

**LEGISLATIVE ASSEMBLY OF SASKATCHEWAN**  
**First Session – Sixteenth Legislature**  
**8th Day**

**Monday, February 26, 1968**

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

**WELCOME TO STUDENTS**

**Mr. E. Whelan (Regina North West):** — Mr. Speaker, it's my pleasure to introduce to you and to all Hon. Members, 140 young citizens from Regina North West. This large group are in the east gallery and the west gallery. They are the grade 11 History class from Martin Collegiate. With the students are three History teachers, Mr. Shields, Mr. McGraw and Mr. Steininger. We are pleased that their visit here is included in this History course. All Members join me, I'm sure, in extending a warm welcome to them and expressing the wish that their stay with us this afternoon will be pleasant and informative and educational.

**Some Hon. Members:** Hear, hear!

**Hon. D. Boldt (Rosthern):** — Mr. Speaker, I would like to introduce a group of students from the Waldheim-Hepburn area. They have been touring the city here this afternoon and this morning. I'm sure that we welcome them here in this House and that we hope their visit will be informative as well as educational and we wish them a safe journey home. I'm sorry that I couldn't meet them before the House met but I will see to it that I will be at the door when they leave the Chamber.

**Some Hon. Members:** Hear, hear!

**Hon. C.L.B. Estey (Saskatoon Nutana Centre):** — Mr. Speaker, through you, I would like to introduce to the House, a class from Grosvenor Park school in Saskatoon who are now seated in the Speaker's gallery. They have been brought to this city by their teacher, Mrs. Quanne and I think we wish to take this opportunity of thanking Mrs. Quanne for taking such an interest in the welfare of her students. I'm sure we all hope that these students will benefit from their stay in this House and will enjoy their visit to Regina and we wish them a safe trip to their homes.

**Some Hon. Members:** Hear, hear!

**ANNOUNCEMENT**

**SCHOOL CURLING CHAMPIONS**

**Mr. W.A. Forsyth (Saskatoon Nutana South):** — Mr. Speaker, I would like to

draw the attention of the House to the outstanding record of the school boy curling champions of this province who had an outstanding time at the playdowns. These boys are from Aden Bowman collegiate, which is in my constituency and under the leadership of Skip Rick Folk were Neil Gallagher, Dave Folk and Jim Spinney and their coach, Mr. Bill Hamilton. They were successful in reaching the finals and as you know, unfortunately lost the final event, but I think they were very worthy and outstanding representatives of this province at that time.

**Some Hon. Members:** Hear, hear!

**Mr. Speaker:** — I must apologize to the Member for Saskatoon Nutana Centre for not giving them the correct introduction when he rose to speak.

## QUESTIONS

### BATTEN REPORT

**Mr. W.G. Davies (Moose Jaw South):** — Mr. Speaker, before the Orders of the Day, may I ask the Premier — all the news reports have intimated that the Batten Commission Report has been delivered to the Government — if this information is accurate, if the copies of the Report therefore will be delivered to Members of the Legislature, and if so, how soon can this be done?

**Hon. W. Ross Thatcher (Premier):** — Mr. Speaker, the Hon. Member will realize that this was a three-province investigation. I talked with Mr. Manning this morning and Mr. Weir. Mr. Weir had not yet received the Report although Mr. Manning had. This Government received it, I believe, on Friday. The Cabinet will be going over it during the coming week. Then as soon as we can receive concurrence from the other two premiers as to a mutual date for release then all Members will receive a copy. I would hope it would be within a week or eight or nine days.

### RURAL TELEPHONE PROJECT IN SPIRITWOOD AREA

**Mr. R.H. Wooff (Turtleford):** — Before the Orders of the Day, Mr. Speaker, I would like to ask the Minister in charge what progress is being made in the rural telephone project in the Spiritwood area. I understand the groundwork, as far as organization work, has been carried out, and I would like to know what the chances are that the project is going to go ahead?

**Hon. L.P. Coderre (Minister of Labour):** — Mr. Speaker, may I say we have several projects that are going ahead this spring and I believe Spiritwood is one, but I would have to check with the Department to see, particularly,

what stage the development is in at this time. I shall do that and give you the information.

## ADJOURNED DEBATES

### ADDRESS-IN-REPLY

The Assembly resumed the adjourned debate on the proposed motion of Mr. D.A. McPherson (Regina South West) for an Address-in-Reply and the proposed amendment thereto by the Hon. W.S. Lloyd (Leader of the Opposition).

**Mr. F. Meakes (Touchwood):** — Mr. Speaker, when I adjourned debate, Friday last, I had said most of the nice things that one says in congratulating all the Members. I congratulated those who had made their maiden speech and went on and talked about the delivery of the mover and the seconder. But one thing I failed to do, which I would like to do now, and that is to express my sympathy to the new Provincial Treasurer (Mr. Steuart). The Member for Prince Albert West takes over a very bad mess left by the previous Provincial Treasurer over a period of four years . . .

**Some Hon. Members:** Hear, hear!

**Mr. Meakes:** — . . . I'm sure he must be in a very tough and sad position.

I want to also take the opportunity of thanking those people of Touchwood constituency who returned me on election night to this Legislature. I want to especially thank those people who worked so terribly hard in the organization to make the defeat of the Liberal MLA a certainty. On election night, Mr. Speaker, the Premier of the Province came on TV. He was discussing the loss of his two Cabinet Ministers, the Member from Melville (Mr. Gardiner) and the Member for Touchwood (Mr. Trapp). It seemed to me that night he laid the blame on the Indian people. He said he couldn't understand why they had not voted Liberal because of all the things that this Government had done for them. I want to say that, in my opinion, and in the opinion of many Indians, this was an insult. In fact the Indians of the Qu'Appelle Valley asked the Premier, I believe, to apologize at one given time. You know, I want to point out this, Mr. Speaker, that it wasn't only the Indians of Touchwood that voted against the Liberal Government and a Liberal MLA. All you have to do is look at the returns of Touchwood constituency and in practically every poll, the Liberals lost votes. Indeed you could take any three of a whole number of polls and the majority given to myself under the CCF was as large as, or larger than those given by the three Indian reserves. As usual the Premier open his mouth and put his foot in it. Certainly more Indians worked in that election than had ever worked before, and the Premier wonders why. I'd like to tell him. The Liberal candidate in 1964 promised to the Indian people the moon and the stars and

the whole universe, and it seemed to me it was all dressed up in strawberries and whipped cream. And by 1967, the Indians realized that this was another, in what they would call, a mooneass lie. In case somebody doesn't know what mooneass means, it means a white man's lie. They have been used to this for a hundred years. In 1964, Mr. Speaker, the Liberal candidate promised the Indians power on all the reserves, and on October 11, 1967, the power wasn't there. In 1964, he promised telephones to all the Indian reserves; and by the fall of 1967, there were no telephones. He promised them roads, and the only roads that were built were by the Federal Government, and there wasn't very many of those built. The Liberal Member promised the Indians of the Standing Buffalo that the Highway No. 35 would go from Lipton, through past the Sioux Bridge and bypass the town of Fort Qu'Appelle.

It seems to me though, Mr. Speaker, that the main reason that the Indians didn't vote Liberal was because of the Premier himself, quoting from the Globe and Mail of May 12, 1966, said that they bred like rabbits. And certainly I know, in my travels through the reserves, how many Indians mentioned this to me and said, "He compares us to animals." And I note his remarks the other day in the House in which he referred to the explosive birth rate on the Indian reserve as being one of the greatest. I want to point out to him, and I want to point out to this House, that if there's an explosive birth rate on Indian reserves, the main reason is because of the white man, the white man that sneaks on to those reserves in the middle of the night . . .

**Some Hon. Members:** Hear, hear!

**Mr. Meakes:** — . . . and the Premier wonders why. This is right, Mr. Speaker, this is the reason for the big explosion. Now don't get me wound up on it. The Indian people are not that stupid. They knew that there was money being spent on these marble floors out here, and they knew that the Premier had an exclusive airplane. He even came out to Touchwood constituency in a helicopter, he dropped down into the centre of them. They knew that there was money for this kind of spending, but they saw there was no money spent for them.

**Some Hon. Members:** Hear, hear!

**Mr. Meakes:** — But it wasn't only the Indian people, Mr. Speaker, who voted against the Liberals. Let us look all across the constituency.

First of all I would like to look at the hospital situation. First of all the hospital situation in Ituna, in 1964, the Liberal candidate, two days before the election, stood on a platform and promised a new brick hospital within 18 months. He went further; he claimed that if a CCF Government was elected that we would close that hospital because of the Hospital Report of 1963 which said it was due for conversion in 1970.

The people of Ituna and I too, after listening to the Minister of Health (Mr. Grant) trying to chop off eight other small hospitals, are now wondering what's going to happen to the Ituna hospital. Mind you, they have been assured that it will be built, and understand that plans are made to build in the spring. It's too small for a community, a town of 1,300 and I ask the Minister if there is going to be any action in Ituna? There's money for wrecking these walls that we see going on every day in the corridors here. That should be money for people first and for things afterwards.

**Some Hon. Members:** Hear, hear!

**Mr. Meakes:** — Let us look at the Lestock hospital situation, Mr. Speaker. First of all, I must review the history of this hospital. In 1935 a few of the sisters of the Order of the Grey Sisters of the Immaculate Conception moved into Lestock and started a hospital in an old manse, and through those bad years they turned nobody away. The sick were looked after. In 1957, the hospital was expanded to 24 beds and again as the community grew, the Department of Health in 1962 okayed an expansion of another further ten beds plus a nurses' residence. But because, Mr. Speaker, the same Order also operates a hospital in Esterhazy, in your constituency, Sir, because of the exploding population at Esterhazy, they decided to build the Esterhazy hospital first. But I want to point out to this House that, by 1964, all plans were complete to go ahead with the Lestock hospital. But what happens in 1965? We find out that plans must be changed. And now there's to be no nurses' residence. And now a letter comes out from the Department and says that arrangements are being made for a union hospital, a union hospital, I understand that the Sisters are supposed to run. All I hope is that this works out. But these Sisters have hospitals all over Canada and in other parts of the world. And if it comes to the time when there's a disagreement between the hospital board and the Sisters, that we may well lose them. I certainly hope not.

It looks to me, Mr. Speaker, that this is the way this Government is acting. They are trying to get rid of small hospitals and certainly there's a shortage of all hospital beds in the cities. I can find people from my own community that have been waiting three and four months. And here we have a hospital in Lestock which serves three Indian reserves. It covers a large area for the maternity cases and the accidents and above all, Mr. Speaker, one of the greatest things about this hospital is that, when people are on their last days and are dying, they don't have to lie in a hospital a hundred miles from the family, but they are sent back to the hospital where their loved ones can visit them every day.

I must put on the records what these Sisters have meant to my family, myself, the community and hundreds like me. We owe them a debt of gratitude that money can never repay. It seems to me that this Government has betrayed the people of that area,

betrayed the Sisters, by not letting that original plan go ahead. Here we have dedicated women, ready to serve and they are being curtailed because of lack of action by this Government. And I say again, there's money for four-lane highways from Saskatoon to Regina or from Regina to Swift Current, but apparently they have to cut down on the money for hospitals. It might pay to put on the records, Mr. Speaker, what some of these Ministers across the way were saying a year or so ago about small hospitals. The Member for Qu'Appelle-Wolseley (Mr. McFarlane) said on February 23, 1967:

As we took office, we sat down with the hospital authorities and established a better spirit of co-operation. By working with these people we have been able to improve standards, slow down the rate of cost increase and by this combined effort, we have preserved the hospitals in the rural areas that the NDP were going to close down. Some of these that come to mind are a few in my own area in the province, such as, Qu'Appelle, Montmartre, Maryfield, and Lampman.

Lampman closed, Maryfield and the others would be too, if the Minister of Health had not had so much opposition in recent weeks from those areas.

I want to go on, Mr. Speaker, with what's going on in Touchwood. The people in Touchwood through the years were used to seeing Governments doing things. The CCF Government brought natural gas from Fort San to Cupar, and it was on the program of the Power Corporation for 1965 from Ituna to Raymore. And in 1964, the Liberal candidate and myself both promised natural gas in 1965; another broken promise of the Liberals – still no gas. There is money again, as I say, for the other things that I've mentioned, the marble walls and the four-lane highways. Last fall during the election the Liberal candidate was promising natural gas for 1968. I certainly hope that this is one promise that this Government will fulfil. The people there deserve natural gas as do other areas, and they deserve it on the same plan as the rest of Saskatchewan and should not have to pay more.

**Some Hon. Members:** Hear, hear!

**Mr. Meakes:** — Let us go on and look at farmers and agriculture. I want to say, Mr. Speaker, that never have the farmers of Touchwood worked as hard to defeat a Liberal candidate as they did in 1967. Again the farmers went out and defeated them. After the Liberal candidate had promised everything possible in 1964, he won the election, and I went home, as I said the other day, and became a private citizen. After I was nominated again I started travelling; it didn't matter, Mr. Speaker, whether I was travelling in the good farm land from Cupar through to Lipton or whether I crossed over the Touchwood Hills to Punnichy and from there through to Goodeve or whether I went into the Beaverhills area and through to Jedburgh, there was no

difference. The small farmer is being pushed out – in one area, over a 30 per cent decrease in three years, a mass exodus from the farms. As I said yesterday, I realize there's going to be fewer farms. But there was no adequate training for those people who are leaving the farms to meet the problems of an urban society. In fact in my opinion, Mr. Speaker, the Liberals are glad to see them go. The question I ask all Members of this House – and I think it's a serious question – Who are going to be the farmers in the next generation? Why are going to be the farmers? Who is going to take over the land in the next fifteen years from now? Certainly, there are people on the farm now who average 50 or better. Their sons and daughters have left the farm because of conditions and I think this is one of the problems that we are going to have to face.

Mr. Speaker, let us look at education. Once again there were more teachers who worked to defeat the Liberals in Touchwood than ever before, and this was the Minister of Education (Mr. Trapp).

**Some Hon. Members:** Hear, hear!

**Mr. Meakes:** — I might suggest to the new Minister of Education (Mr. McIsaac), you'd better pull up your socks and do a bit better than the last one did or you'll get the same medicine as the last one got in Touchwood. School units were forced to cut back construction, cut back on education as well. And I want to point out, Mr. Speaker, that it is the children who suffer when school construction is cut back and education is cut back, it's not this Government in its ivory towers and it's not us, but it's the children themselves. Units were forced to raise their mill rates. Why? Because of inadequate grants. What happened then was that the school unit boards got in trouble with the rural municipalities because the rural municipalities were the ones that had to collect the tax. No wonder the Premier wonders why.

Let us look at the rural municipalities. Again, I had more councillors working for me than ever before. The Liberals have much to say about unconditional grants, but I'd like to point out to this House, Mr. Speaker, that in 1959-60, the Government gave \$5,845,000 towards grid roads. The grid road program is finished now. The Estimates for grants for 1967-68 were only \$5,500,000. This was the reason why it was able to increase the unconditional grants, because it was not spending the money on grid road programs. What's happened all through my constituency? Farmers are forced to move to the villages, because the roads from the grid roads to their farms are inadequate, and because the children have to go to school. They are just sick of shovelling or plowing snow. Municipalities have been forced to raise their taxes. It is interesting, Mr. Speaker, to look at (I'll take as an example), the rural municipality of Garry No. 245 where the mill rate from 1959 to 1964 remained stable at 35 mills. In 1964 to 1967 it went up to 42 mills, and the council now feels that this coming year it is going to

have to raise it another three mills.

Let us look just for a moment what this means to a taxpayer, a man owning a half section with an assessment of \$5,850. His taxes in 1963 were \$427, and by 1965 they had increased to \$468.69 and by 1966 they had increased to \$512.71, that's an increase from 1963 to 1966 of \$92.64. The farmers of that area say that it would have been better if they'd never got the homeowner grant and kept giving the municipalities money to keep that mill rate down. No wonder, Mr. Speaker, that the people turned against the Liberal MLA and the Liberal Government. And the Premier wonders why.

Let us look, Mr. Speaker, at the youth of my constituency. Again, I never saw such a group of dedicated people. I want here and now to say, "Thank you for the dedication and the hard work that the youth put into the election." They made posters, they put them up, they delivered literature, they campaigned from house to house, they did everything that anybody else would do, and then if somebody else wouldn't do it, they did it. Why did they do this? They did it because they knew university fees were up, they knew the limitations in the enrolments of the universities, they knew the autocratic attitudes of a Liberal Government. And I want to say here and now that the youth were tired of being pushed around. Wherever I go the young folks were laughing at the Youth Caravan. They considered it a joke. I think it's only natural, Mr. Speaker, that most of our youth are more idealistic, and they didn't buy this materialism off the Liberal party.

At this point also, Mr. Speaker, I would like to put some other figures on the records of this House. I have here in my hand a document authorized by the Touchwood Liberal Association. This is a 1964 piece of campaign literature. They say on this for a family of four in Saskatchewan, taxes are: provincial \$416, municipal \$428, for a total of \$844 and then they go on and say in the next line, "Keep Saskatchewan ahead, is deep in the heart of taxes." Pretty smart. But let us look at these figures today, four years later. The provincial taxes based on four people, an average of four are \$766.56. Municipal taxes have gone up to \$535.76. This makes a total tax for a family of four, \$1,302.32. This is \$458.32 more than it was four years ago. If we were deep in the heart of taxes in 1964, Mr. Speaker, we must be deep in the realms in that place we can't mention in this House, but in which it would be even warmer than it is here.

**Some Hon. Members:** Hear, hear!

**Mr. Meakes:** — Come back, Mr. Speaker, to what happened to the people of Touchwood. The women of Touchwood certainly never worked before to elect a CCF candidate as they did this time. I ask you why, I can tell you why. The answer is fear, fear of losing Medicare. These are the people who have to worry about their



children and they have to worry about what would happen, if we did lose our Medicare, or if we did get a deterrent fee or a sickness fee, as it sure sounds like it in the Speech from the Throne. These are the worries of these mothers.

The next thing they're worried about is the high cost of living. Certainly this Government has done nothing about this except to have an unreported Commission. Pardon me, I guess it is reported as of this weekend, but certainly unreported until then. The ladies of Touchwood were weary, weary of no action on two hospitals. They were weary about what they would do when their loved ones are sick, if these hospitals are closed. They were sick of nice words and no action. They worried about their children getting to university and the costs, and then the Premier wonders why Touchwood turned against him.

Let us look, Mr. Speaker, at the urban centres of Touchwood. The businessmen came out and voted New Democrat this time more than ever before. Why? Because when agriculture suffers, our small businessmen suffer. When the returns from agriculture are small, business is small. Taxes are up and services are down. In 1963 the previous Government started a program of dust-freeing streets. As far as Touchwood is concerned, the Liberals slowed it down, they never did anything.

I want to point out to this House that the costs of this program to the small villages and towns are just too expensive for the smaller centres. I suggest that the Premier live in one of these villages for a few months and eat the dust every day. He wouldn't wonder anymore why the people of Touchwood didn't vote Liberal. I say again there was money for four-lane highways. The priority is more important for four-lane highways than it is to build roads to farmers' homes, so that they may have an all-weather road.

One thing, Mr. Speaker, that I must mention is the report that was tabled in the House the other day, the Frazier Report on Mental Health. If the Government had listened to the CCF MLAs two or three years ago, it wouldn't have to have this Commission, it wouldn't have to have this Report.

**Some Hon. Members:** Hear, hear!

**Mr. Meakes:** — All I hope is that the Government acts on this Report. There are some terrible indictments in this Report. I am only going to deal with a couple of them. I am now quoting from the Report on page 21:

After visiting and reviewing the in-patient facilities we have concluded that discharge criteria were not consistent, uniform, predictable, nor did we see any written criteria. Considering all of the in-patient facilities together, discharge did not appear to be related in any consistent manner to the age of the patient, the amount and the type of psychopathology, the adaptive and coping

capacities of the patient. The availability of community therapists, the opinion of the referring physicians, the opinion or the wishes of families, etc.

I know of cases in Touchwood constituency where sick ones were moved back to their parents and to their families. Without even discussing it with them they received a letter saying they will be coming home. To me, this, Mr. Speaker, is a terrible indictment of the lack of feeling for human beings.

Just the other day when I was speaking in the House, Mr. Speaker, I referred to what I felt was the neglect of this Government in terms of what it was doing for agriculture. I would like to say a few more words about it. In 1964 this Liberal party went out and promised – I don't know how many – thousands of different things, but one of the things they promised was to work to aid in diversifying farming for promoting expansion of the livestock industry. As I gave the statistics the other day, I'm not going to go on to reproduce the figures on the records again because they are on Friday's records. But certainly the records were proof that practically in every phase of the agricultural industry or livestock industry that there has been a reduction, in the population. The Minister of Agriculture (Mr. McFarlane) as I said the other day, was in the shadow Cabinet prior to 1964 and he was always yelling in this House about what a Liberal Government would do to assist agriculture. Well surely he must have been neither in the Cabinet nor in the Caucus in the last three and one half years, or if he was, he wasn't making himself very clear and very loud.

I want to say again that we're in a hungry world. The world today is hungry, except our western nations. This Department of Agriculture in Saskatchewan, as well as the Department of Agriculture in Canada should have as one of the main objectives, and as one of the main things it should be remembering that we have a hungry world and that people are going to continue to get hungrier. The problem must be solved. If we don't within a few years, Mr. Speaker, those hungry people in the other parts of the world are liable to come over here and take it from us. We haven't many years left to go. Mr. Speaker, from what I have said this afternoon, this Speech from the Throne that we had presented to us, has nothing in it to solve the ills and problems that I mentioned that are in Touchwood constituency. Absolutely nothing! For this reason I will not be supporting the motion but will be supporting the amendment.

**Some Hon. Members:** Hear, hear!

**Hon. E.F. Gardner (Moosomin):** — Mr. Speaker, in rising today to participate in the Throne Speech debate I would first like to express my sincere thanks to the people of the Moosomin constituency for returning me to this Legislature in the recent election. I believe that the people of Moosomin are generally pleased with the present Government. They are happy with: the homeowner grants, land clearing grants, hog barn grants, lighted school

house grants, snow removal and grid road maintenance grants and many of the other new programs started by this Government. They appreciate the improved health services; the new nursing home just opened in Moosomin, the new hostel just opened in Grenfell, the approval for an addition to Broadview hospital.

I congratulate the local people for the efforts they have made to get these services, and I hope that something can also be done in this regard at Whitewood, our other major town.

Mr. Speaker, the Member for Moose Jaw North (Mr. Snyder) spent a good deal of his speech the other day doubting the existence of new industry in this province. I realize that he may not be seeing too much in Moose Jaw, as I understand that city is acquiring a country-wide reputation of being a tough place for industry because of the attitude of local organized labor.

However, we have a new \$70 million potash mine under way in Moosomin and I am not talking about something just in the planning stage. The railroad is under construction and work is being done at the mine site. Manitoba tried desperately to attract this mine to their province to get a start in potash. We are pleased that our Liberal Government was able to convince these people that the Socialists were gone for good . . .

