

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

Monday, December 9, 1974.

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

WELCOME TO STUDENTS

MR. E.C. WHELAN (Regina North West): — Mr. Speaker, it is a pleasure to introduce to you and through you to all Members of the Legislature 85 grade eight students from St. Peter's School in Regina North West. They are seated in the west gallery. Their principal, Gerald Small is with them as well as their teachers, Eugene Jacques and Andy Joerissen. On behalf of all Members I say to these young visitors a very warm welcome and may your visit with us be pleasant, informative and educational.

SOME HON. MEMBERS: — Hear, hear!

MR. G.B. GRANT (Regina Whitmore Park): — Mr. Speaker, it gives me great pleasure through you to introduce to the House, 15 ladies in the Speaker's Gallery from the Whitmore Park United Church. Of particular interest is the fact that the wife of the Minister of Social Services, Mrs. Taylor, is with the group. I know all Members of this House sincerely welcome them to this Session and hope that their tour afterwards will be educational and informative.

SOME HON. MEMBERS: — Hear, hear!

POINT OF PRIVILEGE

PARTIAL CLOSURE OF BURNS AND COMPANY

MR. D.G. STEUART (Leader of the Opposition): — Mr. Speaker, I should like to rise on a Point of Privilege. On Thursday last, I rose in the House and I directed a question to the Premier in regard to the announcement by Burns Foods Limited, concerning closure of part of their plant next March with the subsequent layoff of about 248 of their employees. I stated at that time that I had phoned the president of Burns Foods Limited in Calgary, Mr. Art Child and discussed this closure with him. I stated that he had informed me, which he had, that his officials had been discussing the question of the possibility of this closure for some three or four weeks with an official of the Department of Labour of the Province of Saskatchewan.

I subsequently watched a newscast that evening and the Premier stated at that time that he had checked with the Department of Labour and I think with the Department of Industry and there had been no consultation prior to a letter with any official of either of those departments.

I phoned Mr. Child and informed him of this. He said he would contact his officials that had given him this information.

December 9, 1974

He phoned me back the next morning and informed me that in fact the official had been discussing the possibility of closure for some weeks, with, to use his words “a senior official of the Government of Saskatchewan, but that the individual was not employed by the Department of Labour.” I asked him to give me the name and he said he was sorry this had become a controversial matter, that he would give the name to either the Premier or any of the Cabinet Ministers if they phoned him, or if any member of the Press or anyone else wanted to phone him in Calgary, he would state exactly what I have stated, that; he did tell me they had been in consultation with an official of the Department of Labour, Government of Saskatchewan, for several weeks and that subsequently when he checked he had either been misinformed or misunderstood it. He had given me that information, I passed it on to this House is good faith and that it was, again quoting him, “a senior official and he would give them that information.” He felt that he did not want to name the person, but he would to a member of the Government.

I give that information to the House. I say that the main point here is that it is unfortunate that that individual did not inform Ministers, including the Premier, I take the Premier’s word that they didn’t. The main thing now, of course, is that I hope as the Member for Prince Albert West that the Government will take all possible action to see if this unfortunate layoff can be avoided and work with the company to see if it can’t be avoided or at least to see if the numbers to be laid off can be reduced and the blow softened to whatever extent is possible through government action if, in fact, there is anything they can do.

HON. A.E. BLAKENEY (Premier): — Mr. Speaker, I know we thank the Member for Prince Albert West for that information, thank him for correcting information he previously gave to the House with respect to alleged information given to the Department of Labour which now proves to have been inaccurate. With respect to the possibility of information having been given to, “A senior official of the Government, not a member of the Department of Labour,” there are, of course, some hundreds of such officials.

AN HON. MEMBER: — Thousands . . .

MR. BLAKENEY: — Maybe, depending on one’s definition of seniority, perhaps some thousands of such officials, Since neither the Leader of the Opposition nor anyone on behalf of his Party is prepared to volunteer the name of this unknown official, it is somewhat difficult for anyone to pursue the matter further. I think that if Mr. Child wishes us to have that information presumably he will provide it to us. If the Member for Prince Albert West wants the House to have this information, presumably he will get the information provided to the House. Under those circumstances, it is clear that the information provided previously was inaccurate. When further information is provided we will also attempt to verify it to see whether it is accurate or equally inaccurate.

QUESTIONS

FINANCIAL CONTRIBUTIONS

MR. D.F. MACDONALD (Moose Jaw North): — Mr. Speaker, before the

Orders of the Day, I should like to ask the Minister of Labour (Mr. Snyder) if he has received any financial contributions either directly or indirectly from any labour unions for his personal campaigns in Moose Jaw. Also, I should like to ask him whether he received any manpower assistance during the election from union personnel who are not normally resident in Moose Jaw.

SOME HON. MEMBERS — Hear, hear!

MR. G. SYNDER (Minister of Labour): — Well I should inform the Member first of all that I am not on a first name basis with the Hal Banks group that his federal counterparts in Ottawa seem to be having such a close association with much to their embarrassment. As far as on an individual basis I would hope that a number of trade unionists have supported my campaign. I would hope that there would be some contributions that would be made in the future also. As far as manpower being provided, I think on at least one occasion the Saskatchewan Federation of Labour, I believe, provided one person for a period of a couple of weeks. This, to me, I regard as being a perfectly legitimate kind of contribution that the trade union makes on occasion to myself and to other candidates. I would hope that they would be supporting not only in the past but in the future.

MR. MACDONALD: — Mr. Speaker, as a supplementary. Really it is the same question again, because it wasn't answered. I asked whether or not any labour unions had made contributions to his personal campaign. He didn't answer that. My supplementary would be that in view of the fact that a conflict of interest problem has been raised by his own national leader and by Morton Shulman and others, I should like to know if the Minister has received any financial contributions? If so, is he prepared to make the names known of these contributors and the amounts to this House so that they can become part of the public record?

MR. SNYDER: — In answer to the Member's question, Mr. Speaker, our party has always been of the opinion that the source of campaign funds should be open and should be general knowledge to the public. We have made this point on a consistent basis throughout. Quite frankly, Mr. Speaker, I would be more than delighted to see us laying before the people of Saskatchewan the source of our campaign contributions in the same way as Members opposite will be required, in the future, to make known the source of their campaign contributions. This, I think, is a two-bladed sword, it cuts two ways and we will be delighted to provide you with all of that pertinent information. I trust you will be required, at the same time, to provide the public of Saskatchewan all of the information concerning the source of your campaign contributions.

RADIOGRAM, ILE-A-LA-CROSSE

MR. H.E. COUPLAND (Meadow Lake): — Mr. Speaker, before the Orders of the Day I should like to ask the Premier if he has received that radiogram from the concerned parents at Ile-a-la-Crosse which was sent on November 26th, to both him and the Minister of DNS, if so what action has been taken to resolve the situation?

December 9, 1974

MR. BLAKENEY: — Mr. Speaker, the answer to the first part of the questions is: Yes, I received a radiogram, or telegram, from two people, it was signed on behalf of two people in Ile-a-la-Crosse, a man's name and a woman's name. They elude me at the moment. I remember reading the wire. On receipt of the wire the matter was referred to the Department of Northern Saskatchewan. A week ago last Saturday a meeting was held in Ile-a-la-Crosse by the Northern School Board - my report indicated - of the local school board with a group of teachers and some parents and that a second meeting was held with another group of parents whom I might characterize for these purposes, as the concerned parents who sent the wire. Subsequent to this I am, advised that the Northern School Board considered the matter at a meeting last Wednesday and decided that they were not in a position to take the action requested by the concerned parents to discharge a number of teachers and superintendents because grounds for discharge had not been provided. Insofar as I am aware the matter rests there. I am not aware of whether or not the concerned parents are sending their students back to school or not. I am simply not up on what may have occurred in the last couple of days.

MR. COUPLAND: — Mr. Speaker, a supplementary. I was informed yesterday that this group of concerned parents, which is far more than two, are still very concerned, there are still 150 to 200 children who are out of school. They informed me that a letter is going forward to the Premier signed by at least 50 concerned parents and they are going to keep their children out of school until they get some satisfaction. I wonder if the Premier and the Government would set up an independent inquiry to get this straightened out so these children do not suffer any further lack of education?

MR. BLAKENEY: — Mr. Speaker, I am sorry if I conveyed the impression that the group of concerned parents consisted of only two. I did not mean to convey that impression. What I meant to say was that the wire or radiogram was signed by two. This is not to suggest that I felt that there were only two parents involved. In fact I knew there were others because I knew that at that meeting of a week ago last Saturday there were more than two parents represented.

With respect to whether or not an independent inquiry is appropriate, we will certainly consider that. The Northern School Board is, as you know, a semi-independent board. I ask Members opposite to be careful on this, before they assert that the Board is a government agency matter, they had better check with the Member for Athabasca (Mr. Guy), because I have heard him say in this House any number of times that the Northern School Board was not a government agency and that accordingly the teachers of that Northern School Board were not government employees. We remember when the Member for Athabasca, as such a teacher, was elected to this house. We remember that had he been a government employee he would not have been able to sit in this House. He asserted with some vigour that he was not a government employee. And in the course of so doing, asserted that the Northern School Board was not a government organization. However that may be, there has been an attempt, over the years under several governments, to keep the Northern School Board as an independent body. We would not wish to make judgments on

their behalf. But, if in fact, an investigation is the way to handle it, we will certainly look into it.

DECENTRALIZING OF WATER SUPPLY BOARD

MR. E.C. MALONE (Regina Lakeview): — Mr. Speaker, before the Orders of the Day I have a question I wish to direct to the Minister of Labour in his capacity as Minister in charge of the Saskatchewan Water Resources Board.

I trust that he may answer this question, he didn't answer the last one asked by the Member for Moose Jaw North. My question is: Does the Minister intend on changing the head office of the Saskatchewan Water Supply Board from the present location of Regina and moving it to another location, that is, Watrous, and if so, how he justifies this move and why is it being done?

MR. SNYDER: — Perhaps I should update the Member. I am no longer the Minister in charge or the chairman of the Water Supply Board. My colleague, the Minister of Northern Saskatchewan, (Mr. Bowerman) is currently the Minister in charge, chairman of the Board. He may wish to comment further. You will know, I believe, of the commitment of this Government to decentralize a number of the agencies of government. Accordingly this - will you allow one to finish answering the question? - then the Minister of Northern Saskatchewan can amplify or expand on it if he wishes.

What I am saying, Mr. Speaker, that it has been the commitment of this Government to look for ways and means to decentralize the operations of this Government and this is one of the activities it was felt could be properly decentralized.

MR. MALONE: — . . . answered my question from the appropriate Minister.

MR. SPEAKER: — The Member directed his question to the Minister of Labour. I have no knowledge as to where the Member wishes to direct his question.

MR. MALONE: — The fact that there was a change that I was not aware of, would the appropriate Minister answer the question?

MR. ROMANOW: — I wonder if we could put questions put by Members until later this day.

MR. MALONE: — Could I have my answer, Mr. Speaker?

MR. BLAKENEY: — Mr. Speaker, the answer is: Government policy will be announced in due course.

ADJOURNED DEBATES

ADDRESS-IN-REPLY

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

MR. T.M. WEATHERALD (Cannington): — Mr. Speaker, it is my distinct pleasure to have the opportunity to speak in this debate. It is particularly a pleasure for me today after the tremendously successful Liberal Party Convention that was held here in this city . . .

SOME HON. MEMBERS: — — Hear, hear!

MR. WEATHERALD: — . . . on Thursday, Friday and Saturday of last week. I say successful, Mr. Speaker, because that convention attracted something like 1,300 delegates and visitors, which in my time in politics in Saskatchewan, which goes back the last 15 years or so, is by far the largest political convention that has been held in our province.

SOME HON. MEMBERS: — Hear, hear!

MR. WEATHERALD: — A good deal of this interest and enthusiasm that was shown by the delegates is directly attributable to the terrific work that the Leader of the Opposition, Mr. Steuart, has been doing, going around the Province of Saskatchewan and explaining to the people of Saskatchewan the things that the Government opposite have been doing and how important it is that a viable alternative be presented in the next election.

SOME HON. MEMBERS: — Hear, hear!

MR. WEATHERALD: — I am convinced that with the leadership and the enthusiasm that was shown at that convention that the Liberal Party will have little difficulty in replacing the machine opposite when that opportunity becomes available to Saskatchewan people.

SOME HON. MEMBERS: — Hear, hear!

MR. WEATHERALD: — Mr. Speaker, I should like to say a few words about my constituency this afternoon but because of the stringencies of radio time, in order to be fair to all Members so that Members of this Assembly, both the Opposition side and the Government side, get their opportunities to speak on the Debate, my speech will have to be somewhat condensed and, therefore, I will forgo that opportunity at this time.

Today, Mr. Speaker, I should like to talk about the agriculture policy of the Government opposite because I think the trend that the Government opposite has been bringing about in agriculture has been extremely important and must be understood by all of us within our borders.

Since the last Legislature met, Mr. Speaker, there has been a considerable number of new initiatives by the NDP Government. Most of them, might add, in my view are bad. I say most of them, not all of them.

Premier Blakeney and the NDP Government have indicated their intention in the agricultural economy of our province to bring about an industry that is largely controlled by an NDP Government. That is precisely what I want to talk about this afternoon. The question that farmers in Saskatchewan must ask themselves is, who is it that is going to control agriculture? An NDP Government or the farmers of this province, Mr. Speaker.

SOME HON. MEMBERS: — Hear, hear!

MR. WEATHERALD: — It is obvious that if we continue in the direction that we have in the last three and one half years that the NDP will control agriculture and the farmers will have little or no say. I just want to review the actions of the Government opposite in the past three years.

We started off after the NDP were first elected with the Family Farm Protection Act and that, Mr. Speaker, can well be remembered for its infamous action by putting the bad debts for machinery onto the backs of the Credit Unions and small implement dealers and I am sure that many of them remember that.

Then, Mr. Speaker, we had presented by the Minister of Agriculture (Mr. Messer) the infamous Foreign Ownership of Land Act that called the sons and daughters of farmers in our province foreigners if they lived in another part of Canada. Fortunately this legislation was beaten back by the Liberal Opposition and an outraged Saskatchewan public.

SOME HON. MEMBERS: — Hear, hear!

MR. WEATHERALD: — I might say, Mr. Speaker, in this context that the Opposition stands for control of foreign ownership of land but does not want restrictions on other Canadians.

The Land Bank was then instituted, giving the province the right to buy large quantities of farm land with no likelihood that any amount of this land, Mr. Speaker, will ever be sold back to farmers. I say that there is little likelihood that it will ever be sold back. The Government sets the price and then it is only sold for cash back to the farmer within a six-month period after having leased it for five years. The Government sets the price and I think that is extremely important if it is ever sold back. A lease also says that the Government may sell it, it does not say it shall sell it. It is also interesting to note that any capital gain in that transaction if it is ever sold, accrues to the Government. The farmer who has been the lessee for the number of years receives absolutely nothing.

I want to read to you, Mr. Speaker, a quote from Mr. Uskiw, the Minister of Agriculture in Manitoba. I think it is significant in Saskatchewan because it exhibits NDP thinking. I quote from an interview reported in The Winnipeg Free Press with Mr. Uskiw, Minister of Agriculture, the NDP Government of Manitoba:

The only responsible land owner in sight is the Government he represents.

Now, Mr. Speaker, I think this in itself is an example of what

December 9, 1974

the NDP think and what they want as far as ownership of land is concerned.

Fourthly, Mr. Speaker, the Government moved into Intercontinental Packers and passed the changes to The Natural Products Marketing Act. This was another government intervention into meat packing and it closely involved farmers. The Government controls the supply of hogs in Saskatchewan through the Hog Marketing Commission. It is absolutely despicable that they have never seen fit to allow farmers to elect the Board of Directors and allow the farmers to run this Commission. Certainly this is unprecedented in the rest of Canada as far as marketing boards are concerned and we totally object to this concept.

SOME HON. MEMBERS: — Hear, hear!

MR. WEATHERALD: — Mr. Speaker, it is utterly ridiculous that we now send hogs from southeastern Saskatchewan some 300 miles to the Intercontinental Packers in Saskatoon while at the same time living only about 60 miles from a packing house in Brandon. I can admit to the idea that it is nice to create jobs in our province and I am sure we are all interested in it but not at the expense of wasteful freight costs and producing great inefficiency in the industry. That is precisely what we are doing when we ship hogs 300 miles to packing houses when we can ship them something like about 60. That is absolute inefficiency and increased cost, money that is going to pay freight for a useless reason.

Mr. Speaker, it is time we returned to the democratic system that existed under the previous Liberal administration of The National Products Marketing Act allowing for a legally elected producers-controlled board. The Hog Marketing Commission is too closely associated with Intercontinental Packers to be able to do the job that hog producers wanted it to do and for the NDP, of course, this is precisely why they won't allow farmers to run the Hog Marketing Commission.

I come to another matter, I think, which is of extreme importance to people in Saskatchewan and particularly the ones who live in my constituency. I refer to the recent suggestion by the Premier when he was speaking in front of the Legislature in which he called for, "a National Beef Authority because it would bring orderly marketing to the beef industry." Then at the recent NDP Convention in Saskatchewan, I quote:

Mr. Broadbent called for a National Beef Marketing Board and a massive land banking system.

Mr. Broadbent in the National Leader in the House of Commons for the NDP. To a cattleman in our Province of Saskatchewan a "National Beef Authority" is just a plain old marketing board the Premier is talking about and I predict that the NDP will make a move for a National Beef Commission in the same manner that they did for hog producers, with or without the cattlemen's consent. This, of course, is brought about by changes in The National Products Marketing Act which allows the Government to set up a beef marketing commission at any opportunity they wish without the beef producers' consent.

I want to talk about grain marketing because again it

comes down to the well-known NDP attitude in agriculture of a closely controlled industry run by the Government of Saskatchewan.

Producers, in a fair and open vote, recently voted by majority in favour of the open market for rapeseed. After receiving information produced by people representing the various options of Wheat Board selling or open marketing, producers in Saskatchewan voted in favour of open marketing. Mr. Speaker, regardless of whether one favours the Wheat Board method of selling rapeseed or whether he favours open marketing, the decision was, I think, in a fair and honest manner arrived at. The Blakeney Government instead of respecting that decision have done everything possible to harass and disparage that decision that had been made by farmers.

After the rapeseed vote, Mr. Speaker, a similar situation existed in the open marketing of domestic feed grain. And once again I come to that particular situation, because once again many farm organizations in Saskatchewan, particularly the United Grain Growers, Stock Growers, the Unifarm in Alberta, the Alberta Government, the Canadian Cattlemen's Association, Palliser Wheat Growers, and in fact the Conservative Party Members in Ottawa supported the open market of grain as far as the domestic market was concerned. I refer only to the domestic market because this is what it applies to. The open marketing has never been suggested as far as the export marketing of grain was concerned and I am sure if it were it would be totally rejected by the farmers of Saskatchewan. In the past federal election the NDP attempted to make this an issue which was one of the planks of their platform that received the most attention, that they would oppose the decision which allowed open marketing of domestic grain.

In that election the NDP vote in Alberta amongst farmers was practically negligible. In Saskatchewan it was about 31 per cent including the urban areas. In Manitoba in the farm areas it was about 20 per cent.

One might think that since both the Conservative Federal Members and the Liberal Federal Members received something like 80 per cent of the vote in western Canada, that the NDP would be willing to respect the decision for open marketing, but not the NDP. They still continue completely and totally to harass that decision as though they had received 80 per cent of the vote in the last federal election.

SOME HON. MEMBERS: — Hear, hear!

MR. WEATHERALD: — Mr. Speaker, I just want to say that the whole thrust of the NDP policy in marketing of any kind has been for the NDP Government to move in and control farmers to the greatest extent possible. The NDP Government has in this short period taken away from farmers the opportunity in many cases of ever owning their own land. They have eliminated the farmers' opportunity to make marketing decisions regarding their products, a decision which for some 30 or 40 years was respected by allowing farmers to decide whether they wanted compulsory marketing boards and to elect their Board of Directors, and it is only within the last three years that that time-honoured opportunity has been taken away, allowing the NDP to set up compulsory marketing boards without the farmers' consent. The

December 9, 1974

NDP Government has, in many cases, completely shown disrespect for individual farmers' rights when the farmer has given his decision regarding what he wanted done in the agricultural industry.

In summing up, Mr. Speaker, I want to say this NDP Government under Premier Blakeney is totally unable to understand that farmers often do fully support such organizations as the Canadian Wheat Board and various other marketing boards, but at the same time also want some marketing decisions left to their own judgment.

SOME HON. MEMBERS: — Hear, hear!

MR. WEATHERALD: — This is why farmers wanted an open market for rapeseed.

Mr. Speaker, I know that the farmers are thinking a great deal about it these days and in the next election the farmers of Saskatchewan will have an opportunity of passing judgment on whether they want NDP-run agriculture that will reduce farmers to "hewers of wood and drawers of water," who will have no right to make decisions whatsoever as to how their industry is run, or whether they want to reserve some rights in marketing for themselves, Mr. Speaker. I think that that will be a major issue and I have no doubt whatsoever as to what the outcome of that decision will be when they pass judgment on the NDP Government.

Mr. Speaker, I obviously will be supporting the amendment and will not be supporting the motion.

SOME HON. MEMBERS: — Hear, hear!

MR. R. GROSS (Gravelbourg): — Mr. Speaker, it is with a great deal of pleasure and pride that I take part in the third Throne Speech Debate by our Government. I have pride in it, Mr. Speaker, because once again we have introduced a Throne Speech nothing short of spectacular. A Throne Speech which accurately and thoroughly outlines what has taken place in the past year and what is going to take place in the future year. Mr. Speaker, it also outlines the challenges of the future.

Mr. Speaker, I would be remiss if I did not congratulate the mover and the seconder who have done more than an admirable job in moving and seconding the Throne Speech. They have reiterated our record and, Mr. Speaker, you are going to find in the future that record will bear repeating more than once.

Mr. Speaker, before I get into the meat of my Throne Speech Debate I should like to contradict comments that were made last Friday by the Member for Morse (Mr. Wiebe) and probably my opposition in the Morse constituency in the next election. I might add also, Mr. Speaker, that he will no doubt make a fine constituent next time around.

SOME HON. MEMBERS: — Hear, hear!

MR. GROSS: — I have no real personal qualms about Jack, he is an excellent person as far as a human being is concerned, however, Mr. Speaker, he is the only person whom I know who speaks out

of both sides of his mouth, saying two different things at the same time. In his remarks on Friday he cut through a little vein of mine, he said that in the southwestern part of Saskatchewan, where we are solid NDP, in case anybody is wondering, that we have done a poor job of representing the Government. Well, Mr. Speaker, I can account for what has been done by Members like Allan Oliver and David Lange and Everett Wood, Eugene Flasch, and when I travel around those particular areas I hear nothing but commendable comments in regard to those Members.

SOME HON. MEMBERS: — Hear, hear!

MR. GROSS: — I can speak, however, Mr. Speaker, with a lot more authority in terms of what I have done in my own riding. I can say this with a great deal of pride because I think a great deal of pride I have shown in being a representative of Gravelbourg and I can talk back and look back at something like 4,700 problems that I have handled. They may have been all little problems but for the individuals very important problems. I can prove that I have handled those problems. I have a card indexed of those problems on file, they are on display for anyone who may want to look at it.

MR. WIEBE: — Are they solved, Reg?

MR. GROSS: — And they are solved, every one of them. Those 4,700 problems are solved and those 4,700 people are very happy with the kind of representation they have had in Gravelbourg.

SOME HON. MEMBERS: — Hear, hear!

MR. GROSS: — Mr. Speaker, I can go on and I can talk about the programs that I have worked for in my constituency with pride. I can talk about and I can tally them up, roughly \$5 million worth of programming that I have worked for or initiated in that riding. I can even remember, Mr. Speaker, being in Vanguard and having the Member for Morse in strange country, in my own constituency, opening one of our swimming pools that we worked hard on, Those are the kinds of programs that my constituents like to see. Those are the kinds of programs that they are going to see in the next four years if they elect myself as Member for Morse.

Mr. Speaker, I should like also to point out here that Jack took considerable time in his speech on Friday to talk about the great Otto Lang, the supposedly great Otto Lang. Mr. Speaker, he said what great things Otto Lang is doing for Saskatchewan. Well, I can only hope that Jack will continue that kind of line in the election. I can only hope that all Liberals across the way will be out polishing up the image of Otto Lang because it needs a good deal of polishing, as they are already doing in trying to polish up the image of Dave Steuart who also needs a great deal of polishing.

Mr. Speaker, getting on into the Throne Speech I should like to talk about the performance of our Government in the last three years. The important thing that we have done in the past three to four years, Mr. Speaker, and I think it stands out more than anything else, is to restore the programs that were destroyed in the past seven years of Liberal regime and

December 9, 1974

terror. Mr. Speaker, we have replaced the programs that were so vitally needed before and put them back into shape and restored them for the people of Saskatchewan. We have even gone further, Mr. Speaker, as our mandate asked us to do in 1971 and we have brought forth new and dynamic social programs oriented towards people and have literally turned on our economy.

SOME HON. MEMBERS: — Hear, hear!

MR. GROSS: — Mr. Speaker, the major part of my address will deal with the challenges of the future facing the people of Saskatchewan. The Throne Speech pointed out, Mr. Speaker, two main challenges that face our people in Saskatchewan. Those two main challenges as laid out in the Throne Speech have to be, (1) transportation and agriculture and (2) resource development with the main emphasis on who owns and controls that resource development.

