you that under that Conservative and NDP Government in Manitoba that may only be the tip of the iceberg compared to what will happen in Saskatchewan today if we let Springate go uncontrolled, as the Premier and his Government are prepared to do at the present time.

The oil and gas, potash and base metal industry followed in rapid order. Nor were they content to confine their controlling efforts to resource industries, they invaded the business field with the purchase of varying degrees of ownership and control over Intercon, Ipsco and others. Included in this was the right

to close down an individual entrepreneur for five days with no recourse to the law.

No institution has been free of the heavy hand of government. The University, teachers and school boards, hospitals, senior citizens, welfare recipients, local governments have all felt the unwelcome presence of the Blakeney Government.

When one asks Mr. Blakeney what his Government is going to do he says, 'This is the Saskatchewan option.' I hope the people of Saskatchewan will study this option well because along with what I have already mentioned today, it includes decline in population, increased taxes, greatest labour unrest that this province has ever seen, rampant political patronage as seen by Service Printers, the advertising in the Commonwealth and Delta Holdings in northern Saskatchewan.

What the Saskatchewan option and Premier Blakeney are really saying is these are problems we have not the ability or the courage to do anything about, but aren't we lucky to be living in Saskatchewan under an NDP Government.

We, in the Liberal Party, say this is a defeatist attitude. We believe these problems can be solved. We are not content to see Saskatchewan stay as it is and continue to decline. We believe if we return some of the rights and responsibilities to individuals and get the Government off their backs, that progress can and will be made.

SOME HON. MEMBERS: — Hear, hear!

MR. GUY: — We believe that sensible, fair resource and industrial policies will encourage development, rather than stifle it, but it won't be under a Premier who lacks the courage and the leadership to admit that the NDP philosophy is wrong in many areas. It will come from a Liberal Party under Dave Stewart, who have the faith in the future, growth and development of our province and who are not afraid to face responsibilities and challenges of those willing to risk their time, money and effort to make Saskatchewan grow and become a better place to live.

In conclusion, Mr. Speaker, I want to just make one comment about what the Member from Saskatoon Hanley (Mr. Mostoway) and the Premier said in regard to me running in the new seat of Rosthern. This is not surprising when one considers it was the Government, not the Independent Boundaries Commission that eliminated my present seat from the electoral map. After trying for four elections and one by-election to defeat me, they took the easy way out and by legislation they ordered the Boundaries Commission to eliminate the seat of Athabasca.

However, I am proud to be nominated to contest the Rosthern seat in the forthcoming election and I am sorry that Mr. Mostoway refused the same opportunity, because I must say that I find, talking to many people in my constituency, that we think alike in regard to many government actions and policies.

We oppose the erosion of individual rights, we believe farmers should own their land. We don't appreciate a Hog Marketing Commission rammed down our throats. We would like to see less restrictions and more assistance to small businessmen

and a greater share of the tax dollar go to local governments on an unconditional basis. We don't like to see the welfare system abused. We believe those that deserve welfare should live in dignity, but those who are able, should be provided with the opportunity to work. We object to the ever-growing power of Government bureaucracy. We cannot condone the immoral practices of using Service Printers and ads in the Commonwealth to finance the NDP election campaign. Because the people in Rosthern constituency, along with the rest of the people of Saskatchewan think this way, I cannot support the Motion but will support the amendment.

SOME HON. MEMBERS: — Hear, hear!

MR. D. H. LANGE (Assiniboia-Bengough): — Mr. Speaker, I rise in support of the Throne Speech and I should like to answer some of the allegations made by the previous speaker, concerning socialism, freedom and the Land Bank.

Mr. Speaker, today we have the good fortune to enjoy an agricultural economy that is prospering, holding out new hope for people of rural Saskatchewan. But I want to travel back in time to that great seduction of the Canadian people, the 1968 general election.

I,

There was hope then, too, fascination with a new kind of Liberal Prime Minister was sweeping the land. Remember? They said, grow all the wheat you can and we will sell it. Do you remember that, Mr. Speaker? I remember that! The just society, that's what they called it, wasn't it? One Canada, indivisible, truly just. Agriculture was in good shape then, Mr. Speaker. Farmers confident of the grain marketing picture painted by their Federal Government were making investments in farm implements, livestock and farm land. They were investing at a time when prices for farm inputs were on the rise. The country was anticipating inflation and with inflation came austerity.

Mr. Speaker, do you remember when the Federal Government allowed the chartered banks to raise their interest rates on federally backed loans such as the Farm Improvement Loan, from five per cent to eight per cent, when number two red wheat was selling at \$1.28 per bushel; when quotas were almost nil? I remember that.

Remember how grain prices fell; how quotas were restricted; how promised markets disappeared? And do you remember that day in the summer of 1969, Mr. Speaker, when Pierre Elliot Trudeau said, "Why should I sell your wheat?" I was at the Regina Inn that day and I remember. There were other farmers there too, holding signs which made some rather perceptive observations about Prime Minister Trudeau. Do you remember those signs, Mr. Speaker? Our farmers, their backs against the wall, were facing low grain prices, restricted quotas, non-existent markets, farm costs, high interest rates, machine company seizures, and Liberal indifference from the Governments of Saskatchewan and Canada.

Farmers imprisoned by economic forces beyond their control heard little talk from Liberals about their individual freedoms. They had no economic freedom and so there was nothing for Liberals to talk about. Was there, Mr. Speaker?

Liberal seduction of the Canadian people became a sordid affair for the prairie farmer.

In 1971 this sad state of affairs brought an overwhelming reaction from the Saskatchewan electorate. The New Democratic Party began the long, arduous task of implementing step by step its election mandate, the New Deal for People.

The New Deal for People, a socialists' program for the reconstruction of the Saskatchewan agricultural economy has now been almost completely implemented in less than three and one-half years. And step by step along that way the Saskatchewan Liberal Party, most notably Members opposite, have constantly harped on the alleged loss of individual freedoms through socialist programs like the Land Bank.

Now let's talk about socialism, freedom and the Land Bank, 1974 marks the 30th year that the people of this province have been living their day to day lives with the help of socialist programs. Socialist programs which increase the individual freedom and material standard of living of each person in this province.

SOME HON. MEMBERS: — Hear, hear!

MR. LANGE: — The socialist programs which have become a model for all of the country and which even the richest country in the world has not yet been able to achieve. Every citizen of Saskatchewan can in expert fashion tell you about the benefits and security that have come from medicare, from Saskatchewan Power Corporation, from comprehensive automobile insurance or any of the many socialist accomplishments by the people of Saskatchewan.

SOME HON. MEMBERS: — Hear, hear!

MR. LANGE: — Mr. Speaker, which political party was responsible for implementing the wishes of the people of this province in the form of bright, imaginative socialist programs? We know it was the CCF-NDP. And we know which political party it was that fought the CCF-NDP every gruelling step of the way. The party that criticized all the socialist programs we now enjoy. The same party which talks about too much government power, about destruction of individual rights, about loss of personal freedom. That is the Liberal Party. The same party which has held power in this province for over 40 years has come forward with very few lasting meaningful programs to benefit the average person. All of which, Mr. Speaker, brings me to the Land Bank;

The Land Bank is a socialist program which was introduced this Government in 1972 to transfer land from retiring farmers to younger farmers. Since then it has been the program the most criticized by the Liberals. This of course, is an acclamation of the success of Land Bank. The success of any New Democratic socialist program to benefit the people of this province can be measured in direct proportion to the degree of criticism that the program receives from the Liberal opposition. It is important for us to discuss the Land Bank, partially to clear up some of the misconceptions about the program. But more particularly because the issue of the Land Bank exemplifies most of the differences between the socialist thinking of the New Democratic Party and the lack of thinking by the provincial and national

December 5, 1974

Liberal Parties.

SOME HON. MEMBERS: — Hear, hear!

MR. LANGE: — Several years ago the Task Force Report on Agriculture was issued by the Federal Government. The report said, two out of every three farmers in Canada would disappear due to the economy's scale of large farms coupled with technology.

The agricultural policies of the Federal Government over the past several years have been predicated upon that kind of thinking. This important fact plus the fact that many Saskatchewan farmers are nearing retirement age meant that farms would be offered for sale in the next several years. This is happening when the prospects for future agricultural production have never looked brighter. Quite obviously the emphasis upon technological and financial investment in the future is going to be in the production, processing and distribution of food. Why else would scavengers like Cargill and Continental be coming to Canada?

SOME HON. MEMBERS: — Hear, hear!

MR. LANGE: — The New Democratic Party of Saskatchewan has looked at the impending situation of large farms becoming larger and said that farms do not have to be large in order to be efficient. That, in fact, a farm of any size can be efficient and that a farmer even those with modest land holdings should have the freedom, the option to stay on the land, to earn their living by producing an essential commodity for other people. It is well known that there is no end of assistance available to large farmers with plenty of assets.

The problem arose when a farmer of little means decided to expand his holdings or when a retiring farmer wished to liquidate his farm and yet back his son or daughter to start a farming on the same farm. The problem, Mr. Speaker, was clear. Retiring farmers would either be bought out by large corporations, which meant the destruction of the family farm or the provincial government would become a transfer agency between the retiring farmer and the would-be farmer. So, in the face of Federal Government lassitude, the Government of this province established the Land Bank Commission. Now, three years after its establishment, the independent Land Bank has provided for over 1,000 farmers to stay here in Saskatchewan and make their living on the land.

SOME HON. MEMBERS: — Hear, hear!

MR. LANGE: — We have used Saskatchewan money to ensure that Saskatchewan people can farm Saskatchewan land.

SOME HON. MEMBERS: — Hear, hear!

MR. LANGE: — We have used a socialist program to ensure that more young farmers will have the individual freedom to be involved in the vital role of food production for the starving third world.

Mr. Speaker, this kind of freedom for Saskatchewan farmers is in sharp contrast to foreign corporate farming. The Land Bank program has earned a good deal of interest all across North America. It has been lauded by eastern newspapers and American senators alike, as an innovative solution to problems of land transfer. In spite of this, Mr. Speaker, the Land Bank has been severely criticized by the Liberal Opposition of Saskatchewan. In spite of the fact that the Land Bank Commission has received 4,000 applications from farmers in this province, probably half of whom did not vote for this Government, we are still being criticized.

The greatest single criticism we hear from Members of the Opposition is that the Government wants to own the farm land in this province. Well, we have had other examples of government owned agricultural land in this province which are many years old. The oldest grazing land in this province dates back to before the province was formed, to before 1905 under a federal government. Grazing land has always been leased, grazing land has always been allocated on the basis of need - the same way the Land Bank is administered.

SOME HON. MEMBERS: — Hear, hear!

MR. LANGE: — And ranchers in this province have for two generations been making money through the cattle industry because of subsidized rates on government leased land, lease land which has never been sold. The difference between Land Bank acreage and grazing leases is that we have gone one step farther. We have provided the lessee with the option to purchase the land after a five-year period. One reason for this five-year period is to allow the farmer to build up purchase equity which he does not originally possess.

Mr. Speaker, the Land Bank program is not a compulsory program. Farmers do not have to sell their land to the Land Bank, but have the option to do so. Neither are farmers required to lease land from the Land Bank Commission but they have the option to do so if their application is accepted.

