

**LEGISLATIVE ASSEMBLY OF SASKATCHEWAN**  
**Fifth Session — Seventeenth Legislature**  
**7th Day**

**Friday, December 6, 1974.**

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

**WELCOME TO STUDENTS**

**MR. H.H.P. BAKER** (Regina Wascana): — Mr. Speaker, I am very pleased to be able to welcome a number of students in the west gallery and the Speaker's Gallery this afternoon. We have some 90 students from Balfour Technical School in our city, they are accompanied by their teachers, Mr. Wahl and Mr. Harder.

This is my home school where my daughter took her high school training. It is not too far from where I live and it is outstanding for its many high school football wins. I think they have won more provincial championships than any other high school in this province.

They are also today being hosts, Mr. Speaker, to some 120 debaters who have come from the four western provinces and the Northwest Territories for contests. They are going to be here the next two days, and one of the topics they are debating, I should like you to know, is on the "Canadian Pacific Railway, its Role in the Future of Western Canada." I think it will be most interesting and some of our men here, I think Mr. MacMurchy, is taking part in the seminar.

I should also like to welcome some Grade Seven and Eight students from Wetmore School. Mr. Lupastin is their teacher. Wetmore School, I might say, was the largest and oldest public school in this province until recent years. I had the pleasure of representing them in the south east constituency. Now that we have Regina-Victoria, I will have the privilege of representing them again. I welcome them here today on behalf of this legislative Assembly and I hope their stay will be most educational and that they will learn much from their law-making body. Again, welcome.

**HON. MEMBERS** — Hear, hear!

**STATEMENT**

**LAY OFF OF 200 WORKERS AT THE BURNS & COMPANY PLANT**

**HON. G. SNYDER** (Moose Jaw South): — Before the Orders of the Day, Mr. Speaker, I should like to make a brief statement with reference to the statement which was made by the Leader of the Opposition (Mr. Steuart) in a House yesterday, concerning the suggested lay off of 200 workers at the Burns & Company Plant at Prince Albert.

To quote from the official record, Mr. Speaker, the Leader the Opposition said and I quote:

I am informed by the President of the Company that the Department of Labour and the Government of Saskatchewan were informed many weeks ago.

December 6, 1974

I want to tell you today, Mr. Speaker, that departmental officials have confirmed that no notice was received by the Government of Saskatchewan or by the Department of Labour prior to the arrival of that letter yesterday, December 5, 1974. The Department of Labour has been in touch with the writer of that letter, Mr. W. F. Goetz, the vice-president of Industrial Relations for the firm with the following results. The Deputy Minister of Labour, Mr. Mitchell, is to meet with Mr. Goetz on Thursday, December 12 in Prince Albert to discuss the problems at the plant. Secondly, Mr. Goetz informed Deputy Minister Mitchell that his letter to the Minister which arrived Thursday, December 5 was the company's first notification of this impending situation. Let me repeat, Mr. Goetz confirmed to Deputy Minister Mitchell that his letter to the Minister that arrived Thursday the 5th was the company's first official notice to the Government of Saskatchewan.

I have been advised also, Mr. Speaker, that the employees at the plant under the terms of the technological change clause of The Trade Union Act have received no notice and the technological change clause requires 90 days notice of any technological change. No notice has been served upon the employees. And once again, Mr. Speaker, the Leader of the Opposition has displayed the kind of wild irresponsibility which has become his trade mark in this House over the years.

**SOME HON. MEMBERS** — Hear, hear!

**MR. SNYDER** — Once again, Mr. Speaker, he has acted in a most irresponsible manner which isn't in keeping with the position that he holds in this House.

**SOME HON. MEMBERS** — Hear, hear!

**MR. C.P. MACDONALD** (Milestone): — Mr. Speaker, I just want to make a brief comment on the words of the Minister of Labour. I am not sure whether or not - I was not in the House yesterday because there is a Liberal Convention with 1,200 to 1,400 Liberals down in the Regina Inn. We would like you all to come down there and have an opportunity of hearing them. But I do want to say that the tragedy of what the Minister of Labour has said that he didn't mention what has happened to the 240 or whatever the number of employees. He hasn't mentioned the cause of the responsibility for the lay of the implications to the city of Prince Albert, the efforts of this Government. . .

**AN HON. MEMBER** — What's the question?

**MR. MACDONALD** — I'm not making a question, I'm making a comment on a statement by the Minister, it is not a question.

**MR. SPEAKER** — Order! It is usual that if a Minister makes a statement someone from the Opposition has a right to comment as long as stays with the flavour of the statement that has been announced.

**MR. MACDONALD** — All I want to say is that it is very unfortunate, first of all, for the meat packing industry of Saskatchewan, it is very unfortunate for those 200 and some employees of Burns,

that all that the Minister of Labour has said to you today is to make a personal attack on the Leader of the Opposition rather than trying to indicate some positive action on behalf of the Government of Saskatchewan in order to alleviate that kind of a situation. It also indicates the health of the livestock industry in the Province of Saskatchewan is a direct result of the agricultural policies of the Minister of Agriculture (Mr. Messer) in Saskatchewan.

**SOME HON. MEMBERS** — Hear, hear!

**MR. SNYDER** — Mr. Speaker, the suggestion has been made that nothing has been done and I feel obliged to clarify. . .

**MR. SPEAKER** — Order! It is not debatable. Your statement is on the record and whether the statement was or was not reacted to in a proper manner is for the House to judge but we can't debate it.

## QUESTIONS

### CAUSE OF LAY OFF OF WORKERS AT BURNS & COMPANY

**MR. J. WIEBE** (Morse): — Mr. Speaker, before the Orders of the Day, I would like to direct a question to the Minister of Agriculture. In light of the announcement made by Burns which we have just been discussing, that they will be cutting their staff by 240 in March because of a lack of hogs being marketed in, Saskatchewan, I should like to ask the Minister of Agriculture, will this affect Intercontinental Packers as well? Will they the same fate in March, or is Burns problem the result of an unfair allocation of hogs by the Hog Marketing Commission?

**SOME HON. MEMBERS** — Hear, hear!

**HON. J.R. MESSER** (Minister of Agriculture): — Mr. Speaker, I can say and I want to say very clearly there has been no unfairness by the Saskatchewan Hog Marketing Commission in the allocation of hogs to any processor be he in Saskatchewan or outside of Saskatchewan. I think it is unfortunate that the Member insinuates that perhaps one of the reasons for the closure would, in fact, be the activities of the Saskatchewan Hog Marketing Commission.

In regard to the first part of his question, Mr. Speaker, he says that the plant is closing down as a result of a reduction in hog production in the Province of Saskatchewan. Yes, there is, there is a reduction of hog production in the Province of Saskatchewan, but it is not as great in the Province of Saskatchewan as it is in other provinces and I know of no reduction or closing of packing plants in those provinces and I suggest that it is for some other reason that the announcement has been made by Burns that they are closing. We have heard not only in Legislature but in Saskatchewan on previous occasions announcements that plants were going to be closed by Mr. Childs, the president of Burns and those plants have not yet been closed. He has referred to the Prince Albert Plant on occasion in the inferring that it was about to be closed in order, I think, to improve his strategy and his negotiating ability with the Saskatchewan Hog Marketing Commission.

**MR. WIEBE** — Mr. Speaker, a supplementary question. Just to alleviate the charges that I have made and to avoid a question on the Order Paper or Order for Return that would take six months to answer, will the Minister of Agriculture assure this House that on Monday next he will provide the following figures — the number of hogs marketed to Intercontinental and Burns six months prior to the implementation of the Hog Marketing Commission. Also the number of hogs marketed to Intercontinental and Burns six months after the implementation of the Hog Marketing Commission. Also the amount of hogs marketed to Burns and Intercontinental Packers in the last six months.

**MR. MESSER** — Mr. Speaker, there is no way that I can do that by Monday, for a number of reasons. I think it is an extensive amount of information to be asking for. I would have to consider whether or not the companies which are purchasing the hogs in fact want the information made to the general public and I think the Commission undertakes to do a lot of the business in a confidential manner. It is not, I think, within their right to release all information which may affect companies that are dealing with them. I am sure some Members of the Opposition will agree with that. But I will give consideration to it if the Member will put the question on the Order Paper.

**MR. WIEBE** — Mr. Speaker, you are saying that the allegations I have made are correct.

**MR. SPEAKER** — Order! We can't debate it.

#### **AMENDMENT OF HUMAN RIGHTS ACT**

**MR. C.P. MACDONALD** (Milestone): — Before the Orders of the Day I should like to direct a question to the Attorney General (Mr. Romanow) in a different vein and ask the Attorney General if it is the intention of the Government to amend the Act establishing the Saskatchewan Human Rights Commission so that parents will not break the law in determining what sex they will welcome into their own homes, particularly students? I should like to bring in an example of a personal case if I might. I have six girls and one son. My son is in Nova Scotia going to university. This fall I did invite a young lady into my home until she got established. I wonder now would I be breaking the law in advertising in the month of January for the second semester in order that I make sure that I brought a girl in and I didn't necessarily have to bring a boy to mix with my many, many teenage daughters. I wonder if the Attorney General could give us some indication as to whether or not he is going to amend this Act?

**HON. R. ROMANOW** (Attorney General): — Mr. Speaker, I think the Member has raised a very important question. Certainly I have received and Members of the Assembly have received a number of queries from people respecting this particular section of our Human Rights legislation. I think that there is widespread misunderstanding by the public which gives more reason for the need to look seriously at amending this particular Act as to the sex and private home situation. And, accordingly, I can advise the Member that I personally and my department people are very much actively looking at this now with a view to determining the feasibility of introducing legislation later on during this Session.

**MR. MACDONALD** — Just a supplementary question. I want to tell the Attorney General I am very glad to hear that. There is a sense of urgency the Minister is aware. We have a shortage of housing for university students in both Saskatoon and Regina particularly in the boarding level and I would like to ask the Minister if he is planning to do it prior to the adjournment of the House before Christmas? I would like to also advise the Minister that if he brings in this amendment and it is a very short amendment, a few words, it doesn't take any great detail, that Members of the Opposition will co-operate in seeing that that particular legislation is amended prior to the adjournment of the House before Christmas. I want to assure him again that we feel very strongly about this - it is ridiculous - and we will co-operate in every way in order that that can be passed as quickly as possible.

**MR. ROMANOW** — Mr. Speaker, I regret I can't give the Member any assurance that the amendment will be brought in at this sitting of the Session because quite frankly I haven't had the opportunity nor my colleagues to have made any policy decisions in this matter. I simply tell the Member that I view it with the same degree of importance as he does and whatever decision will be made will be brought forward to the Legislature as quickly as possible.

### LAND PRICES IN REGINA AND SASKATOON

**MR. J.G. RICHARDS** (Saskatoon University): — Mr. Speaker, I should like to address a question to the Minister of Municipal Affairs (Mr. Wood), in the absence of the Minister in charge of the Saskatchewan Housing Corporation. It concerns land prices especially in Regina. These prices have doubled from \$3,000 in 1971 to \$6,000 in 1974. The question to a Minister is, what provisions does the Provincial Government have to stop what is obviously very large profiteering in urban land in Regina and Saskatoon even if it has not yet reached the stage of the large metropolitan cities of the country?

**HON. E.I. WOOD** (Minister of Municipal Affairs): — I am afraid that as the Minister of Municipal Affairs I have to say that I don't believe we have any on the Statute Books at the present time. We have looked a good deal at the possibility or the desirability of bringing in some legislation that would have some bearing on the subject but at the present we don't have that legislation in place. So far as the present situation concerning the value of land in the cities of Regina and Saskatoon, the housing portion of it, this has been largely under the control of the Minister in charge of the Housing Corporation and I am afraid I can't bring you up-to-date on it. I would have to confer with him and possibly the Hon. Member can himself.

**MR. RICHARDS** — Is the Minister in agreement that my estimates are approximately accurate of \$3,000 according to CMHC per lot in Regina in 1971 and \$6,000 per lot in 1974? I am glad to see that the Government is considering legislation to put a halt to the speculative profiteering here. Is there any guarantee that during this Session there will be something in the order of legislation on the resource industries to end what is obviously speculative profiteering on urban land?

**MR. WOOD** — No, I am sorry I cannot give an answer on either one of those questions. So far as dealing with the current price of land in Regina, I have not been in close contact with the Housing Corporation for some 11 months now and you would be surprised how quickly I forget these things. My “forgettory” works very well and I am afraid that I am not in touch with the situation there. So far as the legislation is concerned I am afraid I cannot give any guarantee that it will be brought forward at this Session but we will be making announcements on that in due course.

## **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. E. KAEDING** (Saltcoats): — Mr. Speaker, I am pleased to have this opportunity again to enter this Debate in support of the Speech from the Throne. It is a great satisfaction to me to have been part of the Government which presented not only this document, but others which have preceded it since 1971.

Mr. Speaker, the Members opposite, who have contributed this Debate, have attempted to portray this Throne Speech as unproductive in that it does not contain the outline of future programs in the magnitude that they have come to expect from this hard-working Government. The contents of this document may appear to be somewhat subdued in terms of the last three years but when one compares its content with the very best of the Liberal Government between 1964 and 1971, I can assure you it will withstand any comparison.

It is interesting to note that in the past three years the volume of legislation passed by this Government almost equals that of the entire seven lean years of the Liberal Government. I invite Members opposite to look down on the Clerk's table and compare the skinny books of statutes compiled in those years to the substantial volumes of 1971 to 1974.