Mr. Speaker, I would think that the present trend of agriculture in Saskatchewan, if one is to sum it up in terms of the grain industry is nothing short of fantastic. I will deal with what is happening in that history and what clouds are hovering over that industry in the future, but, Mr. Speaker, I want to take a little bit of time to talk about the Hog Commission. Lately, of course, it has been receiving a great deal of publicity from the Liberal Opposition.

Mr. Speaker, I would think that the Hog Marketing Commission has done a great deal for hog producers. I can speak with authority on that because I am a hog producer. Mr. Speaker, our Government established the first orderly marketing of hogs in Saskatchewan, we have set up a stabilization plan which has literally salvaged the total industry. Mr. Speaker, I got very upset when I heard the violent attack about two years ago when we were setting up the process, the great filibuster, the debate that was on in regard to the Hog Marketing Commission. The Liberals attacked violently the Commission and what it could stand for. So with true Liberal logic, the Liberals contradicted themselves and were hypocritical, Mr. Speaker. I should like to bring out one example and it refers to the Member for Morse (Mr. Wiebe), who is also a fellow hog producer, has a hog barn and produces a great number of animals out of that hog barn. There is nothing wrong with that, that's great, Mr. Speaker. However, I can remember very clearly when the Hog Marketing Commission debate was on, when the debate on the stabilization program was on, I can remember very clearly that Member opposite fighting, dropping innuendo after innuendo, doing everything in his power to destroy the very essentials and basic need for that Commission. In his speech on Friday, again he made a violent attack on the Commission, subsidies, grants, whatever it may be in terms of the agricultural industry. Well that's all right, Mr. Speaker, to do that in opposition, but while Mr. Wiebe was taking a violent attack on the Commission and stabilization programs, on the other hand being a hog producer he was taking stabilization money, taxpayers' money, but arguing against the benefits of the Hog Marketing Commission. Well, Mr. Speaker, there is nothing wrong with Jack taking money out of the stabilization plan, what is wrong is attacking the Commission and being hypocritical. I am sure the people in Morse are going to judge that stand. On one hand he is running all over the constituency of Morse, running down the Hog Marketing Commission, running it down throughout the province,

with innuendo after innuendo, yet Jack was on one hand, “gimme, gimme, gimme,” all the money in terms of the stabilization plan and on the other hand he is cutting it all to ribbons. Mr. Speaker, that is the kind of Liberal hypocrisy and Liberal logic that exists in Members opposite. That is the kind of things the people of Morse will be wanting to consider at the next provincial election, this kind of innuendo, this kind of Liberal hypocrisy and logic.

Mr. Speaker, I should like now to turn to the grain industry and I said I was going to talk about the future of agriculture and what is going to happen in terms of that grain industry. I would predict with probably great safety, that there are some grey and black clouds cluttering the horizon of the grain industry. One would have to examine the world situation before he could fairly draw any conclusions on what is going to happen back at home.

Mr. Speaker, at the World Food Conference in Rome it was pointed out, I think very clearly by delegates there, that the present population of the world is at around 3.5 billion people. That population, very shortly, by the year 2,000 is going to double to 7 billion people. There is going to be an unprecedented demand for food. The other interesting fact that the Conference brought out I thought, Mr. Speaker, was that the present world stock in terms of food supplies, in 1971 was 67 days, that is 67 days of world food stocks that any country or underdeveloped nation could call on if they got into a national emergency. In 1974, Mr. Speaker, that figure has dropped to 21 days. In 1971, 67 days and now in 1974, 21 days.

Mr. Speaker, there are problems facing the world in terms of feeding its people. There are presently, I understand, 1.1 billion people starving. The conclusion, I think, that you could draw from those figures is that there is going to be an unprecedented demand for our grain in the future.

Mr. Speaker, coming back to home. I think the present situation, if one was to sum up with what is happening in the grain industry, is that you have a great number of older farmers, wanting and wishing to retire. They are now at a transitional age of 56 which I believe is the average age of our farmers and he is now getting into a situation where he pretty well has to retire. He's also got the added condition of being affluent. At the present time there is a great deal of money rolling around, so the transition is made with great ease. It couldn't be a better time, Mr. Speaker, because the Land Bank is also helping to ease that transition to take place faster. Apparently 1,000 leases to date have been transferred through the Land Bank program.

However, Mr. Speaker, with this great optimism, with this great affluence there are still clouds in the future of agriculture. Mr. Speaker, one of those clouds that are in the future and I have referred to it many times in the past is the Task Force Report on Agriculture. That very report, Mr. Speaker, says that two-thirds of the family farmers must leave the farming picture by 1980. Other programs are rail line abandonment, programs like inland terminals, Crow's Nest rates are to be abolished.

Mr. Speaker, I am going to take a little bit of time to outline the present frustration and problems young farmers now find themselves in. I think the kind of programs that are

December 9, 1974

coming ahead in the future are definitely going to have some bearing on young people. They are definitely going to have to make them do some very serious thinking whether they are young farmers or not. However, I would think that looking back on the politics of agriculture that it runs in cycles. We had farmers fighting 50 or more years ago to establish things like wheat boards, to establish things like pools, to establish things like co-operatives. I see right now, Mr. Speaker, when you look ahead and my speech will bear it out as I go on, that those very institutions that were fought so hard for, that strife took place over, are going to be destroyed.

Mr. Speaker, every Member on this side of the House, can very well remember, older Members in particular, those days of strife. I can't, I wasn't brought up in those days, along with a lot of other younger farmers. However, they can remember and, Mr. Speaker, we are going to be relying on their help to guide young farmers through the next trying period, the next five years that lie ahead for young farmers.

Now, Mr. Speaker, when I talk about the Task Force Report I thought it might be a good idea to bring to the House and reread a few little interesting paragraphs in the Task Force Report on Agriculture. The Member for Lumsden (Mr. Lane) the other day was commenting let's bring back the Task Force and that's what I decided to do. I have brought back the Task Force, Mr. Speaker, and I should like to read a few quotations out of that Task Force Report on Agriculture. It makes for very interesting reading, especially four years after it was written. The Liberal blueprint designed for agriculture in the future. Mr. Speaker, they had on page 8, they call the blueprint, Canadian Agriculture 1980 Circa Model. They talk about, and I'll only run through it briefly, won't go through the tremendous verbal diarrhoea they had in the Report. I quote:

Decreasing number of farms and farmers and farm labour force should be the stated objective. Fewer family farms, two thirds of the farming population must leave. Increasing farm size. Tougher domestic and international competition. Less independence for individuals. Increasing planning and contractual arrangements resulting in backward, forward and horizontal integration.

Mr. Speaker, that list goes on and on and on.

Mr. Speaker, they make a very clear quote in the Task Force Report on the next page. They talk about what they accept and what they would reject in terms of an agricultural model. I would like to quote again, Mr. Speaker.

In sketching out this kind of model for agriculture circa 1980 we are, of course, rejecting the public utility or socialized concept of agriculture. Members of the Task Force sincerely hope that the option is avoided.

What are they saying in that paragraph, Mr. Speaker? Are they saying that we reject any form of co-operatives and wheat pools in the agricultural industry? What are they exactly saying? Well, I think, Mr. Speaker, that's exactly what they are saying. They are saying that we reject the socialized concept of agriculture, we reject pools and we reject co-operatives.

Mr. Speaker, the next page has what I think a real dilly of a statement. They have some key recommendations, if these kind of things on the page before are going to be implemented, what are you going to do when you remove two-thirds of the farming population by 1980. And I think from the key recommendation number four is an ideal quotation to read back to Members opposite, to read back to them so that they can get an understanding what their Federal Government friends are trying to do to our younger farmers.

Key recommendation 4.

Younger non-viable farmers should be moved out of farming through temporary programs of welfare, education and provisions of jobs in other sectors of the economy.

Here is what they are going to do for older farmers:

Older farmers should be given assistance to ensure that they have at least a liveable standard of living.

Well, Mr. Speaker, that's the blueprint on agriculture, that's what Liberals are planning and what Liberals are designing for the future for that particular industry.

Mr. Speaker, they go on in that report and I could go on all day in this report and tell you all the great revelations that were made by that committee. On page 130 they have 16 key recommendations, 16 key recommendations to weaken and destroy the Canadian Wheat Board. The man they put in charge to get rid of that Wheat Board is no other than the Hon. Otto F. Lang from Saskatchewan. Well, Mr. Speaker, that's the Task Force on Agriculture, and a few quotes from what they are planning to do.

Well, you say that is all very well and good, removing two-thirds of the farming population, that being the main motive for the Federal Government but how and exactly are they going to do this? I would agree that if you are going to remove that size of a population off the landscape of Saskatchewan you've got a few little interesting problems ahead of you in how you are going to do it.

Mr. Speaker, I think it is very simple how they are going to do it. These programs are now unfolding every day, we see more and more programs coming out of Ottawa, more and more arrogance, now showing us how they are going to do this. Mr. Speaker, the first way to get rid of two-thirds of the farming population is to cut off their only source and way of supplying their market. The transportation system is the only way to get their product from farm gate to market gate and, of course, that is by abandoning rail lines. Rail lines carry virtually every ounce of product farmers raise in Saskatchewan and all over Canada, rural farmers and this is how you do it, you cut off their water supply.

Mr. Speaker, I have taken the liberty of bringing a map into the Chamber. I wish there were television cameras around to focus on what is going to happen. However, Mr. Speaker, we can assure Members opposite, there are 45 Members on this side of the House, that we will vigorously campaign to ensure that 43 Members will be available to get out the picture.

Mr. Speaker, what I have here is a map and that map

December 9, 1974

outlines the rail line abandonment programs for Saskatchewan. Now you may ask where did I get this fancy little map from. Well, Mr. Speaker, where I got those fancy little figures from was from the Canadian Transport Commission which designates points that are going to be abandoned and I would ask the Members opposite either to ask me to table the document or else secure documents for themselves. The document states in page after page, mile after mile, of rail line abandonment that is going to occur in the Province of Saskatchewan. When is this going to occur, Mr. Speaker? They say January 1, 1975. That is only a matter of days and hours away. With the arrogance being displayed every day by the Federal Liberal Government you can be assured that this might indeed take place. Why not enact a blue print on agriculture which is going to destroy all the farming population of rural Saskatchewan?

Mr. Speaker, there are something like 5,975.2 miles of Saskatchewan tracks that are going to be abandoned, supposedly on January 1, 1975, if Liberals opposite and Liberals in Ottawa have their way. 5,975.2 miles of which 953.9 miles is what they consider section 256 track. What is section 256 track for anybody that is wondering? Well, that is the part of the Railway Act or The Transportation Act that says these rail lines that the railways have applied for abandonment under section 256 and are already under file in the Canadian Transport Commission. Section 258 of The Transportation Act are lines that are frozen under federal legislation. They are also subject to being unfrozen on January 1, 1975. So if any Member is interested in reading more about the Railway Act I have quite comprehensive excerpts explaining the Railway Act. It talks about Section 254, 256 and 258. It also talks about how and when you abandon rail lines.

MR. A.R. GUY: — Table it.

MR. GROSS: — With pleasure. Mr. Speaker, you have here in the blue cross lines which are section 256 on the map and the striped blue ones are section 258 lines. These are all the lines that are going to be abandoned in rural Saskatchewan. The Member for Morse might be interested in knowing that there are a couple in his constituency that will also go.

Mr. Speaker, it takes no expert economist to figure out what is going to happen when you abandon rail lines in rural Saskatchewan to the magnitude they are talking about here. When I look around in my own area, virtually every branch line that exists will be abandoned, virtually every branch line except the main line, that runs from Moose Jaw through Swift Current out to Alberta will be the only existing line in this particular area. Mr. Speaker, that is indeed unfortunate, it is not very promising for our young farmers to look forward to have that kind of a future, where they may indeed be hauling grain hundreds of miles to get their product to market.

On the other side, Mr. Speaker, of this map I've got the inland terminal proposal which is part of this document here. It's a nice thick one, it talks about grain-handling transportation costs in Canada, prepared for the grains group, also for the Minister, the Hon. Otto F. Lang, August, 1971. In that document they go through some fairly comprehensive proposals and they come up with one proposal that talks about 12 inland terminals for Saskatchewan, 12 inland terminals. If I can flip

this overlay over, you will see the big picture, Mr. Speaker, you see 12 inland terminals as taken out of this document that was tabled for Otto Lang, you see 12 inland terminals with quite a penetration in Saskatchewan. We have drawn 50 mile radius lines, similar to the one that Weyburn is going to have. We have shown the map just for interest's sake, to see the kind of penetration that the inland terminals will have in Saskatchewan. I wouldn't think what we put down here as radius miles to be the law of the land in terms of inland terminals but they can quite easily put blocks in and switch these things around so that they would cover the entire Province of Saskatchewan forcing grain farmers to haul a radius of 50 miles, maybe a hundred driving miles and so on. Pretty devastating, Mr. Speaker, pretty devastating for the demise of rural Saskatchewan.

Mr. Speaker, I want to talk a little bit about the inland terminal at Weyburn. I want to talk a little bit because in the Star-Phoenix, November 26th, they quote the announcement of the inland terminal. They talk about \$4.7 million inland terminal, 90 per cent financed by the Department of Regional Economic Expansion, they talk about the construction to start in spring, they talk about it to be ready for the 1975 crop year, they talk about it handling a rate of 45,000 bushels every hour and loading something like 100 hopper cars in an eight-hour shift and they also talk about having a 20 million bushel through-put capacity.

Mr. Speaker, Members opposite probably can't see this Weyburn terminal on the map but the interesting conclusions one has to draw after he looks at this little proposal of having an inland terminal, drawing from a 50-mile radius, is that how is it going to support that particular farming area. Well, Mr. Speaker, some figures of the receipts of grain elevators in that area tell us that there are something like 35.1 million bushels being produced in that radius area. 35.1 million bushels when the inland terminal has a through-put capacity of 20 million bushels. Mr. Speaker, that is going to have some pretty great effects on the present country elevator system in that area. They talk about the present elevator system in that area, having a capacity to store 14.9 million bushels when the inland terminal is only capable of storing one million bushels. So that means that farmers will be asked to store more and more grain. Mr. Speaker, that is not very promising I think for the people in Weyburn area who are thinking about hauling their grain to a market, to an elevator, when they are going to be forced to haul in a 50-mile radius which may be 100 driving miles. The terminal, if you read through this report, the orange one, tells you about the tremendous efficiency these inland terminals are going to have. They talk about operating 24-hour shifts, they talk about having farmers deliver on time, on appointment basis, Mr. Speaker, that will have some pretty serious ramifications for our small farmers. There are a great many questions to be answered about inland terminals and that whole concept. But how do you expect a country elevator system out here in the Weyburn area to exist when an inland terminal is gobbling up almost every bushel that can be produced? How do you expect small communities like Milestone, Yellow Grass, McTaggart and so on, the whole list of them to exist when, Mr. Speaker, the elevators are going to have to be removed or some other system is going to have to be looked to when farmers are going to be forced to haul their grain to Weyburn? How do you answer the conveniences of hauling in the winter time when there is a snow storm on, when you expect farmers to dig into a

December 9, 1974

bin at three o'clock in the morning to haul grain?

Mr. Speaker, it is almost unreal even to think of, it's almost unreal to have to think about the future for young farmers. It is unfortunate, Mr. Speaker, because the time, as I said before, has never been so right for young farmers to get into agriculture. We've got great affluence in terms of the price per bushel of wheat. Things are going right for the first time in the grain industry and now we have this kind of a harebrained proposal on the horizon, designed to kill wheat pools and the country elevator system; designed to kill the Canadian Wheat Board through the demise of other programs that I alluded to in the Task Force Report on Agriculture. All the very cornerstones that made agriculture a success story in Saskatchewan are now going to be eroded.

Mr. Speaker, it is unfortunate that we don't have more time to talk about inland terminals or rail line abandonment but, Mr. Speaker, I can assure Members opposite that come the election we will more than just be talking about inland terminals, we will have some very definite proposals to counteract such ridiculous and such harebrained ideas of Otto Lang and federal Liberals in the East.

Mr., Speaker, as I said time is coming to an end and I should like to wrap up my remarks by saying that young farmers will reject completely and totally the concept announced by Members opposite and federal Members sitting in Ottawa; that we will work as hard as we can to destroy that kind of concept coming into being and, Mr. Speaker, I will be supporting the main motion and it has again been a great deal of pleasure taking part, for the third time, in the Throne Speech Debate.

SOME HON. MEMBERS: — Hear, hear!

MR. E. C. MALONE (Regina Lakeview): — Mr. Speaker, I think this is the first time since I have been in this House that I have heard a Member devote the time allotted to him on the Debate from the Throne Speech to launch a personal attack against the present Member who will be his opponent in the next election.

I think it shows, Mr. Speaker, just how desperate the Member is, who just took his seat, because he realizes that he simply does not have a chance against the present and future Member for Morse and I think that if that Member had taken the time last weekend to drop by the Regina Inn and see the greatest gathering and collection of Liberals ever in this province any hope that he would have had would of been completely dissolved.

SOME HON. MEMBERS: — Hear, hear!

MR. MALONE: — Mr. Speaker, I should first of all like to offer my congratulations to the Member for Nipawin (Mr. Comer) and the Member for Saskatoon — Hanley (Mr. Mostoway) for the honour given to them by the Premier as the mover and seconder of the Throne Speech Debate.

The task given to these Members was formidable, indeed, in that the Throne Speech was so barren of content, so lacking in ideas and initiatives and imagination, that one would be hard-pressed to find anything worthwhile at all to say about its

contents.

SOME HON. MEMBERS: — Hear, hear!

MR. MALONE: — Accordingly it was understandable that the Member for Nipawin did not refer to the Throne Speech at all during his remarks, and I don't blame him, for the less said about it the better, but took the opportunity to indulge himself by giving the usual tired recitation of socialistic propaganda and dogma that Members on this side of the House have been forced to listen to for the last few years.

SOME HON. MEMBERS: — Hear, hear!

MR. MALONE: — The Member for Saskatoon-Hanley did not speak about the Throne Speech either. But it was interesting to note that he mentioned many things that he hoped would have been contained in that speech that were significantly absent. He, in effect, gave his own Throne Speech and I must say there was far more content in it than in the one offered by the Government to this Assembly and to the people of Saskatchewan. Perhaps if the Cabinet listened to its own backbenchers more instead of relying on its overpaid and imported socialist planners for advice the people of Saskatchewan would be far better off.

SOME HON. MEMBERS: — Hear, hear!

MR. MALONE: — I had hoped, Mr. Speaker, that at the very least the Speech would have contained some provision for supplementary allowances to aid senior citizens. This Government is surely aware of the plight facing the elderly people of this province who because of inflation, are having a desperate time eking out a basic existence. This comes through no fault of theirs, inflation is not their fault, inflation is our fault, because no matter how thrifty and frugal our senior citizens were during their income-earning years in putting something away to fall back on during their days of retirement, they have been robbed by inflation of their savings and they simply cannot live in comfort as they are entitled to on what they receive under current government pension plans.

All of us who are gainfully employed can take some steps to protect ourselves from inflation through demanding higher wages or setting higher professional fees or whatever, but the elderly person cannot because he simply does not have the means at his disposal to do so, and I say that this province and this Government, with its record revenues from resources and taxation, has a moral obligation to assist those who came before us and built this province to what it is today.

SOME HON. MEMBERS: — Hear, hear!

MR. MALONE: — I do not accept the statement of the Minister of Finance (Mr. Robbins) that the Government simply cannot afford to make any payment to senior citizens at this time. This Government can afford it, but its priorities are not the welfare of the people, its priorities are not to help those who cannot help themselves, its priorities are control and power. Its priorities are to take over businesses and industry wherever

December 9, 1974

it can, not to help people, because its philosophy demands that it take unto itself power and control wherever possible before looking after the interests and welfare of the people it governs.

This lust for power and control is not confined only to government takeovers from the private sector but is found among the Members of the Cabinet itself. I noted with interest the comments of Mr. Wartman that a struggle for power was taking place in the Cabinet between the Minister of Social Services (Mr. Taylor) and the Minister of Health (Mr. Smishek) as to what department would look after the needs of senior citizens. While the Cabinet was devoting its time and attention to this internal dispute, nothing was being done to help the senior citizens, but this should come as no surprise to anyone in this province because first and foremost in this NDP Government's philosophy is the question as to who is to be in charge rather than what needs to be done.

SOME HON. MEMBERS: — Hear, hear!

MR. MALONE: — In any event, it would appear that the Minister of Social Services has been victorious in this petty internal squabble with the Minister of Health and I congratulate him for his dubious victory. However, we must now look at him and see what solution he has come forth with to solve the problems facing our elderly people. What was the solution that he came up with in this regard? Was it to give any financial assistance whatsoever to our senior citizens? Was it to put added revenue in their pockets so they can protect themselves from the inflationary times? Was it to give them one thin dime? No, the only thing that this Government is prepared to do for senior citizens is to establish another government agency. Another agency that will cost the taxpayers of this province thousands of dollars, another agency that will create even more bureaucrats in a government that is already top heavy with imported socialist planners; another agency that will attempt to control the lives of those who come under its jurisdiction, but will not in any way give them the assistance that is so desperately needed.

I cannot help but think, Mr. Speaker, that the old CCF governments of Tommy Douglas and Woodrow Lloyd would have been responsive to the wishes of the people in this regard and would not have shown the complete insensitivity to the problem that has been displayed by the Minister of Social Services and his colleagues in the NDP Government.

I am sure that their answer to the problems of senior citizens is completely unacceptable to them and, in fact, does not even meet the request that was made by the Senior Citizens Commission to have a separate government department to look after the needs of elderly people.

I can only hope that the injustice being done to senior citizens will be rectified when the Budget is brought down sometime next year and that there is some concrete proposal in it to give senior citizens what they need most, money, and not simply more government planners and bureaucrats.

SOME HON. MEMBERS: — Hear, hear!

MR. MALONE: — If the Government sees fit to do this, and I hope they will, I am sure that the people of Saskatchewan will realize that the problem facing the pioneers of this province has been in existence for some time and could have been resolved and dealt with many, many months ago. The people of this province will realize that if the Government finally does give much-needed assistance to senior citizens that they will only be doing so on the eve of an election and whatever assistance that they do give can be regarded simply as an election bribe of the most blatant nature.

Mr. Speaker, I should now like to make a few remarks in connection with the Premier's recent statement in this House about resource taxation and the dispute with the Government of Canada over the alleged change of position by that government on future equalization payments.

Mr. Speaker, the Premier took great exception to the change in the policy of the Government of Canada of the disallowance of royalties as a deduction from taxable income by oil and gas corporations. He said that this is a direct infringement on the right of Saskatchewan to tax mineral resources. He inferred that the result of this change is that Ottawa has treated Saskatchewan differently than it has other provinces.

Let me say, Mr. Speaker, that the Premier has failed to point out to the people of Saskatchewan that no other province in Canada taxes its industries, whether they be resource or otherwise, in the same manner as Saskatchewan. That is, no other province says to the businesses carrying on under its jurisdiction - we will allow you to make only so much money and we will take everything that is earned over and above that amount, leaving nothing for the future development of those businesses and leaving nothing that can be taxed by the federal taxing authority in Ottawa. The result of Saskatchewan's policy in oil and potash is, in effect, to rob the Government of Canada, as it has robbed the companies and as it has robbed the people of Saskatchewan . . .

SOME HON. MEMBERS: — Hear, hear!

MR. MALONE: — . . . by denying the future development of resource industries. Under the guise of royalties the province has taken unto itself all profits accruing to oil and potash companies except for a very small portion left to them which this Government has decided is to be their fair share. A portion that is so small that it does not leave to Canada, that is the federal taxing authority, anything left over to tax after all expenses and business costs have been paid. If other provinces for instance, Ontario, enacted legislation similar to ours whereby they said to manufacturing companies - we will allow you to retain X number of dollars and all of the rest will be paid to the Provincial Government as a licence fee to carry on business in that province, surely the Government of Saskatchewan would be the first to object that Ontario is not being fair and that all of Canada should share in the profits of these companies through taxation, taxation that must be levied by Canada as the federal authority.

How can we, in Saskatchewan, justify taking such a big chunk of the pie that nothing is left over for the federal authority, that is Canada, to tax on behalf of all of the

December 9, 1974

people of Canada. For if all provinces acted in this manner, that is they all took the entire profits from a business that is carrying on business in that province, then there would be no tax base remaining for income to be raised for the benefit of all the other provinces and the people who reside in those provinces.

This, of course, is not to say that Saskatchewan is not entitled as of right to a fair and just share of the return from the resource industries, but surely a fair share is not everything. The Premier and others opposite will, of course, say that the other provinces are receiving their fair share through the taxation of oil that is exported from the country. But I would point out that none of the proceeds from these monies are used in general revenues and that they are entirely used to subsidize the cost of oil and gas in other parts of Canada. That is, the Government of Canada, does not receive any money from the export tax that can be used as other tax sources are used for the benefit of the country as a whole. The result of this is that no other province of Canada receives any benefit from the price being paid for Saskatchewan oil, except for the subsidy through the export tax. Surely the Government of Canada, on behalf of all of the people of Canada, is entitled as of right to something, the only question that remains is how much. I personally would like to see the Federal Government allow royalty deductions to the extent of perhaps 15 per cent of the amount paid, however, this is a matter for negotiation and perhaps there are other and better solutions. The Federal Budget has made some concessions in this regard, albeit small ones, and I now suggest it is the turn of the province to make the next move, for if it does not the result will be that there will be no longer an oil and gas industry in Saskatchewan, or for that matter any expansion of the potash industry and the only real loser will be the people of Saskatchewan and this will be a classic case of the Government cutting off its nose to spite its face.