Mr. Speaker, farmers do not have to buy land from the Land Bank but have the option to purchase land if they so wish under specified conditions. Compare that kind of individual freedom with the freedom farmers would have under corporate feudal farming. Corporate feudal farming does not trouble a Liberal Government.

Mr. Speaker, according to the Members of the Liberal Opposition, we the NDP are the Party that restricts people's freedom, deprives them of their rights and takes away their land. Their slick flashy political propaganda, paid for by the corporations demands that the NDP of Saskatchewan give the people back their land.

Mr. Speaker, who are these freedom fighters of yesteryear? These Don Quixotes of the great plains? These men from La Mancha? They call themselves Liberals. They are the people who brought you Bill 2 which forced compulsory arbitration in labour disputes. They are the people who deprived you of your basic democratic right, one person, one vote. The present Leader of the Opposition commandeered a redistribution which gave not one person one vote but some persons one vote, many Liberals three votes.

December 5, 1974

The Member for Prince Albert West who now talks about individual freedom commandeered one of the most despicable gerrymanders in the history of Canadian politics. And here, Mr. Speaker, I must admit is a first for the Saskatchewan Liberal Party.

The New Democratic Party had to appoint an independent electoral boundaries commission to restore to you a basic democratic freedom that was taken from you by the infamous Liberal gerrymander.

SOME HON. MEMBERS: — Hear, hear!

MR. LANGE: — Mr. Speaker, I am convinced that any relation between the word Liberal in Liberal Party of Saskatchewan and liberty, that phrase denoting personal freedom, is purely coincidental.

These are the same Liberals who talk about destruction of personal freedom because of political intervention through the Land Bank. The same Liberal Party which imposed utilization and deterrent fees upon the sick and who confiscated the estates of the mentally ill, while they were in office. Incredible and hypocritical as it may now seem, they are speaking of political intervention by our Government in the Independent Land Bank Commission.

These are the same Liberal MLAs who are proposing an amendment to The Land Bank Commission Act to provide for an option to buy, Mr. Speaker. The Statutes of Saskatchewan clearly show that an option to buy from the Land Bank after five years of land lease is at this very moment the law of the land.

SOME HON. MEMBERS: — Hear, hear!

MR. LANGE: — Mr. Speaker, where has this Rip Van Winkle opposition been for the last three years? Ignorance of the law is no defence, neither is it a point of opposition. I cannot in all conscience understand why Members opposite are misrepresenting the law of the land for some ill conceived and twisted conception of narrow political advantage. You simply cannot represent people by misrepresenting their laws.

Mr. Speaker, let us turn away from Liberal mythology and politics of misrepresentation to the historical record of CCF-NDP in Saskatchewan in matters relating to policy on tenure of farm land by individuals.

Upon coming to power, Canada's first socialist government in the second session of 1944 legislated an Act for the protection of certain mortgagers, purchasers and lessees of farm land. This Act came to be known as The Farm Security Act, 1944.

SOME HON. MEMBERS: — Hear, hear!

MR. LANGE: — Among other things it restricted orders of foreclosure affecting the homestead and related home quarter. Mr. Speaker, I submit that The Farm Security Act, 1944 was a blow for freedom for the Saskatchewan farmer in the face of finance companies, eastern banks and the Liberal Government at Ottawa. Section eight of that Act even went so far as to bind the provincial Crown and affect its rights as if it were a

mortgagee vendor or lessor like the finance companies. The present Government since taking power has continued this long tradition of actual accomplishments to protect and advance the freedom of the individual.

In the spring of 1971 the New Democratic Party again formed the Government of Saskatchewan. In the summer of 1971 we again introduced an Act respecting the protection of farm property, The Family Farm Protection Act. While the provincial New Democratic Party were taking action to protect farm property, including land, implements, livestock, crops from repossession, the Federal Government allowed the bank interest rates to soar, implemented LIFT and restricted quotas for grain delivery to the Board.

SOME HON. MEMBERS: — Hear, hear!

MR. LANGE: — There were provisions for extending the redemption period for mortgaged farm land, to prevent seizure of farm implements and livestock, and to give farm families prior entitlement to farm crops to cover their costs of production and living allowance. I ask you, Mr. Speaker, is this the act of a government that deprives people of their basic rights and freedoms? Is this the act of a government that takes people's lands from them? No, Mr. Speaker. It is the act of a government dedicated to individual freedom and security to the family farm and to the development of rural Saskatchewan.

SOME HON. MEMBERS: — Hear, hear!

MR. LANGE: — Compare that with a letter which I saw in 1969 from the Hon. Darrel Heald, the then Liberal Attorney General for Saskatchewan. The letter was in answer to an inquiry from a farmer who had been a victim of the increased interest charges on his farm improvement loan from five per cent to eight per cent during a period of low quotas and rock bottom wheat prices. Mr. Heald wrote back to say that it was good business for the banks to raise the interest rate, how else could they make a profit.

During one of the most severe agricultural depressions Saskatchewan has experienced, Mr. Heald was concerned that the banks should make a profit. The farmer was wondering how he was going to hold on to his machinery. That reflects the degree of concern that the Saskatchewan Liberal Government had about individual freedom of farmers in this province.

Mr. Speaker, it should by now be clear that the Saskatchewan New Democratic Party has and is using a coherent socialist philosophy of freedom to protect Saskatchewan farmers from the stated attempts by successive Liberal governments to rationalize agriculture and to have fewer and larger farm units. I want all of us to think about that for just a moment. Aren't the Liberals with their shortsighted agricultural and monetary policies such as LIFT and stabilization really the ones who are taking the land from our people? Is it not they who should give the people back their land?

If it had not been for the New Democratic Party Family Farm Protection Act in 1971, many farmers would not have come out of the Liberal austerity program to be here in 1973 to gain the

December 5, 1974

advantage of \$5 a bushel wheat.

Compare that, Mr. Speaker, with the record of the Liberal Government. Compare Land Bank, the social philosophy of scarce resource allocation with LIFT. That immoral waste of scarce resources in the face of world starvation!

Mr. Speaker, can you imagine paying wheat farmers not to grow wheat? Now most farmers in this province don't have a university education. But with two generations of agriculture experience in this province, they do know when to seed and when to harvest. Can you imagine a university law professor who has never taken home the rent, who has never been out of academe to see how other people live in the face of world starvation, in the face of economic and climatic uncertainty in agriculture, actually having the incredible, intellectual arrogance to tell farmers, don't use your land, don't grow your wheat? Mr. Speaker, that was an insult to the intelligence of the Saskatchewan farmer.

SOME HON. MEMBERS: — Hear, hear!

MR. LANGE: — Mr. Speaker, what kind of man would put into place so insane an agricultural policy? The same kind of man who would try to stabilize farm incomes at all time lows through illegal denial of statutory payments to the farmers under the Temporary Wheat Reserves Act, the reward for which was to become the Minister of Justice for Canada. The same kind of man who will in time emasculate the Canadian Wheat board, an invaluable achievement of the philosophy of socialism aimed at stabilizing farm income from grains at maximum levels. The same kind of man who would threaten net farm incomes and the future of rural communities through the elimination of the Crow's Nest freight rates. The same kind of man who would lower the material standard of living of all Saskatchewan people by taking provincial and Crown corporations such as the Saskatchewan Power Corporation, thereby inflating the price of natural gas. The one and only Otto Lang. That Benedict Arnold of prairie Liberals, that glorious example of political prostitution. Eric Kierans claims "he's lost his marbles" and the Saskatchewan Wheat Pool has asked for his resignation.

Now as you know, the Watergate tapes have revealed former President Richard Nixon's rather perceptive observation concerning Prime Minister Trudeau. Mr. Speaker, I lie awake at night wondering what he might have said of Otto Lang.

SOME HON. MEMBERS: — Hear, hear!

HON. D. W. CODY (Minister of Co-operatives): — Mr. Speaker, before starting my main remarks today, I should like to congratulate the mover and seconder, John Comer and Paul Mostoway, for the excellent job they did last week in explaining the programs which our Government has brought forth in the last three and one-half years.

Before I go on as well, I should like to direct a few remarks at the Hon. Member from Athabasca (Mr. Guy), the Member of course who is not in his seat now and he's usually not in his seat because he's out in the constituency

campaigning and also I look across the way and I only see four Members in the House at this time.

Mr. Speaker, the Hon. Member from Athabasca said, we received more money than any Liberal Government did from Ottawa. I agree with him, that's right. We did receive more money but because we had more programs and because we had a Premier who went to Ottawa and had some hard knocks with the Minister of Finance. That's why we got more money.

He also went on to say that programs would not start in Saskatchewan before we went to Ottawa for more money. Well I tell you that in the area of flood assistance in the town of Qu'Appelle, you want to go to the town of Qu'Appelle some time and see what's being done there without one red cent of Federal Government money. They are rechanneling the ditch, they are building a new bridge and, Mr. Speaker, they are spending up to \$1 million and there isn't one plugged nickel of Federal money in there.

MR. LANE: — Mr. Speakers on a Point of Order. I wonder if the Hon. Member is prepared to indicate to the public of Saskatchewan there are twenty Government Members missing?

MR. SPEAKER: — Order, order! That is not-Point of Order, that is just an interruption.

MR. CODY: — Mr. Speaker, I don't mind being interrupted as long as the interruption has some decent basis to it. However I want to go on to say that at Fort Qu'Appelle we also put in an implementation office, we've done a lot of work in the Fort Qu'Appelle area and not one plugged nickel has been put in by the Federal Government. All Saskatchewan money.

Another item which the Hon. Member for Athabasca mentioned was that the Independent Boundaries Commission had cut him out of his seat in northern Saskatchewan. Mr. Speaker, the truth of the matter is that the Department of Northern Saskatchewan doing such a good, job in the North, that he is afraid to run in the North, that's why he's not running in the North.

SOME HON. MEMBERS: — Hear, hear!

MR. CODY: — Mr. Speaker, today I am not going to try to cover all the programs and policies which this Government has implemented, in the last three years. I could talk about programs such as the Land Bank, FarmStart, Hog Stabilization program or the Cow-Calf Advance program. I could speak about a hearing aid program, or abolition of deterrent fees, or the Family Income program. One could speak about the Community Capital Fund which allows communities \$75 per capita on a five-year program and gives communities such as Fort Qu'Appelle \$120,000 and gives communities like Lumsden \$68,000, Gray \$4,700, McLean \$15,000 and to Pilot Butte \$50,000. Mr. Speaker, that's the kind of program we could talk about if we wanted today. Or we could talk about unconditional grants of \$10 per capita giving communities like Fort Qu'Appelle an additional \$16,000 and Lumsden an additional \$9,000. Money for whatever they wish to use it for, not dictated by using the words of the Leader of the Opposition, "heavy

December 5, 1974

handed Government.”

Mr. Speaker, one could go on and on talking about the programs of this Government. In fact, one could also mention the mess which the Ottawa Liberals have placed this province in. A mess not only in resources but also in agriculture, Mr. Speaker, one only needs to talk about rail line abandonment, a feed grains policy, erosion of orderly marketing and the worst of all, the encroachment on the Crow's Nest Pass Agreement.

Mr. Speaker, I want to warn the farmers in this province and the people of Saskatchewan that we must not allow this Liberal Party in Saskatchewan, who are solidly behind the liberals in Ottawa, ever again, ever again, to gain power because we shall see the biggest disaster of all time.