**SOME HON. MEMBERS** — Hear, hear!

**MR. KAEDING** — It is appropriate therefore that having put into place the large number of major pieces of legislation which this Government has done that there should be a period of consolidation so that Government departments could more fully integrate these programs and that the people of the province could become more conversant with the major developments which have taken place. It is also appropriate it seems to me in this period of rapid inflation which we are now experiencing not only here in Saskatchewan, but in Canada, and indeed throughout the western world that a responsible government would re-examine its priorities and try to avoid adding major new programs which help to feed the inflationary spiral.

Mr. Speaker, the Member for Lumsden (Mr. Lane) in yesterday, giving the most abusive tirade ever heard in this House, complained that there was no reference to inflation in

this year's Throne Speech. Probably that was an oversight. I am sure the Premier felt that everyone in Saskatchewan was aware of what this Government had done to ease the effects of inflation in this province. He could have referred to the removal of seven cents per gallon, with a significant saving of \$35 million to farmers and vehicle owners.

**SOME HON. MEMBERS** — Hear, hear!

**MR. KAEDING** — He could have mentioned the Property Improvement Grant which had increased from \$12 million to \$52 million, a saving to home owners, farmers and businessmen of \$20 million. Or he could have mentioned that we picked up the entire increase in educational costs to school units, thereby eliminating the need for tax increases, another \$37 million. He could have told you that the Community Capital Fund put another \$47 million over a five-year period at the disposal of urban municipalities to help hold the line on taxes and provide capital improvements. The elimination of the deterrent fees and the removal of medicare premiums took another \$22 million off the cost of living.

In all, Mr. Speaker, this amounts to the very significant total of \$161 million.

**SOME HON. MEMBERS** — Hear, hear!

**MR. KAEDING** — We would have thought that everyone knew of these programs, but apparently the Member for Lumsden learns a little harder than the rest, so I thought I should remind him. It was unbelievable to hear this same Member lecture this Government on its lack of action to prevent starvation in the under-developed countries. Where was he when his federal Liberal counterparts imposed a LIFT gram in 1972 and denied millions of bushels of wheat to hungry people of the world?

He accused us of putting a stop to potash development. I inform him that there is a \$30 million expansion underway in my constituency and if the federal Liberals would keep their "cotton pickin' fingers" off our royalties that industry would get along very well indeed.

**SOME HON. MEMBERS** — Hear, hear!

**MR. KAEDING** — Mr. Speaker, when I look back at these past three years since we have been entrusted with the government of this province, I am very proud indeed of its accomplishments. In 1971, in spite of the fact that we have a potash industry in my constituency, many people there were discouraged and disheartened and many of our young people had left the area to seek work in other provinces. Retail sales had dropped to disaster levels. Homes and apartment blocks were empty and many businesses had closed their doors and a general air of gloom pervaded the scene. The Liberal Government of the day had managed to alienate the working people, the small businessman and pitted teachers against trustees and labour against farmer. Taxes had been levied on property, on meals, on entertainment and on the sick in an effort to maintain faltering programs.

The first priority of the Blakeney Government was to develop programs which would revive our rural areas and bring some

December 6, 1974

stability to agriculture and upgrade the standards of living in the rural communities. The success of these programs is evident in all of our communities today.

One needs only to look at the main street of towns in my constituency to see the tremendous change. Where only dust and gravel existed four years ago, you will now find an oiled main street in every town, village and hamlet in the constituency, thanks to the Mainstreet program introduced in 1972.

**SOME HON. MEMBERS** — Hear, hear!

**MR. KAEDING** — Since that time many communities have continued to extend their dust-free surfacing to cover most of their business section and many residential areas through assistance provided under the Street Improvement program and the Community Capital Fund. Many of these businesses which were closed have reopened again and housing is at a premium in every community.

I have here, Mr. Speaker, a copy of a news release which came out only this morning:

Eventful day at Spy Hill - five businesses reopened on Main Street, a new town office, a new SGIO agency, a grocery store, a plumbing shop and a new regional library.

If that isn't progress in our rural community, I should like to know.

**SOME HON. MEMBERS** — Hear, hear!

**MR. KAEDING** — Villages such as MacNutt and Tantallon, which were off the main highways had been clamouring for years to get an outlet to a provincial highway. Within two years, both communities have been tied into the highway system through the Open Roads program and this year the village of Waldron was added as well.

The Speech from the Throne indicates that over 600 miles of grid and connecting roads will be added to the highway system and the scope of that program will be evident by the start of extension of No. 15 highway to Bredenbury, a connection that was promised by successive governments. Thanks to this Government, this road is now becoming a reality, as is the Binscarth grid road north of Spy Hill, which becomes an extension of No. 22 to the Manitoba border. A new system of dust free grid roads, now under study, will further upgrade the rural system.

I believe every town, village, hamlet and municipality in my riding has taken advantage of the assistance made available to them under the Winter Works program to provide employment for people and to assist in providing facilities and needed services. Many major projects were undertaken or assisted. A curling rink in Bredenbury, a swimming pool in Langenburg, renovations in town of Churchbridge to the town hall, skating rinks in Stockholm and Spy Hill, a recreational director in Esterhazy, as well as many smaller projects such as assistance to gun clubs, cemeteries, community halls and drop-in centres and a host of others.

To accommodate the ever-increasing need for senior citizens services a new 35-bed care home has been approved in Langenburg and low rental housing units have been approved in Churchbridge,



Spy Hill and Esterhazy. Several other communities have applications pending.

It is rather ironic, Mr. Speaker, to have those so-called champions of the senior citizens opposite, criticize this Government for its program of aid to senior citizens. Try to remember, or should we rather forget, that these are the same people who have opposed almost every major program we have introduced for the welfare of older people. These are the people who applied deterrent fees and utilization fees in 1968 which were borne, more by the aged, than by any other group in our society, whose requirements for senior citizens' care homes were so rigid that only the largest towns could qualify for a home.

Under our Government, senior citizens who require level II or level III care have the medical component of that care subsidized to the amount of \$3 per day for level II and \$7 per day for level III. In addition, many community services have been added to make life for senior citizens more attractive. The senior citizens Home Repair program has assisted many of them to improve their homes in which they wish to remain.

In the 1974-75 year the estimated cost of programs for community service and subsidies to care home patients in the constituency of Saltcoats will amount to about \$52,000. How much do you think they got in 1970-71 under the Liberal Government opposite? Was it \$20,000? No! Was it \$10,000? No! Was it even \$5,000? No! Surely it must have been at least \$1,000? Something less than that. Sorry folks, the total spent in 1970-71 in the constituency of Saltcoats on services for senior citizens was the grand total of \$600. Let's compare that, Mr. Speaker, \$52,000 in 1974 to \$600 in 1970. What a difference!

Another priority for this Government was to provide a means of getting young farmers started on the land without requiring large amounts of capital which they did not have. The introduction of the Land Bank program provided an opportunity for many of these young farmers, while at the same time, providing a means whereby older farmers could sell their land for a decent price on retirement. In spite of the vicious attacks and outright lies being spread around the province by the Members opposite, I believe this will be one of the major pieces of agricultural legislation in this decade.

**SOME HON. MEMBERS** — Hear, hear!

**MR. KAEDING** — It is unfortunate indeed, Mr. Speaker, that Liberal and Conservative critics alike should be so bitterly trying to misinterpret and misrepresent this program. They say that farmers are forced to sell to the Land Bank. How stupid, Mr. Speaker. Can they document one case in evidence? They tell you that the Land Bank will never sell the land. One needs only examine the terms of the lease which states that the lessee may apply after five years to purchase the land, based on market value. They will tell you that after five years you will have buy the land or your lease will be terminated. Again, they are false. The lease provides that the lessee will have the lease until age 65, or until death and cannot be terminated except for breach of contract, the same as any farm credit transaction. What better protection can anyone offer?

December 6, 1974

It is true that there are some problems with allocations. When the demand for leases is such that up to 20 or more applicants apply for leases on a single parcel of land, allocations can become very difficult. However applications are assessed by as fair criteria as possible, on a point system, to try to get the most worthy recipient. Not everyone will agree with the allocations on those cases, but that can't be avoided. It does prove the point, however, that the plan is serving a real need in the rural area.

The Hog Stabilization program which this Government initiated last winter provided the kind of real assistance that our hog farmers needed to weather a most difficult period.

**SOME HON. MEMBERS** — Hear, hear!

**MR. KAEDING** — Now that prices are returning to more acceptable levels these farmers are still in business to take advantage of better prices while many of their counterparts in other less fortunate provinces were forced out of business. It is rather discouraging, however, to find that some of these some operators who received the benefits of this much-needed protection should still be critical of this Government and at this Government's attempts to provide an orderly marketing system.

I should like to turn for a minute or two, Mr. Speaker, to the matter of labour legislation. You will recall that when this Government took office in 1971 the working people of this province were under some of the most restrictive labour laws in Canada. Under Bill 2 their rights to collective bargaining had been seriously eroded and their rights to organize into unions of their choice was often denied. The Workman's Compensation Program had fallen into disrepute and many claims were ignored or refused. In successive years, this Government, through a series of changes in The Trade Union Act, Labour Standards Act, Workers Compensation Act and The Occupational Health and Safety Act, has once again put Saskatchewan in the forefront in labour legislation.

**SOME HON. MEMBERS** — Hear, hear!

**MR. KAEDING** — Here is just a review of a few changes:

- The 40-hour week has become standard;
- Three weeks annual holidays with pay after one year; four weeks holidays after ten years;
- Equal pay provision for female workers;
- Maternity leave for females;
- Technological changes provisions;
- Workers have a right to a leave of absence to become candidates for public office;
- Right to refuse dangerous work;
- Minimum wage of \$2.25 per hour, one of the best in Canada.

Major changes have been made in The Workers Compensation Act to upgrade benefits to insured workers. Survivors' benefits rose from \$134 to \$275 per month. Total disability rose from \$173 to \$325 per month and temporary disability rose from \$40 to \$75 per week at the minimum. The cost of living adjustment to long-term recipients of two per cent per year since disability was incurred That's for those with accidents previously.

The Occupational Health and Safety Act is slowly but surely having its impact as labour unions and management adapt to its regulations. I am confident that our labour force will appreciate the protection it provides.

Members opposite like to deride this Government for lack of initiatives to provide jobs for our young people. Sad criticism indeed from those who were the Government in 1971 when the brave promise was of 80,000 new jobs. But our tradesmen and young people were leaving the province in droves because the jobs did not materialize. In contrast, in the past three years 25,000 new jobs have become available in this province and many of those who have left are returning. Unemployment is practically non-existent. Major expansions in timber operations, in machinery manufacturing and servicing and potash development will continue to provide additional new jobs in the years ahead.

How much better, Mr. Speaker, to record 25,000 new jobs under the NDP Government than a promise of 80,000 jobs under the Liberal Government and none delivered.

**SOME HON. MEMBERS** — Hear, hear!

**MR. KAEDING** — Hr. Speaker, farmers in Western Canada and the organizations that represent them are becoming increasingly alarmed at the succession of new developments being proposed for their industry by the arrogant Minister in charge of the Canadian Wheat Board, Otto Lang.

**SOME HON. MEMBERS** — Hear, hear!

**MR. KAEDING** — The imposition of the Federal Feed Grains Policy over the protest of every major farm organization; the proposal to abandon up to 3,000 miles of railway lines which means the end of elevator facilities on those lines; the introduction of flexible tariffs; the encouragement of inland terminals and now as a climax to all these, a serious proposal to end the Crow's Nest rates for grain and grain products with a vague promise of some compensating programs.

I have on my desk here, Hr. Speaker, a copy of the Task Force Report on Agriculture, commissioned by the Federal Liberal Government and tabled in 1969. This document was drafted by persons appointed by the Federal Government, not one of whom was a farmer and only one of whom had a remote connection with western agriculture. This Report, Mr. Speaker, contains many interesting proposals and recommendations. At the very outset it begins with a blunt, cold statement that in order for agriculture to become an efficient and viable industry, at least out of every three farmers would have to go. Then it goes to outline how much more efficient it would be to have these farmers with larger farms and larger trucks hauling grain to inland terminals on main lines. It recommended that the trading of coarse grains be returned to the open market.

You will recall, Mr. Speaker, that in the debates we had in the House since 1971 over the abortive stabilization plan and on the feed grains issue and on rail line abandonment, the Member opposite vehemently denied any association with the Task Force Report. They said it was only a report, that they did not agree with most of it and that it was foolhardy for us to suggest that recommendations would ever be implemented.

December 6, 1974

As I re-read this Report recently, my blood suddenly ran cold, because, Mr. Speaker, almost all of the recommendations made in that Report are now slowly but surely taking place under the guidance of the so-called champion of the Wheat Board, and friend of the small farmer, Otto Lang.

When, Mr. Speaker, did God appoint Mr. Lang to be the saviour of western Canada? When was he given the divine right to decide for western farmers what kind of marketing system they would have, what kind of transportation system they should have, and what kind of grain assembly system was right for rural Saskatchewan? Time after time he has ignored the expressed wishes of the major farm organizations, he has bypassed alternatives proposed by western governments and completely ignored a plebiscite by western producers which voted almost unanimously to retain feed grains under the Wheat Board.

We now have a new feed grains policy imposed against the wishes of farmers and in spite of the warnings that it would have serious complications. We now have the open market operating side by side with the Canadian Wheat Board handling grain through the same agents and the same elevators. Somehow agents are supposed to keep separate accounts, bin grain for two accounts. It has added to increased staff and bookkeeping, both at the local level, also at head office levels.