**Some Hon. Members:** Hear, hear!

**Mr. Gardner:** — . . . the political climate was favorable to industry, and we are happy that the mine site was established a few miles on our side of the border.

Now I plan to speak briefly on education. I hope that what I have to say will generate more light than heat. In the past few months some aspects of education have received more publicity in this province than at any time in our history. We all know that education all over Canada faces substantial problems, but the amazing fact is, Mr. Speaker, that none of the diatribes we are currently being subjected to has had anything to do with the basic problem facing education. We have heard a great deal about crisis in education, academic freedom, lengthy arguments on financing, and dire predictions of strikes and loss of teaching personnel.

Now good education should be of concern to all and I suppose it is inevitable; but it's unfortunate, Mr. Speaker, that some groups and individuals should use these issues for political purposes, for personal reasons or simply to get their names in the paper.

For those genuinely concerned with education the past few months have been a trying time. We have seen a period of time when the Government and responsible University officials have been meeting and working together to better understand their respective problems.

**February 26, 1968**

The Government has to cope with the problem of raising vastly increased sums for the Universities, both for capital and operating grants. And when the Government asks the taxpayers of this province for this money, as a responsible Government, it wants to be able to assure the people that these sums are being spent to the best advantage. For this reason the Government wants to know how the money is being spent, but at the same time it doesn't want to interfere in any way with the internal operations of the University.

Unfortunately on each campus we have a small minority of staff and students who have used this issue as an excuse to attack the Government and the Premier, to get personal publicity, and all in the name of academic freedom. Now this is a popular slogan, Mr. Speaker, and professional protestors have made use of this banner to recruit a certain amount of support for their own purposes. By their actions they have clearly shown that they are much more interested in perpetuating the issues than in terminating them. They enjoy the alleged problems and are disappointed when it became clear that any issues which may have existed would be resolved.

Mr. Speaker, I feel that I have more reason than most to be concerned about maintaining university integrity, reputation and academic freedom. I was born in this province and I got my education here. I entered university at Saskatoon and interrupted my training there for three years to serve in the Air Force. I returned to that University and graduated in Engineering. I took additional training at the University of Saskatchewan and I taught there for some 11 years.

And now, Mr. Speaker, as a Member of this Legislature, I represent a large group of Saskatchewan taxpayers. So I doubt if any or many can claim an interest in the University for a greater number of reasons. I would be the first to object if I thought there was any threat to the University. I feel as competent as anyone to judge just what constitutes a threat to academic freedom and at no time, Mr. Speaker, in the past three or four months have I felt this threat did exist.

**Some Hon. Members:** Hear, hear!

**Mr. Gardner:** — Mr. Speaker, I think you can understand my feelings about some newcomer to our province or our University, who may be here simply because we offered him more money and may be gone next year, when some other university offers him more, or about some left-wing student agitator who can hardly wait to get his degree, so he can take off for the United States or Eastern Canada. When people of this type make a lot of noise about academic freedom at their university, I think we are certainly justified in suspecting their motives.

From some of the articles in the student newspapers and even letters in our own daily papers it is obvious that many of these people have used the controversy for their own ends. I would

like to just give you an example. Mr. Speaker, we have about 3,000 students on the Regina campus and we have several hundred more on the staff. There are about 135,000 in the city of Regina, and as everyone knows an attempt was recently made to convince these people that a crisis existed at the University. A well-planned and well-publicized meeting in the Met Theatre with a few imported big name entertainers attracted a mere 300 or 400 people, and most of these were simply disgusted later by the tone of the meeting. After all, Mr. Speaker, we can get 20,000 people out to a Sunday afternoon football game! So can we say that the students and the citizens who stayed away from this meeting by the thousands were unconcerned about education? Not so, Mr. Speaker. The truth of the matter is that they just did not believe that a crisis existed or that there was any threat to education or university autonomy, and they refused to let themselves be used by unscrupulous individuals for political or for other purposes.

Mr. Speaker, I am not going into details on University-Government relations, however, I would like to make a few general comments. I would first like to commend Dr. Spinks and the Board of Governors for the fine manner in which they acted in spite of a good deal of provocation from the University staff and students, and I suspect some provocation from the Government. Dr. Spinks, in particular, acted at all times like the true gentleman that he is.

**Some Hon. Members:** Hear, hear!

**Mr. Gardner:** — The people of this province and especially the academic community owe him a great deal as it was largely through his efforts that mutual understanding was arrived at. I had feared that the fine art of British diplomacy was perhaps dead and gone, but his performance has restored my faith. The Board of Governors are a group of distinguished public-spirited citizens who give freely of their valuable time, and they should also be commended.

**Some Hon. Members:** Hear, hear!

**Mr. Gardner:** — Mr. Speaker, we have heard a great deal about academic freedom and no doubt we are going to hear a great deal more. Now just what is academic freedom or for that matter, just what is a university? I can assure you the definitions are not nearly as simple as you might imagine.

On the campus there are perhaps two concepts of what a university consists of. We have group one who say that it is a place to go to create, meditate, to do research and to philosophize. We have group two who say that it is a place to train young people to do the professional jobs required in our society and our economy, to provide us with the engineers, the lawyers, nurses, doctors and teachers who are so badly needed.

**February 26, 1968**

There is probably a need on a campus for some members of group one, but I can tell you that a province or a government that gets a majority of group one is in trouble.

Many of you have heard about the Regina campus case of the missing hippy prof. Here we have an individual who was hired by the University last fall to teach a class in English Literature. He was a true hippy – he was unshaven, unkempt and unusual, to say the least. He turned his office into a typical hippy pad. He wore old clothes and lectured to his students while standing in the pool in front of the university buildings. He often failed to show up for classes at all and many students either dropped his English 240 class or stayed home as they were getting nothing from the course.

No doubt, Mr. Speaker, you are asking yourself this question. Why did the head of the English Department or the Dean of Arts and Science not do something about this? Presumably they didn't want to interfere with this man's academic freedom. I am sure they were well aware of his actions and by doing nothing it appears that the University and perhaps even the Government condones this sort of thing. The fact is, Mr. Speaker, that this man was not fired but quit on his own accord without notice, and was back in Missouri before the university officials knew he was gone, leaving his students deserted in mid-term. I mention the above, Mr. Speaker, only to show you what academic freedom can mean in an extreme case.

I will agree that it is difficult to say whether or not the people of Saskatchewan, through their elected Members, should have any influence on decisions made within a university. But many of these decisions, Mr. Speaker, directly affect the taxpayer. There are many examples of this and I would like to cite just one for your consideration.

At the present time there are something over 400 foreign students on the Saskatoon campus alone. Most of these are from the Far East and most of them are taking post-graduate work. These are the students that are by far the most expensive to educate because graduate classes are very small, often three or four in a class; they require the attention of the senior and the highly paid professor and they require much more expensive facilities. Various estimates have been made, but I would suggest that a graduate student would take at least the time and facilities of four or five junior undergrads. So this means that these foreign students are costing the Saskatchewan taxpayer perhaps \$2 to \$3 million per year, and they are taking up the time and facilities equal to perhaps fifteen hundred undergrads.

Now, Mr. Speaker, at a time when our University is faced with massive increases in enrolment and the accompanying problems of providing the necessary staff and facilities, and at a time when we are short of teachers, nurses, dentists, etc., in our own province, are we justified in utilizing these scarce staff and facilities to train so large a group of foreign students

rather than train an additional 1,500 of the sons and the daughters of the taxpayers of Saskatchewan. To carry this a but further, Mr. Speaker, if the Government of the day – and this could be any Government – was concerned about turning away 1,500 of our own students, and provided the university with another \$2 or \$3 million, under the present system university officials could take this money, bring in another 400 foreign students and still limit the enrolment in first year nursing or education, if they so desired.

I am not giving you this example as a criticism of our university policy regarding foreign students, but merely to indicate how internal university decisions can affect our taxpayers and our economy.

I am not going to make comparisons about how much we spend on the University compared to the former Government. I think they did a reasonably good job for the University, and I would like to think we are doing much better. Nor am I going to quote a lot of figures to indicate how our University is financed. These are futile arguments and you can juggle the figures any way you like, as the Leader of the Opposition (Mr. Lloyd) tried to do the other day, but you are not going to fool the Saskatchewan taxpayers. You might confuse them about academic freedom or universal accessibility or some other favorite campus topic, but not when it comes to dollars and cents, and the Leader of the Opposition should know this as well as anyone.

We are no longer a have-not Province, Mr. Speaker, we get nothing from Ottawa that doesn't come from here in the first place. University costs have increased tremendously in the past few years and the \$30 odd million we are now spending comes ultimately from one source, and that's the pocket of the Saskatchewan taxpayers.

**Some Hon. Members:** Hear, hear!

**Mr. Gardner:** — Now a word or two may be in order regarding tuition fees. As you know tuition fees provide about 25 per cent of the operating costs of the University. Under the Socialist Government in 1959-60 for example, the student paid a little over 26 per cent and the Government about 73 per cent. In the present academic year the student is paying less than 20 per cent and the Government over 80 per cent. The student pays less now than he did under the previous Government and he still pays one of the lowest rates in Canada.

A university education, Mr. Speaker, is a bargain today for any young person. No other group is in such a preferred position in our society. If a young man wants to get a university degree as an asset with which to make his living, the taxpayers

of Saskatchewan will pay about 80 per cent of the cost of this asset.

**An Hon. Member:** Hear, hear!

**Mr. Gardner:** — However, if he wants to start a business, buy a farm or some other enterprise, he must pay the full cost himself. And often the university graduate picks up his degree, which has cost our taxpayers something over \$5,000 and leaves this province to live elsewhere, while the young farmer or laborer who has received no government subsidy stays here in this province to pay his taxes and to contribute to our economy.

I am sure that no one in this House wants to see any qualified student barred from the university for financial reasons and I'm also sure, Mr. Speaker, that with the assistance available today no qualified student is barred. In the recent University controversy, I fear that some of the general public may have been impressed by the statements of certain faculty members simply because of their position or academic degrees. A doctor's degree in History or Sociology or English may make a person an expert in that particular field, but doesn't necessarily qualify him as an expert in some other field.

Now I would like to discuss fully some of the real problems facing us in education, but time permits only to mention them briefly for your consideration. First of all in large areas of Saskatchewan we are offering our young people what amounts to only one choice in education. We say, either you get the academic grade 12 offered, which is essentially a university entrance standard, or you become a dropout and accept the stigma that this implies. Obviously all young people are not suited to obtain this academic grade 12 and we are being unfair to them in many cases.

Secondly, in spite of tremendous sums spent on teacher training and education research, the quality of education in our schools often seems to be deteriorating. Students enter university in many cases unable to spell, write or compose a decent paragraph. Like most Members, I received a good deal of mail from teachers in recent weeks and one I thought was typical of this particular problem. One lady teacher in my constituency wrote me about her concern for maintaining high teaching standards and she had three spelling mistakes in a few short lines.

And thirdly, Mr. Speaker, in my constituency we have one of the largest concentrations of Indian people in Saskatchewan. In the town of Broadview there are 116 Indian children in elementary grades and only nine in high school. In Whitewood there are 16 in elementary grades and only one in high school. While there are 125 Indian students in the Broadview school, only one has ever graduated from grade 12. The ratio here is then about 13 in public school to one in high school. The provincial average is about four in public school to one in high school. The Indian children are bright, intelligent youngsters, but



some motivation must be provided to keep them in school. We talk of utilizing our natural resources and here is one of our most valuable natural resources, Mr. Speaker, left virtually untapped. And this is a situation that none of us should be proud of.

These problems I have briefly referred to did not originate with our Government nor with the previous one. They are problems which should be above politics and which we should all work together to solve. And I am sure that these problems will get the attention of this Government.

Mr. Speaker, in closing I would just like to offer a word of reassurance and consolation to the citizens of this province. I hope that the general public is not too concerned about the statements from some of our university staff and students, because this concern could well be the real threat to our University. There always seems to be a small group of radicals, extreme left-wingers and various other assorted oddballs who get all the attention.

**Some Hon. Members:** Hear, hear!

**Mr. Gardner:** — They often get key jobs on the campus papers and student councils, and we tend to be overly concerned about the future because of their statements. You can take a bum off the street, Mr. Speaker, provide him with a university education and you may just end up with an educated bum.

**Some Hon. Members:** Hear, hear!

**Mr. Gardner:** — However, I would like to assure you that the reasonable majority of University students are decent, reasonable, hardworking, young citizens who are genuinely concerned about the future of our country and our society, and most of the staff are also in this category. I suggest that we should all take time off some day, Mr. Speaker, to talk to some of these people and it will restore our faith in the future.

Mr. Speaker, in view of what I have said, I think it is obvious that I will support the motion but not the amendment.

**Some Hon. Members:** Hear, hear!

**Mr. P. Schmeiser (Watrous):** — Mr. Speaker, as the newly elected Member from Watrous constituency, I would like to join with the other Members of this House in offering my congratulations to you on your re-election to the high office of Speaker. I know you will continue to rule in a fair and impartial manner throughout your new term of office. It is with warmth and sincerity that I greet and congratulate our Premier and the other Members of this House. I also take this opportunity to congratulate my colleagues as

mover and seconder of the Address-in-Reply.

As most Members of this House already know, Watrous constituency has been under the guidance of the Opposition for the past 25 years. In many ways it was like a people lost in the desert . . .

**Some Hon. Members:** Hear, hear!

**Mr. Schmeiser:** — . . . a voice crying in the wilderness. Finally, after 25 years they have seen the pillar of fire and have been led through the desert to the promised land of milk and honey.

**Some Hon. Members:** Hear, hear!

**Mr. Schmeiser:** — As the Hon. Member from Hanley (Mr. Heggie) has indicated, it has been a turning of central Saskatchewan to a new future, a new hope. This is a sign that our people recognize that the development of our natural resources is the concern of the Liberal party, a development that must be entrusted to a party that has awakened the potentialities that had been dormant for so long under the reign of the Socialists. Mr. Speaker, as a new Member from the Watrous constituency . . .

**Mr. Thatcher:** — New generation.

**Mr. Schmeiser:** — . . . I would like to express my appreciation to the people, not by verbal utterances, but by a constant concern for the problems and well-being, not only of this generation but of the generation to follow. My concern will not only be for their material well-being, but will also be a concern for that which is of more importance, a concern for their rights, so that the ordinary, common person will never be considered unimportant or of no value.

Mr. Speaker, we have been blessed in the constituency of Watrous with great potash resources. These are already being developed, are offering job opportunities to our youth and are adding greatly to the economy of this area. The increased population and wealth are giving new life to our towns and gradually are introducing a new pattern of living. The future development of our water resources, the system of reservoirs and canals will add greatly to the development of our area. It will be an inducement to the establishment of new industries, it will provide for the development of greatly needed recreational sites. It will be the answer to the many problems faced by towns without a good water supply. It is difficult to evaluate at this point the importance of a constant source of fresh water, but the future years will prove the value of our concern in this field, a concern that will greatly benefit all the people of our area. In particular, the level of the water in Manitou Lake will be raised and maintained, thus providing for the future development of an already existing health and recreational centre that

was a victim of fluctuating water levels. Planning can now proceed with the assurance of a maintained water level, the assurance that is required for long-range planning.

Mr. Speaker, constant consideration must be given to roads in our farming communities, roads that permit passage during all the seasons of the year. In general, our farm roads are greatly in need of improvement and development throughout our area. The present program of providing farm access roads must continue to increase, and the standards must be maintained, if we are to aid in the development and future of all our people.

Mr. Speaker, up to this point I have mentioned a few of the material concerns of our people. Now I would like to manifest my concern for values that cannot be measured in dollars and cents. We must always be aware of the needs of our senior citizens, the men and women who pioneered this country and provided us with the opportunities that are presently ours. I am most happy to be able to state that in the Watrous constituency there are senior citizens' homes in Watrous and Middle Lake, and that another is being constructed in Cudworth.

Mr. Speaker, as a Member of this Legislative body and as a father of a young family, I am very interested in the opportunities for youth in this province. This interest extends to all phases of their lives. This interest will include educational, industrial, agricultural and recreational development. However, the most important concern that we can have is that our Province will show in its policies a concern and respect for people; that people will always be placed ahead of dollars . . .

**Some Hon. Members:** Hear, hear!

**Mr. Schmeiser:** — . . . that our Province will always guard and promote the rights and dignity of the ordinary man. This concern, Mr. Speaker, has already been shown during the past year in the following Acts: 1) The Criminal Injuries Compensation Act which provides payment of compensation to persons injured by crimes of violence; 2) The Cost of Credit Disclosure Act which provides for clear information about the cost of credit; 3) The Unconscionable Transaction Relief Act which allows the courts to renegotiate loans where the transaction is harsh or unconscionable. However, this concern must be continued in forwarding this principle that every person is free and equal in dignity and rights without respect to race, creed, color, nationality, ancestry or place of origin.

Mr. Speaker, the constituency that I represent is composed of people of many creeds and places of origin. We must always remain vigilant in developing a society that will not suppress but will enhance the richness of each ethnic group and thus bring about a greater society. We must remain vigilant that our province be free of prejudice and discrimination, whether this comes from individuals, companies, the Legislature or the judicial body. Mr. Speaker, it is impossible for the common man to protect himself alone in this complex society of ours. It is of

**February 26, 1968**

the utmost importance that qualified and trained men be commissioned to guard and further the recognition of the inherent dignity and the equal and unquestionable rights of all people of our province. This, Mr. Speaker, will be the foundation of our future development. This will be the province where the rights of the individual comes first, where the material development of man will not lead to his destruction but to his betterment.

The Speech from the Throne has indicated policies directed towards the achievement of this end. I, therefore, urge this House to adopt the motion before it and defeat the amendment. I will vote accordingly.

**Some Hon. Members:** Hear, hear!

**Mr. F.K. Radloff (Nipawin):** — Mr. Speaker, it does give me a great deal of pride, and it is a real privilege for me, to again serve the people of the Nipawin constituency. Today I am proud to represent a Government which is going to make again a major contribution to Saskatchewan welfare, to the economy, and to the advancement of the people of this province. Mr. Speaker, to you I wish to express the appreciation and support of the people of the Nipawin constituency for their continued support and their faith in me to serve them. While, of course, my majority is somewhat of a limited nature and of course my tenure in this Legislature could be temporary, as long as I am here I am going to serve the people of my constituency . . .

**Some Hon. Members:** Hear, hear!

**Mr. Radloff:** — . . . to the best of my ability and to do everything possible to make it a better place to live.

**Mr. R. Romanow (Saskatoon Riversdale):** — Talk fast!

**Mr. Radloff:** — Now, many people accuse our Government of moving too fast. I am quite amused by a comment the other day from the Member for Saskatoon Riversdale (Mr. Romanow) when he called this a pussy-cat Government, because certainly the actions we have taken so far would not indicate that type of action. And of course, the Member from Saskatoon Riversdale had a number of rather amusing sayings, “chug-chug Government” and how he was going to represent the “go-go age.”

**Mr. Thatcher:** — Tommy Douglas!

**Mr. Radloff:** — But I would say to this Member it might be well for him to consider sometimes. These go-go people don't go too far and that chug-chug-chugging along might be very beneficial.

Last Thursday I listened to the Throne Speech with great interest. I can say that the program outlined by our people introduces new legislation, new thoughts, and of course it carries out the Liberal pledge of establishing new standards to encourage new industry, full employment and increased benefits and opportunities. Mr. Speaker, special highlights of the Throne Speech read at the opening of the first Session of the 16th Saskatchewan Legislature, include some 14 special measures to meet changing present-day problems. Now some of these measures are: new measures for law-breaking drivers; better control of health facilities; a Saskatchewan flag; the dropping of religious criteria in child adoption procedures; closer scrutiny of University budgets for operating and capital expenditures; new teacher salary bargaining procedures; increased minimum wage; municipal sharing of tax levies on potash mines; regulations for collection agents; a great voice for Indians in local education; the expanding of our crop insurance program; the use of French as an instructional language in certain schools; the establishment of an Alcoholism Commission. I expect many NDP people on the opposite side of the House are wondering why they did not think of these measures some time ago. It is an exciting legislative program and one that promises increased benefits and more protection for the people of Saskatchewan. I find that the citizens of Saskatchewan are happy that the Liberal Government of Premier Thatcher continues to approach and solve the many problems with new ideas and different solutions. And I can say that the people of Saskatchewan are continually amazed by the Premier's vigorous and determined efforts to chart a new course for Saskatchewan.

**Some Hon. Members:** Hear, hear!

**Mr. Radloff:** — Mr. Speaker, several days ago I was approached by a gentleman, who asked me if I was going to support the legislation to allow liquor advertising in local papers. He stated he was CCF and that he could buy his liquor without seeing any more advertising in the papers. He went on to state that he was a good CCFer and he felt that he was a good citizen. Mr. Speaker, I know that this man is loaded with money.

**Hon. D.G. Stuart (Provincial Treasurer):** — Loaded all right!

**Mr. Radloff:** — And so far as I know, this man has never squandered a nickel needlessly, other than for his own needs. At this time I did recall some sage claiming there are only two kinds of Socialists – the needy and the greedy.

**Some Hon. Members:** Hear, hear!

**Mr. Radloff:** — So knowing of this man's condition, I said to him that you are a very poor Socialist. He wondered why I said that. I stated that with the money he had, he should be spending money

to assist mankind. This gentleman then stated that he had earned the money and advised me not to worry about his situation because he was going to move from Saskatchewan and live at the Coast. I told this gentleman that his plans were typical of Saskatchewan Socialist planning. Make all the money you can in Saskatchewan and then leave our country for warmer and more pleasant climates . . .

**Some Hon. Members:** Hear, hear!

**Mr. Radloff:** — . . . sometimes looking for opportunities to increase their sometimes ill-gotten gains. I told this man what Saskatchewan really needs is people who are going to stay in the province and invest their money and use their abilities to build a better Saskatchewan. I also stated to this man that I expected that all NDP Members on the opposite side of the House would use the same criteria for criticizing all Liberal legislation because they can see nothing good in anything else but their own particular type of legislation and thoughts.

Mr. Speaker, today, the legislative program outlined by this Government proposes to make satisfactory settlements with many of the acute problems, problems that should have been settled by the previous Government many years ago, problems that the Leader of the Opposition (Mr. Lloyd) could have settled when they were the Government. The Hon. Mr. Lloyd's comments to reporters on the Throne Speech, as reported in the daily papers are in text, "What you say about hardly nothing except it is hardly nothing," are typical comments of the Member from Biggar (Mr. Lloyd) when he can find no other criticism to offer.

As the representative of the Nipawin constituency, I must take this opportunity to convey to the Government and to the Members of the Legislature some of the needs and problems faced by the people of the Nipawin constituency. Mr. Speaker, I can say that the people of my constituency are aware of the fact that dollars spent must be taken from some individual or some company. The people of my constituency are also aware of the need at this particular time for the Government to curtail unnecessary spending during this year of financial limitations and high interest rates. The people of the Nipawin constituency do not wish me to present any requests upon this Government that are not legitimate requests for the Government's consideration. It is unfortunate that northern Saskatchewan and in particular the Nipawin constituency, did not receive just consideration by the previous CCF Government in the allocation of capital expenditures similar to those they made in the rest of Saskatchewan. They should have given greater effort to improve the services in the north. Roads, bridges, schools, municipal assistance, all received scanty consideration by the previous Government. Consequently, because of the CCF or NDP oversight in this regard, the load to provide the many acute needs of our present community falls on the Liberal Government. I am happy to say at this time that my Government has been doing an outstanding job at recognizing these needs and of trying to provide the answers

and improve the situation.