SOME HON. MEMBERS: — Hear, hear!

MR. MALONE: — Mr. Speaker, many Government spokesmen over the last few weeks have left the impression that Saskatchewan has been double-crossed or misled by the Government of Canada because of its change in the equalization payments that were announced in the recent Budget Address by Mr. Turner. The spokesmen have left the impression that Ottawa did not live up to the spirit of the agreement that was reached last March. Only last week was this situation clarified and rectified when the Premier acknowledged in this Assembly that the Interpretation given by the Prime Minister and the Government of Canada to the agreement of last March may have been the proper one. He conceded . . .

SOME HON. MEMBERS: — Hear, hear!

MR. MALONE: — . . . that the Prime Minister may just have been right and by implication, therefore, that he himself may just have been wrong. I give the Premier full credit for making this concession because I believe by so doing he may have avoided a potentially serious and dangerous situation. But I ask now, why did it take so long, why did he allow his Ministers to make the statements attributed to them, why did we have this series of accusations and recriminations that have only served to create an atmosphere of conflict and tension between the Government of

Canada and the Government of Saskatchewan? I say, Mr. Speaker, that the actions of the Government in this regard, that their statements that they have been misled and that Ottawa has not lived up to the spirit of the March agreement should be condemned by this Assembly. I cannot help thinking, Mr. Speaker, that the fact that the correspondence in connection with the March agreement that was tabled in Ottawa several days before the Premier made his statement in this House, was the real reason that the Premier made the concession that he did. For when the Prime Minister tabled this correspondence all the facts were then available for public scrutiny, they were there for all of us to see and it was obvious that Ottawa did not double-cross anybody . . .

SOME HON. MEMBERS: — Hear, hear!

MR. MALONE: — . . . and if anything it was Saskatchewan which did not live up to the spirit of the agreement of last March.

This Government has decided that it does not want to talk about such provincial issues as the Land Bank, The Foreign Ownership of Land Act, the takeover of the oil and gas and potash industries and other provincial issues and they found it to their advantage to avoid talking about these fundamental election issues by taking a cheap shot at Ottawa which they felt would be to their political advantage. They have been proven wrong once again and the people of Saskatchewan will judge them accordingly when the election is called in the next few months.

Mr. Speaker, I should also like to take exception to the comments and inferences made by Members opposite that the Government of Canada is endangering Confederation because of its actions. I think we need only to look back and review a little recent history in this regard to see who really is putting the strains on the bonds of Confederation. It was not the Prime Minister of Canada who a year ago, went on a lecture tour of eastern Canada saying how tough he was going to be, it was the Premier of Saskatchewan who did that. It was not the Government of Canada who said that they wanted to take control of and receive all of the profits from the resource industries, it was the Government of Saskatchewan who did that. It was not the Government of Canada who accused this Government of bad faith, it was the other way around. I suggest, Mr. Speaker, that the treasury benches that sit in the House of Commons in Ottawa are not the ones that are causing the strains of Confederation but it is the Treasury benches that sit to your right.

Mr. Speaker, I should like to go on for some time on this particular subject however I see that my time is just about up so I must say, Mr. Speaker, that obviously I will be voting for the amendment and voting against the original motion.

SOME HON. MEMBERS: — Hear, hear!

MR. E.L. TCHORZEWSKI (Minister of Culture and Youth): — Mr. Speaker, first of all may I begin by congratulating the sever and the seconder, the Members from Nipawin and Hanley and commend them for the excellent job which they did in making their presentation and the work they obviously did in preparing their speeches which they presented to this House. I am certainly convinced and I know that all Members of this House

December 9, 1974

are as well, the Members in the opposite side of the House obviously may differ in that point of view, but I don't think there is any doubt that the Member for Hanley (Mr. Mostoway) and the Member for Nipawin (Mr. Comer) will have many more years to serve their constituents in this Assembly.

SOME HON. MEMBERS: — Hear, hear!

MR. TCHORZEWSKI: — Now the Member for Lakeview (Mr. Malone) made comments in a number of areas which I wish I had the time to comment on, but that would take a good deal of time, Mr. Speaker, and I can only make reference to a couple of them.

First of all, the Member for Lakeview referred to this Government's attitude towards senior citizens. Well, I am not going to comment on that right now, but I certainly intend to make some comment on that later on in my speech, at which time I want to elaborate. As the Member for Prince Albert West (Mr. Steuart) said earlier in the Session this afternoon, "they soon forget." Obviously the Members opposite soon forgot their record with regard to senior citizens and people in need in Saskatchewan when they were in the government.

The Member for Lakeview asked the question: Who is to be in charge, rather than, what is to be done? This was when he described the attitude of the Government of the day. Well I say to him, Mr. Speaker, that it is the people of Saskatchewan who are in charge and that the record of this Government speaks for itself as to the actions we have taken to ease the needs of those people of this province.

SOME HON. MEMBERS: — Hear, hear!

MR. TCHORZEWSKI: — Mr. Speaker, since the 1971 election I have had the privilege of taking part in the Throne Speech Debate several times. Each time I can say that more of the commitments made by the New Democratic Party in the election were being implemented. I am particularly proud to take part in the debate of this Session because essentially all of those commitments have been carried out.

SOME HON. MEMBERS: — Hear, hear!

MR. TCHORZEWSKI: — I should like to express my sincere appreciation to my constituents for their constant co-operation, their assistance and their advice without which no Member of this Legislature could do an adequate job. I have enjoyed working with the constituents of Humboldt, as it was when I was first elected, and as it is now, under the new boundaries as established by the Independent Electoral Commission and implemented by our Government in order that the political gerrymandering of constituencies as in years past would be put to an end once and for all.

When we took office, Mr. Speaker, the needs were great and our Government took up the challenge in every area of need that had been neglected for seven years by the Liberals. In the area of agriculture, in the area of health and social services, education, recreation, industrial and resource development, human rights and ensured that our process of government works in such a way that all of our people benefit from it and have role to play in it. Mr. Speaker, during the first regular

session of 1971, I had the honour of seconding the Address-in-Reply to the Speech from the Throne and at that time the memory of the shocking attempts by the former government to interfere with our democratic process of government were vivid in my mind. The people of Saskatchewan still remember and are wary for they recall that the present Leader of the Opposition was the architect of that political gerrymander of constituency boundaries.

SOME HON. MEMBERS: — Hear, hear!

MR. TCHORZEWSKI: — They know that neither the leadership nor the direction of the Liberal Party has changed since 1971. Now we see advertisements in the papers and the commercials on television that try to mould a new image for the Leader of the Opposition, costing thousands of dollars, but I submit that this is a waste for the memory of the recent past lingers on. Typically in Liberal tradition and Liberal fashion that expensive, slick eastern Canadian advertising agency approach has nothing of substance, proposes nothing new in policy and strengthens what we all know - that the Liberal Party has nothing to offer. It has no policies, no programs, no ideas, a leadership that needs to be made up like a Hollywood movie star, who depends on props, make-up and stunt men, and a leadership that acts only as a front and a mouthpiece for the Liberal Government in Ottawa.

SOME HON. MEMBERS: — Hear, hear!

MR. TCHORZEWSKI: — The Throne Speech of this Session, once again, indicates that our Government will introduce legislation in the area of electoral reforms by ensuring that people who are handicapped are eligible to vote. Over the past three years this NDP Government has made major efforts to reform our electoral system and provide more opportunity for people to exercise their rights in a democracy. The independent Electoral Boundaries Commission and legislation to amend The Elections Act to limit election expenditure were moves in that direction. And now the Liberal Opposition say that they will talk about the freedoms of democracy. I want to hear them talk about those freedoms, Mr. Speaker. I want to hear them talk about the freedoms that they tried to take away when they were in power and those freedoms that the New Democratic Party in government today has restored and improved after 1971.

SOME HON. MEMBERS: — Hear, hear!

MR. TCHORZEWSKI: — They, the Liberals, should know about freedom for they knew only too well how to take it away by their gerrymander of constituencies and I say that they would do it again. I believe, Mr. Speaker, that they would do it again because I don't agree any more that the Liberal Party has no philosophy. I used to think that. I now know that they have one. They have a philosophy of power and that is that they would like to achieve it at any cost and hold on to it at any cost.

SOME HON. MEMBERS: — Hear, hear!

MR. TCHORZEWSKI: — I firmly believe in the democratic system and I am proud to have been part of a government that has improved and insured that system in this province.

December 9, 1974

Mr. Speaker, one of the major commitments of this Government was to rural Saskatchewan. We said we would create the conditions which would promote the maximum number of viable family farms in this province. We said that we would strengthen and improve family farming as the most desirable method of food production and we said we would implement a comprehensive program to revitalize rural Saskatchewan communities. These promises were made and these promises have been implemented.

SOME HON. MEMBERS: — Hear, hear!

MR. TCHORZEWSKI: — Communities in my constituency, Mr. Speaker, and throughout Saskatchewan, have benefited from programs implemented in the last three years. Operations Open Roads and Mainstreet, will have provided every community in Humboldt constituency with an oiled surface road by next year.

SOME HON. MEMBERS: — Hear, hear!

MR. TCHORZEWSKI: — In places like LeRoy and Muenster, St. Brieux, Peterson and Viscount.

The Housing Corporation is providing much needed housing in Humboldt, Colonsay and Lake Lenore and approvals have been given for construction at Bruno. Others are being processed. Approval has been given for an expansion to St. Mary's Villa in Humboldt and now only approval by the federal agency CMHC is holding up construction. The Community College program has brought formerly impossible opportunities to all of these communities, in keeping with our commitment to rural Saskatchewan and family farms other measures have been taken. Legislation has been passed restricting foreign ownership of farm land and restricting corporate ownership. The FarmStart program has been overwhelmingly successful in assisting family farms to diversify in livestock production.

The Throne Speech indicated that some 1,800 loans have been approved through FarmStart. It is interesting to note that the average age of farmers receiving those loans is 27. We said we would provide programs, loans and grants and other assistance and encourage young people to engage in farming and this commitment has been successfully implemented and all of Saskatchewan is the beneficiary.

SOME HON. MEMBERS: — Hear, hear!

MR. TCHORZEWSKI: — Mr. Speaker, the Liberals opposite will argue that they also encouraged diversification. But the problem was that they went no further and when the price of hogs fell out of the bottom and hog producers were hard pressed to continue, their Government did nothing. But our Government, on the other hand, guaranteed an adequate return to hog producers with the supplementary hog price stabilization program.

My constituency is well known as a major hog producing area of Saskatchewan and this program has been greatly appreciated by those producers.

The New Democratic Party promised to decentralize provincial government functions and to encourage development in

smaller centres. We believe in rural Saskatchewan and rural communities. This Government has implemented policies to support them. The Agricultural Machinery Institute at Humboldt is now under construction. The former Liberal Government, to please their corporate friends, did away with a similar service in 1965. Our Government restored it and will now make it possible for farmers paying large amounts of money for equipment to get necessary information about its suitability for prairie conditions. It is disappointing that a Liberal Member opposite, this spring, argued that the institution should be located in the city and that it should not be located in Humboldt. It is also disappointing that the Federal Government has not been prepared to make any contribution at all even though the Barber Federal Commission recommended the establishment of a testing station.

Another indication of our policy of decentralization is the decision - and I know that the Members will be very happy to hear this - the decision to locate the head office of the Saskatchewan Water Supply Board to Humboldt.

SOME HON. MEMBERS: — Hear, hear!

MR. TCHORZEWSKI: — Pardon me, to Watrous. When we talk about decentralization we talk about the decentralizations to various communities in Saskatchewan and so the Water Supply Board will be relocated to the town of Watrous.

SOME HON. MEMBERS: — Hear, hear!

MR. TCHORZEWSKI: — The people will be moving into that community, which is located in the heart of the area served by the Water Supply Board and this move, like many others, will give towns like Watrous, confidence to plan for new development, knowing that their Government supports them in their efforts. Watrous is a thriving community, situated in one of the excellent farming areas of this province. It is near the popular resort of Manitou Beach, whose lake has waters which are unique and believed by many people to have medicinal value. With this Government's commitment to decentralization, communities like Manitou Beach and Watrous will continue to prosper, to develop and help make a major contribution to the Saskatchewan option.

But what did the former Liberal Government do, Mr. Speaker? Well, they eliminated the STC bus service to communities like Watrous and Young and as of the first of this month, under this Government, there is again a bus service to those communities.

SOME HON. MEMBERS: — Hear, hear!

MR. TCHORZEWSKI: — Because of policies of the Federal Government rural Saskatchewan and rural communities are becoming very concerned, Mr. Speaker. The recent undermining of the Canadian Wheat Board and a new feed grains policy is a clear indication that the Federal Government intends to do away with the protection that Saskatchewan farmers have had under the orderly marketing system. And it is shocking to hear Saskatchewan Liberals opposite, whom one would expect to speak for Saskatchewan, support this dismantling of the orderly marketing system.

December 9, 1974

This Government supports the Canadian Wheat Board and we will continue to provide that support on behalf of Saskatchewan farmers and Saskatchewan farm organizations.

SOME HON. MEMBERS: — Hear, hear!

MR. TCHORZEWSKI: — Some of my colleagues have spoken about the Federal Task Force on Agriculture in this debate. That Task Force recommended, in the name of economic efficiency, the promotion of ever larger corporatively managed farms and the depopulation of rural Saskatchewan, and all people in Saskatchewan must continue to unite in the common fight to fight the directions being taken by the Federal Government in implementing those recommendations.

The Feed Grains policy, the LIFT program, the construction of terminal elevators, letting the railways make a decision on railway abandonment, the threatened elimination of the Crow's Nest rated as proposed by Mr. Lang - each and every one are in keeping with the Task Force recommendations.

Cargill Grain Company is not moving into western Canada by accident. They know the Federal Government is doing everything it can to turn western agriculture over to the multinational agribusiness corporations and vicious attacks by the Leader of the Opposition on the Saskatchewan Wheat Pool the other day shows only too well that he and his colleagues are not about to support farmers' organizations. In fact, they lend their full support to the implementations of that Task Force which is a blueprint of the Federal Government in Ottawa.

Let me make it clear for the record, Mr. Speaker, that the New Democratic Party, and this Government, is four-square behind orderly marketing.

SOME HON. MEMBERS: — Hear, hear!

MR. TCHORZEWSKI: — It is four-square behind farm organizations and Saskatchewan farmers in opposing plans by the Federal Government which would lead to the take-over of Saskatchewan by agribusiness such as Cargill and the annihilation of many Saskatchewan rural communities, of which Saskatchewan people are proud and so they should be.

SOME HON. MEMBERS: — Hear, hear!

MR. TCHORZEWSKI: — Mr. Speaker, Saskatchewan today, offers new opportunities. Economic activity in all sectors is up, unemployment is practically non-existent, opportunities exist here for a life that does not include smog, crowded conditions and the difficulties found in many places throughout North America and our Premier has well described this Saskatchewan option. There is a new influx of new people and the return of many people who left prior to the present time. But we should keep in mind that those opportunities are here because of the foundations that were laid by the hard work of our senior citizens. They struggled against great odds and against great obstacles to make what we have here today possible. Now the least we can do for them is to provide the things that they need to participate in Government decisions, to live in their communities among their

friends and relatives and to provide them with adequate service and income.

The Throne Speech indicates that programs of particular benefit to senior citizens will be introduced and these will be in addition to provincial programs which have already been implemented to alleviate the effects of inflation and provide a better living.

Mr. Speaker, the other day the Leader of the Opposition tried to make a big thing of how he would, or what he would do, for the senior citizens of this province. It is very worthwhile examining the record of the former Liberal Government and comparing it to the record of this Government to show that the talk of the Leader of the Opposition is very hollow and meaningless. The other day a vote was taken in the House of Commons to reduce the pensionable age to 60. New Democrats supported the motion, but one party to the last man opposed it. Do I need to tell this House that to a man the Liberal Party opposed it? Mr. Trudeau and Mr. Lang opposed it, every one of them opposed it.

Let us examine a few more examples of that record, Mr. Speaker. The NDP Government has abolished deterrent fees which the Leader of the Opposition imposed upon the old and the sick. Our Government has done away with the hospital and medicare premiums and today no one in Saskatchewan needs to be afraid of not having access to medical care. Liberals reduced that freedom, we have restored it. The new hearing aid program is providing quality hearing aids at about one-third of the previous cost. Liberals opposed this program and their opposition was deafening. But today people hear their criticisms and know them to be the same Liberals who closed small hospitals throughout Saskatchewan without even consultations with the people who were being affected.

Almost 200 senior citizens in Humboldt constituency have taken advantage of the senior citizens' home repair program, to upgrade their homes. Our Government has provided a vastly increased number of special care beds and provided up to \$7 a day to nursing home residents to help meet increasing costs of rent.

In 1974 this Government has approved \$7 million for public housing. The Liberal expenditure in 1970 was \$375,000. Every senior citizen today is able to receive a fishing licence at no cost.

When that \$4.6 million Liberal budget in the Department of Welfare in 1971 is compared to the 1974 budget of this Government, \$14 million for the older people in the Department of Social Services, it is clear that Liberal promises never happen. Surely they must be ashamed of their record; surely this Government's record is a clear indication that the New Deal commitment made to senior citizens by the New Democratic Party has been promises that were not only made, but promises that were kept.

SOME HON. MEMBERS: — Hear, hear!

MR. TCHORZEWSKI: — Mr. Speaker, it has been said before that a government is best judged by the way it treats its people. For seven Liberal

December 9, 1974

years Saskatchewan played second fiddle to the corporate friends of the Liberals opposite. How the government treats the ordinary citizen is its real task and as the Throne Speech indicates this Government, under the leadership of Premier Allan Blakeney, has not stood idly by as did his predecessors, but he has acted with conviction, with a program and with the interests of people in mind.

SOME HON. MEMBERS: — Hear, hear!

MR. TCHORZEWSKI: — There is no doubt that those people, the citizens of this fine province are more secure today knowing that they have a government which has and which will continue to act in their best interests. The great tragedy of inflation is the way in which it affects people who are least able to defend themselves: people on lower, fixed incomes; people with large families. Our Government has provided positive measures to assist these people. We have taken major steps to reduce the impact of inflation on Saskatchewan. The minimum wage has been increased from \$1.50 per hour from the last term of the Liberal Government to \$2.25 per hour in 1974. An increase of 50 cents. The Saskatchewan Assistance Plan rates have been regularly adjusted for people like the handicapped, the single parent, the senior citizen and disadvantaged people. Society has an obligation to look after its disadvantaged in whatever form that disadvantage may be and the Member for Lumsden (Mr. Lane) and others have talked of welfare as if most of these people are bums and no-goods and he attacks the people who are least able to defend themselves, and I for one do not agree with him. He and his colleagues should stop their search for power at any cost and talk about the facts, the facts that in the past two and one-half years the decrease in the number of welfare recipients has been over 16,000. This proves that most people receiving assistance and able to work want to work if given the chance. Liberals did not give them the chance. The New Democratic Government of Saskatchewan has obviously provided those jobs that were required.

SOME HON. MEMBERS: — Hear, hear!

MR. TCHORZEWSKI: — To assist people to absorb the increase in the cost of living, our Government has done much more. We introduced a Family Income Plan for working people providing new opportunities for the family to grow together, to enjoy some of the benefits of society. Under the Family Income Plan the head of the family will always be better off working and contributing to society than would be the case where the family is receiving assistance from the Saskatchewan Assistance Plan.

Mr. Speaker, our Government introduced a new urban package of financial assistance to every urban community in Saskatchewan. This has prevented large increases in property taxation. Large increases in school grants have also done this. Total school grants in my area have increased from \$3 million to \$5 million since the last year of Liberal Government. 'The first gymnasiums in the Humboldt school unit have been built at Middle Lake, Watson and Lake Lenore and others are underway.

SOME HON. MEMBERS: — Hear, hear!

MR. TCHORZEWSKI: — The expanded Property Improvement Grant program has reduced the tax burden to property owners considerably.

Health care programs have been expanded to include chiropractic care. The dental program and the Saskatchewan aids to independent living and soon will include a drug plan.

The Liberals promised a drug plan in 1964, they again promised it in 1967. They said they would hold a plebiscite in 1971. Well, Saskatchewan people had their plebiscite in June of 1971 and in 1975 they will have a comprehensive drug plan which the Liberals talked about and an NDP Government is carrying out.

SOME HON. MEMBERS: — Hear, hear!

MR. TCHORZEWSKI: — This Government has taken positive steps to help Saskatchewan people offset the effects of inflation. The programs I have just mentioned have done this very effectively.

To protect the consumer in the market place, which is becoming increasingly complex, we also established a Department of Consumer Affairs. Over the past decade governments have become increasingly aware of the need to protect and promote the consumer interest. Technological advances have resulted in both increased production and in an increased variety of products. The vast array of commodities available in the various business structures in the market place have created confusion, frustration and dissatisfaction in the minds of many consumers.

Since 1972 over 7,000 individuals and consumer problems have been investigated by the Department and in most cases resolved to the benefit of the consumer. Saskatchewan consumers now have a Department that can take up the problems and speak on their behalf.

A consumer education program is being developed which some other provinces are looking to as a model. Schools and community colleges as well as local organizations are very active in developing consumer education with the assistance of the Department of Consumer Affairs.

Legislation like The Pyramid Franchises Act has removed undesirable practices that were often fraudulent and which absconded with peoples' hard-earned money giving them nothing in return. In December of 1971, the problems arising from pyramid selling reached their peak in Saskatchewan. I am happy to report that operations such as "Dare to be Great" are no longer in existence in Saskatchewan.

The problems associated with warranties and guarantees have been very predominant in the complaints received by the Department. A thorough study is being carried out to determine the type of legislation that is required to provide consumers assurances that warranties are meaningful, in fact, provide the protection that in too many instances, they only pretend to provide.

I was somewhat surprised, Mr. Speaker, at the press reports from the Liberal convention this past weekend indicating that delegates recognized the valuable work the Department of

December 9, 1974

Consumer Affairs had done on behalf of consumers.

SOME HON. MEMBERS: — Hear, hear!

MR. TCHORZEWSKI: — The elected Liberal Members seated opposite should take note and stop their constant suspicions of consumer legislation. It was certainly disappointing to see that the Liberal; Party again showed its disregard for Saskatchewan farmers by indicating that they were not in favour of ensuring that every company selling equipment in Saskatchewan establish a fully stocked parts depot. Obviously, this is another example of Liberal concessions to their large corporate friends who couldn't care less about Saskatchewan farmers' needs.

Mr. Speaker, our Government has implemented major programs and taken measures to redistribute the wealth of this province in order that the lot of the average and low income people could improve. We have not stood idly by as inflation increased the costs of living at a rapid rate. But in order that the rate of inflation can be stemmed we recognize the need for a larger and a broader national effort. In such a national effort Saskatchewan has indicated our preparedness to co-operate.

We cannot continue to allow the economic decision-making of this country to be made by the large corporations, many of which are foreign dominated and give no consideration to Canada and its people. Their reason for existence-is to make a profit. And in the last two or three years they have clearly taken advantage of consumers to increase their profits substantially. Of some 150,000 nonfinancial corporations in 1971, only 600 were worth more than \$25 million and yet those 600 companies out of 150,000 accounted for nearly 60 per cent of all of the profits. These large corporations have become private governments, so strong that they can challenge the sovereignty and the independence of elected governments. In 1973 the cost of living rose 9.1 per cent, corporate profits were up by 40 per cent over the year before.

In the first quarter of 1974 the profits continued in the same way. For example, the profits of Imperial Oil increased by 196 per cent over the first quarter in 1975. For Canadian Industries Limited that was an increase of 194 per cent; and for Westinghouse of Canada, 85 per cent. In the second quarter of this year, corporate profits have increased by 43.9 per cent over the same period last year.

Let me give you some examples by sector. Pulp and paper up 102.2 per cent; petroleum and coal up 83.9 per cent; resource companies up 45.7 percent; and manufacturing up 42.9 per cent; service industries up 22.4 per cent.

Clearly, Mr. Speaker, consumers are paying excessively high prices in order that these and other corporations can inflate the profits. The psychology of inflation is being used to increase prices excessively because it is thought people will expect prices to go up. These corporations don't need concessions that they often get. In 1975 the Federal Government gave tax cuts and other concessions to the corporations in the order of \$1 million. If that money had been divided and given to senior citizens of this country it would have provided a major increase in pensions. This seems to be

an example of very strange priority and surely that must be changed.

This country needs an excess profit tax to discourage excessive profit taking by large corporations. The Food Prices Review Board should be expanded to include all prices and price inputs with the proper power to roll back excessive profits and excessive prices when revealed.

The two-price system which presently applies to wheat, oil and copper should be extended to all basic commodities, including iron ore, steel and lumber.

As things are, the consumer, the small businessman, and the farmer are at the mercy of large corporations. There is a need in this country for people through the various levels of government and through the various community and work associations to exercise the power of planning and directing our economy. They must be taken out of the hands of those in the corporate boardrooms where it has been for so many years. Monopolies and mergers are continuing placing their control in the hands of fewer and fewer. There is a need for immediate implementation of effective controls to curb this monopoly power. Until these types of strong measures are taken we shall not be able to direct our economy in such a way that the rate of inflation can be stemmed.

It must be recognized that there are many influences on inflation. It is not only national but international in scope. There are many factors that one nation cannot change. Some commodities we must import and so have no control over them. Nevertheless within this country we do have vast resources and we should be assuring that these resources are not priced to our consumers just so that a few with power and control can make excessive profits from them.