Under the new policy, the Canadian Wheat Board is required to give preference to non-board grains and yet has been made responsible for overall movement with quota restrictions on board grains and no quotas on non-board grains. A truly confusing and unfair demand.

Room is left under this policy for speculation, manipulation of markets by grain buyers and speculators on the commodity exchange. We have seen feed grain being purchased on non-board accounts at prices significantly below competitive corn prices in eastern Canada. Again we see eastern and western farmers being played off against each other with western farmers the losers.

We have seen this fall a deliberate ploy by the Minister, to assure that the open market for feed grains would be given advantage in securing a share of the market.

We have seen the entry of a foreign multinational grain company, Continental Grain, appear on the scene. They are chasing open market grain and having it delivered by truck to the government terminal at Moose Jaw. The terms under which grain is handled by this government terminal also leads one question whether another rip-off is not taking place; with the profits going not to western producers, but to private traders not even resident in this country. It would appear that this foreign-owned grain giant is using publicly owned facilities with no capital investment at a tariff of about one-half charged by most companies.

The question arises, Mr. Speaker, who needs these multinational companies in Saskatchewan? Whom are they here to serve? Who stands to profit from their transactions? The answer is very plain. They serve their masters, the international traders. Any benefit to local farmers is incidental.

Mr. Speaker, in view of the apparent concessions and inequitable benefits being granted to Continental Grain Company, I call on the Federal Government to make a full public disclosure of their dealings with this company, particularly as it relates to the use of government inland terminals. It is intolerable to think that they should have concessions which would provide them with a competitive advantage in feed grain marketing over our local co-operative companies.

Mr. Speaker, there are many more things I should like to have said in this debate. I should like to have talked about the Community College Program and its value to the rural community. I should have liked to point out the tremendous increases in grants to our urban municipalities and our school units and I should have liked to have an opportunity to discuss resource development, particularly as it applies to the potash industry which has been so vital a factor in our communities. However, time will not permit me to do so, but many of these issues will be covered by my colleagues in this debate.

It is evident, therefore, that I will be supporting the Motion and opposing the amendment.

**SOME HON. MEMBERS** — Hear, hear!

**MR. D.L. FARIS** (Arm River): — Mr. Speaker, I have enjoyed listening to this Throne Speech Debate. I particularly took note of what the Liberals had done in Ethiopia. I want to remind the Member for Turtleford that this is nothing compared to what the Liberals did in Saskatchewan. The people of Saskatchewan will recall that in the difficult years of 1968, 1969 and 1970 a Liberal Government sat in Regina and did nothing. They did nothing for farmers, nothing for teachers, nothing for pensioners, nothing for sick people, nothing, that is, except add tax upon tax on the back of a province that was broke financially and almost broken in its spirit.

But people are tough in Saskatchewan, they have to put up with drought, floods, grasshoppers and if they had to put up with a Liberal Government they could do that too. But in 1971 they got rid of that government, they got rid of the deterrent fees, got rid of the taxes on farm fuel, got rid of treating teachers like serfs, got rid of the neglect of pensioners.

The last three years have meant good government for Saskatchewan and it has meant a good deal for Arm River. For example this past year has meant continued highway construction on Highways Nos. 15, 2 and 11. Natural gas was extended to Broderick on No. 15 and to Stalwart, Liberty, Penzance and Holdfast on No. 2. One of the most exciting events was the arrival of bus service to the towns along No. 2 Highway. I have worked three years on that project and I want to thank particularly the senior groups and especially Mr. Code and Mrs. Stratton for their efforts. Last time there was bus service to these towns was a few weeks before the election in 1967. It stopped a few days after that election.

Another important development in the Arm River constituency is the taking over of major grid roads leading into the Diefenbaker Lake area; 60 miles of grid from Saskatoon to Cutbank and 30 miles of grid from Davidson to Loreburn will become part of the highway system and be hard surfaced. These connector

highways will mean increased tourist and recreation development in this area. The towns in this Diefenbaker Lake area still require natural gas and bus service. I should like to see an early start on the rebuilding of that Highway No. 19. I will continue to request these from the Government and I shall continue to do so until they are delivered. It is a reasonable request for an increasingly important part of the province.

There are a good many things that affect the Arm River constituency. I know of many cases where a family income plan has been of great help. I think we should be really proud of a plan like this which is a first that means that families with a low income and a large number of children can be guaranteed more money by working than by being on welfare.

**SOME HON. MEMBERS** — Hear, hear!

**MR. FARIS** — Last year we got the Regional Library system to cover Arm River, now we have the community college this year. We have dental care for children, we have over 100 FarmStart loans in the area. We have over 200 senior citizen home repair grants; we have approval pending on 10 units of senior citizen housing at Craik. Construction has already begun on 25 units of senior citizens' low rental housing in Outlook.

Mr. Speaker, I noted that the Throne Speech spoke of more money for alcohol education programs. I will deal with some of my views of the failings of the present programs. But I first want to correct an erroneous impression left by the Minister of Health (Mr. Smishek) in announcing the program. He declared that money now spent in alcoholism represented eight per cent of liquor profits whereas the Committee had recommended an optimum objective of ten per cent. The Committee, in fact, had suggested a minimum of ten per cent. Hopefully in the coming budget we will exceed that minimal figure as we are presently approximate five years behind Alberta in our alcoholism program.

At our recent NDP Convention a delegate from Wilkie came to me and asked, "Don, have you had much to do with the AWARE program?" I replied, "No, nothing." The delegate said, "Good, because people in our area who are involved with alcoholism think that most of these ads are written by the liquor industry." I had to agree that I had great concern about the majority of the ads, because in fact this is not far from the truth. The Premier said in the Budget Debate last March 14th:

We will involve key groups and individuals in Saskatchewan in planning and executing the program including the beverage industry itself.

In fact, the AWARE program is based on similar programs in the United States which have as their theme the responsible use of alcohol. These programs originate in the American Government's National Institute on Alcohol Abuse and Alcoholism, which works very closely with the American liquor industry. Indeed here Canada the House of Seagrams, the great friend of federal Liberal Cabinet Ministers distributes in Canada free of charge the NIAAA pamphlet, "Alcohol and Alcoholism Problems, Programs and Progress." That pamphlet denies any connection whatsoever between legal controls, volume of consumption and rates of alcoholism. It really argues that increased liberalization will socially integrate drinking customs and thereby reduce alcohol problems. The

educational concomitant to this theory is the responsible use of alcohol approach which teaches people “how to drink”.

The first point to be made is that the theoretical basis of this educational approach is wrong. There is no evidence that increased liberalization of attitudes towards drinking decreases alcohol problems any more than there is evidence that increased liberalization of liquor control laws has resulted in decreased alcohol problems. In fact, the evidence points the other way. Right here in Saskatchewan increased liberalization of both laws and attitudes has clearly resulted in increased alcohol problems. In the last 20 years alcohol consumption in Saskatchewan has increased by 100 per cent. Alcohol problems have more than doubled.

In the same period alcohol consumption increased in Holland by 111 per cent, in Austria by 127 per cent and in West Germany by 196 per cent. Their problems grew apace. It seems the whole western world is anxious to liberalize and achieve the sophisticated drinking habits of France. What price does France pay for this sophistication? Only an alcoholism rate of some 20 per cent of the population, 42 per cent of their health bill spent on alcohol-related disease, 50 per cent of hospital beds taken up with such patients. Is that where we want to go? That is where the integration, “responsible drinking” theory will lead. That’s where further liberalization of laws and attitudes will lead.

Now turning more particularly to the AWARE program. It has three weaknesses — 1. The content tends in most cases to liberalizing attitudes. 2. It fails to give people the facts about the social health costs of alcohol use. 3. It does not accompany or lead to governmental action to reduce alcohol consumption and alcohol problems.

The clearest example of liberalizing attitudes is in regard to the very large proportion of the program which is dedicated to drinking and driving. For 20 years the safety councils of North America said, “If You Drink Don’t Drive.” Now the AWARE program tells people that it is all right to drink and drive, only wait an hour for every drink you have had. For example, an ad clearly aimed at teenagers says, “Wait an hour for every drink you’ve had before you drive.” This advice is expanded upon in another ad under the sub-heading, “Allow an hour per drink.” It explains an hour is how long it takes for the average size drink to leave your bloodstream. So, if you’ve had three beers, three ryes, or three glasses of wine, wait at least three hours before you hit the road. Now that is great advice! Three drinks, three hours. Four drinks, wait four hours. Six drinks wait six hours. There is only one problem. Common sense tells you that when people drink they forget such things as how long they have been drinking and how many drinks they have had. How many people you know who will wait three or six hours or whatever it is a party without drinking just one more for the road. It is bad advice, it is foolish advice. Once more both of these ads fail to tell people that different sized drinks have different effects or that for instance body size counts. For example, a 125-pound girl would be over .10 with three drinks. But how about the multiplier effect of alcohol with other drugs, even antihistamines?

Another example of liberalizing attitudes is in the ad “Introducing Alcohol; The Drug Habit Almost Everyone Supports.” There it gives approval to having a drink or two, “if you’ve had

a rough day at the office, this could help you relax and agree that life's not all that bad." What this ad is doing is approving drinking to remove anxiety. It is really suggesting a form of self medication. It acknowledges alcohol as a drug and doesn't go on to try to reduce its use. I consider this a very dangerous piece of advice.

This same ad in the weeklies read, "Alcohol lets you forget what's happening around you. Which is good if you're out with friends to enjoy yourself." This says it is good that alcohol lets you forget what's happening around you when you are out with friends. I really can't believe that the Department of Health would suggest that it is better to injure or kill a friend in a traffic accident than a stranger, better to beat up a friend than a stranger, as long as you enjoy yourself. It just seems to me to be silly and bad advice.

What good is it to make people aware that alcohol is a drug? This is one of the good points of the program. It does this, but then it doesn't have the courage to follow this up by discouraging its use. We half-heartedly discourage smoking, with very little success in our society. We discourage marijuana and other illicit drugs. How can we declare alcohol a drug and then not have the courage to follow through to tell people that it is a hard drug? It is one that has tremendous social costs and personal costs to it and that its use should be discouraged. This should be our stated public position to discourage the use of all drugs, alcohol, tobacco or the illicit drugs. I cannot believe that you can talk honestly to any teenager in our society and hope to make any impact with him at all unless our society has the courage to take this overall consistent approach.

This leads to the second weakness of the AWARE program. The Minister of Health in announcing the program alleged that it was a follow-up on the recommendation of the liquor committee which I chaired. This program does not in fact, follow the recommendation. It does not present a social-health approach. For example, it does not give people the simple facts about alcohol involvement in traffic crashes and death, disabling diseases like liver cirrhosis or brain damage, divorce and family troubles, crimes of violence or losses to industry. Why, are the public not informed for example, of LeDain's findings which follows American findings that alcoholics and problem drinkers were involved in 33 per cent of murders, 38 per cent of attempted murders, 54 per cent of manslaughters, 39 per cent of rapes, 42 per cent of sexual offences and 61 per cent assaults? I don't think the public really realizes this connection and they should know it. Politicians of all stripes like to pretend that it is marijuana hopheads or heroin freaks who are beating up, killing, raping and otherwise assaulting people. It is not! It is your friendly man next door with a belly full of booze.

The AWARE program failed to follow the social-health approach in clearly stating an aim to reduce alcohol consumption. Indeed the social-health educational program was named after the social-health pricing policy designed to reduce consumption. The Minister of Health made it clear two years ago that he was opposed to such a policy and more recently the Minister of Industry and Commerce who is responsible for the Liquor Board opposed it. Well, who supports the social-health pricing policy besides this Legislature's Special Committee? It is, of course strongly recommended by the Ontario Addiction Research Foundation which is probably the best basic research agency in the world.



It is endorsed by the governments and researchers of Finland and Norway. The recent Lord Errol Committee on Liquor regulations in Britain supported it. This year the Expert Committee on Drug Dependence of the World Health Organization endorsed it. I have spoken to many groups around the province and I can't say that I have met with any cross section of citizens of the province who discussed this idea and then failed to endorse it. I am very pleased to know that the Provincial Conference of the United Churches of Saskatchewan endorsed the pricing policy by a vote of approximately 500 to 2. A body as mixed as the Biggar Health Unit after spending a day discussing these problems endorsed this policy.

Its major opponents are the liquor industry and the American Government Agency which works with them. It is very sad that the AWARE program reflects these sources in its approach to the problem.

Because of its lack of proper understanding of the alcohol problem the program is an isolated attempt to do with words what must be done by action. It is not good enough to bemoan increasing teenage drinking unless you are willing to re-examine the lowering of the drinking age. It is no good to bewail increasing alcohol consumption unless you are willing to tackle it with pricing policies which have been demonstrated mainly in the countries of Scandinavia. It is not good to feign concern about traffic accidents when we know that .08 legislation has worked only in countries where enforcement is stricter than it is in Saskatchewan.

What is needed is government action and the mass media program should pave the way for this action. I personally do not expect much action until the alcohol manufacturers power is broken in our society. The Arm River Constituency passed the following resolution:

Resolved that the Government of Saskatchewan take into public ownership all alcohol manufacturers in Saskatchewan by expropriation with fair compensation.

This resolution was passed overwhelmingly by the panel at our recent NDP Convention. It in fact, follows the pattern of Scandinavia where significant portions of the alcohol industry are publicly owned and explains their dramatically low alcoholism rate. For instance, if I were to point to a model for the program on alcoholism I would suggest Norway. Norway has an alcoholism rate of around two per cent. Compare that with Canada's nine per cent or France's 20 per cent. Mr. Speaker, the answer lies in their courage to have a full-blown public policy to attack problem.