Mr. Speaker, I am going to talk about the areas for which I am responsible today, areas of great importance to this province.

Let me start out with activities of the Saskatchewan Housing Corporation. Housing, Mr. Speaker, is a matter of vital concern to all of us. It is also a complex matter. To understand the rationale for the impact of the Corporation's programs, one must be aware of all of the factors that affect the provision of housing in Saskatchewan.

One year ago three main challenges faced this Government.

1. A need for new housing.
2. A need to improve current housing stock.
3. A need for housing for senior citizens and low-income families.

Those three challenges are with us today, but their relative weight of impact has changed. Most of that change has been for the better. For example, the actions of this Government have been: —

1. From January to October to make home ownership possible to more than 1,800 families earning less than \$10,000 per year.
2. To help hundreds and hundreds of families and senior citizens to improve their existing homes.
3. To extend public housing to 969 low income families and senior citizens, the majority of which are in smaller centres.

Now, Mr. Speaker, I should like to provide you with statistics relating to the residential construction industry over the past several years and this Government's effort to encourage and increase the supply of housing units.

In the years - and I'll help the Liberals out here a little bit to recall their record - in the years from 1970 to 1974 I give you the following statistics: —

1970 under a Liberal Government, 1,743 units were built.
1971 under a New Democrat Government, 3,560 units.
1972 an NDP Government, 4,845 units.
1973 6,386 units, and in 1974 we are expecting to exceed

that and have a record 7,700 units constructed in this province.

SOME HON. MEMBERS: — Hear, hear!

MR. CODY: — Mr. Speaker, this is a 440 per cent increase over 1970, the last year of the Liberal Government.

In other areas, the changes have not been so beneficial. Mortgage interest rates have risen three full percentage points in less than one year. Construction costs have continued to climb.

Inflationary pressures continue to push up accommodation costs in virtually every country in the world. The activities of a provincial government can have little direct effect on factors such as these. The best we can do is to ease the impact of these pressures where possible. This we are doing and in a very substantial way.

Mr. Speaker, since we took office the House Building Assistance Grant program was raised from \$500 to \$800 and from 800 to \$1,000. In two successive years, the NDP has changed this grant from 500 to \$1,000. While when the Liberals made grants available to everyone regardless of income, this Government has made grants to those who need it most, the low and moderate income people.

In addition to expanding existing programs, we have initiated new programs to cover those areas which the former administration chose to ignore. We have developed the Subsidy and Self-Help program, the Residential Rehabilitation program and the Senior Citizens Home Repair program.

Mr. Speaker, under the House Building Assistance program the objective is to assist people of low and moderate incomes meeting the down payment requirements associated with purchasing a home.

The main objective of the Subsidy and Self-Help program is to make home ownership possible for persons earning as little \$4,600 per year - the minimum wage in Saskatchewan, and to encourage people to participate in the construction of their own home.

Mr. Speaker, the Subsidy and Self-Help program ties in with the Federal Government's assisted home Ownership program, a program which reduces mortgage payments for people on low incomes. Mr. Speaker, I ask you today and the people of Saskatchewan, what good is a program for low income people when funds which they promised run out in the middle of the term? The Federal Government deliberately and callously, in October, indicated to us that funds had run out in the Assisted Home Ownership program.

Mr. Speaker, approximately 400 to 500 people had made applications. People had given an indication to us that they wished to start building a home prior to January of this year. They were brutally cut off, Mr. Speaker, by the Federal Government's attitude toward the right of an individual to have a decent home, a decent interest rate and a decent mortgage payment.

December 5, 1974

I can assure you, Mr. Speaker, that the program of Self-Help has continued. We continue to pay the \$300 per year subsidy towards reducing the mortgage rates.

Mr. Speaker, each year the Saskatchewan Housing Corporation makes up budgets and co-ordinates its program with the Federal Government. Last year, our budget for the Assisted Home Ownership program was \$25 million. We have expended something like \$14 million to the first of September. Lo and behold, the Liberal Minister of Housing, Mr. Danson, comes along and says in October, the funds have run out. The commitments which they had made to us last January and, Mr. Speaker, not only Mr. Danson, a commitment which Mr. Trudeau made again in July, during the election campaign in Regina was not kept. They did not live up to their commitment, but rather cut off \$11 million worth of funds to the Province of Saskatchewan. And we saw 400 to 500 families in this province go without homes this winter, who are going to be living in substandard housing and I lay the blame squarely at the feet the Liberals in Ottawa, aided and abetted by the Members across the way.

SOME HON. MEMBERS: — Hear, hear!

MR. CODY: — Mr. Speaker, not one word was said by the Members across the way, not one word was said even by the critic for housing on the Liberal side. One would have thought at least he would have said something in regard to this attitude. But they sat quietly by, knowing full well that construction of homes for our poor people would come to an abrupt halt. I think, Speaker, that it is the kind of show that one would expect from the Liberals opposite.

SOME HON. MEMBERS: — Hear, hear!

MR. CODY: — Mr. Speaker, the objective of our program of public housing is to provide more suitable rental accommodations for limited income persons at rental rates related to their incomes and ability to pay. Clearly, if one believes that adequate housing is a basic social right, one must also believe that government has a responsibility in the area of housing. A responsibility I might add which the Liberal Government refused to assume during the years 1964 to '71. During that time, the public housing program, a program which provides rental accommodation to individuals at rents which they can afford, was not only inadequate but was limited to larger urban centres. Over the period 1964 to 1971, Saskatchewan received only 40 per as many public housing units as its percentage of Canada's population would indicate it was entitled to. During these years, Mr. Speaker, the province ranked eighth among the ten provinces in its proportion of public housing units relative to public housing. I think that is a shame.

That, Mr. Speaker, was both with a Liberal Government in Saskatchewan and a Liberal Government in Ottawa. In comparison, this Government has started a record 564 public housing units in 1973 and still another 363 to the end of September this year. An additional 1,911 units have been approved for construction. We hope to achieve 1,000 public housing approvals this year with a future increase to 1,500 units in 1975. Quite a different picture from the 837. Mr. Speaker, feature this one, 837 public housing units the Liberals managed to achieve, not in one year,

but in all the years they were in power, six out of the seven years. That's a shame in the public housing area.

In addition, Mr. Speaker, as part of its policy of helping the rural areas of this province, this Government has extended a public housing program to small communities. In 1974 we made an additional 91 rural communities eligible for public housing projects. There are now 216 eligible communities. All this was done by an NDP Government in Saskatchewan with a very, very restrictive and empty promising Federal Government in Ottawa. Even with trying to build homes on Ottawa's empty promises, the Saskatchewan Government has kept its commitment even if Ottawa hasn't.

Mr. Speaker, in the area of land assembly. The objective of the Land Assembly program is to maintain an adequate supply of reasonably priced land for residential construction. Although this activity has helped to increase the supply of reasonably priced land, it is evident that increasing demand in certain areas of the province will necessitate continued government involvement in the acquisition and development of land for residential purposes.

Mr. Speaker, I can assure you and this Assembly that we will continue to purchase land, we will continue to purchase land where there is a demand for the development of residential purposes. We will not go helter skelter around the cities and ask for annexation but we will be asking for land where it is required for housing.

Under the House Building Assistance program, families earning \$7,000 per year or less are eligible for grants covering ten per cent of the costs of repairs to a maximum of \$800. For families earning \$7,000 to \$9,000 per year, the amount of grant decreases as the amount of income increases.

We are very concerned with the improvement, preservation and utilization of existing housing stock in Saskatchewan. To this end, Mr. Speaker, the Corporation has developed two new programs.

1. Residential Rehabilitation, where homeowners, with adjusted annual incomes of \$9,000 or less, may apply for low interest loans of up to \$8,000 and a 40 per cent grant to a maximum of \$1,000.
2. The Senior Citizens program is number two, a program which has been one of the most successful programs which we have had in this province. This program is intended to assist senior citizens to remain independent and in their own communities.

Senior citizens who own their own homes and are receiving the federal guaranteed income supplement are eligible for grants up to \$500. Since the program started we have approved nearly 14,000 applications and expended \$5.6 million. I want to repeat that, Mr. Speaker, for the Opposition's sake - nearly 14,000 applications approved for a total of \$5.6 million.

SOME HON. MEMBERS: — Hear, hear!

MR. CODY: — Mr. Speaker, I ask what kind a program did the Liberal

December 5, 1974

Government have is their seven years of administration for senior citizens? They didn't have a program. They didn't spend five cents. They didn't spend five cents on our senior citizens. I think it shows the concern the NDP has for its senior citizens.

Mr. Speaker, I want to briefly touch on the Neighbourhood Improvement program. This is a federal-provincial and municipal shared program. It is a program where the municipality designates an area which they feel requires improvement. This improvement could be for water and sewer, social or recreational facilities, or, in fact, could be to improve the housing stock in the designated area. The Federal Government pays 50 per cent of social and recreational facilities and acquisition of land, they also pay 25 per cent of water and sewer services. The Provincial Government pays 25 per cent across the board.

The Federal Government also has a program of rehabilitation and, Mr. Speaker, this is where the Leader of the Opposition (Mr. Steuart), last Monday, tried to mislead the house with regard to a Maintenance and Occupancy bylaw, which the Saskatchewan Housing Corporation had sent out to various municipalities.

Mr. Speaker, it is a requirement of the Federal Government that Maintenance and Occupancy bylaws be adopted before any federal funding will be made available for the implementation of Neighbourhood Improvement programs, or funding under the federal Residential Rehabilitation program.

During negotiations with the Federal Government, concerning amendments to the National Housing Act, relative to the NIP, the province had suggested that the requirement of Maintenance and Occupancy bylaws, in all cases, might not be realistic and CMHC was requested to study the matter further. This did not result in a change in the federal position. Maintenance and Occupancy laws are still a prerequisite for federal funding.

Mr. Speaker, the specific bylaws being referred to by the Leader of the Opposition were discussed with CMHC in developing an absolutely acceptable bylaw to the Federal Government, relative to their funding. The sample bylaws are minimum requirements only, and may be amended or revised by the municipalities or, in fact, not accepted at all if they want to put one in of their own.

SOME HON. MEMBERS: — Hear, hear!

MR. CODY: — Mr. Speaker, the Leader of the Opposition even resorted to such distortions as saying that the Attorney General might put six-year-old children in jail. It's a laugh, really it is. If the Leader of the Opposition knew anything about legislation he would have checked the Bill and found that The Saskatchewan Housing Corporation Act, where this bylaw would come under, hasn't even got a penalty clause.

Mr. Speaker, I'm just wondering, where does the Leader of the Opposition get his information from? Somebody said, Mr. Lang. I don't think it's Mr. Lang. I'm sure it must be an alderman from Saskatoon. I bet you it's Glen Penner, an alderman and Liberal candidate.

SOME HON. MEMBERS: — Hear, hear!

MR. CODY: — I should have thought, Mr. Speaker, if that's where the Leader of the Opposition is getting his information from, that Mr. Penner would have the interests of his people at heart. The people of Saskatoon elected him to do city work, not political work. I say "shame" to a man who was elected by city people to do city work with city money.

SOME HON. MEMBERS: — Hear, hear!