Mr. Speaker, certainly on this occasion, I must thank the Hon. Dave Boldt, Minister of Highways, for his generous consideration of the road problems of the Nipawin constituency. Mr. Speaker, it is unfortunate that I have to report today a few other needs that must be fulfilled. I am almost ashamed to have to point out to the Minister, some of our further needs. The Minister is aware of these needs and he is trying to do something about it. One of our most basic and acute problems is the need of a new highway and bridge at Nipawin. Since Premier Thatcher got this Government moving and we have the large pulp mill at Prince Albert, the many pulp trucks rolling from Squaw Rapids west to Prince Albert are indeed creating a road problem. I think these large trucks are rolling over the bridge with pulp at the rate of something like one truck every hour.

Another need is a new highway bridge over the Carrot River, south of the town of Carrot River. We need the competition of the Carrot River – The Pas highway, which was promised by the previous Government many years ago. We need the continuation of Highway No. 6 through the town of Choiceland to the Hanson Lake road. And the people of Lost River and Teddington districts have requested that I ask the Minister to include a grid road in the highway system.

Of course, there is a continuous need for more oiled and paved highways. Last year there was something like 50,000 tourists who visited the Square Rapids Dam site. Add this to the many other tourists who have visited the constituency and moved through the Hanson Lake road to Flin Flon. That does indicate the heavy traffic and the continuing need to expand the oil and pavement.

With regard to other types and kinds of needs, there is the continuing need for more adequate school accommodation. The north urgently needs a planned comprehensive school in the Nipawin school unit. There is concern regarding Federal grants that are to be made available next year. The present composite high school in Nipawin that was built to house and accommodate 250 students now has an enrolment of almost 500 students. Students aiming for a technical or vocation career need the delayed accommodations. Industrial development, expansion of business, development of a large diversified agriculture area, all require trained personnel who could be trained locally as soon as a comprehensive school can be constructed there. Mr. Speaker, I realize that the problem of proceeding with the comprehensive school is attributed to the request of the Federal Government to slow down until the money problem has improved, but the need remains and I hope that every effort will be made by our Department to have the Federal people reconsider their position.

Mr. Speaker, moving on to other aspects of the constituency, it is fortunate that the new Government of Saskatchewan recognizes the vast potential and the need of development and use of the resources of timber, mineral, wild life and the agricultural

land that exist in the northern part of the province. Today, on behalf of the people in the Nipawin constituency, I must in particular thank the Premier and the Department of Industrial Development for their efforts to have the north developed and all these resources utilized. Mr. Speaker, I can say that the people in the north are thrilled by the Premier's announcement of last week when he indicated that there was a possibility of an agreement being signed by Choiceland Mines and the Czechoslovakia people. Should this occur this will mean a tremendous boost to the economy of the northern part of Saskatchewan.

Mr. Speaker, again the people in the Nipawin constituency are happy that the Government of the Province recognizes the needs of all types of development and that the Throne Speech promises large sums of money for the development of the vast acres of the Cumberland Delta. This is the last agricultural frontier in Saskatchewan. Reports by the Saskatchewan River Delta Development Committee indicate approximately 750,000 acres of land that could be made available for farm land. For the past many years Indian and Metis people derived a meagre living from lumbering, trapping and fishing in the many marshes and the forest areas, generally with very little help from fellow citizens. Certainly in the past they have had very little help from the NDP Government. This is no longer the case. The higher standard of living required by these people, which the Liberal party recognized, forces them to consider other means of employment or to live on social aid. Indian and Metis people continue to demand recognition of their position. Mr. Speaker, with Premier Thatcher's leadership and vision, our Government recognizes the many problems of our Indian and Metis people. All departments concerned are making an all-out effort to create and find new opportunities for them to be rehabilitated and to obtain permanent residence. Mr. Speaker, this Government is proceeding with a development of the Cumberland Delta. To date there has been something like almost \$500,000 spent in the planning and the outlining of the procedures to be followed. And all reports indicate that the local population are highly in favor of a total approach to the utilization of all the resources of this vast land.

Mr. Speaker, the general plan is that the major areas outside the flood area should be utilized for agriculture, while the natural resource base within the fur lease shall be retained for wild life. It is considered essential that the people of the Delta be fully involved in the development process so that they could adjust to full-time employment and agriculture. This will not be easy to do, but with our determination and effort on their part, I think it points to a very successful future. Mr. Speaker, it is desirable that the Liberal Government assist the local population to develop socially and economically in order that these people can fully share all the benefits of this modern age.

A total of six stages have been suggested to be carried out over a period of 20 years, this at an estimate cost of \$27 million. This development will forever change the face of



Saskatchewan. Mr. Speaker, I can assure all Members of the Legislature and the people of Saskatchewan that the forward thinking of the Department of Agriculture and the Department of Natural Resources is giving full consideration to the many varied aspects of developing this rich Delta land. This is a complex, promising immense returns to the participants, should they use careful management procedures. Development of the Delta in the past has been hampered by the threat of constant flooding. But, Mr. Speaker, the flow of water, following the construction of the Gardiner Dam and the Squaw Rapids Dam, has now reduced this threat to a minimum. With the flood threat eliminated it is now possible to fully evaluate the rich rewards encompassed in this land and its resources. Mr. Speaker, more and more people are realizing the possibilities of this venture, and they are satisfied that Department officials are giving adequate consideration to the recreational aspects of hunting and fishing with adequate protection for the wild life, at the same time, planning to obtain the maximum returns from other resources. Mr. Speaker, Department officials are considering all aspects of forestry, fishing, wild life, recreation and land use associated with problems in relation to the complete utilization of the area.

Mr. Speaker, the development of the ten-farm units under Indian management, in the Cumberland House area is now in its third year of operation. To date these units have proved very successful. The Indian people are gratified by the arrangements made by this Government, and I know, after viewing this success, many other Indian people and people of Indian ancestry are asking for the same considerations.

Mr. Speaker, this Government is considering all other people's responsibilities in this area, not only the Indian people's position but that of all people of Saskatchewan. This is a vast area. It is something like 75 miles square, and it is an immense task for a few people to completely assess all the possibilities and eventualities of such an immense undertaking. I expect some errors will be made, but it is very apparent from Delta reports that the Delta Committee and the Department of Agriculture, as well as the Natural Resource people, have taken time and much effort to finalize their recommendations. They have also considered in the report subsidiary non-farming activities, such as peat moss harvesting, wood products recovery, fur farming, commercial fishing and recreational aspects. Such activities under the proper management will add many dollars to the pockets of Delta residents and Saskatchewan people. Mr. Speaker, it has been the objective of the Government to have well informed and experienced people working with the Saskatchewan River Delta Committee. These people can and will encourage a satisfactory, orderly development, and are satisfied that the utilization of the area will bring many benefits to mankind in general. Mr. Speaker, there have been some people who have been asking for information. I'm sure that, if these people would go to the Department of Agriculture and get the latest information, they would be able to offer to the Government some of their ideas and some of their criticisms so that they can be properly answered. Mr. Speaker, the people and citizens of

northern Saskatchewan and in particular, the people of the Nipawin constituency are happy and pleased that the Liberal Government under Premier Ross Thatcher is making an all-out effort to meet the challenge of the Delta in providing immediate funds towards the progress and the general development. The Opposition are free with their criticism generally in the papers of this venture. They make efforts to ridicule Liberal efforts and their organizers do try to stir up the Indian people. Some Indian people might be misled, but generally most Indian people feel that the present Liberal Government of Saskatchewan is the first Government to ever give their depressed conditions priority consideration. Mr. Speaker, I can say without contradiction that the Premier of this Province, perhaps more than anyone else, is concerned about the desire to improve the living conditions of our Indian people and the people of Indian ancestry. The Departments are making new plans and new programs which will be used to encourage Indian citizens to accept their responsibilities and their rightful place in our modern society.

Mr. Speaker, another problem of general concern to the people of Nipawin constituency is that of water pollution in the Saskatchewan River. Many people of the province now are aware of the tremendous fishing potential of the Tobin Lake reservoir and how the area is rapidly becoming a real tourist attraction. Sportsmen from all over the continent are now visiting the Tobin Lake area to fish and are finding it a fishing paradise. Now, Mr. Speaker, the people are indeed happy that the Throne Speech does promise amendments to the present Water Pollution Bill, and the people in northern areas appreciate of the Government's concern in this matter. It is felt that water pollution will continue to be a serious problem and they are requesting protection for this important resource. The people of the Nipawin constituency trust that all necessary action will be taken by the Government to control the effluent and waste from the pulp mill at Prince Albert. The waters of Tobin Lake are a valuable asset to our community and need continuous protection.

Mr. Speaker, this year our constituency was fortunate to have a visit from the Deputy Premier of the Province to assess one of the constituency's most serious problems that is the log and debris in Tobin Lake. And I'm pleased at the Hon. Dave Steuart's visit to Tobin Lake. He did give a promise that his Department would try and budget some \$250,000 for a start to clear the mess of logs from the shores of Tobin Lake. Mr. Steuart stated that it was the desire of the Government to improve Tobin Lake as a tourist attraction. Mr. Speaker, it is unfortunate that the short-sighted NDP policy created an unprecedented problem for an area that could be one of the top tourist attractions of Canada. I'm sure it is a wonderful advertisement for the CCF party to have people come into this area and see the condition that the previous Government left this great lake in. Mr. Speaker, I've yet to talk to anyone who could understand how the previous Government of the province could have made such a costly error. I suppose we will all have to accept the cost of the penalty for some people being led astray by devious propaganda.

Mr. Speaker, today I would like to thank the Hon. Doug McFarlane, Minister of Agriculture, for his continued efforts in support of agriculture, especially agriculture in the northern area. In the Nipawin constituency over 350 farmers have bought their land, and we of the Liberal party can be justly proud of our efforts in this regard. This policy has enabled many farmers to become permanently settled and to make permanent plans for the future, and certainly they can now make a much better contribution to the economy of this province. Mr. Speaker, Liberal agriculture policies have been successful in encouraging new developments, new procedures and giving new stability to our agricultural industry. People who visit the Nipawin constituency can only look to the south and see the large vegetable oil plant there. I can assure you now that there's going to be a large expansion in this plant and it will bring to eastern Saskatchewan, in particular, much added revenue and a constant market for farm agricultural products. Mr. Speaker, in the past year, I would like to say that the Cracking River agricultural area has been settled and it is a great credit to Mr. McFarlane and his Department. Some 29 new farmers have been settled on land that has been more or less waste land, and they are now making a real effort to consolidate this area and to make it something that Saskatchewan people can be truly proud of.

Now, as I close my remarks, I wish to congratulate the mover of the Address-in-Reply, the Member from Regina South West (Mr. McPherson) and I would also like to congratulate the seconder, the Member from Saskatoon Nutana South (Mr. Forsyth). They did make an excellent job of announcing Government programs and policies and putting before the people of Saskatchewan some of the most important issues. I would like to extend to the Speaker the congratulations of the people of the Nipawin constituency on his re-appointment to that position. Many people know the Speaker and certainly they feel that he is doing a marvellous job. Again, Mr. Speaker, I must say that the people of the Nipawin constituency are appreciative of the continued concern by the Premier and by the Members of his Cabinet, and we feel that we are indeed fortunate to have men who have such vision and such enthusiasm for the development of our country. We and the people know that there are many difficult and sometimes impossible situations to solve. The Premier is going at his work with enthusiasm and I'm sure that he is going to solve some of the very major issues.

Our country in the north has educational, professional, cultural, and recreational facilities equal to communities of larger size. I want to invite each and every one of you to visit the constituency and see for yourselves some of the many characteristics and qualities which you do not find in other parts of the province.

Mr. Speaker, as I leave you, I want to thank the Members of the Legislature for their time and attention and we look for you in the northern part of the province to view what we have there.

**Some Hon. Members:** Hear, hear!

**Mr. E. Whelan (Regina North West):** — Mr. Speaker, may I congratulate you, Sir, on your re-election as Speaker of this House. Since you first took this office you have made constant and continuous study of the background, the traditions and the duties that you inherited. Your diligent application to the task at hand is evident to all of us.

I should like to congratulate all Members of the Government who have been selected for new positions and sit now on the Treasury benches. I sincerely hope that the Hon. Member for Pelly, the new Minister of Natural Resources (Mr. Barrie) will make a rapid recovery from his temporary illness.

I would like to congratulate the mover and seconder of the Address-in-Reply. I want to welcome all the new Members to the House, and I want to express to the people of Regina North West my sincere thanks for the majority I enjoy as a result of their expression of confidence. Members opposite did not plan it that way. One look at the ridiculous boundaries is a clear indication to everyone that there was a deliberate attempt to gerrymander the riding of Regina North West. Mr. Speaker, the boundaries are a tangled mess and they are such a tangled mess that my Liberal opponent insisted on locating his bus stop signs in another riding, in the recent campaign. He didn't know where the boundaries were. It is a fact and everybody who lived in the area will testify to this. The boundaries were not drawn so that people would know where they were; that wasn't the purpose. When Members opposite drew the boundaries and totalled the score, it looked like a pretty close thing. They hadn't anticipated the loss that they would suffer as a result of the inept handling of the Saskatchewan Power employees, or the hospital workers, or their failure to live up to their promise to pay up to 50 per cent of the cost of education. This failure drove the mill rate up in the city of Regina like a rocket. And their general anti-labor attitude was bound to galvanize and unite the working people of my riding, white collar and blue collar workers, against them.

Mr. Speaker, in 1964, the group opposite had a majority of votes in Regina City. This time, our candidates overcame that lead and we finished with a good majority.

**Some Hon. Members:** Hear, hear!

**Mr. Whelan:** — Mr. Speaker, I expect the Government will be back on the drawing board with new constituencies. They can work on my riding and I invite them to work on it until they are blue in the fact. Come ahead, you're welcome to try. In my estimation they will try to draw Regina into seven constituencies hoping to take three of them for themselves. Even if these ridings are as small and unexplainable as Moose Jaw North, I don't think they will be successful. If the present boundaries remain as they are, the independent sector candidate from Regina South West will be in desperate shape to get re-elected. If they remain the way they are, he'll be in desperate shape to get

re-elected. I predict by the time the policies of the present Liberal Government seep down, five years from now, he won't make it, because he talks about a cracker-barrel approach, but his philosophy is so old, so out of date, that it was enunciated long before they discovered crackers.

The Premier used to brag about wiping us out. He used to rush down to his seat here and used to tell us, "We'll go to the country, and there won't be seven of you." And then he would get enthusiastic, "There won't be five of you", and we came within 350 votes of beating him. He used to talk about having an election; every 15 minutes he would threaten us with an election. It was quite a bombastic performance. I used to enjoy it thoroughly because I was hoping secretly that he would try it. But there is a different tune this time. He talks about an election maybe in five years, a different attitude. I want to say this, Mr. Speaker, and I want to be most emphatic, I don't care whether he calls an election in five minutes, or five hours, or five weeks, or five months, or five years, because, when the time comes, the Premier and his moth-eaten speech which he makes here and all over the United States, is going to be thrown headlong and the people of this province are going to say, "Good riddance, let's get on with the job."

**Some Hon. Members:** Hear, hear!

**An Hon. Member:** — You said that last time.

**Mr. Whelan:** — I also said, Mr. Speaker, that the former Hon. Member from Melville (Mr. Gardiner), when he laughed at the borders of my riding, wouldn't be back. Take a look for him and see where he is. Have a good look. Just remember that.

**Some Hon. Members:** Hear, hear!

**Mr. Whelan:** — I was out at Melville every three months – just remember. Prior to their election in 1964, the Liberal party promised to the people of Regina City that they were going to make grants of 50 per cent to cover the cost of education. We've got a Liberal pamphlet that says this. Fifty per cent of the cost of education. Well their grants have been around 30 per cent. This is about, I would say, their regular batting average. But the net result has been that taxes on city homes have gone up. Meanwhile the Premier has been raising taxes pretty rapidly and about as fast as you can for a Premier, that has been elected on a policy of reducing taxes.

**Hon. L.P. Coderre (Minister of Labour):** — Henry is the one . . .

**Mr. Whelan:** — Look at the Estimates in 1963-64 – taxes raised by the Province from all sources, according to the Estimates, the total estimates at that time, \$93,892,000. Let's look at

1967-68, total taxes, Provincial revenue from all sources, \$159,928,000. And he was elected to reduce taxes. This was his platform in 1964. In spite of this, huge increases in taxes. Regina did not get its share for education. It didn't get 50 per cent, it got 30 per cent. Mr. Speaker, the McLeod Report, the McLeod Commission on Taxation, recommends that the tax burden be taken off city property. The person on a fixed income, the old age pensioner, the superannuated civil servant, the retired employee, knows the payment of school taxes by land assessment is outdated and unfair. No steps have been taken to alleviate this problem. The plight of these people has been ignored. The Premier is busy rushing off to get tax concessions for mortgage companies, oil companies, and insurance companies and screaming at the top of his lungs when a Liberal Royal Commission recommends taxation on these people. And what are they doing? Here's the Toronto Daily Star, a good Liberal paper, and this is what they tell us:

Canadian insurance companies with 30 per cent of their business place abroad paid \$13,800,000 in income taxes to foreign governments.

It pointed out, in contrast, that foreign insurance companies in this country paid no income tax to Canada on life insurance policies within this country. The 1964 revenues of Canadian insurance companies exceed their expenditures by \$90 million, but they've paid tax on less than \$5 million of that amount. But when a honest to goodness Royal Commission suggests they be taxed, the Premier is opposed to it. He runs up and down the country. I would suggest that he go to bat for the pensioner and the people on fixed income. Here are the people who have got a real deal, these are the people that should be looked at. I congratulate the Royal Commission when they write a section like this in their report. It takes courage to do this, particularly when they are members of a party such as the party that the Members opposite belong to.

May I turn to something else, Mr. Speaker, for a moment. I'm not satisfied with slugging the Saskatchewan Power Corporation employees into submission. I'm not satisfied with holding a sword over the heads of all the underpaid hospital workers in the province. The Government has now decided to introduce legislation which, in effect, will coerce teachers. It will be, in effect, compulsory arbitration. Area bargaining that cannot be settled, if all the rumours that we hear are correct, will eventually wind up as nothing more than compulsory arbitration. Well, Mr. Speaker, we are short of teachers now. The relationship that has existed between teachers and trustees is about to be shattered. Many teachers will go to areas where they will be treated as individuals with bargaining rights, where they will be treated with respect. The net result will be that the young people of Saskatchewan, the young students will be without teachers. Once more the

Government has set a dangerous course. I'm saying this emphatically. I want the Minister of Education (Mr. McIsaac) to listen. I'm saying that they've set a dangerous course, a course that is going to put our educational system high on the rocks.

In my constituency, grade 12 students received a letter from the Premier urging them to stay in the province. I thought it was a dandy document just before the election. I'd like to read some parts of it to the House. I quote:

In addition the Canadian Student Loan Fund makes available interest-free loans up to \$1,000 per year depending on your need. These can be obtained by applying to any chartered bank or credit union. The Government will pay the interest on the loan while you are attending university and for six months thereafter.

It goes on to say:

If you wish to obtain employment upon graduation, numerous opportunities await you. However, I must caution you that your potential earnings will not be as high as they would be if you took further training. Regardless of which course you choose, university, technical training or immediate employment, I hope you will decide to make Saskatchewan your permanent home.

I agree with that. This is good.

If you require more information on training or employment opportunities, please do not hesitate to write either the Minister of Education or myself.

Well, I've interviewed a good many of these students. As a matter of fact I sent out a questionnaire and a good many of them came to my house. Mr. Speaker, I've seen this letter torn up quite a few times. I ask the Minister of Education (Mr. McIsaac): where are these people going to get their training? And how are they going to get their training? A huge percentage of young people in my riding, when they answered the questionnaire, indicated that they needed training such as you would get at the Technical Institute in Moose Jaw.

The Moose Jaw Technical Institute trains people well. It's a good organization, it's a good school, it's an educational asset, but unfortunately, Mr. Speaker, it is too small. It is overcrowded and there just isn't room for the students who are seeking admittance. No new accommodation is being built, and the young people in my riding, who have graduated from grade 12 who haven't the money, who don't want to go to university, have a choice. They can work as laborers for the rest of their lives or

**February 26, 1968**

they can go to Alberta. The population figures bear this out.

I heard the Hon. Minister (Mr. McIsaac) and I think he's a nice fellow – I heard him repeat the announcement that the late lamented Minister (Mr. Trapp) made about North Battleford. I hope he has more luck in the next election with that announcement than the other Minister had. But I can say this, that the young people in my riding need this type of facility and have needed it for the last three years. They are saying it over and over again in questionnaires, they are saying it to their teachers. I urge him to get on with the job.

Regina is in need of developing, at the earliest possible date, a community college that would provide technical training of some sort. There is such a demand that I don't think that we should worry immediately about facilities. The need for education among these students is so desperate that we should find staff and begin the organization of a community college immediately. A recent copy of the *Globe & Mail*, Report on Business, Thursday, November 6, 1967, describes the development in this area in Ontario. I would certainly suggest that the Minister read it. I quote:

Seventeen community colleges in Ontario have made a spectacular start this fall on closing what the Economic Council of Canada calls a long-standing gap in Canadian education, the need for broader post-secondary school training outside of universities. The colleges of applied arts and technology, to give them their official name, have a total enrolment of 11,700. The 9,748 men and 1,952 women are attending classes in converted factories, old schools and other improvised quarters. The eighteenth college will open near Kitchener in January.

And with the article is the picture of a group of young students attending a class in a shopping centre in Barrie, Ontario. I think that all Members of the Legislature, if they haven't already done so, should read the report on community colleges of the Regina Committee on Community Colleges which sets out very carefully the program which could be followed by these institutions. I would certainly urge the Minister to begin immediately, if he has to start as the people in Ontario have, if he has to begin with facilities. As long as he has staff, if he can train these young people, it's better than condemning them to a job as laborers for the rest of their lives when they need training.

Last year, Mr. Speaker, we heard a great deal about the Opportunity Caravan. You know when I walked by that caravan trailer parked in front of this building, I had the feeling it was more of a travelling election sign than



an honest-to-goodness project.

**Some Hon. Members:** Hear, hear!

**Mr. Whelan:** — When the report comes back in the House, I will be asking where the trailers are and how many people were counselled, because I have heard a number of complaints about the effectiveness of this particular project. In my estimation and from talking to these young people, there is a desperate need — and this group talking about community colleges points this out again — the desperate lack of counselling. There has to be a course to train counsellors. This most necessary educational service must have concentrated attention. Hundreds of students leaving school are completely bewildered, because they have not been counselled or because their counsellor is not properly trained to give the guidance they need. Students tell us over and over again that the people who counsel them are nice people, but students are reluctant, Mr. Speaker, to accept their advice because there is a lack of technical know-how in the counsellor's approach. The counsellor isn't adequately trained.