I am convinced that although the problem is difficult, a courageous and consistent public policy will be successful. I frankly don't believe that a Liberal Government would have the courage to undertake such a program. I will continue to urge within this Government that such programs be undertaken because I am convinced that they are in the NDP's tradition of putting people before profits.

I have criticized the Liberal position as being even worse. I say that, because I have heard speaker after speaker from the benches opposite plead the case for commercial liquor advertising, Apparently that is the position of that party, if you are

December 6, 1974

to look at the votes at their last annual convention. Indeed at their annual convention last year, by a vote of over two-thirds they voted for the sale of beer and wine in grocery stores.

Mr. Speaker, I would estimate that if these two actions were to be taken in Saskatchewan they would increase alcohol consumption in this province by at least 30 per cent in one year. I am particularly concerned that both of these measures would particularly worsen the already bad situation in regard to teenage alcohol abuse.

Mr. Speaker, I couldn't conclude without expressing on behalf of the farmers in my area a very great concern about federal agriculture policy and, in particular, the Minister in charge of the Wheat Board, Otto Lang. They have had Otto's Lift program, Otto's gross receipts stabilization plan, Otto's rape seed poll, Otto's feed grains policy, Otto's interference in west coast bargaining, Otto's Crow's Nest rates removal. Mr. Speaker, surely after six strikes he's out. It's time we Otto Lift Lang, Otto Lang should be removed as Minister in charge of the Wheat Board as has been suggested in other places.

**SOME HON. MEMBERS** — Hear, hear!

**MR. FARIS** — But I don't like to criticize without having an alternative suggestion. I would really suggest that the farmers in my area would much prefer Eugene Whelan to be Minister in charge. If we are going to have a Liberal Government in Ottawa let's, at least, have Eugene Whelan there who has shown that he has some concern about orderly marketing. We realize that we cannot remove Otto Lang in the next provincial election. But we can certainly remove every Liberal Member in rural Saskatchewan and chances are we will.

**SOME HON. MEMBERS** — Hear, hear!

**MR. FARIS** — Before I conclude, however, Mr. Speaker, I want to commend this Government for its action on last year's World Development Resolution. I was extremely pleased to be able to move that resolution and even more pleased that the Government acted on it over this summer. Now every dollar donated by the people of Saskatchewan for world development purposes to nongovernmental organizations is matched by the Province of Saskatchewan with another dollar and each of those dollars is matched by the Federal Government. Members and the public in general may be interested to know what organizations are co-operating in this kind of program so that they can direct their world development dollars so that they will be matched in this manner.

At present the organizations are the Anglican Church, the Catholic Church, Cross Roads International, Canadian Hunger Foundation, Lutheran World Relief, Save the Children Fund, UNICEF, CUSO, Foster Parents Plan, Mennonite Central Committee, Oxfam, Presbyterian Church, Unitarian Service Committee, United Church, YMCA, YWCA, and new groups are joining.

Mr. Speaker, it is this kind of action, to feed the hungry to aid the sick, to help the weak, the party of Woodsworth Douglas and Coldwell is all about. An American poet said it well:

I am unjust, but I can strive for justice  
My life's unkind, but I can vote for kindness  
I, the unloving, say life should be lovely  
I, that am blind, cry out against my blindness.

Mr. Speaker, I will be supporting the Speech from the Throne.

**SOME HON. MEMBERS** — Hear, hear!

**MR. G.B. GRANT** (Regina Whitmore Park): — Mr. Speaker, I think the Hon. Member for Arm River (Mr. Faris) would have been better off to have repeated his 1973 speech, because most of us in the House could have agreed with many of the things he said last year. But when he starts prophesying on the outcome of the next election indicating the NDP would win he is sadly lacking in foresight and I am very, very disappointed.

Mr. Speaker, I should like to be able to congratulate the mover and seconder of the Throne Speech but unfortunately I can't because the poor chaps were just not given enough to work with. They did a reasonably good job in reading their speeches. But when you consider how little they had to base their speeches on, it is surprising they did as well as they did.

I am sure that most Members of the House must have reached the same conclusion as my guest did on the opening day of this Legislature. He said he hadn't anticipated a Hell fire and brimstone speech, but at the same time he hadn't expected such a lack-lustre, dull, unexciting document.

This is doubly sad, because this particular individual is a recent arrival in Saskatchewan only having come here 15 or 18 months ago. He is one of the few newcomers to Saskatchewan and it was the first Throne Speech he had heard. He went away disappointed.

Mr. Speaker, I think this chap's remarks sums up the tone of the 1974 Throne Speech - dull, unexciting, repetitious. They have removed those deterrent fees so many times that surely to goodness they can find something else to brag about because I think the general public have accepted that the deterrent fees have been removed. The Speech was an outline of so-called accomplishments and good, bad and indifferent promises kept. I expect we'll see the Throne Speech enshrined as an NDP campaign handout come the next election.

Mr. Speaker, it is quite evident that the Premier plans on fighting the next election on the issue of federal-provincial rights to natural resources taxation. His one concern is that these idiotic differences might be settled before the writs are issued and would pull the rug right out from under him and he wouldn't be able to use it as an issue.

I used the word "idiotic" in referring to the conflict which has developed between Ottawa and Regina. It is almost like a jurisdictional fight between two unions. Personal relations are taxed to the near breaking point and the workers and the businesses suffer the agonies of the conflict.

I am reminded of children who often fight over some article or toy and the first thing you know the argument has been settled

December 6, 1974

but the toy has been damaged beyond repair.

Surely in this enlightened age, it is not necessary for our senior governments to get into such a harangue where, in this case, it is the oil industry that is going to be considerably damaged as a result of these shortsighted policies that seem to have locked each government into their present positions.

They have pushed the oil industry - one of our major industries in Canada - almost to the wall to where there is little or no activity and nothing but a fog-bound future.

I wouldn't want to try to predict which one is right, which one is wrong or which one is going to back down or which one should back down. I think they are both wrong. I don't know whether they are equally wrong. I don't think so, I think the provincial governments are heading in the wrong direction.

Oil exploration here in Saskatchewan has virtually ground to a stop due to this bullheadedness and greed on the part of governments. It used to be so that they would tax for their needs - it has now reached the point where they want to tax business to the breaking point where the business cannot make any return.

It is not restricted to Saskatchewan. I have before me a November issue of the Vancouver Province, and it is dealing with the pulp industry out there. It is addressed to Mr. Williams, the Minister of Forestry Products. It is related to the stumpage rates. It points out that as a result of government interference out there and the setting up of a marketing board where they set the prices for the chips, that a log boom that was sold recently, and as a result of the prices imposed by the Government, the boom was sold for \$191 per thousand less than the actual cost. An article out of the Financial Post a week later indicates that the province has backed down, but they only have done it after it has brought the industry to a standstill in terms of pulp expansion in the province. The industry investment analysts in British Columbia are pointing out the sad situation when a government does this. This is exactly what has happened in Saskatchewan. We are doing it with the potash industry.

I think it is a sad situation too, when an industry such as the potash industry, and particularly the International Minerals, is publishing an article telling how wonderful it is to be in Saskatchewan, you can make a go of it here in Saskatchewan. But what they don't tell is that the record which they are imploring people to get, was made in eastern Canada, it wasn't made in Saskatchewan. They mention a girl's name who takes part in this recording. She is not a resident of Saskatchewan, she is a resident of Manitoba. I think once again we have an irresponsible act by a business.

We have often heard this accusation made against business, if they act irresponsibly. But it seems to me that government of senior levels are becoming more and more irresponsible in their attitude to business.

How can any government rationalize severely damaging an individual's opportunity to fend for himself and substitute government subsidy for that damaged opportunity?

This dampening of private initiative and the substitution

of so-called government action in the interests of the people is beyond my comprehension.

Our Saskatchewan Government through royalties control, can develop and conserve our mineral resources in the best interests of the people of Saskatchewan. But I don't think that anyone will ever convince me that SaskOil and the Saskatchewan Mining and Development Corporation can ever replace the initiative and expertise of private industry.

In the field of smaller, more local type business, I feel that they have, and are, doing well in spite of the Provincial Government. New programs and services initiated since 1971 have not been that earth shaking, and their effect has been minimal in the overall economy.

The greatest single factor sparking business, has been money in the farmers' hands. This has come about largely through world and federal situations and actions, rather than worthwhile moves by our Provincial Government. I'm not saying that the Department of Industry and Commerce through regional business representatives, research and increased loans have done any harm, they certainly haven't. Their beneficial overall effect might be compared to a spit in the ocean. Actions by other arms or tentacles of our Government have more than offset the benefits emanating from the Department of Industry and Commerce.

I am sorry the Attorney General is not in the House and I am sorry that the Minister of Co-ops is not in the House. I wouldn't mention this except that he, I think, played dirty pool yesterday by making reference to it, the number of people in the House. I was hoping the Attorney General would be here because I want to speak for a minute on justice.

Eleven printed lines out of 291 in the Throne Speech devoted to justice, which I feel rates up with inflation as one of our major problems. Those eleven lines refer to only one aspect, albeit an important one, namely, native people, native policemen, native court workers and court sittings on Indian reserves. These moves are long overdue and I sincerely trust that each will prove helpful.

I feel the Attorney General should have demanded more lineage and told the people of this province and the residents of our two major cities particularly what his Government proposes to do to protect the innocent and punish the guilty.

I realize that criminal legislation rests in the hands of Ottawa, but its implementation is a provincial responsibility. It is the Attorney General's job to initiate changes and press Ottawa for action. I hope he tells us what he has done in this regard since June, 1971.

How can we as legislators justify being silent when in our own Capital City people fear to be on our streets after dark? One of your own Ministers over there has expressed this concern. Persons are walking our streets on bail while awaiting trial for violent deeds, including attempted murder and even murder; this may be a shock to you but there are people walking Regina streets on bail and it is suggested that they have committed murder.

It is a pretty sick society when we sit idly by and see a youthful taxi driver kidnapped, roughed up and his cab burned.

December 6, 1974

Last year, a similar case resulted in a cab operator being murdered. The penalty for the perpetrator of this terrible act was life imprisonment, which has been appealed. I dare say that the do-gooders in our society will see that he serves considerably less than the twenty years which is equivalent to life imprisonment.

Mr. Speaker, two years ago while speaking on this subject I said the good people are getting the short end of the deal, while the law-breaking element laugh up their gun barrels, and flick knives and walk free, while clamouring for their rights.

Possibly the lash should be re-introduced. This may be the only action that will deter these monsters who disregard the rights of you and me - our human right to walk our streets unmolested - our right to feel that our private property, homes and businesses and families are secure.

Two Regina citizens last week called me and said that their biggest fear is for their children and their wives. What a society we live in when a city of 150,000 is faced with this.

I need go no further in elaborating the problems - you all know them. We are equally affected - NDP or Liberal - there are no political lines.

What can be done? I feel that legislation should be tightened up and strengthened with more severe penalties. I am a firm believer that punishment is a good educator.

I feel that the bail legislation must be reviewed. We must give more strength and flexibility to the courts, prosecutors and the police. I am very pleased to learn that the City Police Force here in Regina will be increased by some 20 members in 1975 - it is long overdue.

I think there must be an awakening of responsible people to their role in running our society. Who is running the society? Well, I sometimes wonder. I think it is the lawless element that is running our society. We are living in too permissive a society.

As legislators we must do our part to strengthen our social structure and encourage those who are prepared to defend the human rights of the innocent.

I urge the Government opposite - don't delay - act now - we will support actions that will punish the guilty and protect the innocent.

One has real difficulty in discussing the Throne Speech because it says so little. A person must deal with what it doesn't say. And that is why I dealt on the subject that I did as far as justice is involved.

Mr. Speaker, the Government doesn't tell us how the NDP Government has filled every available office building in Regina with its expanded civil service. They have even found it necessary to put clerical staff from Public Health into the Plains Hospital. Government Services are the best customers of Regina rental agents.

No wonder there is high employment in Saskatchewan. The Government forces are such active recruiters of staff that no

one who wishes to work should be unemployed.

Who wouldn't want to work for the Government, look at the list of some of the civil servants, so-called employees of the Government in recent years. Mr. Jack Kinzel, the Executive Officer in the Premier's office at a salary of \$32,700. Was Boldstad, Cabinet Secretary - \$32,700. If you compare these gentlemen with the Deputy Ministers, there are 25 deputy and associate ministers, 19 of them are getting the same as these two persons or a bit less. It seems to me that this is unfair when you consider the dedication and effort expended by most of our deputy ministers.

There are others here I can name, Ralph Smith the Research Officer at \$12,000, there is John Burton - I almost missed him, John I think was fortunately defeated because he is now getting \$26,280 and I am sure doesn't work as hard as he did down in Ottawa.

Another thing the Government has not bothered to tell us about is work stoppages in 1974. The report, that is the Throne Speech, only listed a new August holiday, very welcome, but not earth shaking. Occupational health committees - old hack. A study of a universal sickness and injury plan, not that earth shaking, I don't think. There is no mention made of the ten week construction workers' strike last year. There is no mention of the Dominion Bridge strike which has been going on for some six or seven weeks. Or the threatened stoppage by teachers and believe it or not the Civil Service. As of yesterday a Commission of your own making, the Hog Marketing Commission is on strike. It is quite evident that many unionized workers in Saskatchewan have become disillusioned with this so-called workers' Government. I am sure the NDP have sensed the departure of the teachers from their ranks. We are pleased indeed to see them in fast-growing numbers among our Liberal workers.