Mr. Speaker, there has been a great deal of debate in this House and will be in the future in the public and through the Press on the matter of the Federal Budget and the matter of oil and resources policy.

We recently were treated to another taste of majority Liberal Government arrogance and disregard for western Canada.

SOME HON. MEMBERS: — Hear, hear!

MR. TCHORZEWSKI: — That event was the Federal Budget. Others have spoken at some length on that infamous document so I shall not dwell long on it. The impact of that Federal Budget on the people of Saskatchewan, I believe, as do my colleagues, is reason for concern. It penalizes Saskatchewan more than any other province in Canada. It betrays the agreements reached at the meeting of First Ministers in Ottawa in March. It invades the right of a province to control the development of natural resources within its boundaries. It has weakened the very fabric of Confederation and it proposes to place a penalty tax on Saskatchewan consumers because in the past our provincial governments made arrangements to assure future supplies of natural gas to the Saskatchewan Power Corporation. All this, Mr. Speaker, are stacked on top of the inequities that have historically existed for decades.

December 9, 1974

When there is a rumble in Ontario or a rumble in Quebec, the Trudeau Government makes no hesitation and provides all kinds of special concessions and privileges. But when Saskatchewan makes just claims to be an equal partner in Confederation the Trudeau Federal Government, supported by the Saskatchewan Liberal Party and the Leader of the Opposition and every one of his colleagues, but particularly the Saskatchewan Leader of the Opposition, looking for a seat in the Senate, takes away even more.

The Liberals have argued that the West needed more Liberal Members in Parliament to speak in Government. Mr. Lang pleaded long and he pleaded hard in 1968 during his election campaign for he said he would speak to the people in Montreal and the people in Toronto and the mandarins in Ottawa about the needs, the aspirations and the problems of western Canada and especially Saskatchewan. But in 1968 the people were sceptical, they elected Mr. Lang and one other Liberal Member of Parliament. In 1974 they were a little more hopeful and they permitted three Liberal Members of Parliament from Saskatchewan. How disappointed they surely must be on how they have been deceived and betrayed by the Members.

SOME HON. MEMBERS: — Hear, hear!

MR. TCHORZEWSKI: — I ask, Mr. Speaker, what happened to the explanations that were to be made in Central Canada? Where are these three Liberal Members of Parliament today? And how little time it has taken for them to become part of the central Canada corporate power structure, the Liberal Party.

SOME HON. MEMBERS: — Hear, hear!

MR. TCHORZEWSKI: — One would have to go back many, many years to find when this province and its people have been more unjustly treated by the Federal Government supported by the Liberal Party of Saskatchewan openly and categorically at every turn.

It is difficult to recall such total disregard by any federal government of the principles of Confederation as we have seen since the election of three Liberals to the House of Commons. Surely they cannot be proud of their failure to speak on behalf of Saskatchewan people, as a people who have a right to be equal partners in Confederation.

Mr. Speaker, our Government has always stated our position clearly and fairly on behalf of the people of Saskatchewan and our Government will continue to do that.

Mr. Speaker, I just want to make a few comments on one other matter which is a matter which I am responsible for as a Minister, and that is the area of the status of women. Our Government is committed to a policy of seeking equality of opportunity for men and women. It is a policy of action and not merely one of words. The Task Force Report which our Government commissioned to study the progress made in Saskatchewan on the recommendations of the Royal Commission Report on the Status of Women indicates that indeed significant progress has been made. Therefore we have not stood still. In line with the recommendations of the Royal Commission Report our Government has established a Human Rights Commission which deals with

complaints of discrimination on the basis of sex. Amendments have also been made to The Labour Standards Act, to provide equal pay for male and female employees performing work of a similar nature. And also to provide for 18 weeks of maternity leave for female employees. In addition a Workers' Compensation Act has been passed which provides equal benefits for men and women.

We have taken action in the area of day care. A \$2 million program was established that includes payment to parents or subsidies based on their income. As the Royal Commission Report further recommended, a day care advisory board is being established.

Time does not permit me to mention all of the measures which have been taken to improve the status of women. While we are proud of the progress that has been made, we are also aware that more, much more, remains to be done. For this reason we have established an advisory council on the status of women and this council is the one of three in existence in Canada. This council is playing a vital role in advising the Government of the needs of Saskatchewan women. I should like to commend the members of this council and their capable chairwoman, Mrs. Margaret Harris for their untiring efforts and commitment.

SOME HON. MEMBERS: — Hear, hear!

MR. TCHORZEWSKI: — Mr. Speaker, as you are aware 1975 has been proclaimed International Women's Year by the United Nations. It was noted in the Speech from the Throne that our Government will be undertaking a program to promote this commemorative year. Among the activities we will undertake to note this year, a special grant program will be introduced so that Saskatchewan organizations may have the opportunity to develop and carry out activities that are in keeping with the purpose of this year.

A creative expression contest in Saskatchewan schools will be introduced to create a better awareness of the status of women and funds will be provided to sponsor representatives to regional and national conferences.

Actions intended for 1975 will not only be commemorative, the need has been recognized for creating greater opportunities for women in the middle and senior management positions in the Public Service. Intensified efforts will be made in 1975 to improve women's opportunities in the Public Service. We will endeavour to increase the number of women on boards and commissions so that women will have the opportunity to play a more active role in government. We are concerned with the rights of all women and men and we fully recognize the important contributions women make to our society as homemakers. Therefore, the Attorney General has introduced legislation regarding matrimonial property rights which will provide recognition of contributions by women in the home. We recognize that there remain inequities in the laws as they pertain to men and women, and for this reason the Saskatchewan Law Reform Commission, which has recently been established by our Government has given and will continue to give, priority to the study of marital property law.

December 9, 1974

Mr. Speaker, I have outlined a number of actions this Government has taken and will take to improve the status of women in this province and there is more to be done. I feel it is clear that this Government has proceeded with actions.

Mr. Speaker, in closing I want to say that: there is a commercial on television that says commercials cannot sell cars. There is another commercial on television that tries to sell a leader of a party because his credibility seems to be so lacking in their minds. The New Democratic Party has not depended upon this method of selling its product of progressive legislation and programs that have provided freedom to have access to quality education, to health care and opportunities to live and work in a province that can offer a good life.

This Throne Speech, as have others before it since 1971, speaks for itself. It is a completion and an expansion of the New Deal for People. It is an outline of programs that Saskatchewan people have said they want and they need. It is a document that I, as a Member of this House, can be most proud to support.

Mr. Speaker, I have already made it obvious in my remarks that I shall oppose the amendment and support the main motion.

SOME HON. MEMBERS: — Hear, hear!

MR. E.R. MACLEOD (Regina Albert Park): — Mr. Speaker, I indicated Friday that I would have a few more remarks and these deal entirely with my trip around the world. I was appointed, Mr. Speaker, an observer to represent the Saskatchewan Parliamentary Association at a World Parliamentary Conference in Ceylon. So my wife and I actually went around the world. It cost me something like \$6,000 and it will cost the Saskatchewan Parliamentary Association something like \$1,000 or \$1,100, so being appointed an observer is a little bit like winning two or three free dance lessons. There is much more to it than that and there is a mixed benefit. Nonetheless I did enjoy it.

We went by nine different airlines to eight different countries: England, Italy, Israel, India, Ceylon — now called Sri Lanka — Thailand, Hong Kong, and Japan. I spent three weeks in India, Sri Lanka, and Thailand, mostly in the first two mentioned countries. I met a large number of people. I visited the Canadian Embassy and High Commission people from these areas but despite the fact that I attended this conference, visited a lot of people including government people — both governments of the countries involved and our own representatives — I do not pretend in any way to have become an expert in the area.

With respect to these countries, India and Sri Lanka, the land is beautiful, verdant, it is largely green, tropical and semi-tropical and ought by all standards and measurements to be a Garden of Eden. But it is not, it has been to a large extent destroyed and ruined by the people.

At the conference there were 214 delegates and observers representing 800 million people in the Commonwealth, but 600 million of those are in India. The population of India is increasing at 15 million per year. With the death rate, I

calculate that, for those who like statistics, more than 60,000 women become pregnant in every 24-hour period. And, for those who really enjoy statistics, that is something between 2,500 and 3,000 per hour.

India has 360 million head of cattle, every last one of which is sacred. Now these cattle of India are not a very large beast. They are gentle, docile and if you like a cow as a pet or these cattle as pets, certainly you couldn't get a better kind of animal for a pet than the Indian cow. They are loveable and all the rest of it but they eat and they are given virtually the run of the country. In downtown modern Delhi these cattle can be seen everywhere. It has been estimated rightly or wrongly that these 360 million head of cattle eat each year non-meat products in excess of the products eaten by all the people of Canada, of North America, north of the Rio Grande. That is, the cereal and other crops eaten by these animals exceeds that which is consumed by Canadians and Americans. Yet, in India, there is massive starvation, low pay and a tremendous surplus of people. The pay, for example, can be judged by an ad that I saw in the Indian newspaper. It asked for a lady doctor, obviously it would be against the law in Saskatchewan, but it asked for a lady doctor to be a second director of a clinic, whatever that required. Her salary would begin at \$100 a month, rising in six years to \$190 per month.

The people want out, many people want out. The barber who cut my hair at the Ashoka Hotel, the best hotel in New Delhi, who charged me 50 cents — that, of course, is an exorbitant fee over there — for the hair cut, asked where I came from and when I said Canada, he stopped and said, "Canada is my dream." But the trouble is so many of the people who are flooding our Embassies and our High Commissions to get to Canada have no idea where it is. The Embassy people have told me that many people in India regard it as across the sea to the south of India.

We visited the cities of Bombay, very briefly, Delhi, Agra and Madras. We drove from Delhi to Agra, a distance of about 120 miles through the countryside, over paved roads. The maximum speed that we were able to obtain was 45 miles per hour. We passed dogs and goats and sheep, camels, cattle, buffalo, elephants, and so many people. I saw, during that trip, a total of seven tractors, all I was able to see anywhere and I made special note to try to observe what mechanization there was.

There is a great equality in India. The road gangs are composed not quite equally between men and women. The work throughout the land appears to be by hand and I might say not always of very good quality. At Delhi, outside the Parliament Buildings, I observed them repairing the paved road in the most primitive fashion. They had a fire under the tar barrel, they then emptied the tar from that into a plate or a dish approximately two feet across and they then heaved it onto the heads of the workmen, about equally men and women, who then carried it to the spot where the road was being repaired.

In the city of Agra, which is the city of the beautiful Taj Mahal, right past our vehicle walked a lady carrying a load of manure on her head. I cannot say how strongly I was concerned about this and how much I did not like my trip as well, as I have to say, how much I enjoyed being able to have the

December 9, 1974

opportunity to take that trip. There just is a fantastic surplus of people. In stores there are clerks all around. And why not, they may as well be standing around in a store as standing around elsewhere. But it was pathetic. If you approached one clerk, the others all seemed to be very sad that you hadn't approached them because otherwise they would have no opportunity perhaps that day to deal with anybody.

I did not see, in India, those signs of riches or wealth anywhere, all I saw were poor. Less than one per cent of all the people of India earn enough money to pay any income tax at all. Ceylon is much the same. Ceylon has 25,000 square miles of territory. When you recall that Saskatchewan has 250,000 square miles of territory you will recognize that Ceylon is about one-tenth the size of Saskatchewan. It could easily be tucked away and lost for a few days in northern Saskatchewan. It has a population of 13 million, it has been under foreign domination for centuries, as has India. I might say that both India and Ceylon regard England as merely the latest and one of the briefest and one of the better in a long series of conquerors. The British are rather Johnnies-come-lately and they regarded them somewhat better than some of the earlier ones. Indeed they may thank the British for their 100 years in that territory because virtually every road and every railroad, and in Ceylon the docks, the wonderful dock yards and the sea ports and all the plantations were built and left by the British. Ceylon became independent in 1949. In 1972 it declared itself a republic within the Commonwealth. Ceylon had a revolution in 1971 which had a small amount of fanfare because not that many people knew about it, which was put down with the assistance of the United States of America. The Singhalese have as a result tempered their remarks against the United States considerably. As a result of this revolution of 1971 there are now about 21,000 people in prison, about 14,000 of whom have been there since the revolution of 1971 without having been brought to any form of trial and the United Nations has sent observers and helpers to the Government of Ceylon in an effort to process these prisoners in a sincere, and I honestly believe sincere, desire to try to sort out the good ones from those who were the real revolutionaries.

The economy, of course, is in serious difficulty. They are much desirous of having tourists but they are so far away from the normal beaten tracks of tourists that they don't get as many as they would like, although generally there is slow and steady improvement. The Ceylon Government is using the Ceylon Airforce — the Government of Sri Lanka is using the airforce of Sri Lanka, I should say, partly for its tourist business. If you go into Ceylon you must account for every nickel that you take in and account for every dollar that you spend, on their Form D. To encourage you to come you get a 65 per cent bonus on your money from the Ceylon Government, they are so desperately anxious to get foreign currency.

Gasoline in Ceylon is \$2.20 a gallon. They are using so much of their foreign currency now to purchase gasoline instead of the other things that they so desperately need.

I took my instamatic camera to Ceylon, just an ordinary Kodak instamatic. There are thousands of them of different kinds and I attempted to purchase film. I went to Millers which is a British firm dealing in Ceylon and they had been given authority to import films to Ceylon — to Sri Lanka. They

had been authorized by the Industry Department to import 200 films for the year 1974 but because of the conference to be held the Department of Tourism had authorized a further 65 films to be brought into the country during 1974 and these were allocated around the entire island of Sri Lanka. Two would go to one shop and maybe three to another and it was extremely difficult to purchase film in the country. The price, of course, was controlled. If you were getting any one of these 65 films that were additional authorization you had to pay something like \$3.50 but if you got one of the other 200 you paid \$6.50 for it.

In the city of Colombo, which exceeds a million people, many of us walked downtown every day. I don't know how they recognized that we were tourists. Just because I walked downtown with my Bermuda shorts and my high socks and white shoes and a camera slung around my neck and my Canada button, surely that isn't all it takes. In any event I rapidly attracted an entourage. The whole town seemed to be out there to greet whoever was coming downtown. They would follow you and everybody urging you to go here or go there. There is a great deal of touting, people who try to attract you to one store or another because these touts will receive a commission if they can by any manner encourage you into the store. I gathered very early that each of these touts tried in his mind to predict where you might go so that he could rush there ahead of you and tell the storekeeper he had encouraged the tourist to come to his establishment.

In Ceylon, of course, the salaries were equally bad. The girls in our hotel were paid a total of \$9 per month plus whatever food was served at the time they happened to be on duty so if they were on duty during the regular meal hours they did fairly well. I couldn't help but recognize that these girls could buy with an entire month's salary less than three films for an instamatic camera if they used their entire salary. I have what is just an ordinary watch and the girls admired it and I couldn't help but reflect that if they saved every penny of their salary it would take a year and a half to buy the watch which I so casually had on my wrist.

With respect to the conference itself, the 214 observers and delegates were selected from all parts of the Commonwealth. Some of these people treat it as an annual holiday and privately one or two of the officials from London told me that some of the worst offenders came from Canada. And then he hastened to assure me that Saskatchewan was not one of those offenders. In fact, Mr. Speaker of our House, has in all his tenure in the House and as Speaker attended, I believe, only two conferences. It speaks well then of our fairness and reasonableness in Saskatchewan under both governments for dealing with the selection of personnel. Such is not the case in other provinces. There was resentment from the fact that Mr. Regan, the Premier of Nova Scotia, attended and not only led his delegation but is, in fact, the president. There was resentment because they said with his ministerial or Premier's budget he can go on a holiday by himself, so that some of the people had the strangest views of this trip. In Alberta, the Premier makes the selection of who shall go — he designates the person. In other provinces, it appears that the usual chairman of the Provincial Parliamentary Conference being the Speaker takes that as his own personal right and makes it an annual holiday. In fact some provinces indicated to me that Mr. Speaker

December 9, 1974

said, "I have to go, I must go as the representative. It is one of my duties as Speaker." Some of the Speakers whom I met seemed to indicate that they would be glad to see all the other delegates at the next year's holiday to be held in India. I might say, therefore, that congratulations are due to Saskatchewan in its approach to the selection of delegates.

The sessions were held in Ceylon, in Colombo, in the Bandaranaike Memorial Building. It is a fantastic building, the gift of the Government of Red China. I might say that the Government of Canada presented an airport, a very fine modern airport to the Government of Sri Lanka. And for all the world I was unable to see any notification or any credit whatsoever given to the Government of Canada. I looked throughout the VIP lounge and I assure you there was absolutely no credit there given to Canada and in the trip I made through the main airport I saw no mark of any kind indicating that Canada was the donor of this marvellous facility. I, therefore, do not think we are getting quite the credit that we deserve and if there is a plaque anywhere certainly it is not prominent and I regretted that sincerely.

As a result of the revolution in 1971, the delegates were very well guarded. They were most anxious not to have an incident and it was rather interesting to observe on our bus trips the policemen riding on their motorcycles ahead of us and behind us. We were well guarded, in fact, we were extremely well treated.

There will, in due course I hope, be a full report, when it arrives, presented to the Legislature, but I would say briefly the sessions included "the Indian Ocean as a zone of Peace" and in that respect my regard for the Australians and New Zealanders went up considerably. It was to begin with, a rather interesting thing to observe how the delegate who opened, suggested that Russia, of course, wouldn't think of sending military forces into the Indian Ocean because, "They cherished the love of the common man more than they cherished military bases." The Australians, from the socialist government in Australia — and I make no point of that at all except to say that what a government calls itself in my view has nothing to do with what it really is — stated that it was rather curious that if the Russians cherished this so much that all these Russian military vehicles and Russian military boats were in the various locations in the Indian Ocean which he specified. He stated it very clearly and, of course, everybody acknowledged that everybody down there seems to know where the Russians are. But it was in my view rather interesting that the undeveloped countries have a great habit of closing their eyes to things they don't like to see.

Pollution was high on the list and it is becoming a serious problem that tankers of the world seem to go out to sea beyond the 12-mile limits and flush out their tanks and these, I am told by the representatives of various Commonwealth countries, are causing steadily an increasing problem. There seems to be no way of stopping them because they go out to the high seas and seem to be out of the control of everybody. There was a suggestion that these people should now be treated as modern-day pirates who care nothing about anyone else, just the simplest and cheapest method for them of washing out their tanks.

There were sessions on parliamentary practices to which

our own Mr. Speaker made a worthy contribution.

Oil, of course, was high in the problems of the developing countries. They had supported the Arab countries and the Arab idea that these nations should have total control over their own natural resources. These countries, like Sri Lanka, are now being caught in that argument because the people who are being hurt the very worst by the Arabs taking the advantage of their own natural resources happen to be the people who most supported them earlier. The Governments of India, Sri Lanka, Thailand are spending large amounts of their foreign currency to buy the oil which they so desperately need. They are now faced with the problem of reconciling their current position with their previous position and it was particularly in private discussions that this problem was readily apparent.

Now dealing with myself, as an ambassador, I am not sure that I was the best person to send. The Deputy Speaker of the Parliament of India told me that Indians were now completely equal because they had declared themselves a republic and therefore the idea of a monarchy which was abhorrent to them no longer persisted in India. And I pointed out that this is what they do and that's what you give your people when you can't give them anything worthwhile. The next day he gave me a present and I can tell you the way to make a person feel badly is if you have been insulted, make him a present, he'll really feel badly.

They have suggested to us that we should take their population, that we should open our doors to immigration. I said, there isn't a chance. If you ask us to take 13 million people, for example, one year's supply, it would take 11 years for you to increase your population by 130 million instead of 10. Well, that's really no help to you at all but, I said, it would destroy Canada's economy if we added 13 million to our 22 million people. What would happen is we would destroy ourselves without really doing anything for you. The time has come, I suggested, when you start doing something for yourselves. They seem not to be willing to do so.

I might say that the sense of humour which perhaps I should not have expected over there didn't exist. They are very nice and friendly and docile and lovely people, the Indian people and the people of Sri Lanka, but I guess we are not on the same wavelength. I saw a flag standing out in the wind and it was from the west, the wind was blowing from the west very vigorously and I said to our guide, "Are the prevailing winds from the west," and he said, "No, it all depends on the direction the wind blows from."

SOME HON. MEMBERS: — Hear, hear!

MR. E.R. MACLEOD: — He couldn't understand why I couldn't handle that reply.

In Ceylon we were on the golf course and the Government of Sri Lanka opposes this wicked entertainment but it allows two golf courses on the island. We went to one of them and my wife asked if there were any snakes in the neighbourhood and the caddy said, yes, they come out at six o'clock. I thought it was remarkable that snakes could tell time and the caddy didn't walk so close to me after that, he thought maybe I was some kind of a nut.

SOME HON. MEMBERS: — Hear, hear!

MR. E.R. MACLEOD: — I am not sure that they are a nation that is able to come to grips with their problems. In Thailand I was informed that if you ever had an accident with a bus or anything whatever, the first thing you do is try to get to the door of the bus, get in the way of the driver, because otherwise he would just simply run away. And sure enough the next day there appeared in the front page of the newspaper a picture of a taxi accident, the taxi was demolished, and apparently one of the passengers was hurt and taken to the hospital and it reported that the taxi driver had simply taken his papers and run away. It seemed to me that surely they must know who he is and the answer was, of course they could find him if they wanted to but the reason he didn't stay was because he just didn't understand the situation. It was a problem he didn't know how to cope with so the best way was for him to run away and let somebody else worry about it.

The inefficiencies in these countries have to be seen to be believed. I went into a store, any one of them was typical, I went into a store in downtown Colombo and I bought some candy. I went to the girl who was there and she showed me the candy and she then carried the candy, I followed her, over to another counter where she presented me and the candy and introduced me to another gentleman. The man then prepared an account and he then handed the candy and the account on to another gentleman to check the addition. Since I had only bought one item it was rather a marvellous show of bureaucracy within the store. These two documents then separated, I received one copy and two copies went on. The candy then went to the left down the counter to two other gentlemen. I then presented myself to the cashier and paid and received a stamp which said, 'paid'. One of the pieces of paper which the cashier delivered up, gave back to a gentleman, he took it over to the counter where the goods, the other one stamped the document, 'goods received.' That was my receipt, 'good received'. Now that is what it took to buy about \$3 worth of candy and it seems to me that with that kind of inefficiency which I think is reasonably typical, it is pretty hard to imagine how they are going to get very far unless they make some changes.

India, on birth control, in my view has given up. Birth control in India is simply a joke. It just doesn't exist, despite the fact that they have all these protestations and all this publicity about birth control. It isn't there. Now true, there are clinics here and there and there are some people here and there who are talking about birth control and if a woman wants some advice on control, she may present herself to one of these clinics and receive advice but by and large she receives no equipment or material or anything else. There is the occasional doctor, there are some people here and there but for all practical purposes when you are talking about a nation that is expanding at the rate of 13 million in a year, it is simply a joke. The Government of Ceylon, in my judgement, is still trying. They are still making a serious and dedicated and tough effort to try to solve their problems. It is certainly a controlled economy, they have done everything possible to control their nation. I regret, for example, that their nation has no radio, television. I am sorry, it has radio and newspapers, totally controlled, but no television. I might say that the censorship board it was announced in September was to be headed up by the Canadian Ambassador and he may well be back in Sri Lanka now in charge. A totally controlled economy but

what I am pleased to say — I am not happy with the total control — I am pleased to say that at least they are still making efforts to solve their problems.

Let me say briefly that the thing that this does to our people is rather curious and interesting. The Embassy staff, the Canadians and Americans who live in these countries, are of course given salaries which allow them to live the very best kind of life that can be led in these areas. But they do live a totally artificial life. They are living as well as it is possible to live, they have the best of homes, the maximum of service, government protection and all the rest, but they do have what I think is a weird view of what goes on. I don't see how they can help it because they are not living in a Canadian environment, they are living in a strange environment, they are not part of it.

One Embassy man grew to hate cattle. I am told that this man from the Canadian High Commission in Delhi, as he left Delhi told the cab driver to stop the car and he jumped out of the car, raced over 50 feet to the nearest cow, whaled it with a heck of a kick and came back and jumped into the car and carried on to the airport, much to the total disgust of the taxi driver. He said, "Ever since I got to India I have wanted to kick a cow."

It's a weird situation. We saw starvation all over the place. There is going to be more starvation but the people of the High Commission aren't sure that we should help. Some of them tell me privately that every bit of medical help we give to them today produces more starvation and suffering tomorrow. The Embassy staff develop a very low regard for the people with whom they deal. As a result I predict from what I have seen these peoples' failure to come really to grips with their population, that their populations will continue to grow. I predict labour and population unrest. I cannot see how the Government of Mrs. Ghandhi can possibly continue year in and year out without more and more trouble. I am convinced that we are going to look for more trouble in that area, that is, more trouble is bound to occur in that area. There is going to be more starvation. With that kind of increase in population I don't see how it can be helped. I just don't see how we can solve their problems unless they get on the ball.

As a result, Mr. Speaker, I want to say that I much enjoyed and appreciated the opportunity to go to Ceylon. I think I may have run into an accounting deficiency as a result of my trip there and I propose to speak again about that to our local officials. I am glad I went. It is an experience that I much enjoyed but I can assure you that I wouldn't go again. Considering the kind of ambassador I am, perhaps it is just as well. Mr. Speaker, with those remarks I hope I have given a bit of an overview as to the visit which I took around the world, particularly to the continent down under.

SOME HON. MEMBERS: — Hear, hear!