Mr. Speaker, there are many groups of employees in my constituency who are suffering because their wages are below average and are dropping rapidly particularly since this Government took over. I would suggest that all Members read the last edition of "The Dome", issued by the Saskatchewan Government Employees' Association. You will find a scale in there which shows that since 1963, wages in Saskatchewan have dropped \$3.25 below the Canadian average. Figure it up — 52 weeks in a year - \$3.25 per week - \$169 per year — 270,000 employees. It has cost the people approximately \$45 million. They are that far below the average Canadian wage of \$101.73. This is one of the areas, because of the activities and the program of the Government opposite and their attitude toward labor, where you can measure what the net result of their attitude and their program is. Wages in Saskatchewan are rapidly falling behind. Letters come to me almost daily from hospital employees. Their wages are so low; it is beyond comprehension how they can combat the present cost of living and at the same time maintain a decent standard. It is no wonder to me that hospitals are seeking employees and are unable to get them. It is no surprise to me that wings of hospitals in a city like ours have had to be closed because of a shortage of personnel. The Government, by ignoring the needs of these people, who look after the sick, is taking advantage of their dedication and carrying out a policy that is unappreciative and the essence of ineptitude. If by any chance we are able to negotiate any Federal money for Medicare, the first group that needs attention and must be paid a decent salary are the hospital workers who have been chained to their jobs by compulsory arbitration.

**Some Hon. Members:** Hear, hear!

**Mr. Whelan:** — Mr. Speaker, in my constituency there are a good many RCMP personnel, recognized among the police forces of the world as the best in the field of crime detection and public relations. These public servants have given our province and the people of Canada, a record of proud achievement in combatting crime. We know how diligently and effectively these officers prepare their cases, and we would urge the highest degree of co-operation with them in law enforcement and assisting the courts in their responsibilities.

Our urban municipality has been discriminated against by this Government in payment of library grants and in payment of health grants. I would hope that the health grants to Regina City would be exactly the same as they are to the city of Prince Albert. For Prince Albert, they are \$2.75 per capita; for Regina, they are 75 cents. I would hope that the library grant would be in the amount recommended by the Library Enquiry Committee in 1967. They recommended a dollar. I would hope that the recommendations of the Library Enquiry Committee are followed out. The recommendation of \$1.00, we will be looking forward to.

Many committees in this province, Mr. Speaker, receive complete police protection. The city of Regina is asked to foot the bill for the entire cost of police protection and this is a sizeable expense. Well, they receive a portion of the fines but there are some communities where you pay the whole shot. You pick up the tab. The city of Regina should be given some consideration to pay in part for the policing of the capital city. This would be in line with the policy practised in some other centres in this province.

Our city has many problems. It is a rapidly growing and expanding city. The Department of Municipal Affairs should have a fully staffed, research department which would study and make recommendations on the financing of urban centres like Regina. There should be available to the city complete planning facilities, information regarding the cost of extending transportation facilities and parking facilities.

**Hon. A.R. Guy (Athabasca):** — Henry.

**Mr. Whelan:** — I hear someone talking about Henry. All I can say is they did everything they could, they threw everything at him but the kitchen sink and they were trying to pull it off the wall. But he is sitting here and he's got a majority of 425. Do you want another crack at him? Take it, if you like.

**Some Hon. Members:** Hear, hear!

**Mr. Whelan:** — You know what the score is, every time somebody tries to run again him. It is a waste of time, isn't it?

The city of Regina is entitled to and should receive grants for snow removal. The proper research facilities and a properly staffed Department of Municipal Affairs might be able to find a solution. Perhaps using salt from the Esterhazy area or from the potash mines would cut the cost of snow clearance in centres like Regina City. I think, in addition we should have research facilities for parking. Parking in Regina is a problem at the present time. The citizens of Regina have been paying more and more gasoline tax each year. In return they are receiving a small percentage to help with the construction of arterial roads. This year, according to the Estimates, as a minimum amount, the citizens of Regina will pay \$5,500,000 in gasoline tax. In answer to a question the other day, the Hon. Minister for Highways (Mr. Boldt) indicated that we got \$650,000 of this back for arterial roads. We paid out \$40.00 per capita, we got \$5.00 back. There is no argument against using the largest portion of this to develop the Provincial highway system, but if there is going to be any relief for Regina taxpayers, when one realizes the tremendous mileage travelled on Regina streets, I think it is only fair that at least \$1,500,000 of this amount should be returned to Regina City each year to assist and aid this urban centre in the construction of arterial roads. At the present time the city has to put up 50 per cent of the cost, before they can get a grant for any arterial road that is being built. I think this is unrealistic. I would suggest that a grant be given without any strings attached for arterial roads. In addition, I would suggest that a grant for library, health, and police protection of \$6.00 per capita is reasonable and possible.

Mr. Speaker, the constituency I represent has within its boundaries a good many senior citizens. We are proud to have them located in our riding. A large group of them live in Pioneer Village, Mutchmor Lodge, Hewitt Place and Eventide Home. Last year, the Social Welfare budget was reduced. Reduction came about because of the \$30 payment for pensioners received from the Federal Government. Meanwhile, the rent for Pioneer Village accommodation was raised \$9.00 per month. While the rate is not high, the \$9.00 increase represents a large bite out of a very small fixed income. It would have been a very practical way to say to the pioneers of this province, "We appreciate you", if the Department of Welfare had picked up the \$9.00 increase, rather than passed it along to the pensioners.

Mr. Speaker, on behalf of the senior citizens in my

**February 26, 1968**

riding, I must protest the Provincial Government's confiscation of the \$1.50 a month cost of living payment which was paid by the Federal Government to all the pensioners.

**Some Hon. Members:** Hear, hear!

**Mr. Whelan:** — The \$9.00 per month increase on the Pioneer Village accommodation and later the \$1.50 per month confiscation, spell out to the Pioneer Village residents, in the strongest terms, that the people who operate the Provincial Government and who are in charge of payments to our senior citizens, have inherited the same philosophy, are practising the same principle, as the famous Six Buck Walter Harris. Frankly, Mr. Speaker, I am ashamed to say that I sit in a Legislature, which, in spite of the fantastic cost of living, engineered by their monopoly friends who own the food-processing establishments, would rob pensioners of a miserable \$1.50 in order to balance the Budget.

**Some Hon. Members:** Hear, hear!

**Mr. Whelan:** — The Premier said he would do anything within his power to maintain the economic stability of this Province. Mr. Speaker, I believe it. Mr. Speaker, this Government's treatment of senior citizens proves to me beyond any shadow of a doubt that he will do anything to balance the Budget.

The Regina hospital situation remains the same. It is acute. The Liberals were elected in 1964 because of the promise to immediately erect a general hospital. I have a photostatic copy of that little pamphlet. It was well written and sounded pretty good.

Action on city problems. Aid will proceed immediately to correct the critical hospital bed shortage, for the erection of a general hospital free of political interference.

Well, Mr. Speaker, they added a wing to the Regina General. Taxpayers of Regina City paid through the nose. They took out some old beds and added some new ones. When you total it up we still don't have any more beds. Now they are going to have a new hospital. We are going to get it quick. They have changed the name of the Geriatric Centre to the Wascana Hospital, and so now we have a third hospital in Regina City!

**Some Hon. Members:** Hear, hear!

**Mr. Whelan:** — The employees have been written a letter though. Because they are now hospital employees they are subject

to compulsory arbitration. They cannot dispute; they must accept; they can negotiate so far but when the times comes, they must take it or leave it. Their benefits have to be negotiated. They are at the tender mercy of the board of directors of the Base Hospital. They are now under the South Saskatchewan Base Hospital. This is the little letter they received and I quote:

Because the centre has only recently been established there is no existing scheme of employee benefits. Details of the terms of transfer relative to employee benefits and credits built up in the public service will have to be negotiated.

These people, who have worked for the citizens of Saskatchewan for a long period of time, don't have their benefits guaranteed. They are now under compulsory arbitration. Their benefits have to be negotiated.

Mr. Speaker, let me summarize: 1) Education in this province and particularly Regina City is facing a crisis, the crisis, instigated, planned and organized by the Government opposite; a crisis that will cost us many of the best teachers in the province, that will leave us without vocational training and without student counselling. 2) Hospital workers are in desperate need of decent wages. 3) the RCMP in my riding have an enviable reputation and should be allowed to operate as effective police officers. 4) The whole are of municipal financing needs attention and we feel that Regina is entitled to increased assistance for libraries, police protection, health grants and arterial roads. 5) We regret the financial mistreatment of senior citizens. 6) The transfer of the Wascana Hospital to the jurisdiction of the Base Hospital Board, without guaranteeing pension rights, is not conducive to good employee relations or representative of the wishes of Saskatchewan citizens.

Mr. Speaker, in conclusion, the Leader of the Government (Mr. Thatcher) has told this House that he would do absolutely anything to maintain the economic stability of the Province. If you look at the records, if you go back to the day that Members opposite became the Government, you will find that anything, includes a shocking, irresponsible, and harmful list of activities.

Let's review some of them. I mentioned our senior citizens. He would rob them of \$1.50 in recognition of their services to this country. 2) He would act as a fight promoter, a modern day tax gatherer and professional troublemaker between the teachers and trustees by introducing compulsory arbitration, and thereby bringing about an exodus of teachers unparalleled in the history of our province, in order to bring about his so-called economic stability. 3) He would hold back temporary wages of hundreds of temporary employees, as much as three months

at a time, while they finance by borrowing. These same employees must sit quietly by, unable to protest. They are not even in a union. Their car allowances, too, have not been paid for months at a time. Yes, he would do anything. He would finance on the wages and car allowances of temporary Government employees, outside the union scope.

**Some Hon. Members:** Hear, hear!

**Mr. Whelan:** — This Government and its Leader, would do absolutely anything. They would deny small contractors payment of necessary funds for months at a time, payments months overdue, payments that have to be used to pay gas bills, grocery bills, for heat and light, denied to the small contractors in order to maintain, I suppose, his kind of economic stability. He would impose on sick people, widows, pensioners – we are being warned this is in the offering – even on people who die in the hospital. He would impose on them a penalty for being sick, whether they go home or whether they go to the graveyard. In spite of the fact that the Federal Government is going to put up \$10 million for Medicare, the Government is going to say, while these people are desperately ill, “Pay up.”

**Some Hon. Members:** Hear, hear!

**Mr. Whelan:** — Those who are chronically ill and need check-ups and who are financially unable to put up the fee, will refrain from taking the necessary check-up. Yes, Mr. Speaker, the Hon. Premier would do anything to maintain economic stability. Although a recent request by a Member of the Provincial Government in Ontario, asking for letters from those who had been unsatisfactorily dealt with by private automobile insurance companies, brings to his desk as many as 30 letters a day, Government Members, here led by their Premier, keep talking of selling or making a financial arrangement with the private insurance companies. Although there was no request from the owners – and the owners are the citizens of this province – and although the company, Saskatchewan Government Insurance, enjoyed large profits, Saskatchewan Government Insurance rates on homes and farms were raised 50 per cent in the interest, we suppose, of his type of economic stability.

Although the cost of living has risen rapidly right across Canada, the Premier sits quietly by, waiting for a report from the Royal Commission, we suppose, in the interests again of his kind of economic stability. Although wages have risen in other parts of Canada, in Saskatchewan they have begun to lag drastically behind the Canadian average. Again, we suppose, this proves that the Premier will do absolutely anything in the interests of his kind of economic stability.

Well, I suggest, Mr. Speaker, that we look at some of the programs where he isn't moving, and look at economic stability. The Premier's inactivity in seeking potash markets by contacting the Federal Government or through his Department of Industry and Commerce, for this \$650 million investment, suggests that he is doing nothing in the interests of this industry's economic stability.

Whether he is doing nothing, or whether he is doing anything, and whether it is insurance, the cost of living, wages, teachers' salaries, old age pensioners, potash markets or deterrent fees, we suspect, Mr. Speaker, that the economic stability that he seeks is sought and developed only after he had protected the economic interests of his friends, of his sponsors, and his political allies.

**Some Hon. Members:** Hear, hear!

**Mr. Whelan:** — Saskatchewan needs a Government that will not burden the sick with deterrent fees, that treats teachers and trustees properly, that fights the high cost of living, that will reduce the price of insurance, that is responsible and seeks economic stability in accordance, Mr. Speaker, with the wishes, first, last and always, of the people of Saskatchewan.

Mr. Speaker, I have talked about the need for assistance and the special problems in my riding and in Regina City. I have outlined the unbelievably ineffective programs introduced and practised by the Government in the name of economic stability. I have suggested, Mr. Speaker, that there is another choice. With the evidence before me, my conscience is clear. I couldn't possibly support the motion and I will support the amendment.

**Some Hon. Members:** Hear, hear!

**Hon. L.P. Coderre (Minister of Labour):** — Mr. Speaker, in rising to participate in this debate, I would like to congratulate you personally in your re-election as the Speaker of the House as well as your personal re-election. I know that your keen interest in Parliamentary procedure will contribute considerably to the decorum of this Legislature. On the other hand, Mr. Speaker, I must also sympathize with you in having to hear these repetitious broken records from the other side of the House. I would like to congratulate as well, Mr. Speaker, all the newly elected Members of this House and all those who have participated in the debate. I think I would be remiss if I wouldn't give a special thanks to members of my constituency who have worked so hard to get me elected, as well as all the people of the constituency of Gravelbourg for their support. I would be remiss if I do not extend my sincere thanks to my new Deputy Minister

of Labour, Mr. Ron Parrott; the directors, the field staff and all the staff in the Department of Labour, as well as the new Deputy Minister of Co-operation, Mr. Gardiner; the directors, the field staff and all the members of the Department of Co-operation. And of course I would like to give a special mention to my right hand, my personal secretary, Miss Wolfe.

Sometime during this debate, Mr. Speaker, a Member opposite said that the CCF wing of the New Democrat Party, Saskatchewan section, was a clumsy title. Of course I wholeheartedly agree with him. Now it has become somewhat of a clumsy party. That is evident from what we have heard so far from the other side of the House. One thing that does concern me, Mr. Speaker, is that some of the Members opposite, I believe, were elected under some false pretences. Some were elected as CCF and others were elected as CCF-NDPs, and now according to the Commonwealth, they are NDPs. Now by changing their political affiliation or party while representing the people of Saskatchewan, they are not representing them as they were elected. Well in my personal opinion, Mr. Speaker, I think it is quite improper, but I am willing to condone the fact that they have been elected as CCF, CCF-NDP, or whatever they want. But it seems to me strange, Mr. Speaker, that not one of them has dared to get up and say publicly what he stands for. Is he a CCF? Is he an NDP? Is he a CCF-NDP? I am sure that the people of this House, the people of Saskatchewan, would like to know.

**Mr. M. Kwasnica (Cutknife):** — Where were you on Friday?

**Mr. Coderre:** — Mr. Speaker, they don't know what they are. Mr. Speaker, I am pleased to speak in support of His Honour's Speech from the Throne. My friends opposite have often indicated that the Government has forgotten the people and that we have lost sight of the people. The Speech from the Throne, Mr. Speaker, indicates that people come first; economic growth for the welfare of the people; agriculture, better advantages for agriculture; education for our young people; libraries for the people so that they can avail themselves of these services; Indian and Metis, grave concern and action taken by this Government to help these underprivileged people, to give them better opportunities; health, to safeguard, and the concern for, the health of the people in this province; Commission of Alcoholism; the Frazier Report, a concern for the mental health of the people; Collections Act; Expropriation Act; housing — all these are legislation that is going to be brought down and has been brought down because of grave concern for people. Parks and recreation. What is it? For the people so that they can have their relaxation. And I believe, Mr. Speaker, that the Speech from the Throne relates very clearly that we are concerned with the people, not so much with pressure



groups, but the individual people. We have heard from across this House, Mr. Speaker, charges that we are anti-labor. I am anti-politically oriented to labor bosses. We have some across the way, who . . .

**Some Hon. Members:** Hear, hear!

**Mr. Coderre:** — . . . have taken advantage of the sweat on the brow of labor for political advantages. It seems to be fashionable, Mr. Speaker, for some Members opposite to say that the present Government in Saskatchewan is anti-labor. Obviously it is hoped that their constant repetition of this charge will wear the citizens' resistance down so that they may start to believe it.

I have heard this record, Mr. Speaker, ever since this Government has been in office. I would like to take a few moments of your time, Mr. Speaker, to examine these assertions and implications. One of the actions performed by this supposedly anti-labor Government after assuming office was to raise the minimum wage on two different occasions in a very short while. The Government again discriminated against the working people, when in 1965, the minimum wage was raised to \$38.00. Again, we discriminated by raising it to \$40.00 in the next year. I might as well make a clean breast of it, Mr. Speaker, we are so anti-labor that we are going to raise it again very shortly, substantially, in the very near future.

**Some Hon. Members:** Hear, hear!

**Mr. Coderre:** — The question of increase in the minimum wage is under continual study, Mr. Speaker, in the likes of such factors as growth, the rise of the cost of living, the trends towards higher average incomes and so on.

It has been said a number of times lately by a few of these individuals that the Government of Saskatchewan is preventing employees from joining the labor unions. It might be said that this Government has pursued these anti-labor tendencies in that direction very successfully lately, so much so that labor unions in Saskatchewan have increased over the last three years more than in the previous seven years of the CCF Administration. In the last fiscal year alone, Mr. Speaker, almost two thousand employees were added to the total number of employees certified in bargaining units, as a result of a total of 112 certification orders issued by the Labour Relations Board.

I have mentioned The Pension Benefits Act, which was enacted last year and which is now in force. The passage of this Act represents another example of this supposedly anti-labor bias, in as much as it is intended to promote the establishment, the extension and improvement of employee pension plans throughout Saskatchewan. Other steps taken by the Government, Mr. Speaker, in the labor field include: enactments of improvements of The Workmen's Compensation Accident Fund Act. Accordingly we have

**February 26, 1968**

recently appointed a Committee of Review to review the work of the Compensation Board expansion; of training facilities under the apprenticeship program; designation of new apprenticeship trades; and in co-operation with the Federal Government, Mr. Speaker, granting of increased allowance for persons receiving training.

One might expect that an anti-labor Government would be beset by a terrific flood of industrial disputes. However, this is not the case again in Saskatchewan. Over the past three years, Mr. Speaker, annual average time-loss per wage earner in strikes under Provincial jurisdiction has been one one-sixth of the national average of Canada as a whole.

It might be interesting to discover what has happened to wages in general under the present Administration. Average weekly industrial wages and salaries in Saskatchewan in April, 1965, averaged \$80.37, in September, 1967, the average amounted to \$97.14, representing an average increase of 20 per cent. It seems very strange, Mr. Speaker, that almost everyone gets the impression that Saskatchewan wage earners seem to be flourishing under this supposedly anti-labor Government. The truth of course is this, Mr. Speaker, that the Government of Saskatchewan isn't anti-labor at all.

In the first place, Mr. Speaker, any logical individual would realize that no Government would last who would discriminate against any group, that is as large as that formed by our wage earners, who with their families make up almost half of the population of Saskatchewan. Did you notice, Mr. Speaker, in the last election that more Members were re-elected from urban areas? Did you notice that in the second place that a government of course has no right to discriminate against anybody? An elected government has a duty and an obligation to serve all citizens of this province. And this I submit this present Government of Saskatchewan is doing it in a mature and responsible way.

In the case of labor legislation, it must not be overlooked that most of the labor statutes currently being administered were originally passed in 1944. I can assure you, Mr. Speaker, that this Government is keeping legislation under constant review, with a view to facilitating the social and economic development of the province. Having in mind the indispensable contribution being made by the working people to the continued progress of the province, how are we doing that? By industrial development, just creating job opportunities.

I would like to say a few words about industrial development and job opportunities in Saskatchewan. This is something to which the Government assigns and has assigned and will assign very high priority. We assigned very high priority when we took office in 1964 and this is a continued priority. Since that time we have encouraged new industry to come to Saskatchewan in increasing numbers and, as a result, a previously agriculturally oriented economy is becoming more and more diversified. One of the most obvious products of this industrial program has been

the growth of our non-agricultural labor force, very close to 270,000. I have a hunch, Mr. Speaker, that a few of the diehards across the way still doubt this figure. But I can assure you, Sir, that that is still so. If it were not, this province would have been afflicted with the worst case of under-employment since the depression years.

There are two reasons for this. Firstly although agriculture is still our largest single industry, the trend in farm mechanization and larger farms has been resulting in a continuous decline in our agricultural labor force. The thousands of persons who in earlier times would have found employment on the farms are coming into the urban areas to find work in non-agricultural industry. The fact that employment opportunities have been made available to these persons has averted a serious employment crisis. In the second place, the election of this Government has coincided with the entry into the labor force of the so-called post-war baby crop. The percentage of the labor force formed by persons, say under 25 in 1961, was only 19.6 per cent; in 1964 it was 22.1 per cent. Last year 26.2 per cent of our labor force consisted of persons under the age of 25. It has been imperative therefore that the Government take steps to create employment for our young people; and this we have done and will continue to do and put every effort behind it, so that we can provide jobs for young people so that they will not leave the province like they did under the previous 20 years of Socialist administration.

**Some Hon. Members:** Hear, hear!

**Mr. Coderre:** — To illustrate this point, let's take a brief look at the unemployment data available. The average number of unplaced job applicants registered with Canada Manpower Centres in Saskatchewan during the three months of January, February and March, the period of the year when unemployment is at its peak because of the climatic conditions, was lower in 1967 than in any corresponding year since 1953. What do you think about that, fellows? Moreover according to DBS, the Saskatchewan unemployment rate in 1967 was just three per cent, the lowest rate in Canada; on January 13, 1968, the second lowest, desirable to be much less, but still very, very good, thanks to the industrial development . . .

**Mr. A.E. Blakeney (Regina Centre):** — Of B.C. and Ontario?

**An Hon. Member:** — That's right.

**Mr. Coderre:** — . . . of Saskatchewan, right here in Saskatchewan.

With regard to job opportunities, the increase in Saskatchewan employment index between 1965 and 1966 was the largest average annual increase in the history of the present statistical series, which was started in 1949. The index continued to

**February 26, 1968**

increase in 1967. Up to October, the latest month for which the data were available, monthly indexes in 1967 were significantly higher than the corresponding figures in 1966, and it's progressing. If there has been a problem at all, it has been related to a shortage of manpower, especially in the skilled occupations. At the end of September, 1957, there were approximately 3,400 jobs, unfilled job vacancies registered with Canada Manpower.

There are of course many other indicators of industrial progress in Saskatchewan. Here are some. The aggregate labor income increased by 43 per cent between 1963 and 1967, 42 per cent in that short time! The value of manufacturing production in 1967 is estimated to be \$447 million, an increase of \$76 million over the 1963 level; the value of oil produced in Saskatchewan over \$212 million, 27 per cent higher than in 1964-64; natural gas \$7 million in excess, more than double the value of 1963-64; copper production \$1.5 million in 1966-67 over 1963-64, nickel and platinum appeared on the list of metals commercially produced in Saskatchewan for the first time in 1966-67. Is this not the index? Sodium sulphate is increasing year by year, and there will be more. From this brief outline, Mr. Speaker, it may be seen that we have experienced considerable industrial development since 1964.