Listening to a broadcast this afternoon, I found it a little shocking to learn that in 1972 in Canada we have 7.8 million man lost by unionized workers. Now there is 28.5 per cent of workers unionized, so 28.5 per cent of our workers were involved in 7.8 million man days. That was the worst record in the history of Canada. 1974 looks as if it's going to be a new record because up to September 30th that figure is 7.3 million man days. And it is anticipated that by the end of 1974 it will hit 10 million.

What has happened in Saskatchewan? We did have 17.1 per cent of the workers unionized in 1972, I haven't a more current figure. But in 1971 there were 1,924 man days lost; 1972, first year of NDP Government, 75,000 man days lost; 1973 it improved a bit, only 33,000. The estimated ball park figure for man days lost in 1974, and this is a real shocker, it is a good everybody is sitting down, in Saskatchewan is 300,000 man days lost as a result of strikes.

**AN HON. MEMBER** — Shame, shame.

**MR. GRANT** — I will say nothing further about that because I think it speaks for itself. I am firmly convinced that Mr. Snyder, the member for Moose Jaw is not interested in doing anything constructive to stop this. He is scared stiff of the union and is not prepared to raise a hand in protest against what is going on.

December 6, 1974

Mr. Speaker, every day in every way the Government shows its true colours.

The control and ownership of natural resources by the people is acceptable by most people in Saskatchewan. However, Saskatchewan taxpayers are not ready to accept the Government as the only developer of these resources. I am sure that Government Members realize that I heartily disagree with their philosophy that the Government must get into business and take over business. Government's role is to govern, to set the rules and then let the individual or business develop and grow.

**SOME HON. MEMBERS** — Hear, hear!

**MR. GRANT** — The voters of this province did not give the NDP a mandate to take over oil exploration, mining, farming, forestry, meat packing and potash.

Government Members will realize in 1975 they went too far, the people are fed up and contrary to what the Member for Arm River (Mr. Faris) says, the Liberals will form the next government, not the NDP.

**SOME HON. MEMBERS** — Hear, hear!

**MR. GRANT** — Twelve months ago I didn't foresee the resurgence of Liberalism to the degree we have witnessed of late months. We should have adjourned this House so that you could all be in attendance with the other 1,200 delegates attending the Liberal Convention.

**SOME HON. MEMBERS** — Hear, hear!

**MR. GRANT** — Teachers, potash miners, farmers and business men. Mr. Speaker, I think it is quite evident that I cannot support the Motion, but I will support the amendment.

**SOME HON. MEMBERS** — Hear, hear!

**HON. A. TAYLOR** (Kerrobert-Kindersley): — In taking part in this debate may I first of all congratulate the mover and the seconder of the Address-in-Reply. During the past few years the Members of Nipawin (Mr. Comer) and (Mr. Mostoway) have demonstrated their ability; their speeches in this debate are merely a further indication of how ably represent their constituents.

Mr. Speaker, the Speech from the Throne indicates activities of this Government up to the present time, and some thrust being developed for the future.

The new emphasis in the Department of Industry and Commerce and through SEDCO, towards assisting the small businessman has indicated to them our concern over their well-being and needs. In the past the small independent businessman has in many ways been the neglected member of the business community. The establishment of business reps serving functions similar to the Ag reps, and the extension of SEDCO loans to small business has overcome much of this discrepancy.



The Saskatchewan Economic Development Corporation will, of course, continue to be interested in large undertakings, but it now shows a new interest in the operation of small business. Surely, this is as it ought to be. The large corporation has the expertise it needs within its own organization. The small independent merchant is the one who has the greatest need of government assistance.

I'm sure that all Members were also happy to note that the average age of those receiving FarmStart loans was 27. An indication that here is indeed a program assisting young men and women in their farming operations.

**SOME HON. MEMBERS** — Hear, hear!

**MR. TAYLOR** — The Family Income Plan which was introduced by our Government at the last session, and which started paying benefits in October of this year, has been of substantial assistance to many working people in this province. Now this program has not defeated inflation, but it is assisting many working people to meet the demands of inflation. It should be noted that we are the first Government in Canada to provide a program to supplement the wages of those who are working. In this way we are the first government to guarantee that those who work are better off than they would be on public assistance.

**SOME HON. MEMBERS** — Hear, hear!

**MR. TAYLOR** — The work incentive aspects of this program are of extreme importance to the people of Saskatchewan.

Now one of the new thrusts., Mr. Speaker, indicated in the Speech from the Throne, will be of particular benefit and is programmed for senior citizens.

Some comments have been made, Mr. Speaker, by Members opposite about financial assistance for senior citizens, by those on the Liberal benches who would have us forget their record and speak only about today. But we're not going to forget their record, Mr. Speaker. Let me give you some examples. In 1971, in an election year when they were designing a budget that would be attractive for votes, they put aside \$4 million under the Saskatchewan Assistance Plan for senior citizens. Our Government has provided this year \$7.6 million. In that same 1971 budget they fled \$56,000 as subsidy grants to special-care or nursing homes, \$56,000. This year we will provide \$5.4 million. In construction grants for these same homes the Liberals provided \$525,000 and this year we shall be providing \$996,000. For community services for the aged, to provide meals-on-wheels and homemakers, the Liberals provided \$60,000 in 1971, this year we providing \$850,000 for the same program.

**SOME HON. MEMBERS** — Hear, hear!

**MR. TAYLOR** — Our Government introduced a Senior Citizens' Home Repair program that will provide \$3 million in benefits, and low rental for senior citizens which will provide \$605,000. The Liberals also were collecting from senior citizens approximately \$2 million in deterrent fees and \$3 million in medical care premiums. This meant, Mr. Speaker, that they collected from

December 6, 1974

senior citizens half a million dollars more than they gave to these same senior citizens. This is their record. In comparison with this, Mr. Speaker, our Government this year will be providing more than \$23 million in benefits to the senior citizens of this province.

We have also, Mr. Speaker, carefully reviewed the recommendations in the Senior Citizens' Commission Report. We have already acted in those areas where immediate action was possible. There has already, for example, been a substantial increase in the community service grants available for senior citizens. We are conducting unannounced inspections and evaluations of nursing homes. We are recommending to those constructing nursing homes that there should be a minimum number of double rooms. Unfortunately I cannot report any action from the Federal Government on those recommendations directed towards it.

The Senior Citizens' Commission urged the province to continue its efforts federally towards the establishment of a guaranteed annual income for all people. In referring to the Federal Government's Old Age Security and Guaranteed Supplement Program, the Commission recommended a guaranteed income of \$350 for individuals and \$500 for couples. They further recommended that pensions be available at age 60 and that the spouse remaining at home be able to participate in the Canada Pension Plan. Mr. Speaker, there has been little or no action in any of the fields.

At the present time the Federal Government has established a study on the question of the spouse receiving coverage under the Canada Pension Plan, and we will be happy to discuss this with the federal authorities and attempt to find a solution for this problem.

You will remember, Mr. Speaker, that the major recommendation, in fact some say, the only recommendation of the Senior Citizens' Commission, was for the establishment of a Senior Citizens' Agency. We have given very serious consideration to this proposal and to its implications. The total agency concept confronts with some very serious concerns. I should remind you that the concept was to have an agency which would also deliver services to senior citizens. That is to say it would have its own staff, would hire its own home care nurses, homemakers and so on. The agency would become responsible for the medical and social need of senior citizens. After careful consideration, it is our belief that this would not meet the real needs and requirements of the senior citizens of Saskatchewan. It would badly fragment the delivery system and the delivery of these services throughout the province, and lead in some areas to the unnecessary duplication of Services. It would also have the unfortunate result of segregating senior citizens from the main stream of society. To accept the agency concept in total would mean saying to people that up until a magic age, for example age 65, if you have a health problem or a social problem, you receive services from the Department of Health or Social Services, but after the magic age you must go to this new agency for your services. This we believe not only to be unnecessary but undesirable. Or what about the couple where one member is over 65 and the other under, where do they go for their service?

There are also rehabilitative services provided through the Department of Health for those with a particular physical disability, regardless of age. It would seem unwise for us to

fragment this service so that the Department of Health provided it only to those under a particular age. Let me say here, Mr. Speaker, I'm not being at all critical of the work done by members of the Commission. They spent many long days and months preparing and working on their report, and they have identified clearly three major problems facing senior citizens throughout the province. First, the availability of information regarding programs which are already in place. Second, the need for far greater co-ordination between the Departments of Health and Social Services in meeting the requirements of this very special group of people. Third, the need to expand the delivery of services to our senior citizens.

The Commission pointed out that senior citizens frequently experience a feeling of alienation from society, and of loneliness and frustration; frustration because they don't know where to turn for assistance that might be there waiting for them; frustration because no one seems to speak on their behalf. Segregation of services would not, I believe, overcome this feeling of alienation.

As a result of the Senior Citizens' Report, our Government intends to introduce a program which we believe will meet these needs without creating fragmentation and segregation. We intend to establish within the next few months a provincial senior citizens council which will include a full-time chairman and part-time members. The council will also be provided with staff for its work. The council will represent the views of the elderly, and keep these views before the Government and its departments. It will also provide a central information service for the senior citizens of the province, providing information about the various programs available, we hope both federally and provincially. It will be asked to assist in the development and support of local senior citizens councils and other organizations meeting the needs of the elderly in our province. The provincial council will also serve as an advisor to government in the development of new programs, both by initiating such discussions with the various departments and also by serving as consultants to the departments. At the same time this council will work to ensure the co-ordination of the various departments providing programs and services for senior citizens.

It is also at this time our intention to encourage the development of local senior citizens councils throughout the province. As some of the Members will remember, the Commission Report called for regional councils, and we do not oppose this concept. We feel we must start with a local base before moving to a regional council. The local councils will represent the views of the elderly at the local level. They will develop guidelines and recommendations for the development of community programs for the aged. They will assist in the co-ordination of existing services to the aged in their communities. They should serve as vehicles for senior citizens to express their needs for community services and see solutions to their problems. They should also prompt community action in meeting the needs of the elderly. These groups will also be encouraged to provide information, co-ordination and referral services in their local areas. In this regard, Mr. Speaker, the Provincial Government will provide financial assistance.

At the same time, Mr. Speaker, we will establish a Senior Citizens' Branch within the Department of Social Services. This branch will provide the technical, financial and administrative

December 6, 1974

support necessary for the development of programs for senior citizens. It will have the responsibility for the licensing of special-care facilities and, in consultation with the provincial council, will encourage senior citizen participation in the development and support of local councils. This Branch will have the responsibility for assisting in the promotion and organization of community-based activities and services for the elderly. In consultation with the provincial senior citizens council the Branch will conduct a public information program.

You will see from this, Mr. Speaker, that our Government has reacted in a serious and responsible manner to the report of the Senior Citizens' Commission.

**SOME HON. MEMBERS** — Hear, hear!

**MR. TAYLOR** — Our proposal will make it easier for senior citizens to play a more meaningful role in the development of programs which will be of direct benefit to them. It will ensure that these citizens are aware of the present programs which are available; and it should lead to the expansion, not only of the kind of programs available, but of the number of locations in which they can be found. This proposal is a further indication of our Government's deep concern and respect for the pioneers and senior citizens of this province.

Mr. Speaker, I should like to say a few words now about Core Services Administration. I have, with some interest in recent months, read and listened to some of the comments by Members of the Opposition regarding this agency. I've heard the Member for Moose Jaw North (Mr. D. F. MacDonald) speaking in a way which could only be taken as an attempt to incite the withdrawal of services of the employees at Valley View Centre. I've been astonished at the political games that these Members would play with a program whose whole emphasis is to bring the handicapped more into the main stream of society. They have complained of such things as overcrowding and understaffing. Mr. Speaker when I hear Members opposite criticize the retardation program in this province, there is a verse of scripture that comes quickly to mind.

Why do you see the speck that is in your brother's eye, but not notice the log that is in your own eye?

**SOME HON. MEMBERS** — Hear, hear!

**MR. TAYLOR** — Particularly when the Opposition tries to make something of overcrowding and understaffing. Mr. Speaker, their voices have a hollow ring and there is more than a log in both eyes.

I'd like to point out to you some of the facts. At Valley View Centre in 1970 under the Liberals there were 1,169 patients. At the same time there were 561 staff persons. Compare this with September of this year when the number of patients at Valley View had dropped to 891 and the staff had increased to 704, This was 278 patients less than in 1970 and 141 additional staff members

**SOME HON. MEMBERS** — Hear, hear!

**MR. TAYLOR** — One could also note that in 1970 there were 335 people on direct care staff while today there are 410. But the most important aspect of our work with the retarded is not in the increased number of staff, important as this may be, but in the changing emphasis on the program. The increasing emphasis has been to equip the handicapped to live as normal a life as possible within the community. Now there are those who think we have not moved quickly enough in this direction. However, great strides have been taken and they've been made in co-operation with the public, and not by imposing our will on the communities involved.

Let me again give you some examples. 1970 there were 35 spaces in developmental centres for the mentally retarded, this year there will be 129. In 1970 there were no spaces in group homes, this month 182. In 1970, 219 clients in approved homes, this month 339. In sheltered workshops in 1970 there were 421, this month 562. In 1970 there were six spaces available in activity centres, we will have approved 335 this month. There were no work stations for the retarded in 1970, we have approved 70 work stations. In 1970, 269 of our clients were enrolled into vocational training under the Vocational Rehabilitation of Disabled Persons Act. We will have approved this for 800 clients.