MR. CODY: — Mr. Speaker, in the area of Co-ops I should like to give you a few statistics as to what the Co-op and Credit Union movements mean to this province.

Mr. Speaker, the Credit Union movement today has almost 400,000 members in its 256 credit unions and 58 branches. They are a significant employer in Saskatchewan, employing over 2,000 people. In the last two months they have exceeded the one billion dollar mark in assets. And to show you how powerful an organization they are, in the last year the Saskatchewan Co-operative Credit Society had to bail out the centrals of Alberta and of Ontario.

Mr. Speaker, there are over 1,030 consumer marketing, production and community co-operatives in Saskatchewan with membership approaching 500,000. Their assets now exceed \$500 million. And, Mr. Speaker, I think, as you can see, credit unions and co-operatives are a major force in this province and this Government continues to place high emphasis on co-operative principles.

SOME HON. MEMBERS: — Hear, hear!

MR. CODY: — High emphasis on co-operative principles to further social and economic needs for the people of this province.

Mr. Speaker, our Department, this year, has developed 48 new co-operatives. Eight of these co-operatives were co-op farms, and, incidentally, for the benefit of the Leader of the Opposition and the Members opposite, and particularly the Member for Moosomin, (Mr. Gardner), these were not land-grab schemes, these were co-op farms, organized and will be operated by people working together - not by corporations from the United States, but by people working together, supporting and strengthening their local communities.

SOME HON. MEMBERS: — Hear, hear!

MR. CODY: — Mr. Speaker, my Department is presently working on a co-operative housing program. I am not going to take time today to deal with all of the details because they are not all worked out and I shall be making announcements on that program in about three weeks. This program, Mr. Speaker, I think will fill the gap for people who cannot afford homes today, and be a major breakthrough in housing using co-operative principles.

Mr. Speaker, I should now like to report to the House on another area. I refer, Mr. Speaker., to the 1974 Saskatchewan Flood Assistance program.

The problems which were encountered this year can be traced back to the fall of 1975 where excessive rainfall resulted

in high water levels in many areas as of the province. This was further aggravated by abnormal snow coverage last winter and a later spring run-off. The combined effect of these factors was to produce serious flooding in many widely distributed regions of the province.

Mr. Speaker, I want to take this opportunity to pay tribute to the people of Saskatchewan who demonstrated that like their pioneer forefathers they would neither be dismayed nor defeated by the challenge of the elements.

SOME HON. MEMBERS: — Hear, hear!

MR. CODY: — As the flood waters encroached on the city of Moose Jaw, the embattled citizens united in a desperate effort to protect their families, their homes and their city.

You are familiar with the Lumsden saga - the heroic efforts that were put forth by the residents of Lumsden and surrounding communities as the Qu'Appelle River threatened to completely engulf the town.

Mr. Speaker, this story was repeated in dozens of communities in Saskatchewan, in Estevan, in Weyburn, in the Beaver River area in northwestern Saskatchewan, in Jan Lake and Pelican Narrows in the northeast, just to mention a few. I want to take this opportunity to place on the public records of this province, my sincere appreciation and acknowledgement of the dauntless spirit of the people of this province.

Mr. Speaker, as I mentioned earlier, this Government took decisive action to cope with the serious problems confronting the people of Saskatchewan. A committee of Ministers was set up and immediately the committee, together with a committee of officials, worked night and day to develop a policy and program which could be speedily administered.

On May 1, I announced in this House the basic outline of a program to provide assistance to individuals, municipalities and small businesses in areas hit by unusual flooding. This program included assistance to cover the costs incurred in the immediate disaster period, the reconnaissance and containment of floods and the safeguarding of persons and property, plus post-flood assistance to individuals, to local government authorities, farmers, to small businessmen and to hospitals and charitable organizations.

We established a Provincial Flood Assistance Agency and appointed Harold Jones from the Department of Finance as provincial coordinator. Other agencies of government contributed generously to the staffing of this agency. Gordon Pritchard, manager of SGIO Claims Centre in Saskatoon, Dick Besler, from the Department of Education, coordinated the Administrative Support Services. In the Department of Highways, Mr. Bill Viel was available and looked after direct assessment. Virtually the entire crew of adjusters from the Saskatchewan Government Insurance office were assigned to provide assistance in assessing flood damage and preparing reports for the Flood Assistance Agency. This aspect of the program received invaluable assistance from the independent adjusters, with considerable sacrifice and personal inconvenience. They gave unstintingly of their service so that claims for assistance could be processed

expeditiously.

Mr. Speaker, I would be remiss if I did not also acknowledge the efforts made by other agencies and departments, such as the Department of Municipal Affairs, Municipal Road Assistance Authority, Department of Northern Saskatchewan, Department of Agriculture and the Emergency Measures Organization. There are many others, Mr. Speaker, who made significant contributions to the successful operation of our Flood Assistance program. To all of these people, and to the citizens of Saskatchewan, I say "thank you" for a job well done.

Mr. Speaker, I wish that I could say that everyone in the province had demonstrated a willingness to pitch in and assist in combating the problems that confronted us last year. But, unfortunately, such was not the case.

Mr. Speaker, the Leader of the Opposition, in a futile effort to restore his credibility as a leader and to divert attention from the gaping cracks within his own party, has resorted to the type of partisan sniping that has permeated his actions in this House continuously.

Without any viable alternative to present, he has consistently criticized the sincere and effective actions of this Government to attack the problems of flooding in this province. Without any regard for the facts he has consistently attacked the generous policies which have been developed for flood assistance and the consistent fashion in which these policies have been administered. Without any real concern for the people of Saskatchewan who suffered losses as a result of the flood, he has chosen to use human suffering and tragedy for cheap political purposes.

He even, Mr. Speaker, went so far as to say that at one point we paid small businessmen in Moose Jaw and area, who didn't have it coming. He went on to say they weren't desperate and they weren't broke and we weren't to pay them. Well, I'm pleased to say that we did pay 56 small businessmen and they had it coming and they deserved it and they were within the guidelines.

But, Mr. Speaker, the reason the Leader of the Opposition is so critical is because three of his friends didn't get paid - Imperial Oil, Gulf Oil and the Royal Bank of Canada. I make no apologies whatsoever to this House, or to anyone for paying 56 small businesses and leaving three large multinational corporations to fend for themselves.

SOME HON. MEMBERS: — Hear, hear!

MR. CODY: — Mr. Speaker, I should like to outline, for Members of the House, the policies under which assistance has been made available to victims of flood assistance, the policies which the Leader of the Opposition is so anxious to undermine.

For many years, the Federal Government has subscribed to the theory that where a disaster occurs in one part of the country the costs associated with facing that disaster should be shared by all Canadians. When a disaster occurs in New Brunswick, the people of Saskatchewan pay their rightful share of the total cost of coping with that disaster. When a disaster occurs in Quebec, the residents of Saskatchewan are called upon

to contribute through their tax dollars. And, Mr. Speaker, when a disaster occurs in Saskatchewan we have a right to expect that the financial burden of that disaster will be apportioned among all the people of Canada.

Consequently, when we were first contemplating what form of assistance could be provided to flood victims, we entered into consultation with officials of the Federal Government who made available to us a document entitled, "Guidelines for Peacetime Disaster Costs Eligible for Financial Assistance)." This document sets forth the terms and conditions under which the Federal Government will share in disaster costs in any province. There were certain conditions in these guidelines that we felt were unduly restrictive. For example, we felt that the definition of a business which could be eligible for assistance was more typical of the situations in Quebec or the Maritimes than it was of Saskatchewan. We also felt the Federal guidelines did not adequately reflect the importance of the agricultural industry in this province.

We made our representations to Ottawa on these questions, we sought to have the guidelines expanded and enlarged to cope with situations that we knew would exist in this province. Unfortunately, Mr. Speaker, in this, as in so many other critical areas, the voice of Saskatchewan falls on deaf ears when we make representations to Ottawa.

We were told, here are the guidelines, this is the only basis on which we are prepared to share in the program. Faced the certainty that the entire financial burden would fall on the province if we did not adhere to federal guidelines, we reluctantly accepted the inevitable. We issued provincial guidelines which parallel and are not inconsistent with the federal guidelines.

What are the basic elements of these guidelines, Mr. Speaker?

1. To individuals we are providing assistance to restore their dwellings, real and personal property to conditions similar to the pre-disaster condition.
2. To small businessmen we are providing assistance to restore their business premises and stock-in-trade to the pre-disaster condition.
3. To primary agricultural enterprises, we are providing assistance to restore real property and household farm machinery, equipment and livestock to the pre-disaster condition.
4. To local governments we are providing assistance to restore community and government property to pre- disaster condition.
5. To hospitals and charitable institutions we are providing assistance to enable them to continue to provide service in their communities in which they are located.

In addition, we took immediate steps to make financial assistance available to persons who were forced to evacuate homes, such as Moose Jaw and Lumsden and large sums of money were expended in those areas.

To give you some idea, Mr. Speaker, of the dispatch with which this program was introduced and became effective, let me point out that the initial announcement was made in this House on May 1; on May 9 the Flood Assistance Agency was established in temporary quarters on Cornwall Street. On May 16 a complete informational kit was sent to every municipal office in the province. On May 24, 200 claims had been processed and payments totalling more than \$110,000 had been made. Since that time approximately 150 local government authorities have applied for, and received designation as areas in need of flood assistance. As of November 29, 1,666 claims have been received for processing and payments in full have been made to 1,596 of these claimants. Total payments to November 29 exceed \$3.3 million and additional payments are being processed almost every day. And I should like to say at this point that we do not have one federal dollar in this program to date. We did not wait for Ottawa to make the decision; for Ottawa to participate in the program, we made payments immediately for people we knew needed the money.

SOME HON. MEMBERS: — Hear, hear!

MR. CODY: — The majority of the outstanding claims are on behalf of local government authorities in respect of damage to roads, bridges and other municipal structures. The reason for this should be readily apparent - with some 130 to 150 municipalities filing claims, it was imperative that the field inspections be made while weather conditions permitted. Consequently, the preparation of written reports has not kept pace with the field inspection. Nevertheless, through the excellent co-operation both the Municipal Road Authority and the Department of Highways, the majority of damage has now been appraised and we expect the remaining claims to be settled in the very near future.

Mr. Speaker, we estimate that the total costs of the Flood Assistance Program will be in excess of \$8 million. Of this amount as I said previously \$3.5 million has been paid out to date to individuals, small businesses, farmers and local governments. This does not include sizable amounts distributed by various government departments in payment of dislocation grants and in the containment and control of flood situations.

Mr. Speaker, we hope that it will not be too long and we will have reimbursement from the Federal Government, however, as I said before we have made these payments without a nickel of Federal Government money.

Mr. Speaker, we recognized there was a need last spring and we acted. We saw that immediate action was required to assist those who had suffered losses because of the flooding and we took that action.

Mr. Speaker, in the election campaign of 1971 we promised the people of Saskatchewan a New Deal for People. We promised them performance instead of pious platitudes. We promised them concern for people instead of special concessions to the privileged few. Mr. Speaker, we have fulfilled these promises and the people of Saskatchewan have been the beneficiaries. The Leader of the Opposition may harp and criticize and shed his crocodile tears but the electors in this province know that we have been faithful, and we have been faithful to our mandate and we will be continuing to be faithful in the next six months. I am sure the with the kinds of programs that we have you will see a lot more New Democrats on this side of the House come the next election.