MR. H.H. ROLFES (Saskatoon Nutana South): — Mr. Speaker, I want to inform the House first of all that I shall not be able to give them an interesting travelogue as the Member for Albert Park (Mr. MacLeod) has been able to do. I would like to comment on, not being critical, but I think

December 9, 1974

his travelogue in itself attests to the fact that inequalities exist. That's not a criticism meant for the Hon. Member. But if I understood him correctly I think he said the trip itself cost around \$9,000. I am not being critical of that fact, but I think it does seem to indicate to me that maybe there are solutions to the problems in this world if we put our priorities in order.

I was interested in his comments on birth control in India. If you had listened to Douglas Roche, the Member for Edmonton Strathcona, I believe, or to Romeo Miaone, who attended the Population Conference in Bucharest or the Rockefeller Foundation all of whom made it very clear that birth control is not the answer. The Rockefeller Foundation has even given up on birth control. They reported to the Bucharest Conference that the answer lies in the fact that we must develop a new standard of economy in the world. That unless you give some hope to these people for the future they will not take our advice. They will not listen to what we have to offer. How can we expect them to listen to us when they can see such inequalities in the world. Last year I asked this question in the House: what effect did the increase in the cost of wheat alone have on the third world? The Member for Albert Park pointed out that most of the revenue of Third World countries today goes for petroleum, a direct consequence of decisions made by people in developed countries. Then we dare ask the question, why these people will not control their own population. We are really not getting at the causes of the problems.

Mr. Speaker, the other day the Member for Athabasca (Mr. Guy) said, why don't the people in this House talk about inflation. I'll tell you one of the reasons we don't talk about inflation is because inflation is mainly an international and a national problem. Just for the information of the Members opposite, I picked up the Leader-Post the other day and it said, "Blame Laid on Ottawa for Increased Inflation." Did Stephen Lewis say this? No. Who said it? Jean Luc Pepin former Trade Minister under the Trudeau Government.

SOME HON. MEMBERS: — — No-oo-oo.

MR. ROLFES: — Yes, former Trade Minister under the Trudeau Government. But, Mr. Speaker, that doesn't mean that this Government doesn't believe that there isn't anything that we can't do to do away with, or at least alleviate, some of the pressures on those people who suffer because of inflation. Later on in my speech I will certainly make it very clear, that the Blakeney Government is concerned.

I also want to make a few remarks concerning the Leader of the Opposition (Mr. Steuart). He said the other day that he had been in my constituency, but he would have been there a month earlier if he hadn't postponed the nomination from October to November. I understand that they did have a wanted sign for me and I was very pleased because I went and checked, Mr. Speaker. What he forgot to tell us was that the wanted sign said, "Wanted — Rolfes back in 1975."

SOME HON. MEMBERS: — Hear, hear!

MR. ROLFES: — Now, Mr. Speaker, I also noticed that the Leader of the Opposition was labouring under a real difficulty the other

day when he was making his speech in the House. The first page went well, he was going really well, he turned over the page and he suddenly stopped dead in his tracks and I was wondering why, so I inquired. I found out that his speechwriter had quit on him. His speechwriter had written on the second page, "All right, you old wind bag, you are on your own."

Mr. Speaker, I think the old wind bag expression could apply to about 60 Members in this House and I hope that the Leader of the Opposition takes it in that spirit.

Mr. Speaker, let me congratulate my seatmate the Hon. Member for Nipawin (Mr. Comer) as mover of the Throne Speech and also my colleague from Hanley (Mr. Mostoway) for I think they played a significant part in this debate. But it has been rather easy for us since 1971 to be either movers or seconders because the Throne Speeches we have presented have been people Throne Speeches. They have done a lot for the people of Saskatchewan.

I went to talk also, Mr. Speaker, about participatory democracy. The Members opposite like to have the people of this province believe that we are arrogant; that we do away with local autonomy; that we don't involve people. Let me put the facts before you, Mr. Speaker. The facts say that the Legislative Committees on Welfare, Agriculture, Business, Liquor and now Highway Traffic and Safety involve a lot of people. Recommendations made by these committees are based on what the people are suggesting. The Government acts on these committees' recommendations and, Mr. Speaker, that to me is democracy in action.

There were other committees. Again, there were numerous meetings held and I know that thousands of citizens were involved in these meetings. The Government had committees on kindergarten, community colleges, trustee-teacher bargaining, family life and family planning, environmental studies and finally, Mr. Speaker, a law reform commission to mention only a few. Again, the people made suggestions, the committees brought in their recommendations and again the Government acted. This is consultation; this is participatory democracy.

In addition to the above there were the Premier's successful and well-received bus tours and the many Cabinet meetings held throughout the province, not to mention the Cabinet office that was established in Saskatoon.

Mr. Speaker, in 1971, after seven stagnant years, the people of this province were anxiously awaiting for some good progressive legislation and good progressive legislation they got. They accepted our New Deal for People. They gave us a mandate. Our Government has acted on that mandate by involving people, by seeking their advice and by protecting the rights of these people from foreign intrusions.

Mr. Speaker, I should like to say a few words on The Fair Accommodations Practices Act. I believe that there have been some concerns expressed to MLAs and I know that they have been expressed to me about some of the provisions in The Fair Accommodations Practices Act. Our amendments attempted to protect the rights of the individual and to avoid discrimination based on the sex of the individual. In so doing, this Legislature did not foresee what some of the difficulties in this

December 9, 1974

amendment would do in respect to accommodation in private homes.

In my opinion, the Legislature may have erred in making this amendment apply to private homes and, therefore, I would ask the Attorney General to examine the possibility of bringing in an amendment which would, in effect, delete private homes from the provisions of that Act.

Student scholarships — an interesting topic for Members opposite. In 1971 we promised to set up a comprehensive bursary program for university and technical students. And we have acted. We have a comprehensive bursary program. Since 1971 over 10,000 students have received bursaries — an average of about 3,500 students a year. Well over \$3 million has been paid out in bursaries alone, excluding scholarships, Canada student loans and Saskatchewan student loans. We promised help and we have acted.

SOME HON. MEMBERS: — Hear, hear!

MR. ROLFES: — But, Mr. Speaker, that is not the first time that students have been promised help. In the election campaign of April 1964, candidate D. G. Steuart speaking at Kindersley and quoted in the Prince Albert Herald — April 7, 1964, said this:

A Liberal Government will make more scholarships available for deserving students in university and advanced technical courses.

Mr. Speaker, that was only a promise. Just like their promise of the 80,000 jobs that they would create. They didn't tell people that these jobs would have to be sought in British Columbia and Alberta. The Leader of the Opposition then said, that more scholarships would be available. How many more? In seven years they gave a total of fewer than 5,000 scholarships adding up to less than \$3 million. It is no wonder that the Leader of the Opposition left. They discontinued the Saskatchewan student loan plan so that a total of all their seven years shows in scholarships and loans awards of about 4,200, adding up to \$2.8 million. As a matter of fact, in every one of their seven years they gave fewer awards than in the years between 1960 and 1964. And in 1973-74 alone our awards went to over 9,000 students with the total being well over \$3.5 million. Mr. Speaker, more in one year than in the total of their seven years. Students know that. They know that the NDP Government will act when it makes a promise.

Mr. Speaker, let me turn to senior citizens. Much has been said so far about the lack of activity for senior citizens and I simply want to say this: that those accusations simply do not hold any water if you look at the records. The Throne Speech clearly indicates that the Blakeney Government is aware of the problems facing our senior citizens and that we are prepared to take further steps to assist them.

Senior citizens asked for more meaningful participation in formulating policy and legislation concerning their welfare. I was pleased, therefore, to note that the Throne Speech indicated that provincial and local councils would be established for senior citizens. I am hopeful also, Mr. Speaker,

that the Budget which will be brought down early next year, will contain further provisions to assist senior citizens to cope with high inflation.

At this time I should like to compare the track record of the Blakeney Government to that of the Thatcher-Steuart Government in providing for senior citizens. Let's see what they had to say to senior citizens.

Senior citizens pleaded with the Liberal Government to abolish deterrent and hospitalization fees. The Liberals said, No. Senior citizens asked the Liberal Government to lower bus and rail travel rates. The Liberals said, No. Senior citizens wanted bigger exemptions on personal income tax. The Liberals said, No. Senior citizens requested to be exempted from paying taxes for school purposes. Again, the Liberals said, No. The attitude of the Members opposite to senior citizens is best described by the words of the former Health Minister, when he was asked to comment on the senior citizens' brief and he replied, "We said there would be no change."

Mr. Speaker, let me just say to the senior citizens today, when they read in the Leader-Post or in the Star-Phoenix that Members opposite are going to promise them \$350 per single and \$500 for couples, let them remember the years of 1964 to 1971, when every request that the senior citizens made the Liberals' answer was, No. The Blakeney Government recognizes the plight of senior citizens. We replaced the callous and do-nothing policy of the Liberals by taking some positive steps to assist our senior citizens. What did we do?

Well, we abolished hospitalization and deterrent fees. We did away with the medicare premiums. We increased the Property Improvement Grant to \$160. We still give financial assistance for hearing aids; we pay the nursing component of Level III care for senior citizens; we instituted a \$500 home repair grant. And by the way in Saskatoon alone, in the past year, \$93,000 went to senior citizens on the home repair program alone.

SOME HON. MEMBERS: — Hear, hear!

MR. ROLFES: — We substantially increased our activities in the area of meals-on-wheels and homemakers. Also, we gave free angling licences to senior citizens. Soon senior citizens will benefit from a drug program.

In actual dollars and cents, Mr. Speaker, the Liberals in their last year in office collected about \$5 million from senior citizens through utilization fees and medical premiums, but budgeted only \$4.5 million for senior citizens. They were willing to take a half a million dollars more from senior citizens without giving them anything really in return.

The Blakeney Government, on the other hand, will spend well over \$20 million on programs for senior citizens this year alone.

SOME HON. MEMBERS: — Hear, hear!

MR. ROLFES: — Mr. Speaker, let me turn to our natural resources. It is encouraging to note that in the Throne Speech this Government

December 9, 1974

will continue to develop our natural resources through public ownership and joint ventures with private companies. Our natural resources like potash, petroleum, forests and minerals belong to the people residing in this province. How these resources are to be developed must be decided by the people of this province, not by multinational corporations or the Federal Government.

If the people of this province want to develop their resources through public involvement — and I believe they gave us this mandate in 1971 — then the Federal Government has no right to interfere with this decision.

SOME HON. MEMBERS: — Hear, hear!

MR. ROLFES: — Federal Liberal MPs may prefer the multi-national corporation route, but the people of this province have chosen otherwise. Any federal tax scheme which prevents, interferes, discourages or penalizes the people of Saskatchewan from choosing the public ownership route as opposed to the multinational corporation route in developing our natural resources, is clearly an intrusion on what has traditionally been thought of as a provincial responsibility and within provincial jurisdiction.

SOME HON. MEMBERS: — Hear, hear!

MR. ROLFES: — This interference is certainly in opposition to the spirit of Confederation and will aggravate the discontent of many western Canadians.

However, Mr. Speaker, the greatest disappointment to the people of Saskatchewan must be the stand taken by the federal Liberal MPs from Saskatchewan. Instead of being the defenders of western farmers and instead of protecting the rights of Saskatchewan people in Confederation, so that we would no longer be the suppliers of cheap raw materials for central Canada and foreign interests, they have taken the position of defending the CPR; they are destroying the Canadian Wheat Board and assisting Cargill, Continental and Richardson; and one Saskatchewan MP is even threatening to side with Cargill against the Saskatchewan people.

Premier Blakeney and his Ministers have the support of most Saskatchewan people for the manner in which they have carried on negotiations with the Federal Government.

SOME HON. MEMBERS: — Hear, hear!

MR. ROLFES: — This country cannot afford further discontent of the people in western Canada. It is important, therefore, that the Premier continue to negotiate the best possible deal for the people of Saskatchewan. The final outcome of these negotiations must be a fairer distribution of wealth from every source to all the provinces in this country.

Mr. Speaker, let me say a few words about the city of Saskatoon. Saskatoon has fared well under the Blakeney Government.

SOME HON. MEMBERS: — Hear, hear!

MR. ROLFES: — The city is bustling with activity. The business community is doing well and you'd be hard-pressed to find any vacant business place as compared to the numerous ones one could find in 1970 and 1971. Well over 1,500 new jobs were created in the city since 1971 and the city will issue over \$40 million of building permits this year. Compare this to the \$13 million in 1970.

Time won't permit me to mention all the benefits being received by Saskatoon in this current year. However, I want the people of Saskatoon and more particularly the constituents of Nutana South to compare the record of the present Saskatoon MLAs in working for Saskatoon with the Liberal MLAs from 1964 to 1971.

Some of the financial assistance that we have received in Saskatoon in the past and some in 1974-75, let me run through the current year for some of them:

Property Improvement grants — \$3.5 million; Winter Works Program — \$350,000; Public Transit Assistance — \$450,000; snow removal — \$150,000; transportation study — \$225,000; police grant — \$535,000; unconditional grant of \$10 per capita — \$1,265,000; grants for community services — \$233,000; grants for special care homes — \$1,505,000.

Mr. Speaker, grants for community services under the Liberals amounted to \$11,365 compared to \$233,000 this year alone under our Government.

Grants for special care homes in Saskatoon under the last year of the Liberals — \$277,000, this year alone \$1,505,000. Employment support programs — \$330,000; new swimming pool \$1,500,000; new bus depot — \$1 million; community capital fund — \$75 per capita — \$9,500,000 over the next five years; school operating grants \$14 million this year alone and school capital grants — \$.5 million; the Department of Culture and Youth — \$375,000; University of Saskatchewan, capital and operating grants — \$43 million; Saskatchewan Housing Corporation — \$915,000; the YES program — \$950,000; Alcoholism Commission of Saskatchewan — \$700,000; psychiatric and external research — \$485,000; MacNeill and Mental Health Clinics — \$500,000.

Mr. Speaker, not to mention such projects as the Lorne Avenue road to Outlook which has been announced, the new Government office building probably about \$10 million; University Hospital expansion over \$23 million. Mr. Speaker, if you take all of these and add them together you will be looking in the neighbourhood of \$100 million to Saskatchewan alone.

I want to ask the Members opposite which one of these programs would they cut. Which one would they cut? Mr. Speaker, Saskatoon has also benefited from the decision to decentralize government activities. We have a Cabinet office in Saskatoon and let me tell you that the people of Saskatoon appreciate the Cabinet office.

SOME HON. MEMBERS: — Hear, hear!

MR. ROLFES: — Mr. Speaker, we also have the Human Rights Commission

December 9, 1974

office in Saskatchewan. We also have the Law Reform Commission in Saskatoon. We have as well a Consumer Affairs office in Saskatoon. We also have the Hog Marketing Commission in Saskatoon. We also, Mr. Speaker . . .

MR. LANE: — They did that to you on purpose.

MR. ROLFES: — Could be. Mr. Speaker, in conclusion I want to comment on remarks made by the Member for Lumsden in Saskatoon. He said that many of the people that are on welfare are bums. Yet, on the weekend I heard him say at the Liberal convention that most people who are on welfare are not bums and are good people. On the one hand we hear the Leader of the Opposition say that the Government is spending too much money, on the other hand he says why aren't you spending money on senior citizens. All I am saying to the Member from Prince Albert West, is you can't have it both ways.

Mr. Speaker, the people in 1975 will certainly show him that he can't have it both ways.

SOME HON. MEMBERS: — Hear, hear!

MR. ROLFES: — Mr. Speaker, from my remarks, I am sure that you will know that I will support the main motion and not the amendment.

SOME HON. MEMBERS: — Hear, hear!

MR. L. LARSON (Pelly): — Mr. Speaker, I want to take this opportunity first of all to compliment the Member for Albert Park (Mr. MacLeod). I think he made one of the best speeches I have ever heard him make.

SOME HON. MEMBERS: — Hear, hear!

MR. L. LARSON: — I was very interested in his travelogue, where he had been, of conditions as he saw them and his very apt explanation of those conditions.

I think that if all of us could probably travel and get outside of the boundaries of our abundant and affluent country we would come back with probably a different perspective and a different outlook. Sometimes I feel that we lack some of that outlook, some of that attitude and some of the experience that the Member from Albert Park was speaking about. Certainly I congratulate him, I enjoyed his address very much. I hope that some day I may have the opportunity to witness, as he did, some of the problems that exist outside of this great and affluent country of ours.

Mr. Speaker, I have several remarks that I want to make, I see that it is very near 5:30 o'clock so with your permission I will call it 5:30.

The Assembly recessed until 7:00 o'clock p.m.

MR. LARSON: — When you called it 5:30 I

was complimenting the Member for Albert Park for his description of his tour and his trip and I meant it very sincerely. And from his personal comments I know that he appreciated what I had to say.

I am also very pleased to offer my congratulations and praise to the mover and the seconder of the Address-in-Reply. I want particularly to compliment the member from Nipawin for a job very well done. I am sure the Nipawin constituency is very proud of him.

SOME HON. MEMBERS: — Hear, hear!

MR. LARSON: — The Leader of the Opposition certainly showed his envy in his remarks and his reference when he referred to a Cabinet post. I am sure that he would be happy to have that kind of talent and that kind of ability on his back benches.

SOME HON. MEMBERS: — Hear, hear!

MR. LARSON: — The member for Hanley (Mr. Mostoway) of course did his usual good job and I offer him my congratulations as well.

SOME HON. MEMBERS: — Hear, hear!

MR. LARSON: — It is extremely encouraging to have men of this caliber offering their services to the public.

In this probable pre-election year I want to take this opportunity to say a sincere thank you to the people of the Pelly constituency for the co-operation and the help that they have given me, as well as for the privilege of serving them.

I want to thank all who supported me at the recent nominating convention. I can assure them that I will continue to serve in humility and in good conscience after the next election.

SOME HON. MEMBERS: — Hear, hear!

MR. LARSON: — I am very pleased to welcome and serve the new members of the Pelly constituency. I look forward to getting better acquainted with them and working in co-operation with them as well.

The Throne Speech so ably delivered by his Honour, was indeed a document worthy of comment. In spite of the comments of the Leader of the Opposition it is very pertinent and relative to today's and future conditions as we see them. I want, before I make my comments, however, on the contents of Throne Speech to say a few things about what has happened to the Pelly constituency.

I want first of all to compliment the Minister of Highways (Mr. Kramer). He doesn't get too many compliments in this House and I am sure that he deserves many more than he gets.

SOME HON. MEMBERS: — Hear, hear!

December 9, 1974

MR. LARSON: — I find the Minister of Highways, a man of his word. We needed completion of No. 57 highway to Madge Lake, it is one of the beauty spots in the province. It was handicapped and held back by an improper road. I brought this to the attention of the Minister and we now have a very fine, a very high speed road into Madge Lake. I thank and compliment him for this.

SOME HON. MEMBERS: — Hear, hear!

MR. LARSON: — We have seen the oiling of No. 8 highway from Norquay going on into the North. It connects with a very important part of the constituency, tourism, lakes and timber. I am sure that if the present Minister continues as he is doing we shall see that road completed and oiled right clean through to Hudson Bay.

I want to say a very special thanks to him for taking the grid road from Togo to No. 8 highway into the highway system. This is a very expensive and costly piece of grid road that has been a burden and a very heavy load to the municipality. It has been a source of some political controversy both in 1964, 1967 and in 1971. I am now quite convinced that with the understanding of the present Minister that we have this snarly little political problem resolved.

I appreciate the things that have come to Pelly constituency because of an NDP Government. I want however, to take this opportunity to talk about some of the things that I look forward to being done after the next election.

We need upgrading of No. 49 highway from Pelly going to the Manitoba border. This, again, serves a very useful purpose. It is a bus road, it is a route for many of the Manitoba people coming into Saskatchewan as well as some of our people who are suffering from the former deterioration of small villages and hamlets that are forced to go into Benito and Swan River for their trading. We need upgrading and resurfacing of No. 8 highway from Wroxton to Pelly. This is a very important road, it serves as a vital link. I am looking forward to it being done. We are also going to do something about the flooding of the Assiniboine River along No. 8 highway south of Kamsack. These are a few of the things that we look forward to having done and with the co-operation and the ability of the Minister, I am very confident that they will all become a reality.

SOME HON. MEMBERS: — Hear, hear!

MR. LARSON: — Now there are other areas in the Pelly constituency that have had some very distinct benefits and advantages from this Government. We really welcome the additional school grants that have come into our area. The school grants certainly have made it possible to maintain an extremely high and extremely worthwhile school program. This has been appreciated. I am sure that we will continue to have this and probably even better improvements.

SOME HON. MEMBERS: — Hear, hear!

MR. LARSON: — The municipal grants structure. We are in an area

where road construction is sometimes rather difficult and rather costly. The municipal grants, the new formula that the Minister has implemented certainly does more for the low assessed and the poor municipalities than anything we have had. This very much appreciated.

The Property Improvement Grants certainly are very welcome and have done an awful lot. I have people who come to me with their cheques and say, this is a marvelous thing, this has really lightened the burden of taxation and we certainly appreciate it.

SOME HON. MEMBERS: — Hear, hear!

MR. LARSON: — The Open Roads program. We have now some oiled all-weather roads going into places like Hyas that was completely forgotten by the former Government, with a new grade and a blacktop road going in. At the recent official opening a tremendous amount of appreciation was expressed not only by the people of the village but also by the municipalities and people that travel it. The same applies to Stenen, Togo and other places.

The Urban Assistance Grant programs are making possible projects that have been dreamt of and never thought would become a reality.

The Winter Works Program, a real boon. We have improvements at rinks at Norquay, at Pelly, at Veregin, a new swimming pool at Kamsack, all made possible by the assistance that has been provided through all of these programs.

The Rural Municipal Road Assistance and Clearing program has all been made possible by winter works. Gravel stock piling. The School Unit has been able to build a garage. They have made an addition to several of the smaller schools in the whole and entire unit. These are very much appreciated and it results in a better community, more attractive, better facilities are available wherever you look.

The Urban Assistance Program, as I said, is one of the better programs. The full impact of this program is yet to be felt, with unconditional grants, street improvements and all the facilities that are being made available.

I want to say a word about senior citizens. The Members opposite do a lot of talking about the senior citizens. I have senior citizens coming to me and saying that this Government has made life for them the best that it has ever been. When you look at the assistance grants for senior citizens, the houses they have been able to paint, in places like Arran, places like Pelly, places like Togo, places like Mikado, you certainly see the effects of it. New paint, new roofs, porches put on, windows put in, rugs on the floors, bathrooms improved, where the quality of life because of this program has really made an impact.

SOME HON. MEMBERS: — Hear, hear!

MR. LARSON: — I can tell this House, Mr. Speaker, that it is appreciated and appreciated very much.

December 9, 1974

I want to commend and compliment the Government of a very satisfactory performance and I look forward to a continuation as the Throne Speech indicates that we will have after the next election.

I want to say a word or two about the Throne Speech itself. I think it can be properly divided into about three categories. One is of the achievements of this Government in this term of office. The second, the problems and the sobering effects of the arrogant actions of the Liberal Government at Ottawa. I think the third category is the recognition of today's problems and what the Government proposes to do about them at this Session. And also in drawing the attention of the people of Saskatchewan to the real urgency and the magnitude of these problems. The fourth category that I couldn't ignore and couldn't omit is, of course, the disheartening aspect of the totally unbelievable attitude and reaction of the Opposition.

Obviously they realize the precarious position and the reaction has been entirely predictable and expected. They are trying to divert attention from the real issues as outlined in the Speech. We see a deliberate attempt to create a smoke screen as well as a boisterous grandstand play that becomes so obvious that it is ridiculous in its simplicity.

The very simple fact, Mr. Speaker, is that it is a real waste of time and a real waste of effort to try to describe these tactics. I would say that they do an incredibly good job of doing this themselves.

The people of Saskatchewan, Mr. Speaker, remember only too well the performance of the former Liberal Government and its leaders from 1964 to 1971. Those seven destructive years are by no means forgotten. Farmers remember too well the neglect of agriculture. Workers remember too well Bill 2 and the repression of the unions and wage earners. They remember the policy of pushing economic development by keeping wages and working conditions low and bad. Sick people and others remember too well utilization fees, deterrent fees and the general lowering of health, morals and standards. They remember the promised plebiscite on the drug program. Teachers and trustees remember very well the general cutbacks in education and the generally chaotic situation in education. The people of the North remember too well the complete disregard for their plight and conditions.

Yet the Opposition is fairly screaming in criticism of what this Government is trying to do.

A very interesting paradox, Mr. Speaker, occurred a few days ago, when we find the Member for Athabasca, Mr. Guy, who has been so vociferous and vocal in his condemnation of the North and the Department of Northern Saskatchewan. This he has done not once but many, many times in this House. I draw your attention to an article in the Leader-Post headlined: "Guy comes to Defence of Northern Department." It says:

Allan Guy, Liberal Member for Athabasca, argued successfully Friday against the policy statement he said would force abolition of the Department of Northern Saskatchewan under a Liberal Government. Mr. Guy, speaking during the second day of the annual provincial Liberal Convention said that while DNS has been a failure in the

NDP Government's hand, it doesn't mean that the single agency concept of the department is wrong.

Obviously again, Mr. Speaker, you see the attempt of trying to get the best of both worlds. I had never thought that I would hear, in this House, or see the Member for Athabasca coming to the defence of a program instituted by a New Democratic Government. Wonders will never cease.

Ironically, Mr. Speaker, every increase in the minimum wage has been met with frenzied opposition from the Opposition Members. For seven years this present vociferous Opposition, as a government, gave away Saskatchewan resources for a mere pittance. In the months of November and December the return from potash revenue this year will be more than the total revenue during the seven Liberal years. Yet this same Liberal position has opposed every increase in royalties on their corporate friends. Yes, Mr. Speaker, the record speaks for itself and the Members are doing an excellent job of destroying any credibility that they have.