Mr. Speaker, the real effectiveness of this program is best demonstrated by looking at the waiting list at Valley View Centre. This is a list of those who have applied for admission and whom we have not been able to accommodate. In 1970, in spite of the fact that they had over 200 more in the institution than we have today, they had a waiting list of 600. Today the waiting list stands at 12.

A special pilot project for children has also recently been established at Valley View Centre designed for retarded children up to 16 years of age, to prepare them for eventual normalized living in the community. Along with this an in-service training program for staff has been developed. We are in the process of developing two resource homes, one in Saskatoon and one in Regina. These homes will provide short-term accommodation for handicapped people. We've also provided a grant to the Saskatchewan Association for the Mentally Retarded to operate a demonstration project in preventive and protective services. This is intended to provide volunteers with an opportunity of representing the interest of handicapped people. Additional grants will be available to day care centres who assign some of their spaces for handicapped persons. Two institutions, Valley View and North Park Centres are now in the process of becoming more specialized. In October and early November of this year 136 residents of North Park were transferred to Valley View and 74 residents from Valley were transferred to North Park. Those transferred to Valley range in age from 25 to 45. They have been transferred so that they may receive the intensive training necessary for eventual discharge into the community.

Residents transferred to North Park are older residents, and require the long-term care North Park can provide. I might say, Mr. Speaker, that prior to the move the residents and the of kin were all asked for and all gave their approval for these moves. Valley View, in this way, is becoming the centre which will prepare the residents for participation in community programming.

December 6, 1974

I do not believe that any other part of Canada, on a per capita basis, provides the services and facilities for the mentally retarded that is now provided in Saskatchewan. This is not to suggest that we should be satisfied with our progress, There is still much to be done, but we are convinced that we are started on the right road, and will continue to make improvements as experience dictates. I am willing at any time to compare our record in this field with that of the Liberal Government for seven years,

**SOME HON. MEMBERS** — Hear, hear!

**MR. TAYLOR** — On the same lines, Mr. Speaker, may I say how much I welcome the reference in the Speech from the Throne to legislation which will allow handicapped people an equal opportunity to exercise their rights in choosing their elected representatives. Too often our handicapped citizens have been the forgotten group in society. In elections it is extremely difficult for many of them to cast their ballot. I, for one, will support any move which removes some of this discrimination.

In the same vein, I commend the Minister of Government Services, for his policy whereby all provincial office buildings will be built to such standards as to accommodate handicapped citizens in wheelchairs. This is an important move in our province, not just for the provincial buildings, but in the hopes that it will also serve as an example to municipalities and for other public buildings.

Mr. Speaker, I should like to turn to another program introduced by our Government in the last few months, in fact still in the early stages of development. For too long now we have followed the medieval practice of sending people to jail for the offence of poverty. I am speaking, of course, of the people who are incarcerated because they are unable to pay the assessed fine. This strikes me as a holdover from the old concept of the debtors' prison. This method of handling offenders provides no benefits, either to the individual or to society. In effect, it says that the wealthy, or at least those with sufficient funds may avoid prison by paying a fine, but the poor will go to jail.

The fine option program will, for the first time, provide such people with an alternative. It will enable individuals to perform some type of community service as an alternative to incarceration for non-payment of fines. The program will go a long way towards providing equal justice, regardless of one's income level.

I hope, Mr. Speaker, that no one is under the delusion that this is merely a minor problem. During the past year approximately one out of every two persons admitted to a correctional centre in Saskatchewan were admitted because they were unable pay the fine. Because they serve relatively short sentences this means that such people account for approximately 10 to 15 per cent of the actual persons incarcerated on any given day.

Now the person jailed in this manner quickly comes to believe that there is no justice in society when he sees someone else up for the some offence, capable of paying the fine, and therefore walking the streets. If he was a low-income wage earner it is quite possible his job may not be waiting for him at the end of his period of incarceration, and that the only

option at that point might well be total public assistance.

I might say, Mr. Speaker, it is also a costly process for the taxpayer. In some instances it is necessary to provide assistance for the spouse and family who remain at home. But even if this is not the case it costs approximately \$20 per day to keep an individual in a correctional centre. When we project these costs over the average 30 days in default spent in custody, the average \$100 fine has suddenly cost the taxpayers of the province \$600. In addition to the costs of incarceration there are substantial costs involved in obtaining a warrant of arrest from a judge, of arresting an individual, holding him in a local police lockup under guard until he can be transferred under guard to a correctional centre. The centre might be as much as 400 miles away. On his release the Government is responsible for the costs of his transportation to the community in which he was arrested. It makes very little sense for society to spend that kind of money because they could not collect the \$100 fine.

The fine option program, which is just getting underway, is designed to assist local communities and community groups to develop work situations which, when completed, will be of assistance to the community. For example, an individual who owes a \$100 fine, which he is unable to pay, may choose to work for a non-profit group for approximately 44 hours to satisfy the financial requirements of his fine. He might do this by taking a week of his vacation or by working evenings or weekends. And for those who are worried about the penalty, surely it is just as much a penalty to lose some of your free time, as to lose some of your working time.

It is our hope, Mr. Speaker, that this program will benefit the communities who participate by enabling them to undertake some community projects which otherwise might not have been done. We hope it will benefit the individual in that he will be able to pay off his debt to society in a responsible manner and with a feeling of accomplishment. And it will benefit society in the savings over incarceration and in the more humane treatment of offenders. Care will be taken, Mr. Speaker, to insure that work done on this program is work which would not have been done otherwise by regular employees.

May I say that, so far, we are very enthused with the response we have received regarding this program, from the judiciary and those engaged in providing legal services, and from municipalities and community groups.

I turn now, Mr. Speaker, to one of the major programs in the Department of Social Services, the Saskatchewan Assistance Plan. Mr. Speaker, I continue to be astounded at the political games which Members opposite seem willing to play with lives of the unfortunate members of society. Once again, we see these Members opposite attempting to use the old device of divide and conquer. In the realm of public assistance they have been deliberately attempting to divide the people of Saskatchewan and set one segment of society against the other, in the hope that by so doing the Liberal Party will receive the support of any backlash they may be able to develop.

You will remember, Mr. Speaker, that just one year ago Members of the Opposition were attempting to stand with one foot on each side of the fence, and from the recent screams it must

December 6, 1974

have been a barbed wire fence. In July of 1971 they publicly called for a 20 per cent increase in welfare allowances, no doubt to gain some support from those on public assistance. But four months later the same Party condemned the 17 per cent increase as being too much. It would seem that the Liberal Party has now at last decided which stand it must take. It has decided to go on an all-out attack on the poor, and in this way reinforce any prejudices which might exist in society against those who are disadvantaged.

The feeling one gets from reading Liberal press releases is, indeed, that there is a far greater chance of a poor person abusing the Welfare system than there is of a rich man abusing the income tax system. When it comes, Mr. Speaker, to unconscionable profits, the silence from the opposite benches has been deafening, and that, to me, is the real abuse of our so-called free enterprise society. j

It would appear too, Mr. Speaker, that the Member for Lumsden (Mr. Lane) is becoming the chief spokesman for the Opposition in their attack on the poor. I can understand that the problems and the conditions of poverty must seem very, very real to someone in a law office. It is noticeable that the Member for Lumsden and his colleagues refuse to be confused by the facts. Indeed, the Member for Lumsden is to be congratulated for the way in which he has managed to avoid completely any proximity to the facts.

On October 29th he is quoted as saying in a prepared release, maybe written by Liberal office but issued by him, "The real issue is that the number of recipients has remained much the same over the past three years. This means our welfare system has failed."

Now, Mr. Speaker, I should like to have asked where the Member dug up this information, but that would have been somewhat facetious for he did no digging, instead he depended solely on his imagination. The facts, as you know, are quite the reverse. Far from this being the case, the number of recipients has dramatically decreased in the last three years.

**SOME HON. MEMBERS** — Hear, hear!

**MR. TAYLOR** — The figures I will now provide you with, Mr. Speaker, are for the total province, including the Department of Northern Saskatchewan.

In March of 1972 - and I want to remind you that that included the last three months of the Liberal administration - there were 60,109 persons receiving public assistance in Saskatchewan. In September of 1973 there were 51,298, a drop of almost 10,000. In the latest figures I have available for September of 1974 there are 43,758 people receiving public assistance - a further decrease of 7,540.

**SOME HON. MEMBERS** — Hear, hear!

**MR. TAYLOR** — This means, Mr. Speaker, that in the last two and one half years there has been a net decrease in the number of recipients of 16,551. In fact, Mr. Speaker, under the Liberals since the introduction of the Saskatchewan Assistance Plan in



1966 the number of recipients steadily increased. In 1968-69 it was 44,975; in 1969 and 1970 it went up to 52,161. It is only under the New Democratic Government that it has shown any decrease. It seems to me that the record will speak for itself.

I can only assume, therefore, that either the Member for Lumsden is incapable of reading and understanding a fairly simple departmental report, or on the other hand he is deliberately falsifying the facts for his own political advantage.

I want to say a very special word in this regard about the Department of Northern Saskatchewan. In my opinion the staff of DNS have done an outstanding job under the leadership of Mr. Bowerman in the field of social services.

**SOME HON. MEMBERS** — Hear, hear!

**MR. TAYLOR** — They have developed entirely new programs, new to all of North America, in the field of corrections and they are making great strides in this regard. They have also made great strides in economic development and in public assistance. In September of 1973 there were 4,331 persons on public assistance in northern Saskatchewan; in September of this year the figure was down to 2,929. These figures were included in the total I have mentioned earlier.

The Member for Lumsden went on, Mr. Speaker, in the same press release to say that he would like to see the Assistance Plan remodelled on the basis of the New York state system, and he has said this before. What he was talking about was the creation of projects to give recipients work experience and increase their chances of getting a regular job. In this regard he went on to say that the Provincial Government's Employment Support Program should be a permanent one.

Let me say, first of all, I am happy to have his support in this regard, even though he usually doesn't know what he is talking about. We believe that the Employment Support Program is an important step forward in the field of social and income security. We would like nothing better than to see that type of program become permanent, but then our Government has already shown its interest in work-related programs. The previous Liberal administration did nothing in this regard. They did lots of talking but nothing in the way of programs. At the present time we have Employment Support Program. We make use of Training On the Job. We have Work Preparation Centres and Work Activity Programs. Under the Department of Municipal Affairs Winter Works Program, municipalities are provided with a bonus of \$30 per week for each public assistance client that they hire. Apart from Training On Job none of these were in existence three years ago. The thing that is stopping us from expanding programs such as Work Incentives and the Employment Support Program are the Liberal colleagues of the Members opposite in Ottawa.

The Member for Lumsden well knows that the Federal Liberal Government cost-shares on a fifty per cent basis the administration of public assistance in this and in every other province. They have steadfastly refused to cost-share on the same basis work programs such as the Employment Support Program. This, in effect, makes it twice as expensive for any province to put a man to work than it would to pay him public assistance. For dollar we provide in public assistance we receive 50 cents

December 6, 1974

in return from Ottawa. For every dollar we provide in wages to these same people we receive nothing in return from Ottawa,

The same federal colleagues of the Members opposite have recently forced us to remove, from the Saskatchewan Assistance Plan, some of the work incentives we had already had in place with their approval for two years. They have insisted that if we want to continue cost-sharing we must be more restrictive in this regard. Up until recently, physically and emotionally handicapped people, working part-time under supervision in sheltered workshops, were able to keep \$100 of their earnings without having their assistance payments reduced. Under the new regulations, forced upon us by the Federal Government, they will only be able to claim \$50 of their earning exemptions or 25 per cent of their basic needs under public assistance.

Under the new federal rule a married man with a family is allowed to keep \$100 from his earnings or 25 per cent of his basic needs, however, if his income equals 50 per cent or more of that basic need, he loses all of his exemptions and therefore has a very strong disincentive to increase his earnings. This cut-off point of 50 per cent only penalizes a person on assistance who is trying to move into full-time work and trying to be self-supporting. It increases dependency and takes away any incentive to work.

I want to suggest, Mr. Speaker, that if the Members opposite are really concerned about a work incentive, that they apply pressure to their federal counterparts so that we will be able to expand our work incentives and work activities programs.

Let me point out clearly, the Employment Support Program this summer cost the people of Saskatchewan an additional three quarters of a million dollars; the total program was about one and a half million. If we had paid these people one and a half million in public assistance the Federal Government would have refunded three quarters of a million. However, because we paid them to work the additional cost falls entirely on the people Saskatchewan.

Our record in this regard is perfectly clear. From the start of the social security review, initiated by the Federal Government, we have insisted that an employment strategy must be the first priority in income security. We have developed, within our own province, work programs and work preparation grants to assist the recipients of public assistance into the labour market. We have developed and implemented a Family Income Plan which ensures that everyone working will receive a higher income than he could receive on public assistance. No other government in Canada, and certainly not the previous Liberal administration, can make this sort of claim. In spite of all this, the Members opposite limit themselves to stirring up the public because of abuses which are more imaginary than real. At the same time, as I mentioned earlier, they make little reference to the abuse to the economic system which is foisted on the public by their corporate friends.

We are all aware, for example, of the great increase in sugar prices recently. On November 20th it was reported by the Press that a Michigan sugar company had stated its profits during the past 12 months were up 2,000 per cent over the 1975 fiscal year. They went on to say that the profits would have been a 4,000 increase, except for a change in accounting procedure.

I can only assume that for taxation purposes a new accounting procedure would cut their tax payable by more than 50 per cent. It is amazing that the Liberal Members of the House have little, or nothing to say, about this kind of economic abuse.