Mr. Speaker, I am sure that you can tell by my remarks that I will be supporting the motion and I will not support the amendment.

SOME HON. MEMBERS: — Hear, hear!

MR. J. G. LANE (Lumsden): — Mr. Speaker, certainly the Member opposite will not be one of the men back come the next session of the Legislature. He contributed nothing in this debate this afternoon, certainly he didn't talk about the Throne Speech. It is for a very interesting reason that he didn't talk about the Throne Speech. Who over there has talked about the Throne Speech? All they have done is talk about a Federal Budget, they seemed to have talked and they are against the Federal Budget. That's not surprising. That's not very surprising at all because one thing the Federal Budget does is reduce the taxes for a great number of Canadian taxpayers; and a great number of Saskatchewan taxpayers, something that the Government opposite has not done, something that the Government opposite has failed to do. Every year the Federal Government comes with a Budget that removes hundreds of thousands of people from the tax rolls, reduces income taxes for the average working Canadian and the Government opposite raises the taxes, 17 per cent directly, a 34 per cent personal income rate by the Government opposite while the Government of Canada is trying to improve the position of the average taxpayer of Canada.

The Federal Government brings in the policy of tax indexing so that as inflation increases and wages increase taxes don't increase. But what does the Government opposite do? They say that the tax indexing is bad because the province is going to get less income, not bad because it hurts somebody, it doesn't hurt anybody, except for the greedy Government opposite that tries to bleed every cent out of the people of Canada for its own wasteful and extravagant schemes.

We look back at the other Throne Speeches, Mr. Speaker, and it seems that there was a major issue about a year ago and two years ago. I think if we can refer to previous budget speeches that there was a main issue. What was that word that they used. Maybe the Member for Athabasca can remember. Inflation? Wasn't there a word called 'inflation' that we used to hear an awful lot about? It is very interesting that in this Throne Speech the word inflation isn't used whatsoever. Not used once by the Government opposite. Now we know that the NDP policy is that we are going to lay the problems and the programs before the people and we'll discuss the solutions through open committees, and public hearings.

Obviously the failure to comment on inflation in the Throne Speech indicates that perhaps the battle is over. Perhaps there is no more inflation in Canada. That perhaps the war on inflation that the Hon. Premier declared when he used prime television time to talk about three measly little schemes that \$3 a month to old age pensioners. Maybe this great battle against inflation that he was going to fight has been successful. If one reads the Throne Speech then we have to assume that the battle against inflation is over, that we won the battle against inflation. There is no more inflation in Saskatchewan, the NDP are victorious and they under Allan Blakeney have solved the problems. Perhaps however they are not reading the newspapers with the recent announcement that milk prices are going up.

The Government opposite can subsidize beer and liquor and, booze for everybody as they announced in one of their New Deal for People programs, the beer subsidy. What about milk? The average cost of a quart of homogenized milk, in Saskatchewan - it's a local product for the Members opposite in case they forget - is now 44 cents, an increase of 5 cents a quart on October 26 and is now going up another 2 cents a quart in January. What does the Government opposite do? They don't even talk about it.

Milk prices are up, consumer food prices are up - all under provincial jurisdiction. Meat prices have skyrocketed and the Government opposite doesn't have the political courage to do anything about it. They bleed the swine producers and the hog producers on the one hand through Intercontinental Packers and then with the other hand they gouge and profiteer the consumers through Intercontinental Packers of which they own 45 per cent of the stock. This is one of the stupidest deals ever tabled before this Legislature, and that deal made by the Government was that of the Intercontinental fiasco two or three years ago.

No, inflation isn't over, the Saskatchewan Government Employees Association forced to go out on strike to try to get an inflation protector from the Government opposite and they are told, no deal. No way, we are not going to help you.

The old age pensioners asked for more money and what have they got from the Government opposite? They have been patted on the head, given a hearing aid and given three dollars a month through the removal of the medicare premium. That's what the Government opposite has done for the senior citizens.

AN HON. MEMBER: — What about deterrent fees?

MR. LANE: — We can talk about deterrent fees, we can talk about deterrent fees on the drug program. We can talk about deterrent fees and any other aspect that the Member offers.

So the Government decides to cut down on some unnecessary government spending. There is the irresponsible Member for Turtleford (Mr. Feduniak) who sold his hotel in Turtleford, the Feduniak Hilton or whatever it was, that gouged the people in Turtleford, raped them of all their money, stole the money from them, took welfare payments to the pub that he had. So what does he do, he comes to Regina brings all his wealth to Regina and he buys an apartment building. What is the first thing he does with the apartment building, he walks up to some poor tenant and says, "I am a busy MLA, you have got to get out of here" and kicks him out without any notice at all. Then he to tell this house that Haile Selassie was a Liberal, he was a Socialist and an NDP and he did some stupid things like the Government opposite did. That's typical of the Member opposite. He goes on a little trip with the credit union supporters and his friends and the people that tagged along with them, what does he come back with? 50 Spaniards! 50 imported Spaniards to work in the North. That's what the Member for Turtleford has contributed to this House.

AN HON. MEMBER: — . . . anybody out!

MR. LANE: — Oh, I can't believe it. That's what the story says. I can't believe that the Human Rights Commission wouldn't investigate the MLA for Turtleford, as to his kicking people out

December 5, 1974

as a breach of The Landlord and Tenant Act.

But it is interesting, the Premier says he calls; for a big meeting that he is having with Prime Minister Trudeau about fighting inflation. He has demanded this and the Prime Minister refused for so long, now we have got to have one. He goes for a one-day meeting, comes back and says we're going to cut back on irresponsible government spending. He is going to cut back on some capital expenditures, not the government expenditures of course that are necessary, but he is going to stop these big commercial buildings like the credit unions and the local co-ops and these big commercial ventures.

We know that the NDP and the Premier's statement about stopping extravagant government spending isn't true and it is a blatant falsehood, because the Premier and the Throne Speech says that we are going to increase our money to the Department of Northern Saskatchewan. Surely the most glaring example of irresponsible, irrational, extravagant government spending is in the Department of Northern Saskatchewan, \$500,000 left in the waste basket, in the drawers, under the pen set, under the telephone. You name it they had money hidden all over the offices in La Ronge. That's responsible government they want us to say.

That's not responsible government. That's irresponsible government. The people of Saskatchewan are going to hold you responsible. In one welfare district alone \$100,000 overpayment, pretty close to \$1,000 an individual. That's the payment that the Government opposite has made. That is responsible government spending they say. It's irresponsible. It's irrational and was wasteful government that you've given the people of this province. They are going to judge you on that record in June of 1975 or whenever you want to call a date.

Shall we talk about a little care for the people. Government spending is going to be proper says the Premier. They made a \$100,000 welfare overpayment in Buffalo Narrows, according to the Minister of Social Services - he said this many, many times - there are no abuses under the welfare system. The only ones that are getting welfare in Saskatchewan are the aged, the sick and the unemployable. Those are the only ones. Whom does he go to to try and collect his \$100,000 overpayment from? The sick, the aged, the unemployable, the very people whom he says aren't abusing the system, they are the ones whom he goes back to get the \$100,000. He doesn't go after the Department of Northern Saskatchewan worker who made this stupid payment. He goes after the recipient. That, he says is responsible government spending. That's how the Government opposite is going to fight inflation. Now they want the recipients to start paying back. The ones he says where there are no abuses, the ones who can least afford it, are the ones who are going to have to pay back for a stupid government mistake.

They are going to help the old age pensioners. They got a bearing aid. They got patted on the back, now go out and hear a little better. You can't eat a hearing aid, not even a government hearing aid. The old age pensioners of Saskatchewan deserve a lot better than that and a lot more than the \$3 a month that you gave them when you cancelled the medicare premium. You have given them nothing. You think that because you have a former NDP-CCF leading the old age pensioners that you can just throw a bone to them and figure you will not get into any trouble. You are holding the old age pensioners of Saskatchewan up to political ransom. You are treating them like dirt. You have

given them tokenism. You gave them a token commission. You gave them a token \$3 a month payment. Now you have given them a token agency. That's what you really think of the old age pensioners of Saskatchewan.

There is no doubt that this little Throne Speech that was given in this Chamber is merely one attempt to cover up the NDP failure to do anything to fight the fires of inflation. All they have done is fuel those fires through irresponsible government extravagance.

SOME HON. MEMBERS: — Hear, hear!

MR. LANE: — So we get into the position that the Premier is trying to get an issue. Perhaps we can find something in the Throne Speech that maybe looks like an issue. We can see the background of the Throne Speech. He is sitting down with Mr. Dunsky from Montreal who acts for the breweries. "What do I do, what kind of an issue can I have, I am in trouble in the Province of Saskatchewan." Mr. Dunsky sat down and thought. "Mr. Premier," he said, "how about fighting Ottawa, we won that in 1971, maybe we can run it by the people again. We can't talk about inflation. You haven't done anything. We can't talk about old age pensioners, you haven't done anything. You can't talk about helping the average taxpayer, you've raised taxes. Let's go after Ottawa and cover up all those things you didn't do. That's what we'll do." "Great," says little Allan, "we'll have a new campaign and a new issue. We'll go after Ottawa."

"What do we fight them about, wheat prices are too high. How about oil? I need the money anyway to cover up for all the overpayments and expenditures." So lo and behold, we have in the Throne Speech a new issue. Mr. Dunsky says we'll make it look like Daniel in the Lion's Den. David and Goliath was the example, I am sorry I misinterpreted Mr. Dunsky. We get the word from the Member for Turtleford that it's David and Goliath. That means that the Premier yells and screams and bounces up and down and makes all sorts of misstatements and falsehoods and cries, gets down on his knees and is hurting. He is weeping. The battle of Daniel in the Lion's Den, only it is not Daniel in the Lion's Den, it happens to be a battle of wits and our representative went down half armed. That's the problem that we are in today. Really this whole Throne Speech is a disguise in an attempt to cover up the bad bargaining and the failure and the poor job that the Premier has done.

We had an interesting little situation when you get into this fight against Ottawa. Last spring the Premier and the Minister of Agriculture were going around the province saying everybody is against the new feed grains policy. They are all opposed to it. As a matter of fact right during a federal election we are to have a vote. First time that the NDP decided to give the farmers a vote. We thought maybe there was a change of heart. But lo and behold, it is just a new variation of the NDP approach. It turns out that only 22 per cent of the farmers voted on this particular little plebiscite that the Minister of Agriculture had. He can't go to the public with that. So he cries foul weather we've got to have more time to get the ballots in. Not only did he give them more time, he gave them more ballots.

So those who were really opposed to Ottawa, really against this policy, were to get up to five ballots, there were four times more made than there were two weeks before, they could have four

more ballots. It is an exercise in the political tradition of Mayor Daly of Chicago and ex-President Nixon which we get from the Government opposite. Finally by giving 15 and 20 ballots to the individual producers and party supporters, they said 50 per cent of the farmers are opposed to this Feed Grains Policy in operation.