I want to remind this House, Mr. Speaker, of a few conditions that were created to a large extent by the former Liberal Government. I remind you of farmers being blackmailed into not producing under the famous Lang LIFT program. Machinery dealers being closed out for lack of business. Vacant stores and businesses in cities, small towns, villages and hamlets. Small towns literally dying. Thousands of young people leaving the farms and leaving the province because of lack of jobs and job opportunities or even a future. Construction and building almost at a standstill. Strife and discontent on the campuses. Strife between teachers and trustees. Labour and management relations strained almost to a breaking point. Yes, Mr. Speaker, the mood was one of despair and depression.

This Throne Speech has in a very small way reviewed some of the achievements and actions taken by the Government. It outlines some of the corrective measures that are being proposed. This, of course, is to the consternation and despair of the Members opposite. The Leader of the Opposition (Mr. Steuart) calls it a "Nothing Throne Speech." I challenge him, Mr. Speaker, to tell the workers of the Province of Saskatchewan that the repeal of Bill No. 2 was nothing. Tell the workers that raising the minimum wage from \$1.25 to \$2.50 is nothing. Tell them that the 40-hour week is nothing. Tell the women that maternity leave is nothing. I challenge you to tell the farmers who are able to retire in dignity through the sale of their land to the Land Bank that this is nothing. Tell the young men who have been able to start farming on Land Bank land that this is nothing. Tell them that FarmStart is nothing. Tell them that the farmers who have collected subsidies on hogs during the depressed prices is nothing. I challenge the Leader of the Opposition to tell the sick, the hospitalized, the bed-ridden that removal of medicare premiums, removal of utilization fees that were imposed by the former Liberal Government, is nothing. Tell the senior citizens that the home repair assistance grants, hearing aids at cost, as well as many other benefits derived from this Government, is nothing. Yes, Mr. Speaker, I challenge the Leader of the Opposition and all Members opposite to tell the parents of children that the denticare program is nothing.

SOME HON. MEMBERS: — Hear, hear!

December 9, 1974

MR. LARSON: — You go and tell the urban and village councils that the Urban Assistance and per Capita Grant program is nothing. Tell all citizens of Saskatchewan that the drug program just around the corner is nothing. I challenge the whole Liberal Party to tell the people of Saskatchewan that the loss of some \$140 million by the Liberal Turner Budget is nothing. Yes, Mr. Speaker think the Leader of the Opposition really put his foot in his mouth when he said those words.

If we are to take the Leader of the Opposition at his word, then I will expect him to tell the people of Saskatchewan that removal of the Crow's Nest Pass Agreement is nothing. That the threat of his colleague, Otto Long, that after January 1st, and I see by today's Leader-Post that Mr. Marchand has now announced that from January 1 the freeze on rail line abandonment is going into effect. Tell the farmers and the people of Saskatchewan that this is nothing.

I expect that if the Lender of the Opposition means what he says in this House he will tell people that taxing provincial Crown corporations is nothing. I expect further that the Liberal Members in this House will be telling the farmers that the emasculation of the Canadian Wheat Board by the western wrecking champion Otto Lang is nothing. I could go on, Mr. Speaker, however it is my sincere belief that this nothing statement of the Leader of the Opposition will haunt him into total obscurity. I, for one, will never let the people that I come in contact forget his myopic and irresponsible statement.

I want now to make a few remarks with regard to the speech made by the Leader of the Opposition the other day. For over an hour he chastised, scolded, ranted, raved and rasped away at the Premier and the Government. His voice over the radio sounded as if it were his last desperate plea to become the Premier after the next election. Even his own backbenchers seemed to have no enthusiasm for his performance. When the smoke got cleared away and he had finally blown himself out there was one thing that stood out fairly clearly. The Hon. Member for Prince Albert left no doubt in anyone's mind as to what the program and priorities of the Liberal Party would be. It is now crystal clear and the people of Saskatchewan should be equally clear on what the Members opposite stand for and what their program will be. All he really could hold out as their program was the same old, time-worn philosophy of free enterprise. A very interesting paradox, Mr. Speaker, that he should speak of free enterprise. I hold in my hand a statement made by the historian, Arnold Toynbee speaking last April. He said this about the free enterprise system, and I quote:

Historian Arnold Toynbee predicts a free enterprise system will disappear and affluent countries will soon be living in what he called a permanent state of siege economically.

Toynbee, who celebrated his 85th birthday on Easter Sunday writes in the Observer newspaper:

These developments will result from the plundering of the earth's irreplaceable natural resources. Man's plundering of nature now threatens him with pollution and depletion. In so-called developed countries like those of western Europe, United States, the Soviet Union, Japan, growth

is going to cease. They are going to find themselves in a permanent stage of siege in which the material conditions of life will be at least as austere as they were during the two world wars. The wartime austerity was temporary, the future austerity will be perennial and it will become progressively more severe.

This from a man who is respected all over the world. This is his interpretation of the future of the glorified free enterprise system.

I want to go back to some of the comments of the Leader of the Opposition. He talked a lot about freedom. He became very emotional. Yes, one could almost say he became passionate and desperate in his attempts to try to convince even himself that he had a case at all. Let's take a look at some of the lost freedoms he referred to. If the Liberal Party wants to fight an election on the issue of freedom I shall welcome it.

His first reference to lost freedom was to union workers. He chastised the union leaders, he chastised the Government. The Leader of the Opposition tried to leave the impression that somehow somewhere there is some deep, dark sinister conspiracy. I am sure he is not even aware of what it is, but he is trying to convince people that it is there and that it is destroying something and someone and he is trying to exploit it because he believes it has some political appeal. If you want to talk about freedom for union workers, let's talk about freedom from Bill No. 2, let's talk about freedom of collective bargaining, freedom of vacations with pay, freedom of equal work for equal pay. If the Liberal Party wants to talk about freedom, let's talk about freedom from deterrent fees, utilization fees, medical care premiums, crippling costs of hearing aids and freedom from staggering drug bills. If you want to talk about freedom, let's talk about the young farmers on the Land Bank land who are free from the enslavement of perpetual mortgages and debts that will last for more than their lifetime. If you want to talk about freedom, let's talk about the Family Income Plan. Let's consider the freedom gained by low-income families who now have a little more money to spend for necessities.

SOME HON. MEMBERS: — Hear, hear!

MR. LARSON: — The list of freedoms gained is a long one and if the Liberal Party wants to make an issue of this we will be glad to debate it with them at any time and at any place.

It is very obvious to me, Mr. Speaker, that the greatest concern of the Opposition is not the freedom of the individual. What the Leader is really concerned about is the freedom of his corporate friends. He is very obviously in favour of the Winnipeg Commodity Exchange having the freedom to exploit and gamble with farmers and their products. He is very obviously in favour of Continental and Cargill Grain coming into Saskatchewan and Canada and being free to take advantage of every opportunity to gain the opportunity to exploit at their own gain and profit. He certainly must condone the gains Continental Grain made during the last USSR grain sale. He is very obviously in favour of letting all forms of orderly marketing left to the freedom of speculators. He is very obviously in favour of foreign multinational corporations being free to exploit and rape the profits from our natural resources. Obviously the sign is going to go up again, "Come and take it, free for all."

December 9, 1974

That's the kind of freedom that he is talking about and will assure the Liberal Party of plenty of campaign funds come election time.

The Leader of the Opposition is very obviously in favour of railroads having the freedom to abandon rail lines at their own discretion, he is very obviously in favour of the railroads to have the freedom to abandon the Crow's Nest Pass agreement, he is very obviously in favour of inland terminals where farmers will have to haul grain great distances over provincial roads just to assure a profit for his friends, he is very obviously in favour of small towns and communities dying if someone can make a profit out of it, he is very obviously in favour of the Saskatchewan Land Bank being free to anyone who wants to buy it, or take advantage of it. The kind of freedom that the Liberal Party talks about very clearly has no place in today's society.

I could go on, Mr. Speaker, I could go on to list a very great number of important factors related thereto but I want to say a word or two in closing about some of the other aspects that the Throne Speech referred to. It talked about some of the problems of the future. I think if the Throne Speech is deserving of criticism it probably ought to be in the area where it did not go far enough. I think that the signals on the horizon that the Throne Speech referred to are much more ominous and much clearer cut and distinct than we spelled out and probably ought to have spelled out.

I refer to an article that I hold in my hand by Leonard Silk, an authoritative writer on economics, natural resources and ecology at the international level. He writes in the New York Times:

What the earth can supply is limited. The world objective now ought to be survival instead of growth.

In this article he talks about the possibility of energy shortage, resource shortage, food shortage, pollution taking over and threatening to destroy man. I want to refer to man today like the dinosaurs of many eras ago. They ate and they grew and they grew and they ate, and they ate and they grew some more. They ate until they finally ate themselves out of existence and became extinct, if there ever was a parallel it's man's greed to exploit and to destroy the resources; the nonrenewable resources on this earth.

If we want to be objective about the potential of the earth to feed itself we must recognize that we cannot go on and continue to destroy the irreplaceable resources. I refer to the destruction of land, the very basic natural resource that produces the livelihood of human beings. In Canada alone, if we are to take the words of those who have made a study of this particular important item, we find that 24 to 26 acres of arable land, every day of every week, of every month, of every year is taken forever out of food production into urban sprawl, into cement, into blacktop, out of production. This can't continue, we can't continue to do this kind of unplanned, unrestricted destruction of man's resources. We find if we look at the use of minerals that we are destroying minerals at a rate unparalleled. If we continue this gross national product growth syndrome then in about another 500 to 1,000 years we will be consuming the total net weight of the earth in minerals so there will be nothing left. These are the stark, grim realities that

face us and if man wants to avoid the route of the dinosaur he must do something about it and that time is now.

We can't continue to hope that we can grow by raping and destroying irreplaceable resources. We have to look at the realities of where we are today. If I were to criticize the Throne Speech I would say that it did not put enough emphasis on some of these vital, some of these very important factors that we must face. We would be hypocrites if we stand in any legislature or any public platform and try to convince the society of today that we can continue on this self-destruction route of national growth continuously and perpetually. Someone has to take the initiative to try to point out where we are, what we are doing, where we must go if we are to survive.

I could go on for a considerable length of time, Mr. Speaker. I promised my Whip that I would not go over the half hour so I have already transgressed. Very obviously I will not be supporting the amendment but I certainly will be supporting the main motion.

SOME HON. MEMBERS: — Hear, hear!

MR. D. BOLDT (Rosthern): — Mr. Speaker, I have listened to a good number of debates in the last 19 years or 20 years but I never knew that the Liberals were that bad. I have listened to every speech, the only thing that is missing is, they are just like the Pharisee, they should say a little prayer and thank God that they are not as bad as the Liberals. This comes out in every speech; the Liberals have never done a thing that is positive, everything negative. The NDP have never done anything . . .

SOME HON. MEMBERS: — Hear, hear!

MR. BOLDT: — . . . the NDP have never done anything that is negative, it is all positive.

SOME HON. MEMBERS: — Hear, hear!

MR. BOLDT: — Surely to goodness this is shortsightedness. The Premier took the lead and I want to say a few things about his speech.

MR. BLAKENEY: — The word from the pulpit!

MR. BOLDT: — Yes, someone has to talk to the Pharisee! After having listened to the Premier's remarks for several hours he left no doubt in anybody's mind that he intends to conduct the most vicious, misleading corrupt election campaign that this province will ever witness.

SOME HON. MEMBERS: — Hear, hear!

MR. BOLDT: — He has set the tone and every one of his troops is following. It will be a campaign of misrepresentation, lies, personal attacks on individuals, a campaign most Saskatchewan people will be ashamed of.

December 9, 1974

MR. ENGEL: — You want to talk about your own techniques!

MR. BOLDT: — I can tell a lot about your own techniques, if you want to listen to them, my friend over there.

He made reference in his speech that if Liberals get elected, the Wheat Board goes out the window. All farmer controlled marketing boards will be scuttled; health programs will disappear; farmers will leave the province in large numbers; big business will gobble up little Saskatchewan. He has hired enough troops for the civil service, he will get the support from the union bosses and they'll send him the troops from all parts of Canada. He'll use the provincial treasury, which he is doing now, to the limit to further his cause and put on the act as honest Allan, the man whom you can trust.

Mr. Blakeney made reference to me in his speech regarding my position towards the Wheat Board. Well, I want to tell the Premier that he doesn't have to make any announcements on my behalf. I believe all Members in this House, particularly on this side, know that I am quite capable of expressing my personal opinion. I don't need the Premier doing it on my-behalf.

I want to tell the Premier again that Operation LIFT was recommended to Otto Lang by the Wheat Board, by the Wheat Pool, by the farm organizations; they supported it to the hilt.

SOME HON. MEMBERS: — Hear, hear!

MR. BOLDT: — Why did they support it? Because the Wheat Board couldn't sell any wheat. So they had to take land out of production. The Wheat Board wasn't selling any wheat, so we had to take land out of wheat. It does not surprise me in the least that Ted Turner of the Wheat Pool is asking for Otto Lang's resignation. It surely doesn't! In the last year or two Ted Turner has had so many personal defeats he is now seeking for a scapegoat to save his own head. The Wheat Pool spent tens of thousands of dollars telling the rapeseed growers how to vote in the vote last spring and Turner lost that one. Turner of the Wheat Pool lost the feed grain issue and farmers are very pleased to be able to sell feed grain to the Wheat Board and to the open market. It was reported to me over the weekend that the Wheat Pool has sent letters to farmers in the Weyburn area to oppose the grain terminal to be built in Weyburn. He has lost that argument. I read the other day in the Leader-Post that the contract has been let, regardless of what Teddy says.

I say to the Pool members and to the delegates that if my leader had so many defeats and setbacks as Ted Turner has had I would be shopping around for a new president.

MR. ROLFES: — How come you are over there then?

MR. BOLDT: — I'll have a few words to say to you my friend over there.

Because of the attitude of the Wheat Pool and the Wheat Board, I, as a farmer, have little confidence in the Wheat Board

I've told you that before. If it would disappear, I would not regret it for one moment. But the Federal Government in its wisdom and the provincial Liberal Party believe in the Canadian Wheat Board and I am sure it is here to stay. The Premier is using another federal issue just to direct attention away from his failures.

Mr. Speaker, I am sure you can write a book, you could write a book about democracy in your party and he need not tell us about the democracy in the Liberal Party. I just want to tell you about how you were shafted by the Premier. How Government-paid executive assistants took time off and went into your constituency with the blessing of the Premier to seek the nomination while your duties as Speaker prevented you from participation.

AN HON. MEMBER: — Where did the Premier go?

MR. BOLDT: — The Premier can't face me, he walked out a few minutes ago.

When the Premier was asked by one of the Members in this side of the House last spring to intervene on your behalf, his only comment was, Mr. Speaker, he said and I quote, "I understand Mr. Speaker is retiring from politics." Now don't get the wrong impression, Mr. Speaker, that I am sorry to see other Members of your party not returning to this House. I hope none of them will. But the principle of democracy in the NDP is repulsive, something that just couldn't happen in any other political party.

SOME HON. MEMBERS: — Hear, hear!

MR. BOLDT: — Not that it is the only sin the Premier committed within the NDP ranks. I want to say a few words about my friend for Hanley (Mr. Mostoway). Let's examine what happened in the Rosthern constituency in this great free enterprise democratic state in Saskatchewan.

Mr. Speaker, last spring when we were sitting in the House my deskmate, Mr. Guy, brought a dirty rag into the Assembly, *The Commonwealth*. He read an article from it which said, "Rosthern NDP nominating convention to be held in the Osler school auditorium." The date and time were given. On the basis of the new Rosthern constituency boundaries the sitting Member Mr. Mostoway has the Rosthern seat; he lived in that constituency in 1971. He was not notified, or consulted about the convention. This convention was not advertised in the Rosthern Valley News or the Star-Phoenix nor radio or television. Most NDPers today do not know whether there has been a nominating convention held in Rosthern. However, the now unduly nominated candidate feared that the Premier might give Mr. Mostoway his blessing, so the hard-core NDP supporters of that little Rosthern constituency based on the old boundaries called a nominating convention hurriedly and they quietly nominated the present so-called NDP candidate and Mr. Mostoway was shafted.

This can happen in the inner circles of the NDP, it can happen in Communist Russia. What did the Premier say? Not a thing! Mr. Speaker, Paul Mostoway and you were shafted by the Premier and Leader of the NDP. This is dirty politics right

December 9, 1974

within your own ranks. The Premier has the gall to make snide remarks about the present candidate running in the Rosthern constituency.

Let me inform the Premier for his benefit alone how it came about that Allan Guy was nominated in Rosthern. On September 6, 1973, Saskatchewan Valley News carried this release. You can get it from the Legislative Library if you want to, or I can table it. Similar releases were issued to the Star-Phoenix and the news media. I want to read only one small paragraph from it. It was issued by me and I want to quote from it. September 6, 1973:

I am making the announcement now (in regard to my retirement from politics, I should say) so that those who are thinking of running for the nomination will have ample opportunity to do so before the election.

Six months later we advertised for a nominating convention in the Osler school auditorium. Allan Guy was nominated by a very popular individual in the Rosthern constituency, he is an auctioneer and a farmer named Ed Roth. Our leader Dave Steuart was present, our executive was present, nobody was railroaded by anybody. Allan Guy was the unanimous choice of the Rosthern Liberal Party supporters. Nobody was shafted.

MR. MESSER: — How many people were there?

MR. BOLDT: — Between 125 and 150 people and there were less than 25 people in the nominating convention of the NDP — I have this word direct from Mr. Mostoway.

I feel sorry for Mr. Mostoway. I respect him. I am convinced that he would have received more votes, although still losing his deposits than the present unduly elected NDP candidate for the Rosthern constituency.

SOME HON. MEMBERS: — Hear, hear!

MR. BOLDT: — Mr. Speaker, the Throne Speech sounded like an old worn-out squeaky wagon drawn by 18 old plugs, just about ready for retirement. The socialist wagon is worn out, the grain box is empty, they've spent everything they had. In other words, they blew it.

My, what a sad state of affairs this province is in. Labour unrest as never before. We hear speakers talking about labour unrest during the Liberal regime. One three-month construction strike this spring. The Public Service people are threatening to have a strike vote. Civil servants are walking out and now conducting a strike vote, the teachers are unhappy, wanting salary renegotiations, parents withholding children from school; school boards being appointed and school boards being fired by the Government.

The Education Department, the school system, the boards and the universities operate on a day-to-day basis, never knowing when the axe is going to fall.

Government interference and controls are on everyone's mind, just hoping that it won't happen to us next time around.

They have had their fights with the hog producers. They maybe won that momentarily but they will lose it in the end. They had their fight with the rapeseed producers. Mr. Messer was all for the Wheat Board taking over the rapeseed. The farmers didn't want it. They lost that one and the farmers will not forget it.

They have fought with the native people from the day they were elected. They'll never win that one, and it has cost the taxpayers tens of millions of dollars every year with absolutely no results or benefits. They have fought with the oil industry. If winning means driving them out of the province, then the Government has won. But the people of Saskatchewan have lost. They have fought with the potash people and they'll brag about it. We heard it just a few moments ago about all the tax dollars now being collected but that fight will also end up in defeat.

They are fighting with the Federal Government. If Premier Blakeney won't be reasonable, that fight will be most costly to Saskatchewan.

They have fought with the Timber Board, lumber and pulp industries. They have cancelled out all previous agreements and set up Crown-owned industries with unfair competition which will be to the detriment of the Saskatchewan people. The Government of Saskatchewan has made a concerted effort to drive out private enterprise and substitute it with socialism which has never worked, nor will it ever. It hasn't worked in the western world nor has it worked elsewhere.

The Throne Speech opening remarks were directed at the Federal Government. Premier Blakeney and his Government are critical of the Federal Government's intention on resource taxation. Premier Blakeney accuses the Federal Government of departing from the March agreements. Prime Minister Trudeau states that this is not so. He has tabled evidence in the House and here on Friday last, I believe it was, in Regina he put the evidence right before the people of Saskatchewan. But I say both Premier Blakeney and Prime Minister Trudeau are lawyers and I suppose both have legal minds. It doesn't surprise me that they do not agree.

That really isn't the main issue. What really concerns me and concerns a good number of Saskatchewan citizens is whether Premier Blakeney considers himself first a Saskatchewan citizen and second a Canadian? If he considers himself first a Saskatchewan citizen, and all other nine Premiers think like he does, then we will be the complete losers and we will have chaos. If Premier Blakeney wants to tax the rest of Canada for all he can get out of them from resources such as oil and potash, for our benefit, then I can see Premiers Davis and Bourassa claiming the Great Lakes and the St. Lawrence Seaway as their provincially owned natural resource and they can tax the movement of grain to the limit. I wouldn't be a bit surprised if they put \$1 a bushel tax on every bushel that moves through these Great Lakes, in reprisal for treatment received from Saskatchewan.

I can see socialist Premier Barrett of British Columbia nailing \$1 a bushel tax on every bushel of grain moving through his province and sea ports and I am sure he could find every legal right to do so. This fight that Premier Blakeney is

December 9, 1974

engaged in with the Federal Government could burst at the seams and we could be hurt, particularly the farmer who has to ship all his products out of the province. We could be hurt far more than any advantage he now sees momentarily.

Finance Minister Turner has stated publicly that he has made some concession in this last budget as compared to last spring. He has stated that the next move is up to the Premier. I have also noticed on television interviews that he has left some room for negotiations. I therefore challenge the Premier to stop criticizing the Federal Government, get down to Ottawa, the sooner the better and negotiate the best deal possible for Saskatchewan . . .

SOME HON. MEMBERS: — Hear, hear!

MR. BOLDT: — . . . which will also be fair to other Canadians. This is the only way we will be able to get the oil and potash industry moving in this province. This will be the only way we will regain confidence from the industry in Canada.

It has also been said and proven that if the farmer gets a good price for his grain, business in Saskatchewan is good. Sure it holds even more true that if the farmer, the oil producer, and the potash industries get reasonably good returns for their investments, business will be that much better for everyone. If you can't negotiate with them, Mr. Premier, if you have closed your doors, or if you don't intend to negotiate, then call an election.

SOME HON. MEMBERS: — Hear, hear!

MR. BOLDT: — The people of Saskatchewan will negotiate with you and they will send a negotiator to Ottawa.

Your Government, Mr. Premier, has been picking fights and issues since the day you were elected to office. If it wasn't with the Federal Government you picked fights with the native people. It's about time you settled down to the business of administering the affairs of this province. Saskatchewan needs Ottawa much more than Ottawa needs Saskatchewan. If you want to break ties with them, we'll be a wilderness in no time.

The Premier of Saskatchewan must be Saskatchewan's worst businessman. During past debates in this House, when we criticized the socialist policy, he said, oh, we are not afraid of industry, they go where the industry is. Well that has proven to be entirely false. Potash companies are now not looking for potash, not in Saskatchewan, they are looking elsewhere. The uranium industry will be next. You'll tax them out of Saskatchewan as well. If the people of Saskatchewan want that kind of government, I can tell them that after the mining industry is out, then the farmers will be next. Farmers are already seeing some grave danger signs on the horizon. This Government intends to take the land away from everyone.

The Throne Speech clearly indicates that the Premier wants to focus the campaign on the next election on federal policies rather than the record of his Government. There are no new programs suggested, we have increased expenditures which are all eroded away by the increased number of civil servants and inflation.

SOME HON. MEMBERS: — Hear, hear!

MR. BOLDT: — Take a look at the highway program. The Minister of Highways (Mr. Kramer) stated recently that the 1975-76 budget for highways will not be increased to the extent it was last year. That means considerably less highway construction. I have been informed by people in the Highway Department that crude oil for asphalt paving has gone up 60 per cent this last summer. Contract bids have exceeded, in some cases, more than 200 per cent over the expected cost. So increased grants to rural and urban municipalities have assisted very little in actual work done.

The city of Saskatoon, the Mayor said the other day, reported bids coming in at over 200 per cent contemplated costs, so many urgent road and street constructions projects are just not being done.

If we were the Government, and I am sorry the Minister of Highways isn't in, if we were the Government and he was sitting over here he would only have one thing to say to me and that is, he would accuse the Minister of Highways and the Premier of under-the-table deals, rather than to the cost of inflation.

The record of four years of socialism is a dismal one.

SOME HON. MEMBERS: — Hear, hear!

MR. BOLDT: — They wanted and promised to settle the native problem once and for all. If there is one reason why this Government should be defeated it is for the mess they have left behind in the Department of Northern Saskatchewan. The Government has practically removed every good dedicated civil servant from the North and replaced him with a radical socialist, communist or a waffler.

Is it any wonder that the natives are up in arms? And yet the Premier has the gall to say, in the Throne Speech, that "Rapid and exciting development is occurring in the North."

SOME HON. MEMBERS: — Hear, hear!

MR. BOLDT: — The industry that is there today is there because of the seven years of Liberal Government and has nothing to do with your socialistic philosophy.

If there is one thing this Government has excelled in, that must be the building of its political machine. Tommy Douglas could not achieve in 20 years what this Government has done in three and a half years. Practically every known NDPer without a job, or waiting for a job, has been hired by the Government.

Prior to the 1971 election the NDP candidates vowed that political patronage would be non-existent if they were the Government. Well, the same thing happened in 1944. They conducted the election campaign like a religious crusade, and made their declaration sound like the Sermon on the Mount. How hypocritical. Even Mr. M. J. Coldwell — listen to this — M.J. Coldwell stated in Saskatoon on June 9, 1944 and I quote:

December 9, 1974

The day of the political heeler in Saskatchewan will be at an end if the CCF is elected.