Mr. Speaker, the Members opposite attempt to make much of welfare abuse. I suggest to you, Sir, that there is less abuse of welfare than there is abuse of welfare recipients by the Liberal Members of this Legislature.

**SOME HON. MEMBERS** — Hear, hear!

**MR. TAYLOR** — We acknowledge that there is some abuse of the Public Assistance program. It would be naive and foolish to believe otherwise. There are always a few that will abuse any program, and indeed take advantage of society itself. If this were not the case we would need neither police nor courts.

It is our policy in this regard to lay charges against those who are discovered to be abusing the system. In the last twelve months, for example, 18 such charges were laid in this province with eight convictions and one case still pending. I have no hesitation in insisting that charges be laid. And as far as to who goes to jail, they are usually sent there or not by a federally appointed Judge in the Province of Saskatchewan.

**SOME HON. MEMBERS** — Hear, hear!

**MR. TAYLOR** — I have no hesitation in insisting that charges be laid. This is necessary, not just to protect the taxpayers who supporting the program, but also to protect the vast majority clients of the Department of Social Services who are honestly struggling to get by. They tend to receive abuse because of a few who are dishonest.

The other day, in his speech, the Leader of the Opposition said that because there are some rotten people in business, the Blakeney Government wages war on all business. This we know, Mr. Speaker, is entirely false. But I suggest that because there are a few dishonest people who have claimed public assistance the Liberal Opposition wages war on all recipients.

**SOME HON. MEMBERS** — Hear, hear!

**MR. TAYLOR** — I have already indicated that our policy is to lay charges against those who attempt to cheat the system. It might be interesting to discover how many charges the federal Liberals have laid under the Combines Investigation Act. Investigatory powers for this Act rest with the federal authorities. But I have heard of very few charges being laid.

Could it be, Mr. Speaker, that the welfare of the corporations is of greater interest to the Liberal Members than is the welfare of the individual? It is interesting to note that recently a Federal Cabinet Minister, unfortunately, a member from Saskatchewan, has indicated that the Federal Government will support Canadian Industrial Gas and Oil Limited of Calgary, when they appeal the decision of the Queen's Bench Court about the validity of our legislation. This will be a deliberate attempt by the federal Liberals to assist this poor, I suppose, welfare

December 6, 1974

company, in receiving higher profits at the expense of the people of Saskatchewan.

Once again we see the Liberal position of welfare for the corporations, free enterprise for the poor.

I will say, Mr. Speaker, that this Government will continue to speak on behalf of the disadvantaged people of our province, We will not be deterred by the misrepresentations made by the Members who sit on the opposite benches.

For sometime we have seen politicians using the poor as a ploy in an attempt to gain power. We have seen them attempting to blame the poor for every economic ailment of society. I can only say that our Government intends to speak out on behalf of these citizens. We will not be deterred by an Opposition that attempts to make profit for itself out of the sufferings of the unfortunate.

**SOME HON. MEMBERS** — Hear, hear!

**MR. TAYLOR** — We intend to do all that is within our power to assist these less fortunate citizens in becoming fully integrated into the main stream of life. We will do so through training and work preparation; through the provision of employment program with or without the assistance of the Federal Government. We will continue to do so by insisting that a work incentive be built into any income security program. We will continue to work to develop a system of economic security for all Canadians. We will not use the poor as a whipping boy to protect the failures of an economic system which continues to make the rich richer and the poor poorer.

Mr. Speaker, I should like to turn very briefly to a slightly different subject, the credibility, or lack of it, and the desperation of the Saskatchewan Liberal Party. Their credibility, Mr. Speaker, I suggest is probably at the lowest point in history, even lower than it was in June of 1971.

**SOME HON. MEMBERS** — Hear, hear!

**MR. TAYLOR** — But in the normal Liberal tradition they are taking steps in an attempt to correct this situation. It is interesting to note, however, that the steps they are taking follow the normal Liberal tradition. There is no positive declaration of policy. There are no real arguments on issues of the day, indeed on the major issue, that of resource taxation, the Leader of Opposition has merely indicated that we shouldn't have been as trusting of the federal Liberals.

Mr. Speaker, their methods follow the two traditional routes of the Liberal Party. First, a smear campaign aimed at the Premier of the province and secondly, a slick advertising campaign aimed only at selling a product without consideration whether or not that product provides any benefits.

I must say, Mr. Speaker, that the advertising campaign is masterfully done. It wasn't dreamed up by just one or two in the back room. It is a professional job. You only have look at some of the ads to recognize that. I have some of with me. One from a weekly newspaper and a nice one from one of

our daily newspapers. They are very well done, they are nice ads. I congratulate their ad agency, whoever they happen to be. It is really a professional job. We listen to their radio ads, or watch their ads on television, and are even more impressed by the professional productions. It is really slick. They make a fair use out of what some people call subliminal advertising technique; a technique which is supposed, according to the advertising specialists, to appeal to the subconscious mind and to convince you to buy something that you never believed you wanted in the first place.

**SOME HON. MEMBERS** — Hear, hear!

**MR. TAYLOR** — It is being used in an attempt to sell everything from soap to automobiles; and now, as a last ditch effort, it is being used in an attempt to sell the people of Saskatchewan a Party they want nothing to do with. Consider the fantastic costs of such an advertising campaign. It is really no wonder the Liberal Members opposite don't want an Election Expenses Act. When one considers the television, radio, daily papers, weekly paper ads, the cost of the campaign must be in the hundreds of thousands of dollars. But then their corporate friends have had extremely high profits this last year. I suppose they can afford it. No one needs to worry about the \$100 a plate dinner or what happened to the money. We have seen what happened on television.

Now certainly there are some groups that would be interested in a Liberal victory at the next election. No doubt the resource industries would be inclined to put up a fair amount of money to assist that Party. Why shouldn't they be willing to throw a fair bit into the coffers? They know that if the Liberal Party were to win an election in Saskatchewan, the pay-off to oil and potash and other resource companies would begin immediately. But the people of Saskatchewan can't afford this. We cannot afford the pay-off that would be made by the Members opposite to the resource industry as a whole, the pay-off carried out by allowing vastly increased profits to the companies, and a much lower return to the people of Saskatchewan.

Mr. Speaker, the people of our province will not be fooled. They will not permit a slick advertising campaign to provide a cover for a bankruptcy of ideas, a dearth of policy, and a philosophy which puts corporations first and people second.

**SOME HON. MEMBERS** — Hear, hear!

**MR. TAYLOR** — Nor will they allow a smear campaign to close their eyes to the real truth. Ask yourself, Mr. Speaker, "Who is the friend of the people of Saskatchewan?" Is it the Liberal of Steuart and Lang? Lang who introduced the LIFT program to cut back on grain production? Who as Justice Minister supported a potash company in fighting the laws of Saskatchewan in court? A Party led by men who favour the abolition of the Crow's Nest rates for the shipment of grain? A Party that is supporting rail abandonment throughout our province? A Party whose Federal Justice Minister has said that he will join an oil company in fighting Saskatchewan legislation, which brings the oil profits to the people of Saskatchewan? Where is the credibility, Mr. Speaker, of their provincial Leader who remains adamantly silent while his federal friends in the House of Commons launch

an all out attack, not just on Saskatchewan or on western Canada, but on the whole field of provincial jurisdiction? Where is his credibility when he says on the one hand, he would go to Ottawa and get a better deal, and on the other hand we should stop asking Ottawa for our rightful share of taxation? Where was the present Leader of the Opposition when his own Party was in power and when his then Premier went to Ottawa saying I am going, "Screaming for more money from the Federal Government?" Where is the Member for Prince Albert West when his Ottawa friends announced that they will increase the tax on natural gas available to Saskatchewan Power and thus force the price of gas up to the citizens of our province? No advertising campaign will overcome the handicap of poor leadership and the lack of positive programs.

Mr. Speaker, on the other hand the people of Saskatchewan know Allan Blakeney. Since he became Premier of this province he has made a practice of travelling throughout the province. People have come to know him, and when they know him they trust him. They know him as a man committed to building a new and better Saskatchewan. As a man, with a deep concern for the needs of people. As a man willing to take a strong stand against the powerful corporations and a powerful central government. They know he speaks for the rights of Saskatchewan people. They have seen that under his leadership this Government is one which keeps its promises.

**SOME HON. MEMBERS** — Hear, hear!

**MR. TAYLOR** — No glossy ads can make the Liberal alternative credible. The people of the province know that if they should by chance come back into power, we will see the biggest sellout in the history of Saskatchewan, as our resources are once more put up for grabs and for profiteering by the private sector.

Mr. Speaker, the Opposition apparently has all the money they need. They plainly have the services of a good professional advertising agency. The only thing they will not have is the support of the voters of Saskatchewan.

**SOME HON. MEMBERS** — Hear, hear!

**MR. TAYLOR** — Once again, Mr. Speaker, the Throne Speech has set before the people of our province, both the record of this Government and our proposals for future action. A record of which we can be justifiably proud, providing for commitments which will be supported by the people of this province.

Consequently, I will be opposing the amendment put forward by the Leader of the Opposition and will gladly support the main motion.

**SOME HON. MEMBERS** — Hear, hear!

**MR. J. WEIBE** (Morse): — Mr. Speaker, in rising to speak in this debate, it has been normal practice in the past to congratulate the mover and the seconder. I will do so, not for the contents of their remarks or what they had to move or to second, but I will congratulate them on the honour which they received.

This afternoon and ever since last Thursday we have seen speaker after speaker get up on that side of the House and each

and everyone of them with the same theme in their comments. What they are spouting is the old mushroom theory in politics. What is that mushroom theory in politics? It has been very evident for the last five days what that mushroom theory in politics is.

You feed the people in this province a bunch of manure and then keep them in the dark for the rest of the year. That is exactly what the Members opposite have been doing.

**SOME HON. MEMBERS** — Hear, hear!

**MR. WEIBE** — As well, Hr. Speaker, I should like at this time to congratulate the Minister of Culture and Youth for his selection of Swift Current as the site for the Saskatchewan Summer Games. I am pleased that finally this Government has recognized that there is a southwest corner of Saskatchewan. Even though, Mr. Speaker, that there are four NDP MLAs sitting in this House from the southwest part of Saskatchewan, this is the first time since 1971 that this Government has even recognized or considered that there is a southwest corner in this province.

**SOME HON. MEMBERS** — Hear, hear!

**MR. WEIBE** — As well, Mr. Speaker, when you enter into a debate it is normal to comment on some of the points that have been made in the debate by Members opposite. I wish to do that at this time.

My only problem is that the Members on that side of the House have not made any points in their comments with a result that nothing concrete has been said, with the result that my reply to them as well will be nothing.

I should like to look at the Throne Speech itself. What we debating here today, Mr. Speaker, is rather a strange document and probably one of the first of its kind in the history of Saskatchewan. It deals with things out of the past and is void in setting any direction at all for the future. As I said a bit earlier it indicates three things.

First of all it indicates that after only three and one half years in office, the NDP in this province has run out of ideas. I ask, Mr. Speaker, what is the matter, fellows, can't you bring any more people in from outside this province to furnish you with ideas? Are they among the rest of the people of Canada who are refusing to come into Saskatchewan because they realize what kind of government we have got here?

It is quite easy to understand that you need these people, it was quite evident after six months in office that the 43 Members sitting on that side of the House had run out of ideas in only 180 days.

Secondly, and I think this is the answer, that it is an admission by the NDP in Saskatchewan that they do not know how to face nor do they know how to solve the economic conditions which we have now in the Province of Saskatchewan. They have just thrown their hands up and decided to say nothing.

December 6, 1974

It was Ottawa, Mr. Speaker, that provided this province with the wealth that it now has. First of all, through one man, whose name happens to be Otto Lang and who is the one man who those people on that side of the House have continued to ridicule ever since this Legislature opened. Not only that, but it is Ottawa that provides this Government with 40 per cent of its wealth. Again they are using the old tactics of asking Ottawa to solve their problems here in Saskatchewan.

Thirdly, and I think most sad of all is that this NDP Government has lost touch with the people of Saskatchewan. The people of Saskatchewan, Mr. Speaker, do not want more government takeovers, they don't want more government involvement in business of farm lands, or more bureaucratic control over their lives. The people realize that each and every time a government implements a control or regulation to solve one problem that that regulation creates two or three more problems. So that you have a snowballing effect which means more and more government involvement in the lives of each and every one of us.

The priorities of the NDP ignore the real needs of senior citizens who are on fixed incomes and are unable to cope with the rising cost of living. What is needed is a provincial pension supplement instead of just creating a new government agency. No amount of work by a group of government bureaucrats in a Senior Citizen Agency can be as necessary right now as higher incomes.

The priorities of this Government as well ignore the needs of our cattle industry in Saskatchewan. I ask Members opposite, what good was the cash advance which your Government implemented to help the cattle industry in Saskatchewan? It only postpones, Mr. Speaker, a fate which could be worse than the present dilemma that the cattle industry now finds itself in. What than cattle industry in Saskatchewan needs today is help.

The Government opposite will be encouraging young farmers and livestock producers to keep their calves over the winter months. Many of these people, Mr. Speaker, do not have the adequate experience needed to winter these cattle. Many of these people do not have the facilities nor do they have the high priced feed in order to get those cattle through the winter alive.

If they lose some of those calves over the winter months, Mr. Speaker, that cash advance still has to be paid. The cash advance requires that young farmer to tie up as security in that advance everything which he owns with the exception of his own soul. If any of you had the opportunity to look at that application you will realize that that is exactly what it does. I say what position will that young man be in next spring? What will happen next year when he starts to market those calves? Our markets and the farmers will have to look at selling two calf crops in one year. What will that do to our already depressed cattle prices in Saskatchewan?