Everyone is behind this, says the Premier, let's go and fight Ottawa. So then what happens? Lo and behold we have a federal election. Now the rules were a little different and this is where the NDP got caught short. In the federal election every farmer only had one vote, just one. He didn't have five, six or seven or as many as he wanted, he only had one. And 70 per cent of the farmers of Saskatchewan said, we want nothing to do with your approach, nothing to do with your policies, and 70 per cent of the people of Saskatchewan backed them up when they told you what they thought of your constant confrontation policy with Ottawa. You failed, you failed because you did it once too often. You have opposed everything, every single program that Ottawa has brought along you have opposed and you fought against them. You are failing over the oil issue because the people of Saskatchewan don't believe the Premier when he says that Ottawa mistreated him, misled him, lied to him and didn't treat him fairly. They didn't believe the Premier in July of 1974 and they don't believe him now.

It is very interesting the Premier on the one side of the fence says, we have to have our equalization payments, we have to keep them coming in because we are a have-not province. On the other side he says, we have to have all the oil royalties which make us a have province. The people of Saskatchewan aren't fooled by the hypocritical position. You can't have it both ways. You would be doing the people of Saskatchewan a greater service if you stood up and acted like a responsible political party and a responsible government and started talking and compromising and listening and telling the truth and acting in the best interest of the Province of Saskatchewan.

The people don't believe the Premier for another reason. He came back and said that he had this great deal, he gets all the DREE grants, all the transportation grants, all the goodies that he announced. Those goodies are still there, you can't take those away from the people of Saskatchewan. Now the Premier says he is getting a bad deal.

There is a rumour, no one has bothered checking out, that the Premier was a Rhodes scholar and he is supposed to be intelligent, he is supposed to be a lawyer and he was in practice for a while. So he goes down to this big, bad Ottawa that has nailed this province ...

MR. FARIS: — He is a lawyer . . .

MR. LANE: — Yes, you can take any one of the Liberal lawyers on this side and we would come back with a better deal and fight harder and negotiate better for the people of Saskatchewan than all of your lawyers combined and we can do it any day of the week and we will do it in July of 1975, when we try and go back and renegotiate the sellout that you and your lawyers have made. The Premier says he is a lawyer and he is going down to talk to them and they are bad. They have been saying that for many years, 17 years or whatever it is, how bad Ottawa is. Do you think that this supposedly bright lawyer gets anything in writing? No, he doesn't get anything in writing. I bet he even has things in

writing in his law office or has had his secretary do it, but when he talks to someone who is really bad and really dirty and is really out to get him he sits there, puts it all down in his little mind and he is going to remember. Fortunately we know how his mind works and his grasp of the issues, when he finally at least had the courage, in the House, yesterday to admit that he is wrong and maybe he didn't understand right and maybe there could be two understandings of this particular issue and that maybe his wasn't right and that maybe he was wrong. After all that confrontation that we have heard of over the last couple of weeks he admits that finally he was wrong and maybe there are two sides to the story.

We have asked the Premier of this province to prove the agreement that he made with Ottawa. He can't do it. We have asked him and he got the challenge from the Leader of the Opposition, to prove to this House and to the people of Saskatchewan that Ottawa took advantage of him. The challenge has been out and he didn't even try to take it up. We have asked him to prove to the people of Saskatchewan to table the document to prove to this House and to the people of Saskatchewan that Ottawa misled him, that he was taken advantage of when he was sitting down there with this big, bad number one from Ottawa, this smart easterner, that he would take advantage of him.

You ask us to believe that, you ask the people of Saskatchewan to believe that? That he went down there totally unprepared, not ready to bargain, not knowing what he was talking about. All the more reason for him not to go and talk to Ottawa again. I think for the sake of the people of Saskatchewan we have to ask the Premier of Saskatchewan not to talk to Ottawa again between now and next June, please don't negotiate with anybody between now and next June. Don't talk or negotiate with anybody until we, in the Liberal Party, get the chance to take over and get a fair deal and a proper deal and a good deal for the people of Saskatchewan.

SOME HON. MEMBERS: — Hear, hear!

MR. LANE: — Your record of negotiating and bargaining is abhorrent to say the least. Here is this so-called Rhodes scholar, the sharp crackerjack lawyer of the NDP, sitting down with big, bad Fred Mendel, the local boy who started with nothing, he made it, he is big and he is naturally bad. So the Premier sits down with Fred Mendel. How did the negotiations go? He ended up pay \$11 million for a 45 per cent in Intercontinental Packers that nobody else would pay \$3 million for when the other offers at the most were \$6 million for one hundred per cent. Here is Premier talking about that one which cost the Province of Saskatchewan \$11 million and he wants to believe that he is the proper man to go down and talk to the Prime Minister of Canada. People don't believe it.

He talked to Mr. Karl Landeggar, big, bad Karl. He knew that Karl was bad, he told everybody that Karl was bad, but he sits down with big, bad Karl Landeggar. Oh, but he is American. But anyway he sits down and he told everybody how bad Karl Landeggar was. How it is on record just what a devious American this guy was. The Premier sits down with him and pays him \$6 million to get out of a pulp mill that didn't exist. That is the Premier negotiates and this is how the Premier bargains.

Oh, then he sits down with another local boy, not from

Saskatchewan, but a Canadian, who made good by the standards of some people, certainly not by those of the Members opposite. His name is Stephen Roman and he is going to negotiate and he is going to bargain with Stephen Roman. Oh, sure what happened when the Premier got through talking to Stephen Roman? It cost us the Choiceland Iron Mine and it cost us 3,000 jobs in Ipsco and made a steel industry in Alberta that they had no hope of getting before the Premier sat down and talked with him.

I have said it before and I shall say it again, please don't let the Premier go outside this province because every time he sits down and talks to somebody it costs the people of Saskatchewan millions and millions of dollars. If we send him to talk about oil and gas to Ottawa, like the Leader of the Opposition says, it is sending a boy to do a man's job. He can't do it, he can't handle the negotiations with Ottawa. He can't deal with Ottawa.

As I say the NDP policy of constant confrontation has put you into the position with the people of Saskatchewan where they don't believe you when you say that you are getting a bad deal. They don't believe you when you say that you got taken and that you were misled. There is no doubt the Premier can't prove that agreement; the Premier can't prove any understanding that he had; the only thing we have is a statement, and yesterday he admitted that he was wrong.

It is very interesting that we had another situation that was merely alluded to, I think, in the Throne Speech, something of a present problem. It didn't touch on inflation in the Throne Speech; it didn't touch something else and it is called a food bank. That is the only thing that the NDP have, \$4.5 million out of a \$900 million or a billion dollar Budget; that is NDP tokenism. They talked about LIFT and how harmful it was to feed the starving nations.

To show how unaware and how ignorant Members opposite are when it comes to the question of the world's starvation problem that is on now, it didn't start until two years ago. Surprising, they didn't know that. They sent the Minister of Agriculture down to Rome. What happened when he got to Rome? All we got back from them, I understand, is some very nice slides, that is all. He didn't contribute anything, just some nice pictures of Rome. He didn't contribute anything to the conference and that problem has been existing for two years. LIFT was five years ago and if you are too stupid to know when the problem started you shouldn't have gone, you shouldn't have been sent and you would have been better off staying at home. Two years ago, world optimism on feeding the world's populations turned to despair as hunger and famine began ravishing hundreds of millions of the poor citizens and over 40 nations.

I am going to give some facts to the Members opposite that they seem to have forgotten with their token approach and also their failure, their disdain, when they ignored the attempt to debate this matter in the House. It is very interesting that we weren't allowed to debate the matter of starving people and the NDP's position and the NDP conspiracy in this particular program. It is a very funny thing that when two years ago we stood up in this House and the Minister of Agriculture wanted to debate the rail line closure in British Columbia purely under federal jurisdiction, a problem that had been existing for two weeks, beyond the jurisdiction of the Province of Saskatchewan, a precedent was set in this House and we were allowed to have an

emergency debate that day because the Minister of Agriculture wanted it. But when we get into a position where there is wrongdoing on the part of the Government opposite, we can't have a debate. It is a very strange situation. Again, some facts for the Members opposite.

Half a billion people are suffering from some form of hunger. Ten thousand die each week in Africa, Asia and Latin America. Fifteen million people are now starving in West Bengal; in Bangladesh there are barely rations to provide even gruel for the starving and Decca's crowded refugee camps. J

At one time, two years ago, there was hope for these people, but then came 1972. The first problem was that of bad weather. But the weather improved in 1973, but a new set of problems threatened food output, especially in the underdeveloped countries. Fertilizer was in short supply and its price started to climb. Then came the devastating impact of quadrupling of the market price of petroleum by the oil producing nations and the oil producing provinces. It is very funny, very strange, that when people are starving the Government opposite gets caught up in the rhetoric of the sheiks of the Middle East and are going to hoard their oil and gouge the people and make sure it can't be used. You are just as wrong as they are because you are caught up in the same rhetoric and you are doing exactly the same thing that they did and you are giving immoral leadership and an immoral example.

When the people are starving, and potash is in short supply, what do the NDP do? They bring out a new policy and a new policy that is going to mean, and has already meant, millions for the province according to the Minister of Mineral Resources. It has also meant the stoppage of potash mine expansion in Saskatchewan. There we are with those record reserves in Canada, the prime supplier of North America and one of the prime suppliers in the world. There is a world shortage; 10,000 people are starving each week and you are happy to go and grab your millions of dollars. You are so anxious and so greedy to get your millions of dollars that when someone in the Press asks you if we are going to lose any equalization grants, all you can say is, well, I imagine we will lose some but we don't know how much yet. We haven't even bothered thinking about it. They are so anxious and so greedy to get the money that you didn't think of the 10,000 people that are starving each week and you are afraid to talk about it and afraid to debate it. The Member for Arm River (Mr. Faris) took the Members of this Legislature, one year ago, into a meeting and he showed us pictures and slides of people starving throughout the world and he was concerned and he told us that he was compassionate and he told us that it bothered him and he told us that he didn't like it, and what happened when we tried to debate this matter in the Legislature last Friday? He didn't have the political courage to break with his party and to allow a debate so that we could prove to the people of Saskatchewan just how much of a conspiracy the Members opposite are involved in, that is causing directly thousands of deaths every week.

The Members opposite want us to believe that they are concerned; you are not concerned, you are greedy. You want the money, you want the dollars, so you can leave it around in desk drawers and pay your party hacks, Service Printers and Dunsky the hundreds and thousands of dollars. You need the money, you have to have the money, because the people of Saskatchewan know that you are not giving responsible government. They are

starting to realize that your position in the potash industry at the present time and your attempts to close down the potash mines and stop expansion of the industry, they know, the people of Saskatchewan now know that we are getting immoral leadership and immoral government from the Members opposite. And any concerns that they may have, they say they have, for the people of Saskatchewan are phony concerns and are not backed up by the facts.

It is a surprising thing that when tens of thousands of people are dying, the Government opposite comes out with a policy, we are going to grab more money from the potash industry. Obviously the potash industry has no choice and what did they do? Expansion after expansion is cancelled when every ton of potash can help to feed people and yet the Government opposite freezes the expansion of potash, freezes potash production in Saskatchewan. And they try to hold themselves up as a moral party.