This has a two-fold effect. It has created employment for many persons who might otherwise have been without work and would have become social aid cases, with the resultant drag effect on progress. It is significant, Mr. Speaker, in this connection that it has been possible to actually reduce the number of social aid recipients because of this industrial development, because they have jobs today, and that's what they want. At the same time the industrial policy of this Government has resulted in an expansion and diversification of the Saskatchewan economy for the benefit of all the people of Saskatchewan.

This will continue, Mr. Speaker, and I give notice to the preachers of gloom across the way . . . you know, the sad sacks – that more and more benefits – for the people of Saskatchewan will be forthcoming.

Of course this will require good labor relations. The question of labor relations is of vital concern to every citizen of this province, whether directly or indirectly involved in the affairs of labor and management. Briefly stated, the policy of the Government of Saskatchewan in this area is this. We are completely committed to the principles of free collective bargaining, without compulsion or Government interference. You can sharpen up your pencil, Mr. Member from Moose Jaw South (Mr. Davies) because there is a lot more to come. We believe that every trade union has the right to negotiate for wages and working conditions, having in mind the welfare of the members of union. We believe that every employer has the right to attempt to temper the demands of unions, having in mind the continuance of his enterprise as a sound and efficient business operation.

We do not believe, Mr. Speaker, that the Government has any business peering over the shoulders of the two parties while negotiations are carried on, or otherwise interfering with the bargaining process. Collective bargaining, Mr. Speaker, is a well-established procedure in Canada and the orderly and progressive development of the Canadian economy depends on its successful operation.

You will recall, Mr. Speaker, that, as a result of recommendations of the Labour-Management Review Committee, The Trade Union Act was substantially amended in 1966. We now have a streamlined piece of legislation which may be said to provide the ground rules to make the process of collective bargaining more systematic and more effective. The Act provides the machinery, Mr. Speaker, in the form of the Labour Relations Board to certify the union and to ensure that the terms of the collective bargaining agreement between the two parties are carried out. Beyond that the Act does not interfere with the bargaining process, and that is as it should be. I imagine at this point, Mr. Speaker, someone on the other side would like to bring up the question of what about Bill No. 2? I'm surprised somebody didn't mention that. I have no intention of boasting that The Essential Services Act represents a wonderful piece of legislation, it does not. It is however, a necessary one. It constitutes an excellent example of the firm intention of the Government to protect the rights and the welfare of the people to whom it is responsible, the citizens of this province, the people of this province.

Surely nobody in all honesty will question the right and the duty of any Government to take action to ensure that services, essential services, will not be denied to the community. At any rate the right to collective bargaining continues as before. Legislation as passed does not take away that right; it simply provides for the resolving of the problems caused by the collapse of negotiations in vital services, without interrupting the services.

Despite the loud protestations to the contrary, Mr. Speaker, which we hear from our small politically oriented minority, the labor relations policy of this Government is such that labor unions in Saskatchewan are functioning and growing in a natural way, without Government hindrance. The Labour Relations Board in the fiscal years I mentioned issued 112 certification orders, which added 1,996 employees to the total number certified. This represents the largest increase since 1960-61. Moreover, labor union membership in the period 1965-67 increased by 4,865, the greatest two-year increase which has occurred since when? 1955 and 1957. And then these holier-than-thou apostles of gloom – I don't know what you'd call them, the do-nothings – are always preaching that we are anti-labor, and here are the facts that disprove every story to be made.

**Some Hon. Members:** Hear, hear!

**Mr. Coderre:** — The success, Mr. Speaker, of Government policy in labor

relations is indicated by the relatively peaceful industrial relations climate which prevails in Saskatchewan. Despite the many problems associated with the growth of the non-agricultural sector of our economy, and the accompanying increases of the industrial labor force, working time and production losses caused by strikes still remain negligible. With the assistance of our skilled conciliation services, which are provided by the Department of Labour on a voluntary basis, only a very small fraction of labor-management disputes, which actually occur, result in strikes.

Of course a good labor force, Mr. Speaker, must have technical and vocational training. I would like to draw this to the attention of my Hon. friend from Regina North West (Mr. Whelan). However, over the years I've heard a great deal of talk, talk from that side of the House, coming from certain quarters – it appears from all quarters – which apparently concerns education and training. I say apparently, because it's often very difficult to determine what the point of discussion is from over there. In this connection, Mr. Speaker, I am reminded of a story of an NDP Member, who happened to come to Gravelbourg during the campaign, that was the Leader of the Opposition. He was making a speech in a hall in Gravelbourg, the Parish Hall, and after he had been speaking for about an hour, one of those in the audience stepped out into the porch for a breather . . . I wouldn't doubt it. He was asked by a friend who was just arriving at the time, "Who's speaking in there?" The guy replied, "I don't know, a Socialist, Woody, I think." The other guy said, "What about?" And as usual these guys across the way, Mr. Speaker, speak many words, but they don't say what they're talking about. Now . . . just like that broken record.

**Some Hon. Members:** Hear, hear!

**Mr. Coderre:** — It is rather a shame that so much has been said by some individuals about the need for technical and vocational training, but so little has been understood. Actually the problem which exists in this area can be stated in fairly simple terms, and I hope they can understand. We are in the midst of a technological revolution, which is characterized by rising productivity and the transformation of the occupational structure of our labor force. A number of occupations which were there years ago will not be there tomorrow, and this is constantly changing. A number of occupations, largely unskilled, are disappearing and are being replaced by new and more sophisticated ones. In order to keep pace with this revolution and ensure continued economic development, the Government is doing everything it can in these areas, as far as the Department of Labour is concerned – we are aware of this – in the upgrading and the qualifications of our labor force. There is no doubt that there is a serious problem, particularly when one considers the fact that three quarters of the members of the labor force have less than a completed high school education.

If they have less than a completed high school today, the

responsibility rests on the former Government where they should have been training our people for the last 20 years. I have indicated that the bulk of our labor force is below the age of 25. Then they were responsible for not having given that education!

**Some Hon. Members:** Hear, hear!

**Mr. Coderre:** — In the case of the apprenticeship program operated by my Department, we have added four new trades, Mr. Speaker, to the list of trades designated under The Apprenticeship and Tradesmen's Qualification Act. I refer to the glassworkers, the heavy duty repair and title setting and industrial mechanical trades. The number of apprentices' indentures under the apprenticeship program has grown from 1,417 in 1963-64 to 2,343, which is double in three short years, representing an increase of 65 per cent during this period.

Under a co-operative agreement with the Federal Government, living allowances are paid to the apprentices when they are receiving training. The allowances were increased in 1965 and again in 1967 to encourage the apprentices to take the training, so that it would minimize their financial difficulties while they are taking their training, and assist their families. So we end up with good industrial advantages, good industrial relations, good established training.

Then we come to the human rights. Then what have these holier-than-thou Socialists done about it? The Government of Saskatchewan is equally as concerned for the people of this Province, about the question of human rights, as any modern democratic government should be. The Government administers a number of statutes which are designed directly or indirectly to protect the rights of individual citizens. In this general area, I might mention that the Government has taken specific action since assuming office to improve the working and living conditions of our Indian and Metis people. A pioneering piece of human rights legislation was introduced last year. It was The Criminal Compensation Act which was passed, providing compensation for innocent victims. Saskatchewan is a first Province and then they say that we are not concerned with people. We're much more concerned with people than you are.

Of course we have to have consumer protection. I heard the Member from Regina North West (Mr. Whelan) complaining about consumer protection, about this and that. A great deal has been said these days about steps which should be taken by the Government in the area of consumer protection. He has always implied of course that the Government has done nothing to promote the welfare of the consumer, in fact that it is not concerned with the problems which exist. This argument is as stupid as it is wrong. Surely we all disapprove of unjust prices. We all want to abolish poverty, we all want to eliminate income inequalities.

**February 26, 1968**

What then is the Government doing to protect the consumer? It was to protect the consumer that The Cost of Credit Disclosure Act was passed. Why didn't you guys do it when you had 20 years of Administration.

**An Hon. Member:** — What are you doing with that insurance?

**Mr. Coderre:** — . . . providing for the disclosure by lenders of the cost of credit to borrowers? Why didn't you fellows do it when you were there? It was to protect the consumer that The Mortgage Brokers Act was also introduced last year, to safeguard the public against the actions of unscrupulous mortgage brokers, to protect the consumer that The Unconscionable Transactions Act was passed, leaving the court powers to relieve the borrowers from transactions which were unreasonable or where the cost of loans was excessive.

You could go on and on down the list to show that this Government, this Liberal Government, is truly concerned with people. It was the Government's desire to assist consumers that resulted in the establishment of The Prairie Provinces' Price Commission, and we'll hear more about that some time in the future.

In any consideration of spiralling prices and inflationary trends, the role played by Government spending must not be overlooked. At the present time this Government is in a position to demonstrate its concern for the welfare of the consumers by refraining from inventing new ways to spend their money. Finding a new way to spend taxpayers' money is the way you fellows have been doing it for a while. This Government does not have the magic forces which are apparently possessed by those persons who persist in demanding that the Government increase services and reduce taxes. Boy! you could take the list of their promises in the last election. In our experience the more a government tries to regulate public life, the more money it has to have, money which must come either from taxes or from the printing press. Maybe these holier-than-thous know where it is.

I would like to say a few words about the relation of wage inflation, Mr. Speaker, It is no secret for anyone that, when compared with the time a working man needs to earn a certain level of wages, today's cost of food is almost in fact the lowest in history, almost the lowest anywhere. A pair of shoes, a pound of butter, or a gallon of gasoline may be purchased today for an amount of money which is earned in less time than in any previous year. Inflation is not necessarily caused by high wages, as some people believe. Before I go on any further I would just like to state the estimated percentage of a budget, from say a place like Uganda, where 70 per cent of the budget of the wage earner is used to provide food; in Czechoslovakia 51 per cent; Hungary 45 per cent; Japan 36 per cent. In Canada 27 per cent of the budget is for food. Take



for example in 1920, for one pound of beef a person had to work 48 minutes to earn it. Today we work 31 minutes to earn it, based on the average wage; one pound of butter in 1920, 86 minutes; in 1945 31 minutes; today 17 minutes; one pound of coffee 68 minutes, 34 minutes, 22 minutes today. Consequently if you relate it to the hours of work you will find that your cost of food is generally lower. As a matter of fact a recent study carried out by the Canada Department of Labour has shown that labor's percentage share of the value of the gross non-farm business production in 1966 was no higher than in 1949. Inflation comes from continuous bidding on the market, in which labor, industry, Crown corporations and Government agencies compete with each other most of the time.

Mr. Speaker, if I go on a minute over time, I hope you will stop the clock. Then I would be finished for the evening rather than continue after dinner.

It stands to reason that when some Government is in a hurry to acquire certain types of commodities, it's going to try to overbid everybody else, and that it is going to be successful, naturally because it has the money. Certain Crown corporations also exert certain inflationary trends on the market, when they undertake programs for which vast amounts of raw materials, or semi-finished commodities are urgently required.

Another inflationary fact is poor administration of business in a number of private and semi-private agencies. The evil, Mr. Speaker, is so widespread that people have learned so well to live with it that it is almost embarrassing to talk about it. Yet the problem is very real and unless something is done about it, much effort is bound to be wasted on less important matters which have an effect on inflation.

I would like to give you an example of waste and inefficiency which will illustrate the situation in this regard. Last summer a friend of mine ordered by mail a belt for a washing machine and the cost of this item was 85 cents. The dealer took his time, made him wait quite a while, then the dealer expressed the fan belt to him by special delivery with the delivery charges of \$3 for an 85 cent belt. You will all agree with me that this is a silly way of doing business, but you will say perhaps, "Oh well, this is the sort of thing which is bound to happen from time to time."

It cannot be helped, private enterprise, Governments are equally guilty, everybody is guilty, this is no indictment of private enterprise or government; everyone is guilty, including you, Bill. Mr. Speaker, I suppose we've got to put up with boners like that. But I submit, while the case of the fan belt may be an exception, there are many cases where efficiency could be increased by a system of forethought and organization. Higher efficiency means higher productivity. Higher productivity means more funds from which to pay out higher profits and higher wages. Higher productivity also makes it possible to keep costs down. Higher productivity, Mr. Speaker, is the real answer to

**February 26, 1968**

inflationary pressures.

Those persons who seem to be so fond of uttering these hollow statements on the subject of consumer protection would render a service to their province of a much higher order, if they were to actively participate in a plan to encourage greater efficiency in all industries of the province. As for the Government of Saskatchewan, we recognize the inflationary conditions are a cause for serious concern. I am especially worried about people on fixed incomes – the pensioners, the veterans, the widows – who are unable to protect their income when inflation drains away the purchasing power of their dollars. We shall continue to keep under study, Mr. Speaker, the problems relating to the welfare of the consumer and take specific action when required, as we have done in the past, to ensure that all citizens, Mr. Speaker, receive a fair share of the prosperity which Providence has bestowed upon us. Mr. Speaker, it is quite evident that this Government is doing everything it can to keep the ever-growing costs within Government, so that the taxpayers are able to benefit more by it. It's quite evident, Mr. Speaker, that I will not support the amendment, but I will support the motion.

**Some Hon. Members:** Hear, hear!

The Assembly recessed until 7:30 o'clock p.m.

**Mr. W.J. Berezowsky (Prince Albert East-Cumberland):** — Mr. Speaker, may I extend my congratulations to you, Sir, on your re-election to this House. I can say that outside of partisan feelings – and I have them sometimes – I must admit that you have brought dignity and decorum to this Legislative Assembly in the past and I'm quite sure that you will do so in the future. I certainly will behave myself as you shall see tonight.

I also wish to congratulate your very able assistant, Mr. Howes, who has in the past proven himself as a good parliamentarian and just in his decisions. I'm again very glad, I think with the sentiments, I'm sure, of the Members of this House, when we say that the Chair is in good hands.

**Some Hon. Members:** Hear, hear!

**Mr. Berezowsky:** — At this time I'd like to congratulate the Premier of the Province of Saskatchewan for re-electing a private enterprise Government. I wish him well and I hope he gives good legislation to the Province of Saskatchewan. I hope that he'll always be truthful in his statements, whether in this House or when he speaks outside of this House. I have some doubts because I received a clipping from a friend just the other day, concerning a statement that he made to United States

farmers who heard all about the advantages of free enterprise in the Province of Saskatchewan. I notice the Premier is here and I'd like him to listen to this. This is one of the things he said, "The Canadian Province of Saskatchewan has gone in three and one-half years from the bust of Socialism to the boom of return to private enterprise."

**Some Hon. Members:** Hear, hear!

**Mr. Berezowsky:** — He told this to over 5,000 members of the American Farm Bureau Federation at the opening of their 49th Annual Convention in Chicago. Now the interesting thing is this — I'm not going to quote everything I have here, I'll just quote a few paragraphs and if necessary, Hon. Members can get copies for their edification — but it says this:

The Head of the Liberal Party Administration elected on April 9th, 1964, characterized Saskatchewan's fling with Socialism as bitter, disastrous and a producer of skyrocketing Government costs. 'Twenty years ago the Socialists promised to make Saskatchewan the mecca of the working man', he said 'Instead we saw the greatest mass of exodus of people out of an area since Moses led the Jews out of Egypt more than 3,000 years ago.'

**Some Hon. Members:** Hear, hear!

**Mr. Berezowsky:** — Quite an orator, Mr. Speaker. I'd like to ask Mr. Premier what we've had since the Liberals have been in power since 1964 — a crusade?

**Mr. Thatcher:** — We're getting new industries now.

**Mr. Berezowsky:** — I quote further, "The Socialist Administration ran Saskatchewan for 20 years", - we didn't Mr. Speaker, we tried to carry out the directions that the people of Saskatchewan gave to us because we on this side are truly a democratic party. Anyway he went on to say — "during which 270,000 citizens left the province and the Provincial debt increased from \$150 million to \$600 million." Now I can stop there. It was the same kind of nonsense all through his speech but I can stop and ask him one question because as a Premier, we expect him to be truthful and honest and as is done in court, we expect him to tell the truth, the whole truth and nothing but the truth. Why didn't the Premier at that meeting pick up (because he certainly had it), Saskatchewan's Financial Economic Position and why didn't he tell the people, that he was speaking to at that time, if he is the kind of dignified person that I think he should be as a leader of the Government, that in the two or three years that he's been in, the debt of Saskatchewan jumped to over \$700 million. We took over a debt, he said, of \$150 million in 1944 and it grew to \$500 or nearly \$600 million by 1964 and we built

**February 26, 1968**

the Power Corporation and we built up all kinds of assets for the people and Saskatchewan. Now the Hon. Members opposite say, "This is not dead-weight debt." But the Premier tells the people he speaks to in other countries that ours was a dead-weight debt. Although he doesn't say so, but he leaves that impression. Well if he goes that far, let him remember that in 20 years time, he has gone ten times as fast, increasing the debt of this Province by \$100 million.

I also want to congratulate my colleagues on this side of the House who have been re-elected and to express my deep regrets that many able parliamentarians on both sides of the House were not quite so fortunate. I think it's too bad that after Members get some experience that they can't stay and give of their abilities. But that is the price we have to pay in a party system.

And I congratulate all the new Members on this side and the other side whose seats have been decided. I don't want to be too hasty in my congratulations to two Government Members at this time where some disputed votes weren't counted. I can't help but remember when you, Mr. Speaker, sent us some instructions and you stated that we are here at the consent of the governed. I would not want to sit in this House unless I was certain that I was here by consent of the governed.

Now my purpose, of course, today is to deal with the Throne Speech and with matters concerning my constituency and the business of Saskatchewan generally. Before I do that, I'd like to express my thanks to all the voters in my constituency who supported me and elected me for the fifth time. I can assure them that I shall continue to serve them, them only and only the people of the Province of Saskatchewan.

I'm going to have things to say and I shall not be afraid to say them in this House or any other place. Insofar as the Throne Speech is concerned, Mr. Speaker, I can only say that I'm extremely disappointed. I see pages of nothing, no vision, no inspired speech, the only thing that we all can see is higher taxes. It is not even a good caretaker's speech. It contradicts itself. It has no substance, the usual Liberal hash of cover-ups, confusion, callousness and lack of direction, and that's the best I can say for it.

In the Throne Speech debate we can talk about our philosophy and, of course, I think the House was interested in the political philosophy of the Premier and particularly of the Member for Regina South West (Mr. McPherson). If anything, I can say that I was disappointed with both presentations, because when one looks around and recognizes that we live in a modern age – and Hon. Members opposite certainly know that – how can they believe that the private sector of our private enterprise political structure can resolve all our problems and social needs without some universal, equitable tax foundation. Can we expect to have the kind of services that we must have in this modern age by accepting the generosity of modern robber barons?

Yet that is what the Hon. Member from Regina South West meant. What a vision, Mr. Speaker! The only thing I can see – and I've thrown it across the House – this is going back to the feudal system, back to King Arthur and his Knights, a return at the best to the 19th century and not towards the one ahead of us. It certainly means that the people opposite still believe in the rule of vested interests, in the rule of the barons of the modern age. I say it is nonsense and nothing else. It certainly is nonsense, that kind of thinking. And it's difficult for me to stomach this kind of modern Liberalism if you want to call it that let alone the kind envisioned by the two Hon. Members opposite, who want to sustain the status quo, supplying political goodies in the form of outdated laws and regulations with high-sounding phrases, the kind that can be interpreted in different ways by private enterprise-trained lawyers and judges including the interpretation of The Saskatchewan Elections Act. This Liberal philosophy of market and competition of supply and demand, which is outdated, is neither free nor palatable nor democratic. And that's my contention. It is the Premier's kind of philosophy. It contains no equality because these private enterprise capitalists only concede welfare and other public programs to avoid a revolution, such as we've seen during our lifetime, such as we read about in France. Some of us remember what happened in the Soviet Union because of imperialistic Russia's autocracy.

The Premier has expounded and many in his party expounded – I've heard them – that if anyone wants an education, if anyone wants security, then he or she must get it by their own efforts. Such Liberal democrats, if you want to call them that, forget about millions of handicapped, the underprivileged who have been robbed of their resources. They only think of the rat race, how they can be in the forefront and how they could join hands with the powerful magnates. I'll have something to say on that before I sit down today. They know these facts better than I do, because it is the way of their survival and the survival of an outdated and vicious philosophy which they uphold. It seems to me that the Government in the Throne Speech indicates very clearly that it does not understand that we live in a transitional age, an age of social change. It doesn't understand that social institutions have become an accepted way of life and that these changes, technical and political, have brought definite benefits to our provincial community and to our country. The Premier and his supporters opposite know this to be true but they shout to the skies, "Private enterprise will save you; it is the only way to live." The Premier says that's nonsense. Well it is nonsense. It is so outdated indeed, that it is nonsensical. Let me, Mr. Speaker, advise Hon. Members opposite that individual values are weakening and collective values and ideas are strengthening all over the world; particularly in the underdeveloped countries they are away ahead of us. And maybe the Russians have something that you haven't got because they do give free education to their youths, which you deny.

**Mr. Steuart:** — That's right.

**February 26, 1968**

**Mr. Berezowsky:** — What do you know about Bolshevism, the Russians or anything else? You don't even know as much as I do.

**Mr. Steuart:** — I don't want to know it, Bill. Show us your party card. The truth is coming out now, Bill.

**Mr. Berezowsky:** — Now let's get back to the Province of Saskatchewan and think of the kind of things that you should be doing instead of denying. Now, Mr. Speaker, if the Hon. Gentlemen had gone to public school, they would know that even the United States of America was founded on a former revolution or pre-revolutionary ideals, an ideology of freedom and truth. But, because greed and the desire to become rich form the only goal that private enterprises have, much of this ideology has been lost, so it is true that Madison Avenue rules the roost in the United States and the original idea of freedom have been lost there. Our Premier runs continuously to the United States to see if he can bring some of that new Liberalism down here to Saskatchewan, which can only destroy the great democracy that we built here.

Now after these few words that I've said to the Premier, I now say the Government must give true leadership and that our priorities must be people and the needs of our people. Governments must intervene if the needs of our people are threatened, governments must recognize that there must be some intervention in controls for the good of society. If these controls are good I won't disagree with the Government. But it's strange for me to listen and to hear that the Government wants to control education, it wants to control labor, it wants to control all these areas for power. When the Hon. Member from Prince Albert West got elected on the slogan that the CCF, the social democrats, who sit here and who were the Government believed in compulsion, stagnation, and high taxes, yet, Sir, the Member for Prince Albert West (Mr. Steuart) has been the greatest exponent of compulsion and stagnation and high taxes.

**Some Hon. Members:** Hear, hear!

**Mr. Steuart:** — What a terrible thing to say! To think that's my running mate up in Prince Albert! Very discouraging.

**Some Hon. Members:** Hear, hear!

**Mr. Berezowsky:** — Mr. Speaker, I don't know why I'm wasting my time with these stagey gentlemen, but I still hope that there may be some kind of a spark in them that might ignite. Then they'd be able to realize what Saskatchewan and Canada are really facing and what must be done.