But, Mr. Speaker, there are many cattlemen in Saskatchewan who are able to take advantage of that cash advance. And I will tell you a lot of them have done it. And what are they doing with it? They are taking it to their credit union, they are taking it to their bank and they are investing it at 10.5 per cent and that is the profit that they are going to be making on that cash advance. Is this the right direction to help the cattle industry in this province? Mr. Speaker, I say that that



cash advance program is useless and a slap in the face of all cattlemen in this province.

As I said a little earlier, Mr. Speaker, and I say it again, I am opposed to subsidies because I do not feel that they solve the problem. Yet I might concede something in my stand when you look at the possible suggestion of an \$80 grant per calf sold, and this I think should be looked at a lot closer.

The Minister of Agriculture (Mr. Messer) told the people of Saskatchewan that this program would cost \$40 million for all calves sold in the Province of Saskatchewan. I say, Mr. Speaker, that the Minister of Agriculture is talking through his hat. Did he realize last year when prices were high that there were 220,000 calves sold in the Province of Saskatchewan. That doesn't add up to \$40 million, that adds up to \$22 million. I say to this Government, if you feel that a direct subsidy to the hog industry in Saskatchewan is worth \$18 million then I say a direct subsidy to the cattle industry in this province is worth \$22 million. The fact that you are ignoring the cattle industry in this province only means one thing, you want to see the cattle industry in Saskatchewan down on its knees. That is the only industry in this province that you people do not have control over and once you get the livestock industry in this province down on its knees you are going to have that control. I can tell the cattlemen of this province that if this Government is re-elected I will guarantee them that in six months after the election there will be a cattle marketing commission in this province and it won't be voluntary, it will be compulsory, exactly the same as the hog producers in this province.

Let's look at that hog subsidy of \$18 million. Why did this Government bring it in? Was it for a concern for the hog producers in Saskatchewan? If they have that concern for the hog producers, to spend \$18 million, why don't they have that concern for the cattle producers today, and spend \$22 million. That subsidy was put in strictly because of politics, because those Members opposite realize that if the hog industry in this province failed, the direct result of that failure would be blamed on them because of their compulsory Hog Marketing Commission and that is the only reason why the \$18 million was spent on the hog producers in this province. If you feel the same about helping the cattle industry in this province that you did the hog producers, spend that \$22 million.

Again, Mr. Speaker, let's look at the cattle industry and compare it to the hog industry. The hog producer can buy breeding stock today, he can breed that animal and in ten months he will have a return on his investment because he will sell an offspring from that breeding stock. Let's look at the cattle industry. If you buy breeding stock today it takes you three years before you can realize any return on that investment. The people, whom this Government has encouraged to get into livestock took in this province through FarmStart, once they get their fingers burned you can rest assured they are not going to go into the cattle industry again. These are the people that we have to be looking at in this province today.

The established cow/calf operator, the established feedlot operator, he can survive, he can survive this downturn, but can that young man whom we encouraged to go into cattle, survive? I say he can't. He can't because he got into it one or two years ago. The Government, through FarmStart, in many instances instead

December 6, 1974

of encouraging a man to start out gradually, to diversify in a smaller way and eventually grow, they have encouraged him to sink \$70,000 or \$80,000 into hog barns, into feedlot operations and into cow/calf operations. What is going to happen to these people now?

Let's look again, Mr. Speaker, what this NDP Government has done to help those young people in Saskatchewan, the ones whom they have encouraged into livestock. Again, I mention first of all they encouraged them to go into livestock in a big way which tied up a tremendous amount of money and debt in buildings, equipment and livestock. They now have a fantastic debt, with little or no income to reduce that debt. As well, they implemented the cash advance system which I have talked about a little earlier.

Now some of the other ways in which they have helped young cattlemen. First of all let's look at our community pastures. Since forming the Government in 1971, they have not doubled but they have tripled the fees that are required to put cattle into our provincial community pasture system in this province. About one month ago I stopped in at a farmer in my constituency who was just about down and out. Mr. Speaker, he had to sell half of his calf crop, half of his 1974 calf crop, to pay the community pasture fees so he could take his cattle home. And that is a direct result of the kind of help that Government is giving the cattle industry in this province.

Not only that, Mr. Speaker, but grassland lease fees on grassland in this province, have just about tripled as well. And they on that side of the House say that they are concerned about the people in livestock, that they are concerned about young farmers.

Mr. Speaker, what should happen? As I said earlier we are losing, we are in danger of losing one of our greatest industries. We are in danger of losing one of our greatest resources. That industry and that resource is our youth in agriculture and our youth in farming, the youth whom we have encouraged to diversify their agricultural operations and go into livestock. I say that this is needed in the province. We need more young people to diversify their straight grain farm operation and diversify a livestock operation. But why sit on your hands, gentlemen? Why allow those young people to go down and out?

I should like to offer three suggestions that this Government can do to help those young farmers, if you don't want spend the money on a direct subsidy. First of all I call on the Government to initiate a one-year moratorium on all FarmStart loans in this province; give those young men an opportunity to extend the length of term of payment and tell them this year if you are in rough shape, we will not require that payment for 1974 or 1975.

Secondly, I suggest that all interest payments on those FarmStart loans be cancelled for this year. As well, Mr. Speaker, I would suggest that community pasture fees, breeding fees be reduced to 1971 levels and the grassland fees as well be reduced to 1972 levels.

These suggestions, Mr. Speaker, I believe are concrete positive suggestions, suggestions and proposals that will enable the young farmers in this province, whom we have encouraged to go

into livestock, to be able to hang on and stick it out just the same as senior people in our livestock industry who have been established for a considerable length of time.

Mr. Speaker, I should now like to turn to another subject, I am sure many of us watched Provincial Affairs last Saturday night, featuring our fearless Roy Romanow and his concern about rail line abandonment in Saskatchewan. It was a beautiful program to watch, the colour was fantastic and our Attorney General, again, was in his usual form. But I should like to talk for a minute, Mr. Speaker, about the concern that the Attorney General had on that program. I suggest, Mr. Speaker, that that concern was not for the towns and rural communities that would be affected by abandonment. That concern was not for the social and economic costs that abandonment would have on the producer, on businesses, on the communities or on our rural way of life, but rather, Mr. Speaker, it was a concern strictly for politics, a concern for the NDP Government and the New Democratic Party, a concern for political gain, a concern for justification of the actions taken by the CCF-NDP of which many Members opposite were a part of ten years ago, a concern to try to shift the blame for the only rail line abandonment that has ever occurred in this province; a concern to take public suspicion away from the New Democratic Party and place that suspicion on the Federal Liberals.

Mr. Speaker, the Members opposite just do not want to admit that the only rail lines that were ever abandoned in this province were abandoned when their Government or their Party was the Government of Saskatchewan. As I said earlier, many of the Members who are presently sitting on that side of the House were sitting on that government at the same time.

Mr. Speaker, it is a fact that they do not wish to accept and it is a fact that it was a provincial Liberal Government and a federal Liberal Government that called a halt and stopped rail line abandonment in this province.

**SOME HON. MEMBERS** — Hear, hear!

**MR. WEIBE** — They are aware, and I am sure the people of Saskatchewan are aware, that the only time that rail lines were torn up and abandoned in Saskatchewan was when their Party opposite were the Government of this province. At no time, Mr. Speaker, during that controversy did they rise to the defence of keeping those rail lines. At no time did they rise to the defence of our rural communities and farmers who were affected by this abandonment. What was their concern at that time? What constructive alternatives did they suggest? What pressure did they put on the then Conservative Government in Ottawa to call a halt to that abandonment in this province? The people of Saskatchewan, Mr. Speaker, can answer those questions.

The CCF-NDP government sat on their hands and did nothing! They finally became involved in the controversy when they realized the political ramifications of what they had allowed to happen. For the past ten years speaker after speaker has tried to shift that blame. They don't want to stand up and admit that it was an NDP government that allowed rail lines to be abandoned in Saskatchewan. And, again, that it was the Liberal Governments in Saskatchewan and Ottawa that called a halt to that abandonment.

December 6, 1974

The interesting part of the entire controversy, Mr. Speaker is that during the past ten years and during the present debate on this subject, the NDP have not come up with one positive approach to this question. Not once have they put forward any constructive or rational idea or solution to this problem. Sure, they have set up a department of the Government to look into rail rationalization.

We, on this side of the House, have tried fruitlessly to find out exactly in what direction those studies are going and our only indication is so far that it is providing a few extra jobs for a few more party hacks in this province. They have decided, as the Attorney General did last Saturday night on Provincial Affairs, to take the negative approach. They have decided to leave things as they are with no constructive alternative. They are content to allow the rail lines in this province to deteriorate, they are content to allow the services on our rural lines to deteriorate.

The comments by the Attorney General, Mr. Speaker, have been negative. He is content to run down and to ridicule any attempt that has been made by the Federal Government to look into the entire transportation system. During the length of the freeze, Mr. Speaker, not once has the Attorney General nor his Government, made any concrete proposals to Ottawa regarding the entire question. Not once has he been prepared to get involved, to work together with Ottawa in finding a solution to our transportation problems, a solution, Mr. Speaker, that would benefit the entire western region.

Mr. Speaker, I say at this time, that it is necessary for the various organizations, the individual producers, rural governments and western provincial governments to sit down together to assess the facts and to participate in determining the best course of action. We must be able, Mr. Speaker, to understand - and I say to understand each others' problems. Where does our responsibility as Legislators lie in regard to a question as vital as rail line abandonment and the effects that this entire question can have on our rural way of life Saskatchewan, its effect on our economy and its effect on the future of the many farms and towns in this province.

Our responsibility, Mr. Attorney General, is not destructively to oppose suggestions or ideas, our responsibility is, not refusing to co-operate or to go off on our own tangent, our responsibility is to find answers. We must make every effort to take this issue out of the narrow range of both petty party politics, and the interests of the railways and the elevator companies. We must be prepared to ask that all western provincial governments, farm organizations and most importantly, the producers, set petty issues aside and work together with the Federal Government to provide the alternatives, to come up with solutions that if changes are required the grain producer and our rural communities will get the entire benefit of these changes.

I urge the Attorney General instead of trying to tear apart, that he try constructively to work together with other levels of government, organizations and individuals to find a solution that will be beneficial to our rural communities, our producers and our province as a whole.

I ask the Attorney General to put aside his petty desire for political gain. I ask him to sit down and work. I offer today that I will work together with the Attorney General to find a solution, to find the answers that are required. I ask the Attorney General to take the first initiative in that regard and if he takes that initiative he has my co-operation and understanding 100 per cent.

Mr. Speaker, I have much more which I shall like to say on highways this afternoon, but I understand that my time has been allocated to 5:00 o'clock and with that I shall leave my comments on highways until we have an opportunity to debate the resolution which I presented.

For that reason, Mr. Speaker, I will state at this time that I will be supporting the amendment and not the main motion.

**SOME HON. MEMBERS** — Hear, hear!

**MR. K.B. MACLEOD** (Regina Albert Park): — Mr. Speaker, it is with pleasure that I rise to speak in this debate today. I have two subjects to deal with and I should like to deal with one very briefly at this time and the other one I should like to deal with at a later moment.

The first one deals, Mr. Speaker, with the question of the provision of legal services and facilities for legal services in Saskatchewan. We are, in this province, increasingly aware of the importance of competent legal services to all members of society. This increasing awareness was recognized by the commencement in 1967 of the First Legal Aid Plan ever put forward in Canada and it was put forward by the then Liberal Government under the Attorney General, Darrel Heald. Now since that time, with the assistance of the Federal Government, these plans have been expanded and I congratulate justice Minister Otto Lang, the former Attorney General, Mr. Heald and the Attorney General, Mr. Romanow for their particular work in this regard.

The physical facilities, however, particularly in the cities of Regina and Saskatoon and especially those under the control of the Provincial Government have not quite kept pace with this increasing awareness of legal needs.

Under the British North America Act the administration of justice is the responsibility of the provinces. In Regina and Saskatoon there is need for much more court space and more court staff. The situation in Saskatoon is especially acute, where Magistrates' Courts, District Courts and the Superior Courts together with the Land Titles Office all crowd into the same building. I urge the Government to purchase land nearby, south of the present building in Saskatoon, and build a brand new building for the Land Titles office thus freeing additional space in Saskatoon Court House for the law offices and for the courts that are properly there.

I recognize that finance ministers of this and previous governments may well put this type of thing down the scale of priorities. There is great need for these in Saskatoon particularly, and I urge the Government to give close attention to this. I look forward eagerly to seeing something in this regard in the Budget which we assume will come along in late January or early March. I therefore urge the Attorney General

December 6, 1974

and the Minister of Finance and the Government to give this a fairly good priority. I hope that the Attorney General will continue in his efforts to supply legal services to the people of the province of Saskatchewan in the areas where they are not presently properly covered.

Mr. Speaker, with those few remarks relating to the physical needs of our legal system I should like to suggest that I have some lengthy remarks, some 15 or 20 minutes or perhaps longer relating to the opportunity that was presented to me this last summer to represent the Province as an observer along with the Speaker of the House at the Commonwealth Parliamentary Conference in Ceylon (now Sri Lanka). However, Mr. Speaker, it will take some time to deal with this, so rather than have my remarks broken in two parts, I beg leave to adjourn the debate.

Debate adjourned.

The Assembly adjourned at 5:07 o'clock p.m.