Their position on this is nothing less than immoral and it is nothing less than disgusting that the Government opposite would stop just to get some more millions of dollars and they don't know how much. We know, we know that all the talk in the last few years about concern for people means concern for the NDP and not the people, not the old age pensioners, not the starving people of the world. Because you have done nothing and I think it is a pretty black day in the history of your Party when you were afraid to debate the matter. You were cowardly, and afraid to debate the matter in this House last Friday. I know many of your Members didn't like it. And I know many of your Members opposite don't like your position. I know that Members opposite know that they are directly causing and will cause the deaths of thousands of people around this world, because of a greedy policy to get more money. There is no doubt that the leadership that we have had for the last three years has been proven poor, it has been proven to the public of Saskatchewan that he can't deal with Ottawa, the Premier is not the man to deal with Ottawa, he has failed to deal with Ottawa and he won't make an issue of that in the next election because the people know he can't handle Ottawa. He is not the man to do it. When you talk about compassion we know your so-called good record of the last three years is being refuted by the deaths every day of thousands of people.

You give up one-twentieth of our budget, well below the standards that your Party is supposed to say that we are to contribute to international aid, \$4.5 million. You attach a little rider on, everybody else has got to do it. At the same time you don't stand up and willingly say, we feel the people of Saskatchewan should give \$4.5 million in aid. You don't say that. You say, we are prepared to give \$4.5 million if everybody else does it. Where is the leadership? Where is the moral leadership? Where is this talk about the compassion and the morality that you are supposed to have given for 20 years. It doesn't exist under the New Democratic Party. It may have existed under Tommy Douglas, but the people are seeing every day that this is a different party and not related in any way, shape or form to the CCF government for 20 years.

They talk about a Saskatchewan option, it's going to be the Saskatchewan option, you are going to get it if it is the same in Manitoba. We are going to get the clear skies, wind blowing over wheat fields.

AN HON. MEMBER: — It's blowing in here.

MR. LANE: — You better believe it is

blowing. The clouds that we are getting threatened with are the storm clouds of state farms, state control of agriculture. We have got our first state farm in Saskatchewan and the Premier has endorsed this. It is not going to help the young man to get started.

AN HON. MEMBER: — For experimental purposes.

MR. LANE: — That's for experimental purposes. The Minister of Agriculture says that is the first of many. You bet it is an experiment. It's the first state farm and the first experimental state farm in North America outside of Cuba. And that is what you are giving us. There is a Saskatchewan option in the next election you better believe it. It is going to be an option to own your own farm land and we will give the people that option. It is going to be a Saskatchewan option which is going to allow the legitimate and fair businessman to carry on his enterprise without the big hand of Allan Blakeney, the Minister of Consumer Affairs (Mr. Tchorzewski) and without the club being held over the businessman's head. That is what the Saskatchewan option is going to be

It is going to be a choice of either government control of farm land or farmer control of our agriculture in Saskatchewan. That's the Saskatchewan option. It is going to mean an option between government control of the lives of the people of this province. That is the option. That is the Saskatchewan option that is going to be fought in 1975.

We have got an option in 1975, either we can continue this policy of constant confrontation with Ottawa that the Premier espouses or we can have a policy of constructive confederation which the Liberal Party will give and which a Liberal government is going to give to the people of Saskatchewan in 1975.

There is no mistake, Mr. Speaker, I will support the amendment and not support the Motion.

SOME HON. MEMBERS: — Hear, hear!

HON. R. ROMANOW (Attorney General): — Mr. Speaker, I didn't want to interrupt the Hon. Member during the course of his remarks. In my judgement the rules of the House were broken when the Hon. Member for Lumsden directed what I view to be some of the most highly personal remarks personally directed at the Member for Turtleford (Mr. Feduniak) that I have heard in the eight years that I have been sitting in this Legislature. I don't expect the Hon. Member to apologize. I am not asking for that. But I do ask on a Point of Order, Sir, that the rules of the House be complied with when there are continually repeated references to personalities and individuals as I think unfortunately laced that gentleman's speech during this last 40 to 45 minutes.

MR. SPEAKER: — I would say that it is difficult, it is impossible in fact for the Chair here to keep personalities out in a number of these debates. I deplore it myself but it is almost impossible for me to control it. I wish Members themselves on both sides of the House would conduct themselves so that we wouldn't have these personalities, there aren't too many indulging but there are some and I wish they would cease.

MR. ROMANOW: — Mr. Speaker, I won't pursue this matter further but I invite you to peruse the transcript of the words of the Member for Lumsden tomorrow at your convenience. I won't pursue it, I am not asking you to make any ruling on this matter. But I invite you to consider whether or not my comments are well taken on the question of the comments going overboard on the business of personalities. I know the heat of debate. I have been probably as guilty of any of them. But with all due respect, the references to the Member for Turtleford and Mr. Landegger and others, I felt were not in the proper conduct and tone of the Legislature or any Member of the Assembly.

MR. LANE: — Mr. Speaker, I should like to comment. I should like you to peruse the transcript of the Member for Watrous (Mr. Cody) when he referred to the Member for Athabasca not being in the House. I should like you to peruse the transcript of some of the personal attacks made by the Government opposite. I think that the remarks of the Attorney General of Saskatchewan are unwarranted, secondly are unnecessary, thirdly it is uncalled for.

MR. SPEAKER: — I would say a lot of the statements are not called for and I hope both sides will refrain from them in the future and leave the Chair out of these battles across the floor.

MR. J. G. RICHARDS (Saskatoon University): — Mr. Speaker, when the Leader of the Opposition spoke he spent a good deal of time on a proposed bylaw related to the Neighbourhood Improvement program. The implication of the Leader of the Opposition's argument was that we are suffering from big government and should leave the housing market to itself.

On the following day the Premier made reference to this bylaw and he quite rightly made the point that regulations must be devised to prevent landlords from creating slum conditions. In miniature, Mr. Speaker, that exchange sums up the choice that Saskatchewan people have between the two major parties in the province today.

In such a choice I think the people will support the New Democratic Party every time. At least the Government has the virtue of appreciating that there are forces in society which create poverty and which create profit, whereas the Leader of the Opposition is content to snipe about government regulations.

Unfortunately the Government usually is not prepared to follow through on the logic of its position. To take this specific instance, when urban renewal programs are not properly supervised, property values increase, rents increase, poor people are forced either to sell out or can't afford the rents and neighbourhood renewal of poor people's areas merely results in changing their nature. Middle class people replace poor people and the poor people move out to slums somewhere else.

So in a second sense, I think that debate illustrates the frustrations of the political choice in Saskatchewan. We have on the one hand the Liberal Party, unable, unwilling to see the power and the forces which create poverty, which create poor housing conditions. We see on the other, the NDP, which has the virtue of recognizing these forces but is unwilling to follow

through logically on what is required.

Nonetheless, within the context of the NPP and within context of this Throne Speech, I think there are programs which deserve praise.

The Senior Citizens Home Repair program is admirable. I trust that it will be extended. Obviously it is desirable people be allowed to stay in their own homes and avoid moving to institutions as long as they possibly can. At this juncture I should say that I have had lengthy discussions with Joe Phelps over the weekend during which we discussed everything from increasing the Home Repair program to \$2,000 to detailed recommendations about how to implement the recommendations in the Senior Citizens Commission Report concerning provincial and local councils. The latter should be organized to guarantee that senior citizens control them, that they are not influenced unduly by bureaucrats in Regina, politicians or either political party etc. In fact, I understand that Rev. Wartman came on air last week and criticized me from the left. It is not often Mr. Speaker, that I get criticized from the left. Rev. Mr. Wartman said that Richards gave credit to the Government for announcing it was going to implement finally the recommendations of the Report and create an agency of government to deal with senior citizens affairs and provincial and local councils. But says Rev. Mr. Wartman, Mr. Richards has been sadly confused and bemused if he thinks the Throne Speech provisions are a serious step forward for senior citizens. It is grossly inadequate says Rev. Mr. Wartman. Much, much more is needed. I bow to Rev. Mr. Wartman and will withdraw my unduly naive praise for the Government. I am sure the Reverend is correct.

Now, Mr. Speaker, senior citizens constitute, according to the latest Economic Review, fully 98,000 people in our province, 11 per cent of the total. I think the Government has come to its senses and realized it can't afford to ignore that large percentage of people even if they are at the bottom. But if there is a major criticism to be made of the New Democratic Party, it is that that party has become comfortable. It has become complacent with the prosperity which Saskatchewan has fortuitously enjoyed in the last several years.

At the time the 1974 Economic Review was released, the Premier made statements to the effect that these were good times, that Saskatchewan was enjoying good times. Oil money was up, resource money was up, wheat prices were up, things were good.

I trust that Members of this House still appreciate the depths of inequalities that exist in the province. Doctors earn \$770 a week, old age pensioners earn \$65. Hotel workers earn \$69. These are figures for Saskatchewan for the year 1973.

Do Members opposite feel that we can in any way be satisfied when the average physician earns ten times what the average worker or the average old age pensioner takes home? Can we be satisfied in Saskatchewan when the top fifth of the population gets 47 per cent of the income and the bottom fifth gets three per cent? Can we be satisfied when the average family in Saskatoon, the city I represent, in 1970 earned \$9,500 while the average family in unorganized communities in the northern census district (which roughly corresponds to the DNS area) earned \$4,400? These are the inequalities which persist in 1974 despite high wheat prices and despite high oil prices.

And what is going to change that situation? What is going to enforce that there be more equality in Saskatchewan society? I firmly put my faith in the processes of politics, and the processes of political organization. Whether it be political parties, whether it be trade unions, whether it be native organizations forming interest groups, whether it be welfare rights groups.

At one level I think the Government opposite understands that. When the Attorney General spoke up in defence of the Department of Northern Saskatchewan last year he made this precise point. He said that we should expect troubles in northern Saskatchewan as northern people flex their muscles and begin to express themselves, to come out of the apathy and the torpor of years of colonialism imposed upon them.

At one level the Government understands that - when it is speaking in this House, Mr. Speaker. But why, why if the Government understands, does it three days after this Legislature adjourned last May, fire the second-in-command of the Planning Branch of the Department of Northern Saskatchewan? If that man is just an 'inefficient bureaucrat', why does the chairman of the Northern Municipal Council come to his defence? Why during the summer does the Government seek to "reorganize" the Human Resources Development Agency and dismiss 75 per cent of the staff. If these people were not competent people helping poor people's organizations, why then, do these very same organizations through the Citizens Advisory Council of the Human Resources Development Agency, speak publicly in support of the fired civil servants?

I would argue that the people involved in those organizations understand the necessity for politics. They admittedly were making waves because they understood the great political problems. These organizations profited from sympathetic civil servants in areas of the Department of Northern Saskatchewan, in the Human Resources Development Agency, who also understood that process, and who were willing to help organizations, ranging from the Métis Society to welfare rights organizations, to establish themselves. But despite the fine words of the Attorney General in defense of the concept of the Department of Northern Saskatchewan, I very seriously doubt that that Government does, in its inner depths, understand these processes.

Admittedly, I think some credit should be given. I think the appointment of Doug McArthur as Deputy Minister of the Department of Northern Saskatchewan was an excellent choice. I think the statements the Deputy Minister made in Saskatoon last month at a seminar I helped organize were courageous, to the point, frank and honest.