Another thing they had a Royal Commission on Health Services. The Hon. Minister (Mr. Steuart) is quite aware of this Commission

and must have read this in the report of that Commission. I quote one section:

Democratic government is an agency which enables us to transcend exclusively individual and selfish drives and to provide benefits for all or at least the majority of the nation's individuals.

Does that sink in?

**Mr. Steuart:** — What report was that?

**Mr. Berezowsky:** — I told you what the report was. Look it up and read it. I've got a speech to make here, but I've told you what it was. And I say this, that national concern and public responsibility should be the prime responsibility of a Government, and this is where my friends opposite fail. And that's where they failed in the Throne Speech. To them, the private sector has all the answers they say. Industry comes first, as the Hon. Member for Prince Albert West has said, and people are second or subservient to industry and to the money establishments.

**Mr. Steuart:** — I've got half your people working.

**Mr. Berezowsky:** — I say this is a narrow viewpoint, Mr. Speaker. Before the last election, Sir, this Liberal Government boasted of Saskatchewan's industrial growth and prosperity in all the areas of our economy. And there was a prophet in Prince Albert who said over and over again, "Re-elect Dave Steuart, candidate for Prince Albert West and you will have even more and greater things than you have had in the past." And I said, "God help the people of Prince Albert West in Saskatchewan." If we are going to get more of what you have given the people in the last three and one-half years, but unlike the oracles of Delphi, Mr. Speaker, unlike them, the prophecies that he made are not coming forth.

**Mr. Steuart:** — They're coming fifth.

**Mr. Berezowsky:** — They are not coming forth in this Throne Speech at all. The people of Saskatchewan expected great things and did re-elect this Government. Yet immediately after the election — I don't have to say it — the Premier announced austerity, hard times, the need to tighten our belts. It is in the Throne Speech for all of us to read. And I can only say again that this Government is completely confused, telling on one hand how fortunate the people of Saskatchewan are in seeing all this industrial growth (which really started under the former Government) and then on the other hand saying, "Tighten up your belts, boys, we are going to have higher taxes, tough times." If that isn't confusion then I don't know what is.

I should mention something about welfare, I think. We have

a pretty good-looking Minister of Welfare (Mr. MacDonald) and I hope he does his job as well as he looks. I do suggest that, because we live in an interdependent society, capable, professional people are required to administer some of these programs. Under the former Minister as we know – he's not here – I'm very sorry to say that we lost dozens if not hundreds of most capable people in the Province of Saskatchewan. As a result, welfare programs are suffering. At a later time, maybe on another occasion, I'll be able to mention a few things of what I have in mind in this connection.

I should talk a bit about education and concerning education, I think that most Members will agree on the value of social programs, such as public spending on education. We listened tonight to speakers at our parliamentary conference and heard of nations that put education as the priority. Now, education should always be a priority, I think. Maybe we don't have to go to the extent that they did in Africa, but it should be a priority just the same. But the intention of the Government, as I see it in the Throne Speech and what we've heard from the various speakers, is an attempt to tighten controls over education, try to keep the costs down. They say it's very commendable if you can do that, but on the other hand you must remember that, if you get out of line with what other provinces are doing or other parts of Canada or say the United States, then we may lose our teachers. I have met many people in different parts I've been to recently who are very, very concerned, Mr. Speaker, on this particular point. They are afraid that we are going to lose our capable teachers and so I would suggest that you could withdraw the legislation you have in mind. I don't think it's that important. The best argument you can give as far as setting up, say, negotiating areas is to relieve the local boards from doing that particular job. But you should not antagonize hundreds of teachers. I think it would have been better if you could have negotiated through the Teachers' Association on a provincial basis, instead of trying to divide up trustees and teachers. Your original intentions, of course, were very bad because you were excluding principals and other members of teaching staffs who have been in this negotiation business. This Government should never forget the contribution teachers have made in the past with the exception of one or two that I know.

**An Hon. Member:** Hear, hear!

**Mr. Berezowsky:** — Well, the Hon. Member if he feels that I'm referring to him, he's perfectly right, I am.

**Some Hon. Members:** Hear, hear!

**An Hon. Member:** — I was going to be kind to you, Bill, and now I'm going to have to think about it.



**Mr. Berezowsky:** — I think that you are on dangerous ground, Mr. Minister, with all due respect, at what you're trying to do and I'd be very careful.

Now I do want to talk about library facilities in our province. We heard an Hon. Member on the other side of the House the other day — I think it was the Minister, I may be wrong — but he was expounding, telling us what a fine report they had from a Library Committee, boasting as to what they are doing about libraries in the Province of Saskatchewan. Now let me say something that I saw in the last report of the Library Inquiry Committee. Its conclusions are on page 124, Sir, and I quote: "Existing library facilities, public and regional in Saskatchewan are inadequate to meet the needs of the 20th century and if we fail . . .

**Mr. Thatcher:** — That's under the Socialists.

**Mr. Berezowsky:** — You have forgotten that you live in the 20th century. You are always thinking of the 18th century or the 17th. That's in the report, it's your own report.

**An Hon. Member:** — But they are report on CCF . . .

**Mr. Berezowsky:** — You are the Government now and this is just a poor excuse. Why didn't you do your duty? We did things you would never have done and we're proud of what we've done.

**An Hon. Member:** — You did nothing, so we are acting.

**Mr. Berezowsky:** — Now you show us that you can do as well. Later the Report says, Mr. Speaker, "There's room for and demand for improvements throughout the province." I challenge this Government to do just what that Report says: Put in improvements, do the things that should be done.

**An Hon. Member:** Hear, hear!

**Mr. Berezowsky:** — And I want to point out to the Hon. Member for Prince Albert West (Mr. Steuart) who calls himself the Member for Prince Albert, he should be ashamed. You are a Member representing the jail and the penitentiary. I am the Member who represents the pulp mill.

**Some Hon. Members:** Hear, hear!

**Mr. Berezowsky:** — Now, Mr. Speaker, in spite of everything I'm still friendly with the Hon. Member for Prince Albert West. I'm the Member

for Prince Albert East. He married me, I didn't marry him, but he married me and I have to get along with that kind of person.

**An Hon. Member:** — . . . Sewage disposal plant and the Catholic cemetery.

**Mr. Berezowsky:** — Anyway I have some very, very fine institutions and I'm very proud of them, believe me. And I have best of all, the finest people in Saskatchewan, I have the best fish in Saskatchewan, I have the only pulp mill in Saskatchewan, mines and wealth of all kinds.

**Some Hon. Members:** Hear, hear!

**Mr. Berezowsky:** — And I invite you and the Hon. Member from Nipawin (Mr. Radloff) to come into my constituency. By the way I own half of the Squaw Rapids Dam, it's in my constituency too. Seriously, Mr. Speaker, if the Government is to prepare to accept its responsibility insofar as libraries are concerned, I suggest to the Hon. Minister from Prince Albert West (Mr. Steuart) that a good place to start is Prince Albert. The late John Cuelenaere, as we all know, left a bequest of some \$100,000 – I don't know the exact sum, only what I read in the press – and I think that we should carry out his desire that something good should be done with the money that he left behind, and I suggest that this Government should act immediately. Whatever purpose he left it for, let the Government contribute sufficient sums to see that good use is made of this money.

Now I note in the Throne Speech that an increased amount of money is to be spent for highways. Again, the Government is placing priority on highway construction, as we've heard all along. Oh yes, we've cut down on education, we cut down on medical care or this and that, but highways? We are going to build more highways and it's right in the Throne Speech. I don't agree with that priority, due to the fact that the Government is going to spend, I'd say, at least \$7 million in my constituency in this current year on highways, not for the farmers or Saskatchewan people, but for the pulp mill in particular. They will be cutting up our land and as a result farm people are up in arms. I'm getting letters and communications of one kind and another telling me, "Bill, do something. Try to straighten those people out." I have these complaints, I can read them. I think the Minister received a complaint from the Municipality of Buckland, No. 491 telling him that the road shouldn't be constructed across country from the pulp mill down to Spruce Home. For the love of me I don't know why the Government wants to do so, because, if you build the highway in from there, it won't be of much use for farmers because the route bypasses the city of Prince Albert. It's directed to the pulp mill. Why not bring the pulp the way it should be brought down? Why don't you build a road straight north from the pulp mill? This makes logic and sense. When you get into the timber, the timber will be accessible to this road. Then proceed across the north in any

direction you want to go and bypass the communities as you are doing now, but leave the farmers alone.

**Mr. Steuart:** — Too far that way.

**Mr. Berezowsky:** — Too far? That's a darn poor excuse. Too far! These people have torn out the trees and the roots and they cultivated this land. They haven't too much of it. This land is precious to them and no amount of money that you can pay will ever satisfy them.

**Some Hon. Members:** Hear, hear!

**Mr. Berezowsky:** — As well, you are cutting through solid Liberal polls, and, if you want to lose the rest of the votes in Cumberland, just put another road through Honeymoon and Whitestar and the next time your candidate won't get enough votes to save his deposit.

**Mr. Steuart:** — I didn't know you had those places up there, Bill.

**Mr. Berezowsky:** — Oh yes, you have Honeymoon and you have Whitestar and that's exactly where the road's going through, Sir. Certainly the Minister knows the area needs consultations. You've been there having meetings. Hon. Ministers have been out there but you haven't been very successful in your attempts. I'll tell you why. The next time you put up a candidate, you put up a candidate that talks sense to the people. I want to refer to that just for a minute.

**Mr. Steuart:** — We did, Bill, but they are so used to you they didn't recognize it.

**Mr. Berezowsky:** — This gentleman went down to a meeting to which he wasn't invited, a meeting called by the municipality of Buckland, No. 491, at which councillors and the reeve were present. They discussed this highway problem. This gentleman who is a defeated candidate went to that meeting uninvited. He got up in that meeting and spoke up against your Government. He said they had no business to go through there with a highway and with that I of course agree. But he was only doing it to make a favorable impression on the people of that area. He said he was representing the Liberal party or the Liberal Government, I'm not sure. If it was the Liberal Government you tell me whether you hired him, because you hire people like that all over the province, so maybe he was representing you yet he wasn't speaking on your behalf, Sir. Mr. Ted McDougall, who is a councillor and was a potential Liberal candidate but didn't get the nomination, got up and said, "Let's not bring politics into this whole picture, because this should be above politics." He said Cumberland

**February 26, 1968**

should receive consideration from the Government. At this point, Mr. Eldon McLaughlin got up and said that it was a defeated constituency, and they don't deserve any consideration. Now if that's the way you people govern, if that's the kind of instructions that you give to your candidates, or if that's the kind of candidates you have, then you should be completely ashamed and disgraced.

**Mr. Steuart:** — Bill, we don't give our people any instructions.

**Mr. Berezowsky:** — Even the editor of the Prince Albert Herald who happens to be a very close friend of yours, wrote an editorial on this point, pointing that this was a little bit too much . . .

**Mr. Steuart:** — He's your cousin.

**Mr. Berezowsky:** — He's not my cousin, he's my nephew.

**Some Hon. Members:** Hear, hear!

**Mr. Berezowsky:** — I'll tell you another thing you want to know. If you didn't write his speeches and if you didn't threaten him with his job (the Premier said nobody was threatened or afraid of this Government) he wouldn't write the kind of editorials that you make him publish.

**Mr. Steuart:** — Oh, wait till I tell him that.

**Mr. Berezowsky:** — Yes, you can tell him that and you can tell him I said so.

**Mr. Steuart:** — He'll get a divorce. What a terrible thing to say!

**Mr. Berezowsky:** — You can't tell me any different for when I write a letter to the Herald, and the editor writes an editorial just as soon as I submit my letter that he doesn't get in touch with you, then you write the editorial and they publish it in reply to my letter before the people even have a chance to read what I have said.

**Mr. Steuart:** — I must have lost control the last time.

**Mr. Berezowsky:** — Well, I did find what the Hon. Member said and I might as well read it to be correct — I can strike out what I said previously — here is what he said — this is one of your men, one that was your candidate and probably you are paying his way

right now.

**Mr. Steuart:** — Oh, no.

**Mr. Berezowsky:** — You aren't? Well I'll ask some questions and find out. I remember the Minister (Mr. Steuart) said a year ago, when asked about those trailers that you didn't tender them. You said, "Oh, yes, we always tender," but when the question came back it was found that you never did tender, so I was right and you were wrong. Now, the quote is:

The farmers in the area were justified in their concern. I am always opposed to cutting across quarter sections of land. Road allowances were designed by our forefathers to be used for these purposes.

**Mr. Steuart:** — Who said that?

**Mr. Berezowsky:** — Your friend, Eldon McLaughlin. I would think there would be some kind of liaison between yourself and your people who are defeated candidates. But the most shocking part as I said before and I quote again from the press, from the Herald:

Councillor McDougall, a Liberal spokesman, who was serving as chairman of this meeting,

He did run as a Liberal, he didn't get nominated. Here is the quote actually:

I shouldn't get politics involved but the Government does owe something to the people of Cumberland constituency.

And again I agree, and what did the Liberal defeated candidate say:

As far as the Government is concerned Cumberland is a defeated constituency so they don't owe you that much.

I say that is a disgrace for the Government to have someone saying such things and the people of Saskatchewan should know about it.

**Mr. Steuart:** — He is on his own, Bill, we don't tell our people what to say.

**Mr. Berezowsky:** — Okay then. I am going to bring out another point and I am going to challenge the Government to an investigation. I have it on reliable information that when the bills for the last election came into the press, the press was told to send the bills down to Toronto to some advertising company to be paid. When the Members advertised their accounts I was wondering, "How come?" I didn't go on TV, I didn't spend money in the

**February 26, 1968**

press for advertising, I didn't have these big sheets that the Hon. Member for Prince Albert West (Mr. Steuart) had, costing three or four hundred dollars a page, I had a little ad and yet I spent \$2,900. The Hon. Member said he only spent \$6,000 and yet I can see with all the TV and all the press accounts that there must have been \$20,000 spent. Now I know where it came from; from your friends in Toronto who picked up the bill. The worst part of it is they will charge it up to advertising and beat the Dominion Government out of taxes that the Government should get.

**Mr. Steuart:** — Pint of order, can you prove that?

**Mr. Berezowsky:** — I put in my expense account and it is exactly right. I forget what it was but it was exactly what I spent.

**Mr. Guy:** — Either withdraw that or prove it.

**Mr. Berezowsky:** — Mr. Speaker, the Hon. Member will not deny and there are other Hon. Members here too that will not deny, not all of them, but there have been companies that have picked up the tab for them and they could charge it up to advertising in their corporation and income tax. It happened here, in Prince Albert and you are one of them, and I can tell you something else that will make you blush.

**Mr. Speaker:** — Order, order!

**Hon. W.R. Thatcher (Premier):** — The Hon. Member has suggested that this party in the last election in some way received contributions which were illegal. Let me tell you, Mr. Speaker, I know something about my Hon. friends. They indulge in companies every chance they can get. And may I also say, Mr. Speaker, that within two years this party opposite received \$40,000 or \$50,000 for the Hon. Premier from the United Auto Workers in the United States.

**An Hon. Member:** — Sit down.

**Mr. Speaker:** — Order, order!

**Hon. W.S. Lloyd (Leader of the Opposition):** — On this point of order, I'll sit down, Mr. Speaker, according to the rules of the House, and not when I'm told to by the Hon. Premier.

**Mr. Speaker:** — I told you to sit down when I was standing up. Now sit down, if you please. Order! Who was on his feet last? Do you want to rise on a point of order? Point of order for the Leader of the Opposition.

**Mr. Lloyd:** — The Premier tries to make the point that this party has received these many tens of thousands of dollars; he is not telling the truth.

**Mr. Thatcher:** — National party. I'll table the information in the House tomorrow.

**Mr. Lloyd:** — Mr. Speaker, that is not the national party we are talking about. This is the Saskatchewan party.

**Mr. Berezowsky:** — Mr. Speaker, may I proceed?

**Mr. Speaker:** — The Member from Cumberland.

**Mr. Berezowsky:** — Thank you, Mr. Speaker. All I can say is this, I challenge the Premier and his Government to make an investigation. I will give you all the facts you need to know and where to go for them. I am satisfied this is true, that the tab has been picked up by your people in many cases. I'm making this statement and I challenge you to appoint a commission to investigate it.

**Mr. Steuart:** — Prove this or withdraw it.

**Mr. Berezowsky:** — I will not withdraw.

**Mr. Steuart:** — Well, you'll have to prove it then, you've made a statement . . .

**Mr. Berezowsky:** — You prove it.

**Mr. Steuart:** — It would be the same thing if I make the charge that you spend most of your money buying liquor for the Indians. And I can prove that too.

**Hon. D.V. Heald (Attorney General):** — Mr. Speaker, this is for the record. As I understand the Hon. Member for Prince Albert East-Cumberland has made very serious charges. If he will document those charges and make them in writing to me, I will be glad to look into them immediately.

**Some Hon. Members:** Hear, hear!

**Mr. Berezowsky:** — I'll be glad to do that. The person I know that could give the information, Mr. Speaker, might give it to me. I can tell you where it is.

**February 26, 1968**

**Mr. Heald:** — You made the charges, you give the information to this House. Don't go to the outside.

**Mr. Berezowsky:** — You go to the Herald, to the accounting office and you'll get it there. Do you want any more?

**Mr. Heald:** — Mr. Speaker, I am not going anywhere. You made the charges in this House, you make the charges to me, chapter and verse or withdraw.

**Mr. Berezowsky:** — Sir, I am not withdrawing anything.

**Mr. A.E. Blakeney (Regina Centre):** — Pint of order, Mr. Speaker, I suggest that, however much the Attorney General (Mr. Heald) may feel that he is in charge of the administration of justice in the province, it is not up to him to say whether a Member withdraws a comment in this House or not. It is rather improper or discourteous of him to hurl insults across the House and say, 'You'll do this, or you'll withdraw.' I think it is up to the House and I think the House will make its decision in due course.

**Mr. Heald:** — He's quite right, Mr. Speaker, all I am saying is that the Hon. Member has made a very serious charge and I think he has an obligation to this House to either document the charge or indicate to me when he is prepared to document it or withdraw it.

**Mr. Berezowsky:** — Mr. Speaker, I did not charge any Member opposite, I talked about the Liberal party, I said that in the Liberal party somebody had picked up the tab from Toronto, an advertising company and they know that it is true. If they don't want to admit it, that's fine. I said where they can get the information. An employee that is working there passed it along to me, but you can go to the office. If you appoint a commission to investigate you'll find this out. But I will say this, that I am glad that I did not have to have anybody else pick up my tab. I paid my way and my paid have paid our way.

**Mr. Speaker:** — May I draw your attention to Beauchesne's Parliamentary Rules and Forms, Citation 180, subsection 4:

Scandalous charges or imputations directed against Members are equivalent to libellous charges brought against the House itself.

That's all the Members of the House. I think that almost covers the situation which we find ourselves in this evening. Certain charges have been made in connection with expenditures in connection, I think, with the last election. I would suggest that



the Member contributes some proof thereof or he will have to withdraw the charges he has made.

**Mr. Berezowsky:** — Mr. Speaker, I didn't make any imputations against any Member. I referred to the Liberal party. Somebody picked up their tab for advertising.

**Mr. Speaker:** — Well, if I understand the debate correctly the charges were laid against the Member for Athabasca (Mr. Guy). Now there is a possibility that I may have misunderstood. There was quite a lot of noise going on at the time but that was my understanding.

**Mr. Berezowsky:** — Mr. Speaker, the Hon. Members were interfering with my speech and maybe in the heat of debate I may have inferred something about both Members, the Member from Prince Albert West (Mr. Steuart) and the Member for Athabasca (Mr. Guy). If I did, then I, of course, withdraw.

**Some Hon. Members:** Hear, hear!

**Mr. Berezowsky:** — But I say again concerning elections, I think that it is preferable that we pay our own way.

**Mr. Thatcher:** — You get a lot from unions all over the country.

**Mr. Berezowsky:** — I spent \$2,900 in my constituency. That's all we spent, and it is all hard-earned money. If you people wanted to have this out in the open, why didn't you agree with us a year or two ago to have campaign contributions exposed?

**Some Hon. Members:** Hear, hear!

**Mr. Steuart:** — Maybe you don't know they are taking orders direct from the unions.

**Mr. Berezowsky:** — What bothers me is this that, if what I have said is the case — and I have every reason to believe that it is so — then such companies will charge it up to advertising in a case like this, and the Federal Government or the Provincial Government will lose income in corporation taxes to that extent. That's the point I wanted to make.

**Mr. Thatcher:** — No point at all!

**Mr. Berezowsky:** — That is your opinion. I was shocked by the mover of the Address-in-Reply (Mr. McPherson) and his philosophy. I will

**February 26, 1968**

again try to help him see the light, so that we don't have to fight across the floor of the House. Then maybe we can arrive at some understanding of what our job here is. As a matter of fact he made a pretty good speech except that the contents were kind of outdated. I remember hearing something about a McPherson from Ottawa, a professor, so I obtained a book from the library to see if he felt the same way as the Hon. Member who is a McPherson feels. I recommend this book to the Hon. Member, "The Real World of Democracy" and I would like to read a paragraph or two. On page 6, about the middle of the page, it says this:

The claims of democracy would never have been admitted in the present liberal-democracies had those countries not got a solid basis of liberalism first.

The liberal democracies that we know were liberal first and democratic later. To put this in another way, before democracy came in the western world, there came to society and the politics of choice, the society and the politics of competition, the society and the politics of the market.

I hope it is sinking in.

This was the liberal society and the liberal state.

Now I just want to read another paragraph:

This society based on individual choices had of course some drawbacks.

You see what he says about that? This is a learned gentleman, a professor with one of our large universities. This society based on individual choices had of course some drawbacks and we see them in this House.

There was necessarily great equality, for you cannot have a capitalist market society unless some people have got the accumulated capital and a great many others have none.

This is a situation that we see more and more of in Saskatchewan, or they have so little that they cannot work on their own but have to offer their labor to others.

This involves an equality of freedom of choice.

I'll be through in a minute, I just want to read this paragraph, Sir.

**Mr. Steuart:** — What are you quoting from?

**Mr. Berezowsky:** — Mr. Speaker, I thought I quoted from the book called "The Real World of Democracy" by a prominent gentlemen, C.B. McPherson, the Massey Lectures, fourth series, which is used in our University. I didn't get it from Moscow. Now I'll go on from where I left off.

This involves equality and freedom of choice, all are free but some are freer than others.

It goes on, I'm not going to read the whole paragraph, after all I hope you read the book. I hope the Member for Athabasca (Mr. Guy) reads the book. Maybe he may become a democrat someday. I quote:

There is nothing democratic about it in any sense of equality, of real right, but it is liberal.

Now maybe that is too deep for the Hon. Members. I've wasted a lot of time on them. I've got some good material here which I must leave for another time, Mr. Speaker.

**Mr. Steuart:** — Did you get cut off, Bill?

**Mr. Berezowsky:** — I try to get points across that affect my people, and that's my job here in this Legislature. I hope that when this is all finished we'll still all be friends.