He goes on to say and I quote:

I would sever my connections with the Party if it were not so.

Why, this grand old gentleman was as dishonest as all the rest of them.

In those years 1944 to 1964, the Department of Industry and Information became known as the Department of "Vacations Unlimited" by the civil servants who had a job to do and were not privileged, nor did they want to get politically involved.

SOME HON. MEMBERS: — Hear, hear!

MR. BOLDT: — This blatant dishonesty by Premier Blakeney and his Government will backfire. The majority of civil servants resent this kind of public squandering and have indicated to me and to many of my friends, that this Government is too dictatorial, shoves too many people around with its political organizers on the government payroll and you are going to be in for a real surprise come next election day.

SOME HON. MEMBERS: — Hear, hear!

MR. BOLDT: — Why is it that the NDP Government is not being applauded for some of its measures taken? As I said at the outset I don't think that the Liberals are as bad as you people think we are and I don't think that you're as bad, I don't think that you are all bad, you've done a few good things.

SOME HON. MEMBERS: — Hear, hear!

MR. BOLDT: — I am always reminded of the Member for Arm River, Mr. Herman Danielson, who once said in this House to the Premier that if he told the truth it was an accident.

There is no argument that some policies implemented are good, but the people of Saskatchewan just haven't rallied their support to these programs. The Land Bank is a good example.

The seller might be reasonably happy for the Government to have bought his property, but the son, or some other young chap would have liked to purchase it. You have made him a tenant and he doesn't like it.

You boast about the health program, but just how much support do you receive from the public? Hospital boards find it difficult to operate under your budgets, hospital beds are empty because of lack of funds and shortage of staff.

Medical and hospital premiums were abolished and I haven't heard of any amount of support from this measure except from the Government benches. You gave me \$72, my, that made me a rich man! I could pay it myself, now every citizen is helping me pay the \$72 and many object to this method. I don't see why we should pay it to fellows who are on that side of the House.

We all could afford it, after all you were so conscientious about spending money that you've practically doubled the indemnity for every MLA.

The answer to why your programs are not supported is because of your motives. Every move you make is a political move, aimed at enhancing your socialist theories and not necessarily, almost never, good for the province.

Canadians in general believe in the free enterprise system. This country has been built up federally by the Liberals, we have never had a socialist government. Provincially from 1905 to 1944 we had a Liberal Government and those were the pioneers. If they had had a socialist government, if we had had a socialist government in 1905, and listened to the Member for Pelly (Mr. Larson) this evening, we wouldn't have plowed one furrow, not one furrow.

I should like to ask the Hon. Member for Pelly if we are using 25 acres of cultivated land for urbanization every day, 365 days a year, what's his answer? Are you going to shoot the people so that they can't build anymore? What are you going to do? You've got no answer. Barrett tried it. What did he do? He raised the price of a lot from \$5,000 to \$25,000. That is what happened. That was the socialist theory. Friends going over from my area into British Columbia — and this is a fact, I have seen pictures of it, I have heard people remark of it — they drive into the service station in British Columbia and signs right across the driveway say, "We can't Barrett any longer." That's socialism for you.

SOME HON. MEMBERS: — Hear, hear!

MR. BOLDT: — We have people, many citizens in this province came here, some voluntarily, some fled from their homelands, because of socialism and communism and you are stepping right in the steps of the socialist-communist Russia.

SOME HON. MEMBERS: — Hear, hear!

MR. BOLDT: — These people, including my parents and my wife's parents, some of your folks, came over from Russia, what did they want here? They wanted to own a piece of land. That's they wanted.

SOME HON. MEMBERS: — Hear, hear!

MR. BOLDT: — They wanted to own and build their own homes, they are not about to give it up.

When you talk about the Land Bank, will you, Mr. Minister of Agriculture (Mr. Messer), make a contract with one that has leased land, a written contract that this farmer who is renting the land, that he can buy it after five years? Will you do that? No, you won't. The Land Bank is the same as the Land Bank program in Manitoba, those who have leased from the Government have gone to the Government and asked for a written agreement. They want to build farms, they want to build corrals, they want a written agreement from the Minister whether they will sell it in five years. They say that we just can't do

December 9, 1974

that. We don't know what the program is going to be after five years. No sir, you have no intentions of selling the land.

SOME HON. MEMBERS: — Hear, hear!

MR. BOLDT: — Socialism, as Premier Blakeney would like it to be, is not accepted by the majority of the people of Saskatchewan.

I am sure, Mr. Speaker, you will recognize that I cannot support the Throne Speech, I will support the amendment.

SOME HON. MEMBERS: — Hear, hear!

MR. F. MEAKES (Touchwood): — Mr. Speaker, quite a long time ago I promised myself that I wasn't going to get into a fight with my friend from Rosthern, his candour is well known and I will give him the credit that I believe that anything that he says he means. But there were a couple of things I could not resist. When he talked about Saskatchewan needing Canada more than Canada needed Saskatchewan, it made me think of my own stand for (if my Hon. friend, the Leader of the Opposition (Mr. Steuart) would just sit still I'll come to him in a moment. I know he is anxious to hear what I have to say about him.) I think of my own stand through the '60s and the early '70s in terms of Quebec and a lot of people in western Canada were saying, Quebec, let it go etc., etc., and I don't really think that I am an extremely nationalistic person, but I do think that Canada is a great country to live in and I am glad I was born here and I hope I die here 25 years from now. But remarks like the Hon. Member just made will do as much to stir up the dissension in western Canada as the dissension that went on in Quebec.

I think we need one another, and I just wish that Canada might consider Saskatchewan just a little more. His remarks about Mr. Coldwell are not even worthy of answering.

SOME HON. MEMBERS: — Hear, hear!

MR. MEAKES: — Another statement he made and I want to refer to it, in which he referred to the possibility of the civil servants going out on strike. Well, I am kind of proud that they have the right to go out on strike. Under your Government they would have been herded in concentration camps before they could have gone out on strike. Bill 2 would have made it illegal for them to do anything.

We believe in the democratic process and we believe in the right of bargaining. Let me tell you, certainly when we have bargaining there is always a possibility we will have strikes. I believe in the philosophy that the only difference between a free man and a slave is that the free man has the right to withhold his labour.

SOME HON. MEMBERS: — Hear, hear!

MR. MEAKES: — I am not at all ashamed and I am not scared if they decide to go out, all right that's part of the bargaining process and I, for one, will not take it away from them.

I, first of all, Mr. Speaker, want to congratulate the mover and the seconder. I think they each are a tribute to their constituency and certainly to our caucus. I know that we are all proud of them.

SOME HON. MEMBERS: — Hear, hear!

MR. MEAKES: — I know that they have a future in this House that will go on for years to come.

I want also, Mr. Speaker, to congratulate the Premier for his complete rebuttal of the Leader of the Opposition. He is a leader whom we are proud of and I might say that it is very noticeable, practically every Member who has got up in that side of the House to your left, Sir, has attacked him. They know his popularity and they are scared of it.

SOME HON. MEMBERS: — Hear, hear!

MR. MEAKES: — Sorry that the Leader of the Opposition has left his seat, he reminded me quite a bit of that fable of Don Quixote, you know that was the mad Spaniard that went around jousting at windmills that were not there, and really, he spent 70 minutes the other day jousting at those windmills that weren't there. It seemed to me that he spoke for about 75 minutes and he was in a vacuum most of the time.

Before I get down to my address, there are a couple of things I wish to mention. We've had a convention the last few days in town and really I couldn't help but be intrigued, there were 1,200 people. But by golly, Mr. Speaker, the picture that I saw on the third page of December 7th Leader-Post, when I look at it, it says underneath, 'Prime Minister mingles with Liberals.' I see that the Leader of the Opposition was there, if that's a sample of the people who were there, there isn't a person under 60, in fact the Leader of the Opposition looks younger than anybody else in the picture. They must have had a bunch of the old Liberals, that's all they've got left, and when they die it is going to be too bad for you.

I was amused that in today's paper, Mr. Speaker, a headline which says, "Steuart Notes Change." I just want to read a couple of paragraphs:

Provincial Leader, Dave Steuart said Saturday that the Liberal Party Convention proves Saskatchewan Liberals have definitely shed their image as right wingers.

SOME HON. MEMBERS: — Hear, hear!

MR. MEAKES: — "We are becoming a centre of the road party." He said that. "And are and will remain the only alternative to the NDP in Saskatchewan."

You know after listening to my friend from Rosthern and reading that, I just couldn't resist to quote from it. You know, I wish

December 9, 1974

they would be consistent, those fellows over there. You know, the Hon. Member for Pelly (Mr. Larson) referred to the Member for Athabasca (Mr. Guy) and a headline that Guy comes to the defence of the Northern Department. But just on Saturday, on the third page again of December 7th: "Steuart Speech Criticized Federal Resource Tax Policy." I want to quote just one paragraph from it:

Looking at northern Saskatchewan the Liberal leader promised to replace the Department of Northern Saskatchewan with programs which would help people to help themselves.

Now the Leader of the Opposition here is going to replace it and the Member for Athabasca says they are going to keep it. I don't really think they know themselves what they are going to do and certainly the people of Saskatchewan are not going to take any kind of chances on this kind of performance.

The other thing that made me wonder when the Leader said he is no longer the right wing, and again, this is in Saturday's paper. I just want to quote a couple of paragraphs:

Another consumer-oriented resolution which was defeated would have asked a Liberal Government to ensure that every company selling farm equipment in Saskatchewan would establish a fully stocked parts depot.

While criticizing the parts depot resolution delegates charged that the proposal came right out of the NDP handbook. Some said it would increase the price of machinery and others argued that most farmers order machinery before it is needed giving dealerships time to order from larger centres.

There is another paragraph here. I note it says that it was defeated, but it did get the support of the farmers who were there. I guess there weren't very many farmers. It is no longer really a farmer's party.

I was interested also in the report of his trip to Sri Lanka from the Member for Albert Park (Mr. MacLeod), extremely interested, but there was one thing that he said that I couldn't resist writing down, which I abhor and object to from the bottom of my heart. He told about the Canadian embassy man who kicked a cow before he left. To me, this is a complete affront to people's religious beliefs. I am one who hasn't got too many religious beliefs, but I do believe in the right of everybody to believe as they want to and I respect those people's beliefs.

I remember saying to a guide who was guiding me when I was in India and I said it on purpose to get his answer. I said something like this — not saying that I say this, but I have heard it said by Canadians — that if they were to kill every cow in India the food that they eat would keep the starving millions from starving. He was a devout Hindu and he looked at me for a moment and said, "Well, I wouldn't really object to the cows being killed," but he said, "Don't blame the cows for the system." That's what I say to my hon. friend from Albert Park.

SOME HON. MEMBERS: — Hear, hear!

MR. MEAKES: — Well, Mr. Speaker, I turn now to the document that we've been debating and that the Member for Nipawin (Mr. Comer) and the Member for Hanley (Mr. Mostoway) started six days ago to debate. I want to put my views about it and make it known. The Speech from the Throne spells clearly the record of this Government in the last three years. It is clear that that record is exceptional. In fact, no government in Canada, unless it was the Douglas Government of 1944-1948 has ever achieved as much in such a short time. I will deal with that record in a few minutes, but first let me go over the progress in Touchwood in the last three years.

In 1971 there were no nursing homes in Touchwood. Liberals didn't believe in such things for smaller centres. For seven years the people had been trying to persuade the Liberal Government to lower the population base down from 5,000 people. No go! The Liberals used this base only as a base excuse.

An NDP Government under the leadership of one of the outstanding leaders in Canada, did lower the population base from 5,000 to 3,500 people. Within a few weeks a nursing home was being built in Cupar, completed in 1972. This year one is being built in Ituna. It should open next spring. A Liberal Government did nothing, an NDP Government acted for people.

In 1965 the Sisters at St. Joseph's Hospital in Lestock had the go-ahead on a major renovation. What happened when the Liberals took over? In 1964 George Trapp saw that those plans were cancelled. The hospital continued to deteriorate. Only when an NDP Government was re-elected did things begin to happen. This spring tenders were accepted to build a new 21-bed hospital in Lestock. Construction is well under way with the completion date set for next July. Again, the people of Touchwood are grateful to an NDP Government.

When I think of Saskatchewan in its despair in 1971, after seven long years of Liberal Government, I marvel, not only what has been accomplished by this Government, but more so, the cheer and the optimism of our people. Farmers were being paid not to produce grain and in particular machinery agents were going bankrupt. Over 100 businesses closed their doors in 1970 in Regina. Our small communities were dying.

Now, in the last six months in my town, two businesses have opened. Young farmers are returning to the land. The Land Bank and FarmStart are proving their worth. Those young farmers will not forget that the Liberals in this House opposed those programs to the bitter end. If there is one thing that will make certain that there will be no Liberal Government in this province for many years, it is the Liberal record on the Land Bank and FarmStart.

Things are happening in Saskatchewan, good things, and Saskatchewan people appreciate the growth. There are exciting things happening and people know this.

In the New Deal for People we promised that we would reduce property taxation for basic school purposes to an average of 25 mills across the province. This we have done through bigger school grants and through much larger property improvement payments.

December 9, 1974

As mentioned before, this year we introduced a new urban assistance packet of \$100 million over the next five years:

- unconditional grants of \$10 per capita each year towards urban operating costs;
- unconditional grants of \$75 per capita over five years to community capital projects.

I know that in my constituency, Mr. Speaker, that a lot of buildings are being built that wouldn't have been built if it wasn't for the grants. No wonder the people of Saskatchewan are excited, no wonder they will return the Blakeney Government to power whenever the election comes.

Mr. Speaker, let me inform you of a special program that was proceeded with this summer in Lestock. Here I give great credit to the Minister of Social Services (Mr. Taylor) and his Department. Eight men, who otherwise had been and would have been on welfare, built nearly two and a half miles of cement sidewalk and it only cost the village 40 per cent of the material. I watched this program and not only did we get the sidewalks, but these men were rehabilitated and now most of them have taken jobs and are productive citizens. This program was experimental and in my opinion it was a success. I hope the Minister is able to continue this program, even though no federal money went into it. The Liberals, when they were in power, did nothing, only let people rot under their welfare program. Saskatchewan people will not forget that.

Mr. Speaker, I want now to turn to the federal scene. I said last year, and I repeat again, that the greatest traitor ever sent by Saskatchewan people to Ottawa is the Minister of Justice and the Minister in charge of the Wheat Board. Never have a group of people been betrayed, as the hon. gentleman betrayed the Saskatchewan farmer. As the puppet of James Richardson and Sons, he is gradually, methodically setting about to sabotage the Wheat Board, the Crow's Nest Pass rates and return grain marketing to the jungle of the Grain Exchange.

It is easy to see who financed the Liberal Party in the last election — the private grain trade, the Grain Exchange, the CPR have now been paid off. Tommy Douglas's old saying, "You are putting a skunk in the chicken house," was never more apt than in this case.

I agree with the Saskatchewan Wheat Pool when they demanded that he resign or be relieved of his post. It is hard to believe that he, Otto Lang, raised on a farm could betray the farmers, as he has done and continues to do. I am reminded of that quotation that I learned at school, "Just for a ribbon to hang on his coat."

One is reminded of two other Liberals, Charlie Dunning and J. G. Gardiner. Charlie Dunning, as Minister of Transport in Ottawa, in the '20s, sold out to the CPR. After he was defeated he became a director of the CPR. He forgot his friends who had supported him from Yorkton, Jedburgh, Beaverdale and Theodore. One only has to go yet and talk to the older people and they still talk about that betrayal.

Jimmy Gardiner, the long-time Minister of Agriculture for Canada, after he became Minister in 1935 did away with the compulsory Wheat Board. Again, he sold out to his friends in

the grain trade. If there had been no war in 1939 or 1941 there would still be no Wheat Board. It is strange that the record of the Liberal Party for over 50 years has been one of opposing any idea that is progressive and one of always supporting their corporate friends.

Now, in real Liberal fashion, we see Otto Lang again following in the footsteps of his two predecessors to sabotage the farm movement. The old saying of "A Liberal is a Liberal," still remains true.

SOME HON. MEMBERS: — Hear, hear!

MR. MEAKES: — Many of our farmers are mad, especially the younger ones. Many were forced to sell their grain this fall on the open market. Otto Lang made certain that the Wheat Board kept Wheat Board prices low, long enough to force those farmers with debts to pay, to sell on the open market. After they had sold, the Wheat Board raised its prices. These farmers see what they lost by this action. Liberal action has cost these farmers tens of millions of dollars. Again, typical Liberal policy.

Mr. Speaker, let me quote Mr. Turner, president of the Saskatchewan Wheat Pool, in a release of November 12, 1974. He said, in which he was talking of Canada's new system for marketing of feed grains, and I now quote:

The rules under which it operates are clearly stacked to encourage patronage of the open market system.

Mr. Speaker, it is no wonder that I use such strong language in referring to Otto Lang as a traitor. I have knowledge of the English language and I can think of no other word more befitting, more adequate or more descriptive. I believe in calling a spade a spade and I believe that he is a traitor to Saskatchewan farmers.

Recently I watched him on television and it was easy to see the hatred he has for the Saskatchewan Government. It radiates from him like a light bulb at night. He is allowing his personal bias to interfere with his decisions of high office, he is a disgrace to this province, and I agree with the Saskatchewan Wheat Pool president — he should be removed from high office.

Mr. Speaker, this is the man who three years ago was paying farmers not to produce grain because of world surpluses. He has the imagination and vision of an old tomcat.

If the farmer had been allowed to produce food, today we would be able to be pouring food into Ethiopia and Bangladesh and the other hungry people of the world and saving lives from starvation. We, in the western world, have the technology to land man on the moon, but we haven't solved the problem of distributing food to hungry people. We spend billions of dollars in bombing innocent people, but we have little or nothing to spend to save human lives. To me, this is a sin against humanity. We will finally pay for our sins. With our full bellies we watch television with the pictures of the starving people, all the while nibbling at a midnight lunch and saying 'how terrible.' What do we do about it? Nothing. I have said before in this House, and I say it again, if we don't find an

December 9, 1974

answer to these questions, then sometime we will pay for our sins of omission and commission. We are a disgrace to our supposed Christian philosophy.

Our whole education must be revamped. We must start teaching co-operation, not competition. Our competitive society teaches greed, exploitation and selfishness. If we are successful we climb the ladder knocking our competitors off the rungs above us. Mr. Speaker, in this regard I should like to quote from the Prairie Messenger of November 17, 1974. This is an article with the headline "To Teach Co-operation or Competition" by Louise Daly, the writer. Mr. Speaker, I am going to quote a little bit of this because I think it is very relevant to what I am saying. I now quote:

In order to study the competition in our present society we need only to witness the dog-eat-dog formula of the business world. Success entails climbing up the ladder and if a few people get knocked off in the process that is easily dismissed as a part of life. Within the world of education marking policies and grading standards move the student into the arena where the highest man wins, regardless of whether or not he played fairly. There is competition for places in university, for the best cigarette, for the highest position and for the fastest car. It is no wonder that North Americans seldom laud compassionate men and understanding women.

In our quest for success we have lost our humanity. Every nation recognizes the need for compassion and understanding in international dealings, but this same nation propagates an educational system which alienates these qualities within the child. Individually we may receive public acclaim as somebody, but within ourselves we recognize that most of the effort was inspired by the fear of being a nobody.

Throughout the world scholars in many disciplines are becoming aware of the need of co-operation in our modern society. Basically this presupposes a willingness to trust one another, to pool our ideas and resources and to respect and understand our fellow human beings. Through modern methods of communication nations are more aware of one another than ever before, and can face the problems too vast for one nation to handle. They have joined together to face their common problems.

How capable are we within our competitive background of joining them? This would be the way of life in the 21st century. Our modern society proclaims its superiority on the basis of our high standard of living. Sadly enough our teacher cannot equate our standard of living with our standard of life. Of living with our standard of life we have become so caught up in the rat race that we totally neglect things like learning, questioning, wondering and seeking peace within ourselves rather than on the national or international level.

One more paragraph further on:

We must give our students intellectual tools to reach out for a better world for tomorrow, but more important an open heart that will lead them to reach up to a

brother in warmth and acceptance. Only then will we, as teachers, educate them in the art of living.

Mr. Speaker, I think that those words in that paper are very true and very apt at this time in the history of the world. Only through a philosophy of selflessness of being our brother's keeper, of respecting the individual, of loving our fellow man, can we ever hope for a peaceful world; where the brotherhood of man can be a reality; where the weapons of war can be turned into a ploughshare and the sword into a pruning hook. This may sound idealistic. Let it be so. I am glad that I have not lost the idealism of my youth. Life without it would be useless.

Mr. Speaker, because this Speech from the Throne follows the philosophy I have expounded, because it spells out what we have done in the last three years and it follows that philosophy; because of what this Government has done to better our society; because it spells out future plans that will make Saskatchewan a better place to live in, it is with great pleasure and pride that I will support this 1974 Speech from the Throne and oppose the amendment.

SOME HON. MEMBERS: — Hear, hear!

MR. H. COUPLAND: (Meadow Lake): — Mr. Speaker, on entering this debate I first must congratulate the mover and the seconder of the Throne Speech. They did a very good job considering the document they had to defend.

It is obvious, Mr. Speaker, the NDP are going to try and fight the coming election on federal issues. It seems they have become masters at doing this to try and keep the minds of the people off their sorry record here in Saskatchewan.

SOME HON. MEMBERS: — Hear, hear!

MR. COUPLAND: — The Throne Speech is a document that tells the young people of Saskatchewan, in fact, all the people of Saskatchewan, that the NDP Government has blown it. They are not preparing for the future of our young people.

Mr. Speaker, this document offers no realistic alternatives to offset the damage done by the confiscation of Bill No. 42; it offers no future for the potash industry in the province, in fact, it says just the opposite. It says the NDP Government wants control of the potash industry and we all know if that happens that industry will virtually come to a halt at a cost of hundreds of jobs.

Then there is the pulp mill, Mr. Speaker, the one that the NDP sold down the river. We, in the Meadow Lake area, are still waiting for the alternative that was promised, when they cancelled that pulp mill. They must feel very guilty about that or the Premier would not have mentioned all the terrible effluent that he stopped going into the Beaver River.

I say, Mr. Speaker, if he had looked at the plans and the feasibility of that pulp mill instead of getting sucked in by some of his advisors to make it a political issue and play politics at the expense of the people of the North, he would have known no effluent was going into the Beaver River

December 9, 1974

whatsoever.

SOME HON. MEMBERS: — Hear, hear!

Mr. Coupland: — I admit, Mr. Speaker, this is a useless argument because the mill is gone and we are the losers, in fact all of the people of Saskatchewan.

SOME HON. MEMBERS: — Hear, hear!

MR. COUPLAND: — Mr. Speaker, my concern is that this NDP Government has carried on such a vicious attack on business and industry that when we form the Government, after the next election, we will have a hard time to convince people to invest in this province again.

Mr. Speaker, Saskatchewan, in the last two or three years, has lost an opportunity that we may not have again. Pulp has been and is in high demand yet the NDP stopped the construction of one pulp mill and discouraged anyone else from even thinking about investing in that industry in the province. Potash is needed around the world in ever-increasing amounts to help grow food in and for the starving nations, yet the NDP are not encouraging expanding that industry and, in fact, if they are elected again will virtually bring it to a halt.

SOME HON. MEMBERS: — Hear, hear!

MR. COUPLAND: — Then there is the oil industry. Bill No. 42 brought that industry to its knees, losing hundreds of jobs for people in the province, and this at a time when there is supposed to be an energy shortage throughout the world.

Surely, Mr. Speaker, this is a time when we should be encouraging exploration instead of curtailing it. Mr. Speaker, I say that if these three industries were allowed to expand in this province, the benefits to the people would be tremendous, not only for the revenue in taxes that would be derived, but mainly for the high-priced jobs that would be available for our young people.

Mr. Speaker, this has been a time that the Province of Saskatchewan could have started to catch up to our neighbouring Province, Alberta. We should be a 'have' province and could be were it not for NDP policies.

SOME HON. MEMBERS: — Hear, hear!

MR. COUPLAND: — We need this expansion in industry so that we are not entirely dependent on agriculture.

Mr. Speaker, the Member for Assiniboia-Bengough (Mr. Lange) spoke at some length about the NDP socialist Land Bank policy and that's what he called it, not me. He tried to make a point that the NDP protects the small farmer and wants to keep him on the farm. Mr. Speaker, that party opposite may say that they are the champions of the small farmer, but what are the facts?

Mr. Speaker, when I was first elected to this House there was a change of government. The first problem I had was saving two small farmers that the former CCF Government in 1963-64 were putting off their farms, one in the Pierceland area and the other just east of Meadow Lake.

The farmer in Pierceland was trying to guard his property from government bureaucrats with a rifle. I am happy to say, Mr. Speaker, that both these farmers retained their farms, thanks to the Liberal Government of those days. The same situation is going on today.

In one case, Mr. Speaker, they have taken away the farm from a man east of Meadow Lake and they have left him with 40 acres of land and told him that he could raise hogs for a living. I wonder if anyone in this House could give me a plan or formula to show how a farmer can make a living raising hogs on 40 acres of land.

Mr. Speaker, this wasn't enough damage to do to this farmer, no, the NDP had another little plum for him. They came along and ran a new highway from one corner of his 40 acres to the other. On top of this there was a slough in this 40 acres so this man is now living with about 8 to 10 acres and naturally he is having to live on welfare.