Mr. Speaker, I have been at some pains to roast the NDP over the coals for its lack of support for people at the bottom. I think, at this juncture, given that 1975 is International Women's year, it would be appropriate that we remember the record of the Liberal Party. Not all present Members in the House may have been here in 1912 when a certain bill was passed called an Act to Prevent the Employment of Female Labour in Certain Occupations. Now this bill, Mr. Speaker, was put forward by the then Liberal Government of the day, proposed by the then Attorney General of the day, the Hon. Mr. Turgeon. It is a very short piece of legislation and I should like to read the relevant section into the record. The grammar is atrocious but you will have to excuse it.

No person shall employ in any capacity any white woman or girl or permit any white woman or girl to reside or lodge in or to work in or stay as a bona fide customer in a public apartment thereof only; to frequent any restaurant, laundry or other place of business or amusement owned, kept or managed by any Japanese, Chinese or other oriental person.

This was a piece of legislation the Liberal Government in 1912 saw fit to rush through the Legislature in two weeks, and to the discredit, I am afraid, of this Assembly there were no, recorded divisions at any of the readings of that Bill. It sits as a piece of racist, as a piece of sexist, legislation on the Statutes of Saskatchewan. I trust that the Liberals have made some progress since 1912. In fact, in light of the debates that we are to have on the question of women's property rights, one may be encouraged to feel that humanity has managed some small progress in the intervening 62 years.

Mr. Speaker, I now propose to turn to the subject of energy. I feel, in talking about this subject, that it is appropriate to bring up the little ditty from Lewis Carroll.

The time has come, the walrus said
To talk of many things
Of sailing ships and candle wax
Of cabbages and kings.

The subject of energy is so complicated, it involves so many cabbages and so many kings that I have trepidation in entering into the debate. I think first it is appropriate to dismiss the Liberals. It is really not very useful to engage in a debate with them as their position is some schizophrenic melange of what the Canadian Petroleum Association and the Federal Liberals happen to be putting out that week, and it is very difficult to follow such a schizophrenic argument. I shall accordingly level my discussion at the arguments put forward by the Provincial Government. The first thing that has to be stated is that the issue is complex. I should like in that context refer to a quotation from the Premier's speech during this Throne Speech Debate.

It (referring to the Federal Budget) is designed to force the provinces to give the oil companies even fatter profits. The profits of major oil companies are already very, very high. Almost every major oil company has seen profits soar 100 per cent, 200 per cent and more over the last couple of years. Ottawa says the provinces must cut their royalties so that the profits will go still higher.

Mr. Speaker, that was a direct quotation, and I think it illustrates the dishonesty of the Members opposite in trying to simplify down this issue into a debate between the Federal and Provincial Governments. Albeit there is mention of soaring corporate profits, but winds up with the Premier stating that when the Federal Government increases taxes, that amounts to decreasing taxes. Because the Federal Government has increased the Federal income tax that supposedly means that the corporations get increased profits. I beg the indulgence of the House to engage in a few numbers. The numbers I am going to quote come from a confidential Alberta Government report which I released to the House on Monday and was released in Edmonton

by Grant Notley, provincial leader of the NDP.

MR. ROMANOW: — Do you have the copyright on it?

MR. RICHARDS: — Oh, it's perfectly public, perfectly public. In fact I would be quite happy to pass this over to you if you have not yet read it. Have you read it?

MR. ROMANOW: — No, I haven't.

MR. RICHARDS: — Oh, shame, shame.

Mr. Speaker, according to this report, and Members who have their copy available can turn to page 6, the gross profits in 1973 on Alberta oil and gas amounted to \$1.4 billion, and after deductions of 1973 capital expenditures. Now, Mr. Speaker, the analogous figure this year for gross profits in that industry would be fully \$3.3 billion, a more than twofold increase. Now had there been no increase in federal taxation, the post-tax profit after the increase in the provincial royalty in Alberta, would have been twice the level of 1973. These, Mr. Speaker, are the facts which the Provincial Government is not willing to publicize. The Provincial Government does not talk about the bulk of the oil industry in Alberta and the fact that, under Alberta's royalty taxation, had there not been additional federal taxation there would have resulted an 80 per cent increase in the profits of the oil companies in Alberta. Ironically, even with the new increased federal taxation the profit to the Alberta oil industry in 1974 will be higher this year than last. This is not true in Saskatchewan I hasten to add, but in Alberta there is a marginal increase of \$100 million or so in the net profit after deducting royalties, after deducting the new increased income taxes proposed. This gives some indication of the enormity of the profitability of the industry, and should force Members opposite to argue this issue in a more comprehensive manner.

There are a few more things which are illuminating in this -report that I might quickly pass over to encourage people to read it. There are some interesting figures on page 13 which show that two oil companies, well known in Alberta, Numac and Western Decalta paid no Federal income taxes for the previous decade ending in 1973. There are interesting and important figures, which to my knowledge are not elsewhere available, about the degree of concentration of oil production in Alberta. This report shows distribution of royalty payments by company, a rough index of distribution of production. It shows that Imperial Oil, one company, alone paid 22 per cent of the royalties received by the Alberta Government in 1973. It shows that seven companies, all of them multinationals, paid 65 per cent of all royalties received by the Provincial Government in Alberta in 1973. It shows the top 50 companies paid 93 per cent of the total.

Further the report discusses contingency plans of the Alberta government and what they propose to do in terms of provincial corporate tax credits, relief for the federal corporate tax resulting from inclusion of royalties as non-deductible income, extension of the new gas definition, lowering of royalties as applicable to new gas. These measures will result in a \$150 million to \$250 million reduction of provincial taxes and consequent increase in profits in the oil industry.

Mr. Speaker, at this juncture and with some trepidation I should like to call on a page to distribute this material. I want to distribute to every Member as a Christmas bonus the current issue of Next Year Country.

MR. BROCKELBANK: — I hope we are under no obligation to subscribe.

MR. RICHARDS: — That's for your own conscience, John, to decide.

We are very grateful to the Premier for his kind words of support on the back page, but I don't at this juncture want to refer extensively to them. To return to the subject at hand, the Premier is quite right to emphasize provincial rights over property under Section 92 of the BNA Act, to emphasize provincial rights to tax those resources under Section 109, but surely the Federal Government does also have the right to regulate interprovincial trade and to attempt to effect some equalization among provinces. If Members accept the figures I quoted of a doubling of after-tax profits had the previous income tax system remained in force, are Members opposite still willing to argue there should have been no increase of federal taxation relative to the 1973 provisions? I think not. I think that Members, if they analyze this seriously will see that they must take a more comprehensive and complex vision of this problem. If they don't, they will continue to be subject to the kinds of images the Saskatchewan Government is creating for itself in eastern Canada. I refer to a very eloquent cartoon which appeared in the Toronto Star drawn by MacPherson. Now MacPherson is no flaming conservative; he is sympathetic to the New Democratic Party, but this cartoon portrays a barrel in the form of a horse being ridden by a large, fat, ugly American representing the petroleum industry. A lasso representing the Federal Budget is about to rein in, presumably the ugly American. The western provinces are depicted riding shotgun in the rear attempting presumably to ward off increased taxation of the federal industry. Secondly, a front page Star-Phoenix story on the 31st of October 1974, "Lougheed, Blakeney Press Government to End Resource Taxation." Now everybody knows the Star-Phoenix biased fashion of headline writing, but I never heard Members opposite oppose that particular headline or that particular story. Members opposite must recognize the way they have argued an unqualified provincial rights position has resulted in creating an image abroad in the land that they are in common league with the Government of Alberta and that they are not making any distinction between the very rightful claims that we in Saskatchewan as a traditional "have not" province have and the position of the Alberta Government.

What is happening in Alberta? I should like Members at their leisure to read, an excellent piece of journalism, namely the article by Larry Pratt on the Syncrude project in Alberta. This article is from a book which Hurtig is to publish next month. It discusses in a good deal of detail what is happening in Alberta oil exploration and development. I would put to Members of the House that in western Canada we have Lougheed playing the role of Macdonald, the role of John A. Macdonald. Like Macdonald, Lougheed is bartering resources for industrial development. Like Macdonald, Lougheed has his Alberta Gas Trunk Lines, the equivalent of the Canadian Pacific Railroad. Alberta Gas Trunk, the common carrier for all gas in the province is the company opposing the Canadian Arctic Gas MacKenzie Valley

pipelines, the company which is putting together the \$700 million petrochemical complex for Alberta. In short, according to an Alberta Government report coming out of the Department of Industry and Commerce, there are 147 industrial projects afoot at the moment, demanding 18,000 new jobs, for a sum total of \$6.3 billion. The vast majority of this industrial development is based immediately upon petroleum and petroleum developments from tar sands to petrochemical.

There are very serious questions which we in Saskatchewan and we, as Canadians, must answer. Is that the kind of industrial development we want; do we want to continue to base our economic development on another staple, namely oil and extractions from it? Are we prepared for the amount of foreign control that that implies, because it is foreign capital which is developing the tar sands and the bulk of petrochemical developments in Alberta? Are we prepared for the implicit shortages of oil and gas for immediate needs as we divert them into petrochemicals? Are we prepared to continue our excessive dependence on exports to the United States for our economic prosperity? What does this kind of development mean for northern people? The investment of \$5 billion in the tar sands of northeastern Alberta makes miniscule anything happening in northern Saskatchewan. One "small" \$250 million tar sands plant, already in operation, has meant massive social changes not to the benefit of the native people involved in the Fort McMurray-Fort McKay area. Out of 700 people working at the existing tar sands plant only 50 are of native extraction.

Mr. Speaker, having discussed what I think is happening in Alberta, I think that Saskatchewan at this juncture is implicitly deciding there is more to be gained by being the hinterland to Alberta than the hinterland to eastern Canada. We get the crumbs, such as Ipsco development to produce the pipe which will export the ethylene, the gas, the oil and the refined products from Alberta.

What can be the alternative? The alternative I would submit must strike an independent Saskatchewan position, a position clearly independent from Ottawa, clearly independent from the oil companies, clearly independent from the Government of Alberta. We should be arguing for SaskOil to become a precedent for the country. SaskOil should be expanded into an integrated publicly owned oil company, undertaking all of the exploration and development in co-operation with the Co-op Refinery all the refining of petroleum products in the province, and become the sole retail distributor thereof. We in Saskatchewan should be arguing that Petrocan should do analogously at the federal level, not as a Crown corporation dominated by Ottawa solely, for the regional arguments are important. We should argue the right of the Provincial Government to have a say in what Petrocan is, have members on the Board of Directors of that corporation. But, Mr. Speaker, I beg of the Government to separate themselves from the role of Junior partners of the Alberta Government.

In conclusion, Mr. Speaker, this may well be my final contribution to a Throne Speech Debate in this Legislature. I am fully aware of the record of non re-elections of Independent Members of this Legislature. I trust that I have been able to contribute something in the preceding four years in this House. I hope that the electors of Saskatoon Centre will be willing to see me re-elected, but I make it my final plea before I take my seat that if legislators are interested in parliament

surviving with credibility, then the party system as we use it in this legislature must change, because the partisan diatribe that we engage in and our refusal to address ourselves to the major issues which I think are before Canada, before this province, are part of the reasons why politicians and parliament art held in distrust and why the people of Saskatchewan are apathetic towards their politicians.

Mr. Speaker, with that I take my seat.

SOME HON. MEMBERS: — Hear, hear!

Debate adjourned on the motion of Mr. Kaeding (Saltcoats).

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