**Some Hon. Members:** Hear, hear!

**Mr. Berezowsky:** — The Throne Speech mentions, of course, that there has been a decrease in the production of wealth in the province. Of course we always have known that, if the farm industry suffers, so the Province has to suffer. I don't want to repeat what the Premier said about people leaving this province, but I understand that, since they became the Government, about 20,000 people that should never have left this province, have left. We were promised that 80,000 jobs would be provided, and we thought people would come into this province. But as a matter of fact they are leaving. This is very sad for me because I know when I go out sometimes into the country to see half a township of land with maybe two farmers residing there where there used to be someone on every quarter, now I find maybe half a dozen or less families. It makes me sad because I wonder what has happened to the agriculture industry.

**Mr. Steuart:** — . . . jobs.

**Mr. Berezowsky:** — That's right, that's all you're concerned with and that is what's wrong with you. Your whole intent and purpose is just one, to provide jobs for the people. The resources belong to the corporations, give them away and let the people carry water and wood. That's your philosophy and it's a sad one indeed in a Christian society. A sad one indeed, you have said this time and time again, Mr. Minister, "Our first priority is industry and the people to have jobs." As a matter of fact I went to the opening of a store the other day in Regina here. The Hon. Premier (Mr. Thatcher) maybe didn't see me but I saw him and I heard him speak, and he congratulated the company for

**February 26, 1968**

coming to Regina. He said, "This is another private enterprise business coming into Regina," and that is good, Sir. Later he said, "It is going to provide jobs for the people." That's all that you can see – jobs. The fact that inherently the resources of this province – everything that is here, bequeathed as by the good Lord, belongs to the people. That you forget. You take away the property, the wealth of the people, you steal it from them and you give it to the industrial magnates, but the people will have jobs, you say. Still you can't see it, it can't sink into you in spite of what I've said.

**Mr. Steuart:** — What would you do?

**Mr. Berezowsky:** — I would have let our own people go up there and produce the wealth and benefit thereby instead of giving the resources away. The people are paying now, when cutting timber worth \$1.80 or \$1.70 a cord, while you are giving it away for 50 cents to the industry. You are subsidizing industry by millions of dollars as you know. How much did you put in Saskatchewan Pulp Company of which you are a director? You tell us when you get up to speak, how many millions?

**Mr. Steuart:** — Nothing.

**Mr. Berezowsky:** — And who is paying the wages of these men? A million and one-half cords at \$18 a cord, how many millions does that take? How many have you borrowed, how many shares have you bought? You answer these questions when you get up. I can only say that all this thinking that we hear from the Government about jobs, jobs, jobs, is muddled thinking. No wonder there is wasteful practice in the administration. It doesn't matter whether it's the administration of resources, or of education or of Indian affairs, housing, public health, and welfare.

**Mr. Thatcher:** — Don't you like the pulp mill?

**Mr. Berezowsky:** — I appreciate that my people have jobs. What I don't like is that you have taken the prerogative of the people, and you put in \$50 million of public money. By the time you get the plant going it's going to cost \$100 million of public funds. Yet we won't own the mill. That's what's wrong.

**Mr. Thatcher:** — Thousands of jobs . . . Never put up a cent.

**Mr. Berezowsky:** — No wonder that people like John Egnatoff have spoken up.

**Mr. Thatcher:** — What's that got to do with the pulp?

**Mr. Berezowsky:** — It's got to do with the way you administer things, no wonder that Dr. Howard Adams speaks up and no wonder that I speak up.

**Some Hon. Members:** Hear, hear!

**Mr. Berezowsky:** — Now take the need for housing in the Province of Saskatchewan. What a sad situation! There is a greater need in our province today than ever before. Yes, there is some industry, the people are moving from the farms into the city and they have no homes. There are 40 homes or so sitting in Prince Albert, built by some company friends of the Provincial Treasurer (Mr. Steuart). They are standing vacant now for the second year and pretty soon you'll have to be rebuilding these houses.

**Mr. Steuart:** — There's only ten left.

**Mr. Berezowsky:** — It's about time. What is it — three years now? People need homes. What have we done in Saskatchewan towards good housing? We see, as the Premier has pointed out in the Throne Speech, that interest rates have gone up. Why? Is it not the prerogative of governments, of this Government and the Government at Ottawa to see to it that people obtain money for essentials, say housing, at a rate of interest that they can pay, particularly the low-income people. No, you've got to collect nearly nine per cent from them. They can't pay it and so they have no homes. They continue to live like they do in Prince Albert in old shacks all around town. On occasion fire breaks out and some of them die. Of course, the Governments recognize this need but what do they do about it? As I said interest rates are too high and they say it's inflation. But who caused inflation? People ask this question: why is there inflation? Who is responsible? Then some Liberal gets up and says it's because there is too much money in the country. The farmer that has had deficits or hasn't made any money and the workers in the same position say, "Well we haven't got any of it." Just because there is too much money in the country you slap on 8 5/8 per cent interest on housing loans to keep the needy from building a house. So all I can say is that I hope this Government smartens up in Saskatchewan and makes representations to Ottawa and asks, "Why can't you give us money at cost, whatever the cost is. You can give it to millionaires in Bermuda, why can't you lend it to the people of Canada?"

I am going to say a few things about health and this is going to hurt somebody. I am preparing you so you had better get out your bow and arrow. You know when we were the Government we tried to democratize medicine. When the Medical Care Commission came in a few years ago we amended the Hospital Administration Act, Sir, in order that our doctors, because we knew many would be coming in from all over the country, would have a little more of a democratic setup than previously existed under the private Act that we had at that time. So we enacted

**February 26, 1968**

in that Act that doctors could appeal to hospital boards in the event that privileges were taken away. I happen to be on a hospital board, and I should say that I am very proud of the institution. But over the last few years it made me sick to see what the establishment in Prince Albert and the Province of Saskatchewan are doing to doctors who are every bit as capable as you can find anywhere. It is a disgrace and it is the fault of the Minister, the Provincial Treasurer (Mr. Steuart). He brought in a Bill two years ago removing the democratic rights for doctors. It was a surprising thing to do, because looking at the kind of thinking all over the world and if you read the Charter for Humanity, article six, you find:

Everyone has the right to recognition as a person before the law.

Yet here are doctors working in our community clinic denied privileges. Persecuted!

**Mr. Steuart:** — Name one.

**Mr. Berezowsky:** — I'll name them.

**Mr. Steuart:** — Well, name them.

**Mr. Berezowsky:** — I'll name them, lots of them.

**Mr. Steuart:** — Well, go ahead.

**Mr. Berezowsky:** — Dr. Corvin was one and he left this province. He was qualified. Corvin was qualified enough. He went to Vancouver and as soon as he got there began to teach the subject for which he was refused privileges in the Victoria Union Hospital in Prince Albert.

**Mr. Steuart:** — He hasn't got hospital privileges there. He wasn't qualified, Bill.

**Mr. Berezowsky:** — You can't tell me that, I'm on the board and I know what's been going on. Your stooges have been trying to persecute the doctors from the community clinic and you know it.

**Mr. Steuart:** — No, that's not right, Bill.

**Mr. Berezowsky:** — It's about time you smartened up or the people of Saskatchewan will smarten you up. This will be your last chance, believe me.

**Mr. Heald:** — Tell the truth now.

**Mr. Berezowsky:** — I can say this, Mr. Attorney

General, that you will protect the criminal before the law and under the Charter of Humanity, that everyone is entitled to, everyone is entitled to full equality for a fair and public hearing by an independent and impartial tribunal and the determination of his rights. The obligation we have is to see that our doctors in community clinics have a place to appeal to, and that is not to the establishment which does not agree with the idea of community clinics. Yet they cannot appeal to the board. The establishment in Prince Albert, and I suppose in other areas where they have such co-operative community clinics, has the majority of the doctors. They appoint their doctors to the advisory committees. They appoint their doctors to all kinds of other committees and I don't need to list them. Our doctors are ignored and our doctors are persecuted and prosecuted and they are threatened. They told one doctor in Prince Albert, because he had lost one case, which was much less than some of the other clinics had – they started to persecute him – to go before a psychiatrist.

**Mr. Stuart:** — He only killed one person, didn't he. Shame!

**Mr. Berezowsky:** — He didn't kill anybody. When you say he killed that person, you get outside and say that and you will see what will happen to you. He didn't kill anybody. The child died at birth.

**Mr. Guy:** — You said it.

**Mr. Berezowsky:** — I did not say it. It was a death at birth. As soon as they could get that one case against him, then they started persecuting him, taking away his privileges. This was a doctor who saved my wife's life. I have letters here, indicating where, in one case involving a family and a woman who could not have children, this doctor was able to help them with advice and medical care. Now they have a child and the mother is having another one. You never saw a happier couple than these people. This is a medical man that knows what a doctor is supposed to know and yet he is being denied privileges and being persecuted. You had a doctor here in Regina – I'll give you his name if you want – an eye specialist and one of the best in Saskatchewan and in Canada, and he also was denied privileges for over a year by the establishment in Prince Albert, because of the fact that you removed his medical rights under the law. And I want to say to the new Minister of Health (Mr. Grant) that I hope that you will see the necessity, if you are going to have doctors come into this province and you are short of them now, to give these doctors the right to appeal to some independent tribunal instead of being at the mercy of an establishment.

**Some Hon. Members:** Hear, hear!

**Mr. Berezowsky:** — We are proud of our Prince Albert community clinic and it was as the Hon. Members know, formed as a result of the

withdrawal of services by Prince Albert doctors and the establishment during the medical care dispute in 1962. A great number of people have co-operation as their philosophy, such as many of us in Prince Albert. For example, 2,000 of them have by now assembled their personal financial and administrative resources and offered Dr. Hjertas to take over the clinic. We offered him space to work in the clinic and he has been getting doctors.

**Mr. Steuart:** — Does he work for you?

**Mr. Berezowsky:** — Yes, he works for all of us. I mean he rents out the premises.

**Mr. Steuart:** — Oh, that's better.

**Mr. Berezowsky:** — But it is our clinic.

**An Hon. Member:** — He just about lost his licence there for a minute.

**Mr. Berezowsky:** — Of course you would do that, if you could get a chance. You'd jump him right away. I know that and I am glad that you admitted it.

**An Hon. Member:** — Even Dr. Hjertas would like to admit that he worked for you.

**Mr. Berezowsky:** — Anyway, as a medical director we hoped that he would lease these premises and we hoped that he would provide medical care in time of need for our people. Now these citizens of Prince Albert and district shared the beliefs with the doctors that we contacted, that it was possible to have a medical clinic in Prince Albert, in which we could have group practice of medicine and which we now have. We have done very well in the last few years since we established the institution. We have added another storey and we can now put another eight or ten doctors there.

But the difficulty now is that the legislation that the new Minister brought in a year ago — and I have it here in the Act — removed from section 29 of the Medical Profession Act, part C. It had said that if certain doctors had registration in the United Kingdom they could then be licensed in Saskatchewan. Now, however, a doctor who has LMSSA, which is a British qualifying qualifications and probably has FRCS, Fellowship of the Royal College of Surgeons, and a few other degrees as well, cannot be licensed in Saskatchewan. The College does not give him a licence. On one hand you hear the medical profession saying, and the people saying we haven't got enough doctors in Saskatchewan. On the other hand you are refusing these doctors from Great Britain. That is not the purpose of this legislation, surely. So I hope that the Minister will take a look at it and



see that justice is done. Why should the people of Saskatchewan who are paying the shot and want these doctors to come here, be denied the service of these doctors, just because you have an institution and establishment which calls itself the College of Physicians and Surgeons, which persuaded this Government to amend that Medical Profession Act in the way that it did. The amendment is regrettable. Apparently we are stuck right now and can't get some doctors that would otherwise come here and who are very capable people. I could go on into specific cases, but I prefer not to mention any more names of doctors as it has been a very sad situation there. We are sad in the hospital board, we are sad in the community clinic board, and the people, over 2,000 of them, who are members are unhappy at what is going on. I think it is up to the Government to see that it corrects the situation. I am pleading with the Minister of Health to do something about it.

There have been questions asked as to why the people in the north didn't vote for the Government. Well I can tell you why. When you ignore the rights of people, when your people make promises before an election, and break these promises, which I can prove by letters I have here. I can file them if you would like, Sir. Here's one. This is a member of the reserve just eight miles out of Prince Albert. He had to come to me eventually. And it is a good thing he did because, when I went down to Cumberland House just before the election, I said that all you have to do is vote for me and you will get power from Squaw Rapids. The first thing I knew when the election was over this Government began building power lines into Squaw Rapids. So now they know the person they should vote for. But seriously this gentleman writes to me and says this:

Four years ago our superintendent and two officials from the Saskatchewan Power Corporation came to our reserve, the Sioux Wahpatten and held a meeting there. At this meeting they promised us that they would get power in our homes. So far nothing has been done about it. All we have been getting is promises year after year.

Note that, Mr. Minister of Indian Affairs.

Our white neighbors living adjacent to our reserve have power. Our reserve is only seven miles from the city of Prince Albert and that should not be too much of a problem to the Saskatchewan Power Corporation. And on behalf of the members of my reserve, I am asking you, Sir, would you please enquire into this matter for us.

I have other letters from this same reserve, signed by Edward Goodvoice. I think he is disillusioned and you will never get his vote again. I do hope you bring power shortly there. Then again I have other representations for some time, as a matter of fact years ago from Deschambault, to build a road. I have communications from Deschambault where they want a trail so that in the wintertime they can take their fish out overland because of the slushy ice on the lake. They have to have flour for

bannock, groceries, sugar, and surely it isn't much for the Government to carry out its promise, because it did promise and I have it here, all these Liberal promises to build access roads into the north to these communities. These people are only asking for a trail so that they can travel and carry freight overland in the winter and summer. As a matter of fact, a local man up there that has a resort at Deschambault started to build the road himself. I wrote a letter to the Minister, Mr. Steuart, on November 23, asking him to consider the request of these people and I was very sincere about it. I am not going to read his reply in order to embarrass him. I just want to point out that I think the Government is wrong in its policy of not acceding to the request of these people. The Minister thanked me for the letter of November, 1967, in connection with this trail to Deschambault settlement and he said, "We are aware of the accessibility problem at Deschambault." Yes, they are aware of it. "On a number of occasions my officials have discussed this matter with the Indian Affairs Branch. As you know 90 per cent of the population of Deschambault was comprised of Treaty Indians. The Federal Government has advised us that no funds are available in the budget for access roads." So the Federal Government isn't going to contribute anything and the Saskatchewan Government isn't going to contribute anything. That's what the Minister says. I would like to point out to the Minister, that this isn't a reserve, that it is your responsibility. Deschambault is not a reserve. As citizens of this Province these people should have access to the jobs that are available to them at Share Mines or Flin Flon, to take their fish out to market, associate with other people, to work in the pulp industry. They are entitled to this much. For goodness sake, can't you find \$10,000 or \$5,000, or even less than that, to build a trail into Deschambault. These people have been hounding me and pleading with me and I am sure that the Minister has had numerous requests. I have been talking to the new Minister of Natural Resources (Mr. Barrie) – I am sorry he is not well – but I think that I will get better results from him than I did from the former Minister. I can only say this to the former Minister (Mr. Steuart), "You hit foul balls when you were the Minister of Natural Resources. You hit foul balls, as I pointed out, when you were the Minister of Health, and if you hit any more foul balls into left field, this is the last chance you will have. Believe me."

**Mr. Steuart:** — That's a pretty good trick.

**Mr. Berezowsky:** — And don't rip up any more Indian graves at the Cumberland House because you won't get any votes there either. Concerning Indians, may I say this: Pauline Johnson said, "They but forgot we Indians owned the land. From ocean onto ocean that they stand upon the soil that centuries ago, was our kingdom and our right alone."

Let's not as Legislators, gentlemen, forget that. Let us not forget that this is a land of the Indian, and whether he has treaties or not, we have a responsibility to give them all

that we possibly can so that they can mingle with us and become part of the Canada as we envision it in the future. The Human Relations of June, 1967, I think that is from Toronto by E.G. Mortimer, summarizes a report and you can read all of it. I can give you the date of the article and he says this:

Indians should be full citizens of each province and should move under provincial jurisdiction for welfare purposes, yet they should not lose anything by the transfer. The quality and the services they get should go up not down. Every change should win the Indians' consent before it is made.

Don't start telling the Indians what is good for them. Ask them what they want and let them develop slowly so they can get to the same status that we have.

The main emphasis in economic development should be on education.

That is what these people need.

Vocational training techniques of mobility to enable Indians to take employment in wage and salaried jobs. Development of locally available resources should be viewed as paying a secondary role for those who do not choose to seek outside employment.

There is a lot of good in this report. I suggest that the Minister and other Government Members read it. And maybe we will find some of the answers.

Well there are so many things when you come to this Legislature that pile up in one year, that one could talk on for half a day, but I don't intend to today. I have a few things to say in the Budget debate, I hope.

There is one other matter that I want to bring to the attention of the Legislature. It is on this matter of extending and making the French language official. I welcome the suggestion in the Throne Speech that the French language is going to get a place in Saskatchewan. But I would like to point out that although I welcome the principle, I would hope that the Government would not be politically expedient but that they be democratic. I will explain what I mean. First of all it is recognized and considered that a cultured person or a civilized one, should know more than one language. I am very fortunate that I can speak two, and from this vantage point, I say why not make it official to teach any mother tongue in addition to English, if there is a large enough demand for it. Let me remind Hon. Members that Germans, Ukrainians, and certainly Indians have been here for a long time. Some of the Members who sit in this House are of my ethnic origin and are of a third or fourth generation and they are all Canadians. The mother tongue they speak today is not a foreign language, it is a

Canadian language, which is either Ukrainian, German or Hungarian or whatever it might be, in their churches. They use it in their cultural institutions, not to build another nation here, but to hold on to the traditions and customs that they have had in the past and that they want to contribute to an eventual Canada. I agree that, in time it doesn't matter whether it is French or any other language, it will probably disappear, but much good will remain in Canada. And if we really want to be democratic, I think that we should make it possible, not only for the French to be official, but for other languages to be taught, in particular, the Indian language. For example, if you were an Indian today, poor, pushed around, and you didn't even have the right to teach your native tongue in the schools, in a land that was originally yours, just how would you feel? Would you feel like integrating? I don't think so. Now we have of course, as Ukrainian Canadians, organizations in which a great number of people are members, and I certainly support these people. I refer to the Ukrainian Canadian Committee. I hope that all of you received a copy of this pamphlet here in which they present what I would say in the course to follow.

**Mr. I.H. MacDougall (Souris-Estevan):** — My wife thinks you are crazy, Bill.

**Mr. Berezowsky:** — Well, of course, she may think you are too! Mr. Speaker, a paragraph in this letter says this: "However we are against constituting small English-French districts. We don't want small English-French districts any more than others." And then it goes on to say: "We believe that not only one or two, but all elements of our national structure should be used in building Canada's future growth and unity." In essence, Mr. Speaker, if you make only one or two languages official, then we will be the same as Indians. We will be second grade citizens very soon. I am a Canadian. The French have historical rights, I grant that. As I said I welcome what you propose, but I think if you are really democratic, you could go one step further and say to the other ethnic groups whoever they might be; 'If you want to teach your language in the primary grades or in higher grades then it is officially possible.' Have it in the statute books that this is really a free and democratic country and that we recognize people of all origins as being equal. I say particularly, the Indian people. This could be the first step in their integration. I am not going to oppose what the Government proposes, I am only suggesting that it could do a little more than it has said it would do. Now, I have said a great deal. I have pointed out to the Government that I am not entirely satisfied with all of their programs which are indicated in the Throne Speech and I will certainly vote for the amendment and against the motion.

**Some Hon. Members:** Hear, hear!

**Hon. C.P. MacDonald (Minister of Welfare):** — Mr. Speaker, in taking part

in this debate, first of all I would like to extend my congratulations to you as other Members have, for your election to your high office. I also want to take this opportunity to congratulate all the new Members in the House. Certainly all of us have enjoyed their initial remarks. In taking part in this debate, I wish to challenge one theme, Mr. Speaker, the theme that has permeated this House since the inception of this Legislature, people before dollars. The Socialists have attempted to perpetrate this slogan upon the people of Saskatchewan for the past four years. Mr. Speaker, if there was ever a misrepresented, hypocritical, inconsistent, misleading, deceitful slogan, a statement at complete variance with the facts, it is this phoney criticism by the Socialists opposite.

**Some Hon. Members:** Hear, hear!

**Mr. MacDonald:** — Let me give you a few examples of this hypocrisy. During the election campaign the benevolent Leader of the Opposition is quoted in the Leader-Post on September 27th as saying that: “The CCF program puts people before dollars. This means a reversal of the policy of the present Government.” Again, a few weeks ago he took to the news media with charges that the Government was stealing from the senior citizens in calculating his income the two per cent increase in Federal Government payments on their old age security and the guaranteed income supplement. He is again quoted in the Leader-Post:

I strongly object to this chiselling by the Provincial Government to the extent of \$1.50 per month.

**Some Hon. Members:** Hear, hear!

**Mr. MacDonald:** — Patience, patience! Mr. Lloyd said that the Federal Government granted the two per cent increase which amounts to \$1.50 a month, on the basis of old age security, to help those people to keep pace with the rising costs of living. To top it off, he made the following comments in this debate and I quote:

When the Government tightens its belt, it is the lean people who feel the pinch.

He went on to say that this reduction was at the expense of the leanest of the lean people in Saskatchewan. As always the Socialists with the arrogance of solemnity place themselves on a pedestal of virtue and blindly close their eyes to the truth. Mr. Speaker, it reminds me of the lesson in the Scripture, Luke 18. The parable describes two men who went to the temple to pray, one a Pharisee and the other a publican. The Pharisee stood and prayed, “Oh God I thank thee that I am not like the rest of men, thieves, dishonest, robbers, or even like the publican. I fast twice a week. I pay tithes of all that I possess.” The lesson further states that he that exalts himself, shall be humble. This self-proclaimed virtue of the NDP is exactly the same kind as the Pharisee’s.

**February 26, 1968**

**Some Hon. Members:** Hear, hear!

**Mr. MacDonald:** — Mr. Speaker, if the Pharisee walked into this Chamber, I would say that automatically he would take his chair on your left, and I suggest, front and centre. Mr. Speaker, when we judge a political party, we judge it not by what they say, but by what they do. If ever a political party has betrayed the people of Saskatchewan, and particularly the senior citizens, it is the NDPs.

**An Hon. Member:** — 20 years!

**Mr. MacDonald:** — Mr. Speaker, let's examine their record in dealing with the old age pensioner and the need of Saskatchewan. Let's go over their record. Without going into the entire history of the inauguration of pensions by a Federal Liberal Government and their subsequent development, let me begin in 1947. In April, 1947, the Socialists increased the supplementary allowance to \$5.00 per month, thus providing a maximum pension of \$30. This pension was shared on the following basis: The Dominion paid \$18.75 and the Province, \$11.25. It is interesting to note, Mr. Speaker, that the Province extended this generosity of \$11.25 for one month only. Effective on May 1, 1947, the Dominion paid \$22.50. What did the generous Socialists opposite do, Mr. Speaker? Did they pass this on to the senior citizens? They did not. The CCF instead of passing on this increase to the pensioners, reduced its own contribution from \$11.25 to \$7.50.