Mr. Speaker, this farmer's neighbour wasn't quite so lucky, she is a widow. The NDP Government left her only 13 acres to live on and this widow's son didn't fare quite so well, I think they left him with 8 acres. Just imagine, Mr. Speaker, how these people feel about the NDP champions of small farmers.

I realize that farmers get behind in taxes or cash rentals and maybe a government could say that they had reason to remove the farmers from the land, but surely to goodness they could at least have left them with the home quarter that their house is on. This only goes to show, Mr. Speaker, that the Members opposite do not know what is going on in their own government in regard to small farmers in this province. This only emphasizes the fact that the farmers in this province do not want to deal with an NDP Government in regard to their land.

SOME HON. MEMBERS: — Hear, hear!

MR. COUPLAND: — They just don't trust them. The farmers will be looking for a drastic reduction in lease dues for the next season because of the low price of cattle and I urge the NDP Government to lower those lease dues to ease the pressure on the cattlemen who are in a bind over low cattle prices.

Mr. Speaker, the Throne Speech mentioned the Department of Northern Saskatchewan. Well, if there was ever a fiasco in the province, it has to be the DNS.

SOME HON. MEMBERS: — Hear, hear!

MR. COUPLAND: — I had one gentleman, a friend of mine, tell me he worked for the DNS for a month to six weeks but just couldn't take it. He told me that he couldn't sleep nights because it disturbed him the way money was being squandered. It also disturbed him, the army of people who were being put on the payroll and not

December 9, 1974

knowing what they were supposed to do. He said there was no way he wanted to be a part of any such fiasco.

Mr. Speaker, the NDP promised local control for people of the North. Well, they decided to give the people of Ile-a-la-Crosse some local control by allowing them to elect their own school board. But, when this board made a decision that the Government didn't like, the Minister in charge at that time, Mr. MacMurchy, jumped in and said, "Oh no, we can't let you have local control. We are going to give control back to the northern school board." They virtually told that school board, "You are not smart enough to make your own decisions."

It is interesting, Mr. Speaker, that at that time that board had a majority that weren't favourable to the DNS. The situation is a little different right now, they had an election and now there is one majority who favour DNS policy. So all of a sudden the Government says, "Well, we will let you have some local control."

Mr. Speaker, there is a very serious situation in Ile-a-la-Crosse. Up to 200 children are out of school. The parents are concerned about the education the children are getting or not getting. This situation started a year ago, when a group of teachers went into Ile-a-la-Crosse and it is progressively getting worse. The parents say they are going to keep their children out of school until the board gets rid of the principal, Dave Adams. Mr. Speaker, I call upon the Government to set up an inquiry, an independent inquiry, as to the causes of this unrest and to do it with all due haste so that the situation can be cleared up before something serious happens.

Mr. Speaker, a radiogram was sent to Ted Bowerman and Premier Blakeney on November 26th. The same day a woman phoned the Premier's office and was told she could not talk to the Premier as he was busy for the next three weeks. She phoned again the next day and was told there was no way she could talk to the Premier. Now, Mr. Speaker, I know that Premier Blakeney is a very busy man, but surely he could talk to someone about such a serious situation as is developing in Ile-a-la-Crosse.

Mr. Speaker, Ile-a-la-Crosse is split down the middle over the school situation and it stems back to last spring when the locally elected school board made a decision which was reversed by the present Government. That situation has continued to fester and now children are being deprived of an education. It is inferred by some in Ile-a-la-Crosse that the Church is at the root of the problem. According to a news item in the Star-Phoenix, December 2nd, Dave Adams, Principal, is reported as saying some people who held power in the past are reluctant to relinquish that power. There was never any trouble in Ile-a-la-Crosse until Mr. Adams became principal there. This, in itself, has to indicate something.

I want to commend the missions that have been operating in the north for over 100 years and I am sure they have no desire for power, but are only in those areas for the good and welfare of the people. I commend the many men who work in those missions and have dedicated their lives to helping the people of the North over the years. I am sure that they will be continuing to work in those areas long after the agitators are gone.

I am sure that the Government is not aware of the seriousness of the situation. Last spring, when the trouble began, one of the trustees had to move his children out of his home because of fear of repercussions and the threatening phone calls that he was receiving. Just last week I was talking to a gentleman, by phone, in Ile-a-la-Crosse and I told him that I was going to phone another gentleman there, he said, "Mr. Coupland, will you wait for 15 minutes so that I can run across and tell the other fellow that you are going to phone otherwise he may not answer the phone." I am not kidding, Mr. Speaker, shout the seriousness of the situation up there.

It is interesting to note the NDP candidate up in that area, for Athabasca, Mr. Fred Thompson, is supposed to be supporting the parents concerned. And it will be interesting to see what kind of a stand he takes and whether he can convince the Government to take some action. Those people up there are also very concerned about the reports in the Star-Phoenix. They tell me the reporters only got the story from one side of the dispute and did not take the time to get the whole story. This is why, Mr. Speaker, I urge the Government and plead with them, to set up an independent inquiry and get this situation cleaned up before it develops into something far more serious.

Mr. Speaker, the Member for Nipawin (Mr. Comer) mentioned the large numbers taken off the welfare rolls. This may be so but it seems the people of Saskatchewan do not think there is much reduction of the welfare. In fact, welfare is still one of the big concerns in my area.

I hope, Mr. Speaker, there has been a reduction of those on welfare. I am sure that there has been some of them transferred to other programs. If the welfare rolls have been as drastically reduced as the Minister of Welfare claims, I wonder how many of his staff have been laid off? Surely they wouldn't or shouldn't need the same number of social workers to administer to the few who are left on welfare according to him. I venture to say that his staff is growing at the same rate as all the other departments of this NDP Government.

Mr. Speaker, because this NDP Government have not allowed people in the North to have local control and because they are driving industry out of the province and jeopardizing the future for our young people and our farmers, and eroding individual rights of the citizens of this province, I cannot support the motion but will vote for the amendment.

SOME HON. MEMBERS: — Hear, hear!

MR. A. MATSALLA (Canora): — Mr. Speaker, my first words in this Debate are words of congratulations to the mover and seconder of the Speech from the Throne.

SOME HON. MEMBERS: — Hear, hear!

MR. MATSALLA: — Both the Hon. Member for Nipawin and the Hon. Member for Hanley made commendable presentations. Their constituents have much to be proud of, and come next election the constituents will once again favour them as their representatives to this Legislature.

December 9, 1974

SOME HON. MEMBERS: — Hear, hear!

MR. MATSALLA: — Mr. Speaker, the Speech from the Throne given to this Legislature by the Lieutenant-Governor outlines in a very straightforward manner some of the problems facing our province and what this Government has done to overcome the problems, and what it intends to do to make Saskatchewan a province with a secure and bright future.

The Speech makes reference to the Federal Government policies and the effects of its recent Budget. I believe this to be very appropriate and certainly very fitting since the federal policies and the Budget referred to have a very significant impact on the economy of our province. For this Government to ignore the situation would reflect insensitivity and negligence. The Leader of the Opposition knows, or I expect he knows, the situation very well, but he would prefer to play cheap politics by criticizing the Speech saying that the Government is crying to Ottawa. We, on the Government side, Premier Blakeney and my colleagues, will not only cry, but if we must, we will shout to Ottawa in behalf of the people of Saskatchewan so that we can get a better deal for our province.

SOME HON. MEMBERS: — Hear, hear!

MR. MATSALLA: — This Government, Mr. Speaker, is not like the provincial Liberals who are standing by to defend federal policies, good or bad, rather than fight to get Saskatchewan a better deal. This has happened time and time again with the Hon. Leader of the Opposition and his group opposite.

Mr. Speaker, you will recall the weak and poor deal they negotiated with Ottawa in taxation and equalization payments. You will recall the disastrous Operation LIFT which paid farmers not to grow food; the shocking Task Force on Agriculture under which two out of three farmers were to go; the inept job of marketing our wheat; the destruction of the Canadian Wheat Board. And the Hon. Member for Rosthern (Mr. Boldt) again this evening levelled strong criticism at the Wheat Board. The Leader of the Opposition in an exchange across the floor remarked that what the Hon. Member for Rosthern said is all true.

Mr. Speaker, there is much that could be said about the recent federal attitude towards western Canada and Saskatchewan. One could describe the attitude as callous and insensitive — an attitude that is irresponsible and damaging to national unity.

Mr. Speaker, I should like at this time to deal with the federal equalization payments to Saskatchewan. I want to talk about the performance of the previous Liberal administration which the Leader of the Opposition boasts about and compare it to this NDP Government's performance in negotiating a better deal for the Province of Saskatchewan. The Leader of the Opposition a few days ago in this Debate in this House made his usual harangue about his ability to deal with Ottawa to get more money for Saskatchewan. Well, Mr. Speaker, I have taken time to search out the amount of equalization payments Saskatchewan has received since 1964-65 and up to 1973-74. The figures look very interesting and may I say very significant as to who is a better negotiator with Ottawa, the Leader of the

Opposition when he was on the Treasury Bench or our Premier, Allan Blakeney.

Mr. Speaker, let us examine the figures for the equalization payments for these years. For the year 1964-65 — \$24.1 million; 1965-66 — \$26.7 million; 1966-67 — \$34.3 million; 1967-68 — \$26.7 million; 1968-69 — \$14.4 million. And this was during the year when the economy of our province was in a slump. 1969-70 — \$10.5 million, another bad year for Saskatchewan. 1970-71 — \$42.1 million, a little better, but still far short to what Saskatchewan should have gotten. These were the seven Liberal years and as our Premier describes them — “Seven lean Liberal years,” and lean they were. The average annual equalization payments in Saskatchewan during the Liberal period were \$25.5 million.

Now let us examine the more recent years during the New Democratic Government and during the years when our Premier Allan Blakeney did the bargaining and the negotiating. For the year 1971-72 — \$107.3 million; 1972-73 — \$134.4 million; 1973-74 — \$178.9 million. A total of \$420.6 million in three years or an average of \$140.2 million annually. That is about six times more than the Liberal average of \$25.5 million. This is a record of performance in negotiating for equalization payments to Saskatchewan with the Federal Government by this New Democratic Party Government. We can obviously conclude that Premier Blakeney is a negotiator six times better than the Leader of the Opposition was or will ever be.

SOME HON. MEMBERS: — Hear, hear!

MR. MATSALLA: — The record also means that when it comes to deal with Ottawa, this New Democratic Government can do a far better job for the people of Saskatchewan than the Liberals could ever dream of.

SOME HON. MEMBERS: — Hear, hear!

MR. MATSALLA: — Mr. Speaker, with the shameful kind of negotiating performance demonstrated by the Leader of the Opposition, he should be the last one to mention about his ability and his capacity to negotiate with Ottawa.

Sure, the Leader of the Opposition is brave here, when he speaks in the House, but when it comes to dealing with his Ottawa counterparts, he is pretty small, and in the process shrinks into insignificance. Mr. Speaker, this is the record of the Leader of the Opposition and the Liberals opposite. The people of Saskatchewan know it, they haven't forgotten it. There is no way that they can put their confidence in the Liberal Party and a leader that has failed so miserably.

Mr. Speaker, what Saskatchewan needs today is strong leadership and strong government that is dedicated entirely to the betterment of our province and our people. What Saskatchewan needs is the continued strong leadership of Premier Blakeney and a strong New Democratic Government that negotiates seriously and if necessary, will fight vigorously to get Saskatchewan a good deal in the share of federal equalization payments.

December 9, 1974

Mr. Speaker, during the seven years of Liberal regime Saskatchewan experienced its most difficult times. Agricultural and industrial development were on a downward trend. The Liberals tried to make the people of Saskatchewan believe that there was nothing that could be done to halt the trend. Taxes were on the increase and services were cut. Yes, these were Liberal years, they were bad years. The Liberals were trying to make the people of Saskatchewan believe that if they wanted more and better services they would have to pay for them. That was their philosophy. They taxed the people to the hilt! While at the same time they gave away millions of dollars to the large multinational corporations.

Let us, Mr. Speaker, recall a few of these taxes. First, the most outstanding and inhuman tax was the tax on the sick, the so-called deterrent fees which hit the hardest at the unfortunate and the poor. Second, a large number of consumer taxes were increased. The general sales tax was increased up to 5 per cent. The gasoline tax increased by two cents a gallon. Five per cent was applied to all meals including snacks, such as a bowl of soup and a hot dog. These and a host of many other taxes were increased and most of these increases came on the Black Friday of the Liberal Budget of 1966.

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

YEAS — 14

Steuart	Grant	MacLeod
Coupland	MacDonald (Milestone)	Wiebe
Loken	Gardner	MacDonald (Moose Jaw N.)
Boldt	Lane	Malone

NAYS — 33

Blakeney	MacMurchy	Matsalla
Dyck	Pepper	Owens
Meakes	Michayluk`	Mostoway
Smishek	Byers	Gross
Romanow	Thorson	Rolfes
Messer	Whelan	Hanson
Snyder	Carlson	Oliver
Kramer	Engel	Feschuk
Thibault	Cody	Kaeding
Larson	Tchorzewski	Flasch
Baker	Taylor	Richards

The debate continued on the main motion.

MR. MATSALLA: — Mr. Speaker, at the time I was interrupted for this crucial vote, I was indicating to the House the kind of record that the Liberal Government, the former Liberal Government had with respect to negotiating for equalization payments and I compared this with the record of this Government. I was also proceeding to discuss taxes. I do recall the Member opposite, the Hon. Member for Lumsden (Mr. Lane) indicating that at the time these equalization payments were so low that it wasn't necessary for Saskatchewan to obtain high payments. Let me tell

you that the amount of taxes that have been imposed by the Liberal Government at that time, higher equalization payments could have come very handy.

SOME HON. MEMBERS: — Hear, hear!

MR. MATSALLA: — I might say that the total increases in this one budget of 1968 amounted to over \$38 million and if we compile the tax increase information for the entire seven years of the Liberal regime it is shocking to note that the people of Saskatchewan became one of the highest taxed in Canada.

Mr. Speaker, let me give this House the Liberal tax record and offer comparison with the present NDP Government. Before I do this, I want to mention that the Liberals in 1964 made a really big issue of high taxation in this province and they promised that they would reduce taxes. You will remember too, Mr. Speaker, they promised 80,000 new jobs. What has really happened? I am tempted to say that they have reduced the number of jobs and gave us 80,000 taxes instead.

SOME HON. MEMBERS: — Hear, hear!

MR. MATSALLA: — The fact is, Mr. Speaker, that during the seven Liberal years, from 1964 to 1971, a total of some 1,500 taxes had been introduced or increased. The cost of provincial taxation on the per capita basis on every man, woman and child increased by at least 100 per cent or that is, doubled.

Mr. Speaker, I have found it interesting to draw a property tax comparison between the last year of the Liberal Government and the 1974 year of this New Democratic Government. To make this comparison, I am going to use property in the RM of Buchanan, No. 304 of which I am the secretary-treasurer. The average size of land in this municipality is about a section with an average assessment of \$10,000. Applying the municipal and school mill rate for each of the two years, 1971 the last Liberal year, and 1974 this NDP year, the taxes are as follows: 1971 on the mill rate of 78 mills, the taxes amounted to \$780; 1974 with a mill rate of 84 mills, the taxes amounted to \$840; a difference of \$60. That is \$60 higher in 1974 but, Mr. Speaker, if we apply the tax reduction grant in effect for the two years, the net taxes on the \$10,000 assessed farm land are as follows: In 1971 — total taxes \$780, less \$70 grant, a net tax of \$710; in 1974 — total taxes \$840 less grant \$200, net amount of tax payable is \$640. The net tax in 1974, Mr. Speaker, is \$70 less than it was in 1971.

SOME HON. MEMBERS: — Hear, hear!

MR. MATSALLA: — If we consider the fact that the Liberal Homeowner Grant was paid on home property only, many farmers and businessmen did not receive any grant on their farm land and businesses. Hence the net property taxes in 1971 in many cases would be much higher than the \$70 I referred to.

Now giving you these figures, Mr. Speaker, I want to point out emphatically, that in spite of inflation and rising costs, property owners in this province, under this NDP Government, are paying less property taxes in 1974 than they did in 1971.

December 9, 1974

SOME HON. MEMBERS: — Hear, hear!

MR. MATSALLA: — I know that for the members opposite this is hard to believe and they prefer not to believe it, particularly during the high inflationary period that we have been living in and when all of the costs and prices have skyrocketed. But it is true and a fact of life. This was possible, Mr. Speaker, because of the understanding tax policies of this Government.

SOME HON. MEMBERS: — Hear, hear!

MR. MATSALLA: — ... and the fulfilment of this Government's promise to the people of Saskatchewan, this is an exact contrast of what the Liberals did and the Liberal Members opposite will have to agree with me on this.

SOME HON. MEMBERS: — Hear, hear!

MR. MATSALLA: — Mr. Speaker, I'd like to now turn on a subject that has concerned me for some time. Mr. Speaker, over the past years' governments, both provincial and federal, have adopted the philosophy of providing free social services to citizens substantially on the basis of need and means tests. To pay for these services, governments use a large portion of the revenues received through taxes based on ability to pay. People with higher incomes are called on to pay more taxes. The whole concept of providing services to people in need at no cost or at very little cost and extracting revenues from people most able to pay was a good one and still is a good one and one that I basically subscribe to. But I believe that the time has come to re-examine the tax system to establish how it affects the many people who over the years produced a hard-earned income and who over many years contributed towards government programs in order to provide the many so-called free services.

These free services are many, to name a few we have the unemployment insurance, Family Income Program, guaranteed income supplement, housing assistance grants, various agriculture programs, welfare, student loans and bursaries.

The people qualifying for these services are those who demonstrate financial need. Some of these people may have, at one time or another, financially contributed towards the revenues required to finance the free services, but many have not. The lack of contribution by some could be due to no fault of their own. But by others it is due to their work habit and attitude of, quote:

Why should I work more than I have to; if I am short, the Government will help me.

With the many government help programs we have today, I venture to say that the latter attitude is quite prevalent in our society and sad to say it is growing. What I see happen is, individual initiative is being weakened and being destroyed. A desire to improve oneself socially and the willingness to improve one's economic position, I believe, is gradually being lost. This feeling already exists with many who are presently in receipt of free services.

But, at the moment, I do not intend to deal with the group of people who are almost entirely dependent on society. I am more concerned about the group of people who are the greatest contributors to the government tax coffers, the middle-class income group, and who, because of their income level, are unable to qualify for many of the free services available. Amongst this group of people, I sense a feeling of discontent in that they miss out on the many services available. There seems to be a growing feeling of, what's the use of working so hard, working overtime and the like, when the Government takes half of it and gives it to those who are taking an easygoing attitude.

SOME HON. MEMBERS: — Hear, hear!

MR. MATSALLA: — It is the growing feeling among this group of people that I am somewhat concerned about.

Our society must help the less fortunate and the needy people who are unable to help themselves.

SOME HON. MEMBERS: — Hear, hear!

MR. MATSALLA: — This is in accordance with our Christian principles. But, in doing this, we must be careful not to develop a society that lacks initiative and a desire to help improve itself.

What can we as a government do? Our governments today are attempting to develop various programs to provide for a fair distribution of income. This is a good approach and a step in the right direction.

Saskatchewan is now going in this direction and it is leading the way for all of Canada with its new Family Income Program.

SOME HON. MEMBERS: — Hear, hear!

MR. MATSALLA: — The Family Income Program in Saskatchewan is aiming to bring the income of families above the poverty level. The possibility of a Guaranteed Annual Income Program for Canada will, as its goal, provide for a level of income to all Canadians so that none would live in poverty. When this is done, governments should then very seriously consider either doing away with free services or consider providing services on a more universal basis so that all citizens could be at the same beneficiary level. Providing services on a universal basis will remove discrimination and inequities that exist today. It will also tend to maintain initiative and encourage greater productivity by the individual.

To illustrate, Mr. Speaker, let us examine our program aiming to provide equal opportunities for education. In this program I find one inequity that in my opinion needs to be rectified. There is unfairness in the financing of education by students living outside the cities where advanced learning institutions, university and the like, are located. When compared to students residing in these cities the inequity between students, urban and rural, is not very great in situations where the students qualify under the Student Loan and Bursary program. But when we examine situations where outside students

December 9, 1974

do not qualify under the Student Loan Bursary program because of greater financial means, then we find a very glaring inequity.

These students are required to assume the total cost of tuition, books, board and room while the non-loan and nonbursary students living at home in one of the university cities would essentially only have to finance the cost of tuition and books. The board and room item is a big item and it could mean an extra cost of well over \$1,000 to non-resident students. This is the unfair part of it.

To correct the situation, Mr. Speaker, I want to suggest to this Government and the Government at Ottawa, that action be taken to remove the inequity that presently exists. I want to suggest that a program be set up to provide for a form of sustenance grant to the non-resident student on a universal basis, regardless of financial means. The universality of the program would equalize the financial requirements to cover the extra cost of advanced technical and university education.

Mr. Speaker, in my remarks this evening, I pointed out the effect federal policies, particularly fiscal policies, have on the Province of Saskatchewan. I also pointed out the need and importance of Saskatchewan to have strong leadership and a strong government to represent us in Ottawa and to fight in the interests of the people of this province.

Mr. Speaker, I compared the performance of the former Liberal Government and this Government. Without a question this New Democratic Government has established a most enviable and outstanding record of working in the best interests of Saskatchewan people.

The Speech from the Throne endorses the record of this Government and expresses confidence in what the Government proposes to do.

Mr. Speaker, I will be supporting the main motion.

SOME HON. MEMBERS: — Hear, hear!

HON. G. MACMURCHY (Minister of Education): — On entering this debate, Mr. Speaker, I want to congratulate the Member for Hanley (Mr. Mostoway) and the Member for Nipawin (Mr. Comer) on their speeches in support of the Speech from the Throne. I think they did an outstanding job.

SOME HON. MEMBERS: — Hear, hear!

MR. MACMURCHY: — I was very interested in hearing these two Members speak because they come to the Government from the teaching profession and I must say that I have been proud of, and this Government has been proud of, their contributions made particularly towards the educational advancement in this Government.

Now, Mr. Speaker, the Members opposite have been wiggling and squirming in this debate. They have been wiggling and squirming because of a number of things and I just want to talk about two of them tonight and I will have more to say tomorrow. But they have been wiggling and squirming because we have been

talking about our record as a Government in the last three and one half years and we have talked to some extent about their record as the Government from 1964 to 1971. Well, of course, Mr. Speaker, we have a lot to be proud of. We have a lot to be proud of. 139 promises in the New Deal for People, 133 already accomplished. Now that's an enviable record. In fact, it is the most outstanding record of any government in the history of this province, in the history of this country, in terms of achievement.

SOME HON. MEMBERS: — Hear, hear!

MR. MACMURCHY: — There is no question, Mr. Speaker, that as we go into 1975 that this achievement as a government is going to be one of the issues facing the people of the province.

SOME HON. MEMBERS: — Hear, hear!

MR. MACMURCHY: — But in talking about our record of achievement, Mr. Speaker, we can't forget to remind the people of Saskatchewan and the Members opposite of what it was like prior to 1971, just what it was like prior to 1971. It is so long ago and things have been so good, Mr. Speaker, that people forget what it was like in '69 and '70 and the first half of '71. Seven per cent unemployment, Mr. Speaker, retail sales so low that businesses were closing up, bankruptcies left and right.

SOME HON. MEMBERS: — Hear, hear!

MR. MACMURCHY: — Much worse, Mr. Speaker, in terms of our rural Saskatchewan situation, we had no young people going on the farm. Now what is it like today, Mr. Speaker? Unemployment, less than two per cent.

SOME HON. MEMBERS: — Hear, hear!

MR. MACMURCHY: — Retail sales up 25 per cent.

SOME HON. MEMBERS: — Hear, hear!

MR. MACMURCHY: — More young farmers going on the land than we have seen in the last 10 or 15 years.

SOME HON. MEMBERS: — Hear, hear!

MR. MACMURCHY: — There is no question we have a buoyant economy, Mr. Speaker, in Saskatchewan and it is this Government that has used the buoyant economy to strengthen the people of Saskatchewan in their situation.

SOME HON. MEMBERS: — Hear, hear!

MR. MACMURCHY: — I want to ask the Members of this House, Mr. Speaker, what it would be like in this province if we had a Liberal Government in the last three and a half years. Well, we have, Mr. Speaker, a dental care program for children and they voted against the dental care program for children. They said,

December 9, 1974

Mr. Speaker, it was going to drive all the dentists out of rural Saskatchewan. They said it will drive all the dentists out of Last Mountain-Touchwood constituency. Well, there aren't any dentists in Last Mountain-Touchwood constituency. We have a hearing aid plan. We cut hearing aids from \$400 to \$100 and they were opposed to that. Why were they opposed to that, Mr. Speaker? They were opposed to that because they said it was going to drive out those \$400 hearing aid people.

And we have the Land Bank, we have FarmStart and they were opposed to that. They were opposed to that, Mr. Speaker, because it didn't mean more bureaucracy and the take-over of our farms.

Mr. Speaker, in the area of education. When we took office education was a political football. It was a political football, there was confrontation between teachers and trustees and the government. The morale of our education system in Saskatchewan was at an all-time low.

SOME HON. MEMBERS: — Hear, hear!

MR. MACMURCHY: — Since the Members opposite are so interested in education I am going to tell them something about education in Saskatchewan when I speak on this debate tomorrow. I beg leave to adjourn the debate.

SOME HON. MEMBERS: — Hear, hear!

Debate adjourned.

The Assembly adjourned at 9:27 o'clock p.m.