**Some Hon. Members:** — Shame! Shame!

**Mr. MacDonald:** — They discontinued the supplemental allowance and kept the maximum pension at \$30 per month. This action, said the Deputy Minister, would save \$675,000 annually.

**An Hon. Member:** — Stealing it!

**Mr. MacDonald:** — The Socialists chiselled from the leanest of the lean. Such concern for people must have touched the hearts of our senior citizens. How did this affect the pensioners of Saskatchewan under Government that puts people before dollars, compared to the other Provinces. Following the increase by the Dominion, Ontario raised the maximum pension from \$28 to \$40; British Columbia from \$35 to \$40; Alberta from \$30 to \$35; Nova Scotia from \$30 to \$35; Saskatchewan remained at \$30. As a result of these increases the Provincial contributions to the senior citizens were as follows: Ontario - \$17.50; British Columbia - \$17.50; Alberta - \$12.50; Nova Scotia - \$12.50; and the humanitarian Socialists in Saskatchewan - \$7.50. Such concern for people must have touched the hearts again of our senior citizens. The next step in this dismal record of shoddy

treatment of our senior citizens took place a year later. On February 19, 1948, during the debate on the Speech from the Throne, the Liberal Opposition moved the following amendment. Mr. Speaker, I have the journals from the Saskatchewan Legislature, 1948. Here is the Resolution moved by Mr. Herman Danielson, Liberal Member for Arm River:

That this Legislature regrets that your Honour's advisers decided in 1947 to discontinue payment of supplemental allowance to old age pensioners.

Unfortunately, Mr. Speaker, this Resolution was defeated. Every Socialist with their hearts bleeding, with the exception of one, voted against this Resolution. And it is also interesting, Mr. Speaker, in noticing this, some very distinguished Members are voting against it. Douglas – Weyburn; Lloyd – Biggar.

**An Hon. Member:** — No!

**Mr. MacDonald:** — Yes. A fellow by the name of Dewhurst from Wadena.

**An Hon. Member:** — Fred, shame!

**Mr. MacDonald:** — The same fellows. Then on February 8, 1948, after all the pressure from the Liberal Opposition the rich philanthropist, Clarence Fines, announced that effective April 1, the maximum pension would again be increased to \$35 after months of cutting off this poor supplementary allowance. The next step in this sordid record took place on May 1, 1949, when a Liberal Government at Ottawa increased the basic pension to \$40 of which the Dominion Government paid \$30. While other provinces made increases in their contributions, the CCF made none. Again this spirit of concern for people must have touched the hearts of our senior citizens. Since April, 1948, the contributions of the CCF Government had been \$12.50 per month. This consisted of \$7.50 as 25 per cent of the basic pension of \$30 and \$5 supplemental allowance. With a new Dominion increase to \$40, the Provincial contribution of 25 per cent of that, was \$10. By keeping their contribution to \$12.50, the supplemental allowance was therefore reduced by \$2.50. It represented another \$2.50, chiselled out of the pockets of our senior citizens. By this time, Mr. Speaker, I am sure that the senior citizens wish that this concern for people would shift to another segment of the population. Next, Mr. Speaker, believe it or not, following the 1949 Federal Government increases, British Columbia increased its maximum pension to \$50 and Alberta at first to \$47.50 and then to \$50. Once again, the party that has such concern for people failed to raise their pensions. Then, Mr. Speaker, the next step and the most vicious in a long tale of shoddy treatment, this party that in the House of Commons shouts loud and long against any form of means tests, imposed one here in Saskatchewan. It was the most vicious, repugnant piece of legislation ever enacted by any Government in this Province.

**February 26, 1968**

**Some Hon. Members:** Hear, hear!

**Mr. MacDonald:** — The Dominion Pensions Act and Regulations impose no limit on the supplementary allowances paid by the Provinces. The party that puts people before dollars, the NDP imposed by Order in Council No. 404/1948, dated March 9, and effective April 1, 1948, a means test to all its supplementary pensioners. Every chicken, every egg, every carrot and every potato was calculated in the means test. Its result was that the miserable, small, niggardly supplementary allowances of \$5 was reduced for hundreds of Saskatchewan pensions to \$1.50, \$2, \$2.50, according to their means. They deprived 40 per cent of the pensioners in Saskatchewan of all or part of their supplemental allowance. As a matter of fact, Mr. Speaker, there are still hundreds of our senior citizens in Saskatchewan receiving this miserable \$2.50. Once again this concern for people must have touched the hearts of our senior citizens.

The next step in this vicious tale didn't occur in 1950, it occurred in 1962-63. The Old Age Security was raised from \$65 to \$75. Benefits under the supplemental program were adjusted in each occasion to match the Federal increase, except, Mr. Speaker, for persons in nursing homes and boarding out homes. This party that has such concern for people and particularly the sick people, Mr. Speaker, refused to pass on this increase to those senior citizens lying sick in nursing homes. Once again the leanest of the lean were made to suffer. This concern for people must have touched the hearts of our senior citizens, especially those sick in our nursing homes.

Now, Mr. Speaker, be careful, this story of the Socialist treatment . . .

**Mr. C.G. Willis (Melfort-Tisdale):** — Now there ain't no Santa Claus!

**Mr. MacDonald:** — You know, the Member for Melfort should remember that the good Lord gave him two ears and one mouth and if he would open his ears and flap his mouth in the ratio of two to one, his contribution to this House would be doubled.

Mr. Speaker, this story of the Socialist treatment of the senior citizens would be incomplete without examining briefly their treatment of other needy people in Saskatchewan. In his address the Leader of the Opposition (Mr. Lloyd) made a great shout of distain because of the high cost of living and I quote:

The cost of living has gone up 6.6, this increase in the cost of living has to come out of the already low standards of living of these people.

Isn't it tragic, Mr. Speaker, that this sympathy, this compassion, this understanding for the underdog, wasn't in evidence when he was the Premier of Saskatchewan. Despite the tremendous



rise in the cost of living from 1959 to 1964, the benevolent Socialists failed to raise the allowances for the needy in Saskatchewan by one thin dime. Pardon me, Mr. Speaker, they did raise very little the clothing allowance in 1962. Despite the increased costs in food, rent and all the other necessities of life, the blind, the disabled, the widows and the senior citizens received not a crumb, Mr. Speaker. Once again this concern for people must have touched the hearts of the needy.

Let's look at another area, in Child Welfare Resources. One of the most distressing policies of the Socialists when they were the Government of Saskatchewan was their complete lack of development of resources for Child Welfare in this province. Mr. Speaker, up until 1964, the Province of Saskatchewan had the poorest child welfare resources of any Province in Canada. Until that time we had resources to look after 92 children, 10 in Embury House, 36 in the Boys' School, 18 in Dales House and 28 in Kilburn Hall. Of these 92, Mr. Speaker, 46 or half, were in receiving homes that offered neither treatment nor long range planning. A receiving home is merely a place where you take a child that's under protection or neglected, you deposit for two weeks or a month until such time as you find a permanent plan. Saskatchewan had to depend on the charity of other Provinces to look after the unfortunate children after 20 years of Socialist Government. We had children, Mr. Speaker, in Edmonton, in Winnipeg and as far away as Toronto. A disgrace to our Province and a disgrace to the Government of the day. Let me enumerate some of the resources we used in other provinces: Mapleridge Girls' School in Edmonton; Manitoba Home for Girls, Winnipeg; Knowles School for Boys, Winnipeg; Warrendale for emotionally disturbed children in Toronto; Kiwanis Group Home, Edmonton; St. Agnes School for Girls, Winnipeg; Marymount Home for Girls, Winnipeg; Roslyn Home for Girls, Winnipeg. With the development of Ranch Ehrlo, Brown Camps, six new group homes, a new Dales House, we have now a capacity for 197, more than double four years ago.

**Some Hon. Members:** Hear, hear!

**Mr. MacDonald:** — Mr. Speaker, we are still suffering from the Socialists lack of concern in this field. We still have no school for delinquent girls, we still must develop more treatment facilities. Once again the NDP's concern for people must have touched the hearts of the unfortunate children.

In addition, Mr. Speaker, despite this rise in the cost of living, these generous Socialists refused to raise the per diem cost of foster home care for years and years and years. This man who generates such compassion for the poor and the cost of living refused to raise these per diem costs when he was the Premier. Immediately after we became the Government we raised those per diem costs on two separate occasions, the first in September, 1965, and the second in April, 1966. Once again, Mr. Speaker, the NDP's concern for people must have touched the hearts of our unfortunate children. No, Mr. Speaker, the NDPs

don't put people before dollars, they put politics before people.

**Some Hon. Members:** Hear, hear!

**Mr. MacDonald:** — By propaganda, their writers and speakers are constantly attempting to build an image of a party concerned with people. But when it comes to action and performance, it is the exact opposite. Their treatment of our senior citizens is a record that all of us should be ashamed of. The best example of politics before people is in the way the Socialists handled the Christmas bonuses. Here was a program, Mr. Speaker, that our Socialist friends engendered with great publicity. Our friend the Mayor would announce with all the fanfare that bonuses were to be paid. The NDP would proudly announce from the rooftops that once again they were opening the purse strings to render a little Christmas Cheer. But what were the facts, Mr. Speaker? It was one of the most discriminatory welfare programs ever conceived. This discrimination existed not only between communities and municipalities, but even between the needy in the same cities.

Let me take 1965 for an example, the year that we inherited the program. First of all, only Regina, Saskatoon and Moose Jaw provided these bonuses. How could a Government accept the principle of a policy that treats welfare recipients from the larger cities differently than those of the smaller urban centres and rural areas. Second, Christmas bonuses were not provided even in the cities of Regina, Saskatoon and Moose to the majority of welfare recipients. None of these people receiving benefits under the categorical programs ever received Christmas bonuses. Those recipients on Disabled Persons' Allowance, Blind Persons' Allowance, Mothers' Allowance and other categorical programs were denied Christmas bonuses. For example, in the city of Regina, 830 people under social aid received a Christmas bonus in 1965, but a total of 1,753 who received benefits under other programs were denied bonuses. How can a Government say that a person on social aid has a greater need than a seriously disabled person. How can the Socialists subscribe to a policy that discriminates between individuals because of a program under which they receive assistance. Mr. Speaker, this is politics before people. The Socialists spent more money advertising and on propaganda about Christmas bonuses.

**Some Hon. Members:** Hear, hear!

**Mr. MacDonald:** — Now, Mr. Speaker, let me outline briefly the policy of this Government in regard to the needy in Saskatchewan. Let me also outline our policy in regard to benefits to be passed on from the Federal Government. I want the Leader of the Opposition (Mr. Lloyd) to listen carefully. In 1966 the Saskatchewan Liberal Government passed The Saskatchewan Assistance Act. It was the first Province in Canada to pass an Act establishing one integrated uniform program for all welfare recipients. This

kind of a program was the goal of all welfare-conscious people in Canada. Let me quote from a policy statement of the Canadian Welfare Council of June 2, 1958. By the way, Mr. Speaker, this is the same council that the Leader of the Opposition referred to so liberally in his speech on Tuesday. I quote:

There should be a Federal Public Assistance Act which would be in effect, an extension of The Unemployment Assistance Act and which would enable the Dominion Government to share the aggregate costs to a province, and to the municipalities in a province, of providing financial assistance to all persons who are in need.

This has now been accomplished, Mr. Speaker, by a Federal Liberal Government that passed The Canada Assistance Act and which complements The Saskatchewan Assistance Act. But, Mr. Speaker, there is one basic principle imbued in both of these Acts, that principle calls for one uniform program that treats all people in need with justice and equality. It does not discriminate between individuals or between groups. It treats the blind, the disabled, the widows, the senior citizens, and all people according to their needs. It repudiates the principle of giving to one group higher benefits than to any other group. It also eliminates individuals receiving substandard levels of benefits on different programs and brings them up to a level that is adequate to their needs. The best illustration of this principle is to relate it to another discriminatory program of the NDP, The Disabled Persons' Allowance. Under the Socialists, the blind persons and the senior citizens were provided with a supplementary allowance, but not the disabled persons. Mentally and physically disabled people, the people that needed the resources and the care and the medical treatment more than any other group in Saskatchewan were paid \$75 a month on a means test basis, regardless of the size of their family or their needs. No health services were provided. How could the Socialists justify this kind of discrimination?

In practical application, the Saskatchewan Assistance Plan calls for increased benefits to be paid to all persons equally. This was done in 1966 when the former Minister, the Member from Rosthern (Mr. Boldt) increased the allowance schedules for the first time since 1959 by six per cent. They were paid to every individual in Saskatchewan regardless of whether they were blind, disabled, widows or senior citizens, as long as they received benefits under The Saskatchewan Assistance Act. Similarly, Mr. Speaker, in 1967 when the Federal Government initiated the Guaranteed Income Supplement, it decreed that it must be calculated as income for all benefits under The Canada Assistance Act. It meant that it would not duplicate its share under the Old Age Assistance program. It meant that the Province of Saskatchewan would lose the Federal share of that program unless it calculated that increase as income. On that occasion, Mr. Speaker, we accepted the principle that all increased benefits must be shared equally by all people in need. We did not return the increased benefits to the Provincial Treasury. We passed on the one million dollars plus, to every individual

**February 26, 1968**

receiving benefits under the Saskatchewan Assistance Plan.

The Leader of the Opposition (Mr. Lloyd) in his address on Tuesday made the following statement and I quote:

I suggest that the Provincial Government saved in that operation, something like one million dollars.

Mr. Speaker, he knows that that statement is false. He is fully aware of what was done with the Guaranteed Income Supplement savings. Once again politics before people. Mr. Speaker, on April 1, one million dollars of increased benefits to all people covered under the Saskatchewan Assistance Plan were put into effect as a result of the Guaranteed Income Supplement. It was allocated in the following manner: (1) increase in food allowances – 10 per cent; (2) increase in personal allowances from \$1.75 to \$3.25; (3) ceilings on assistance payments for nursing and special-care homes were raised from \$165 to \$180 per month for limited care and from \$235 to \$260 for intensive care; (4) certain other boarding out rates were also raised.

Let me state categorically to this Assembly and to the people of Saskatchewan that this Government is not interested in saving dollars at the expense of the needy in Saskatchewan.

**Some Hon. Members:** Hear, hear!

**Mr. MacDonald:** — Let me also say categorically that we refuse to discriminate between individuals or groups who require assistance. We will treat them all equally. Any additional benefits will be passed on to every recipient.

Now, Mr. Speaker, let me turn to the issue at hand, the 2 per cent adjustment of the Federal Government in its payments to pensioners based on changes in the consumer price index. What does this amount to in Provincial welfare payments? What is the Saskatchewan Government to do with the increased revenues made available by this adjustment? The net amount to the Province of Saskatchewan resulting from this adjustment is according to our calculations \$28,750. I remind the House that we have already in 1967 passed on one million dollars in cost of living adjustments to recipients. This \$28,750, Mr. Speaker, will be used by the Department of Welfare and multiplied many times over to a total of over one-quarter of a million dollars. It will be directed to that area of our caseload where the need is greatest. It is also interesting, Mr. Speaker, that this additional one quarter of a million dollars of increased expenditure under the Saskatchewan Assistance Plan will be spent on our senior citizens. The areas of our caseload where we estimate the greatest need exists in 1968, are increased rates for nursing-home care and an increase in rent schedules for housing. When this Budget comes in, Mr. Speaker, you will see increased expenditures under the Saskatchewan Assistance Plan to cover these necessities. We are presently assessing the increased

costs of renting homes and are now reviewing the maintenance rates in all nursing homes. It is important to point out, Mr. Speaker, that over 35 per cent of all people at present receiving care in special-care facilities in Saskatchewan are receiving public assistance. The total costs charged to the Saskatchewan Assistance Plan are in excess of \$130,000 per month. The average cost of care for all our pensioners receiving assistance under the Saskatchewan Assistance Plan for nursing care is approximately \$110 per month to the Saskatchewan Assistance Plan. If nursing homes are to continue to provide a high level of care, the Saskatchewan Assistance Plan must adjust their maintenance rates for our clients as their costs continue to rise. We now estimate that increased maintenance rates will cost over \$250,000 during the coming year. In addition, Mr. Speaker, new beds now coming into operation during the latter months of 1967 and 1968, will cost an additional approximately \$200,000. This, Mr. Speaker, is where we are directing the \$28,750.

**Some Hon. Members:** Hear, hear!

**Mr. MacDonald:** — I want to repeat again that we as a Government have no intention of saving a few dollars like our Socialist friends opposite did on so many occasions. I also want to repeat, if we are to treat all people in need equally, we must and we will keep our schedules and allowances the same, for all people on welfare.

Mr. Speaker, I want to spend just a few moments reporting to this House on our program to provide special-care facilities to our senior citizens. Here, Mr. Speaker, is the best example I know to indicate this Government's concern for the elderly people of Saskatchewan. It is also the best example to show the ineptitude of our Socialist friends in looking after our senior citizens. The need to provide these facilities has received major emphasis by this Government. We believe that our pioneers and senior citizens deserve the best of care in their declining years. I am also certain that the projects for which many Saskatchewan communities are most proud, are the senior citizens' projects springing up all over Saskatchewan.

On March 31, 1964, there was accommodation in Saskatchewan for 2,583 persons in special-care facilities and accommodation for 2,084 persons in self-contained units. Today, Mr. Speaker, there is accommodation for 4,592 people in special-care facilities and an additional 600 beds, roughly, are under construction or firmly committed to begin.

**Some Hon. Members:** Hear, hear!

**Mr. MacDonald:** — This will bring the total to 5,200 beds, more than double what existed in Saskatchewan four years ago. Saskatchewan is now a leader in providing special-care facilities to the aged. In addition, 805 self-contained living units have been built

since 1964. Mr. Speaker, in 1964 there were 77 senior citizens' projects in Saskatchewan, today there are 118, plus many additions, many extensions and renovations to existing facilities. This did not happen by accident. It was a direct result of the conscious dedication and self-sacrifice of many community and volunteer leaders. Our Government is proud of the part it has played in making this accomplishment possible. These 118 projects represent a Provincial investment of \$7,191,649 and of this amount \$3,372,827 has been paid out since 1964, approximately 50 per cent.

I invite some of our NDP Members across the way to visit some of these nursing homes in their own community. Drive down the streets of Regina and see the new nursing homes of the Salvation Army, Knights of Columbus under construction or the one at Pioneer Village. Drive to Weyburn, Estevan, Bengough, Assiniboia, Moose Jaw, Southey, Melville, Fort Qu'Appelle, Yorkton, Saskatoon and a host of other communities and you will find the Liberal Government's investment in our senior citizens. This is the difference, Mr. Speaker, between the NDP and the Liberals, they put politics before people. We invest dollars in people.

Mr. Speaker, now that I see that I have a few minutes left after making my initial remarks, I want to make a few comments on some of the remarks made by previous Members in the House. First of all, like all of us, I was most interested in the new Members who have spoken. Some of these new Members were ushered into this House with a great deal of fanfare. The greatest fanfare, however, Mr. Speaker, was for the Member for Riversdale (Mr. Romanow). I have an article and I certainly would recommend it to the reading of all the Members of the House. It is in the Star Weekly Magazine of December 30. You know that as a matter of fact I found it very interesting; it is entitled "In Saskatchewan – Roy Romanow", a new Member who scares even his own party.

**Some Hon. Members:** Hear, hear!

**Mr. MacDonald:** — Mr. Speaker, I enjoyed some of the remarks in the article, particularly after listening to some of the comments that the Member had to say. One of the things that struck me most was his intent to pledge undying loyalty to the Socialist philosophy and his undying loyalty to the Leader of his party. I don't really blame him because you know I am really not sure whether he was trying to convince his own Leader, his own party or Members or his own constituents. Particularly after reading the comments in the story, listen to this:

Romanow refused to discuss his relations with Leader Lloyd – at least for the record – but it's no secret in Saskatchewan that his views did not endear him to the old guard during the campaign. And he further infuriated them by not only failing to adopt the hackneyed party

line of incessantly attacking the Liberals and also remaining on such good terms with Liberal candidate, Mrs. Margaret Gent that he used to drive her home.

Then, Mr. Speaker, a little later on it goes on to say:

We don't mind so much that he wants to become another Tommy Douglas in Saskatchewan. What really worries us is that he may secretly be aiming to be another Ross Thatcher.

**Some Hon. Members:** Hear, hear!

**Mr. MacDonald:** — Mr. Speaker, I wonder if that is the reason that they made so many remarks. Then, Mr. Speaker, there is another paragraph that I thought was really amusing. It says:

“Look, fellows” he said, “I am new at this. I don't know whether to come on strong and be a phoney or what. You could carve me up if I say the wrong thing.”

Well, Mr. Speaker, he gave a great performance and he came on strong.

**Some Hon. Members:** Hear, hear!

**Mr. MacDonald:** — Mr. Speaker, then on top of that – don't forget the second part of the quotation. Now, Mr. Speaker, there were another couple of comments, I just couldn't figure out what he meant by “My generation.” I am not sure whether he meant the 18-year-olds.

**Mr. J.E. Brockelbank (Saskatoon Mayfair):** — Mr. Speaker, is that the Canadian you are quoting?

**Mr. MacDonald:** — No it isn't.

**Mr. Steuart:** — It's the Red Star.

**Mr. MacDonald:** — It's the Star Weekly. Mr. Speaker, he referred to my generation, now I am not sure whether he referred to the 18-year-olds in high school, the 21-year-olds in university. The only thing I am positive of he certainly didn't refer to the front benchers across the way. Mr. Speaker, he made the theme of his speech that the Liberals are out of tune with the times. Mr. Speaker, if free tuition in university, massive Government spending at a time of fiscal crisis in Canada . . .

**Some Hon. Members:** Hear, hear!

**Mr. MacDonald:** — . . . that's the trouble, Mr. Speaker, they haven't got

**February 26, 1968**

enough sense to recognize what the problems are. That speech he could have dug out from Tommy Douglas in 1944 or even gone back to Karl Marx. Then, Mr. Speaker, the one thing that I really got the biggest kick out of was his comments on free tuition. You know, Mr. Speaker, there is another little quotation in this article about free tuition. He goes on, he says:

There is a horrible preoccupation in the CCF with being totally honest. You have to use a little political expedience. If we promise something like free university education we don't have to couch it by saying we'll get the Federal Government to help pay for it. We can just tell the public we'll do our best to provide it.

I wonder, Mr. Speaker, what those young university students would say about his political expedience. You know, the only thing I can say, Mr. Speaker, is that he was a little bit refreshing after some of the older Members we have listened to, and I am sure that he will make a real contribution to this House when he gets a little practical experience in politics and perhaps a slight touch of modesty.

Mr. Speaker, you can see by my remarks, I will support the Throne Speech.

**Some Hon. Members:** Hear, hear!

Debate adjourned.

The Assembly adjourned at 10:00 o'clock p.m.