

**LEGISLATIVE ASSEMBLY OF SASKATCHEWAN**  
**First Session – Sixteenth Legislature**  
**9th Day**

**Tuesday, February 27, 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 is my pleasure to introduce to you and to all the Members of the Legislature, 62 grade eight students from North West Regina. They are from the Coronation Park school and are located in the east gallery with their vice principal, Maurice Dolman and playground supervisor, Gary Freitag. All Members will join me I'm sure in extending to these young people a very warm welcome and extending to them our wish that their stay with us this afternoon will be pleasant, informative and educational.

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

**Mr. A.E. Blakeney (Regina Centre):** — Mr. Speaker, first I would like to associate myself with the remarks of the Member from Regina North West in welcoming the Coronation Park students, some of whom live in the constituency of Regina Centre. I would also like through you, Mr. Speaker, to introduce to this House a group of students sitting in the west gallery, immediately behind me in the front row closest to you, Mr. Speaker, a group of some 50 grade eight students from the Sacred Heart school. They are pursuing part of their social studies course in visiting the Legislature. They are here with their principal, Mr. Ehrmantraut, and their teacher, Mr. Kaytusch. They have had a tour of the Legislative Building, a lecture and they now some 50 strong are here to take part in our legislative session. I know that all of you will join with me in extending to them a very cordial welcome to the Legislature and extending the wish that their visit will be pleasant and informative.

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

**Mr. R. Romanow (Saskatoon Riversdale):** — Mr. Speaker, it gives me great pleasure to introduce to you, Sir, and to the Hon. Members of the Legislature, the grade seven students of W.P. Bate school of Saskatoon Riversdale constituency. Members of this House know that W.P. Bate school has been named after one of the great long-time supporters and workers in the Saskatoon area, a former Board member, Secretary Treasurer of various school boards. Present with the grade seven students are three teachers, one of whom I've known for quite some time and I consider him to be a personal friend of mine, Mr. Beerling, also Mr. Redekopp and Mr. Weekes. I can only echo once more, Mr. Speaker, what has been said many times in this Chamber that it is a wonderful thing that young people are getting an opportunity to see democracy in action so early. So I want to also welcome through you and the Hon. Members the students of grade seven W.P. Bate, Saskatoon-Riversdale.

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

**Mr. W.A. Forsyth (Saskatoon Nutana South):** — Mr. Speaker, may I through you introduce to this Assembly a very fine group of students from Lorne Hazelton school which is located in Nutana South constituency in Saskatoon. Mr. Robinson is seated with most of these students at the top of the west gallery and Mr. Potter at the top of the east gallery with the remainder of the students. We are very proud of Lorne Hazelton school in Saskatoon, and we are very proud of the name of Lorne Hazelton in Saskatoon. Dr. Hazelton was a veteran school trustee, served many years, some 30 as a matter of fact, in the service of the Saskatoon Public School Board. Mr. McIntyre, the principal of Lorne Hazelton school, has a very fine group of students and I am happy to see them here today. They are going to tour the RCMP Barracks in Regina. They will also be at the Natural History Museum and I hope that they have a very enjoyable stay and they benefit from their visit to the Legislature.

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

**Hon. C.L.B. Estey (Saskatoon Nutana Centre):** — Mr. Speaker, through you I would like to introduce to the Legislature this afternoon students from Hollistan school which is located in the constituency of Nutana Centre. They are in the Speaker's gallery accompanied by their teacher, Mrs. Korpan. It is our hope that the students will find their visit to the Legislative Building both beneficial and informative and we thank Mrs. Korpan for giving her students the opportunity to be with us today.

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

## QUESTION

### SASKATCHEWAN ECONOMIC REVIEW

**Mr. C.G. Willis (Melfort-Tisdale):** — Mr. Speaker, before the Orders of the Day are proceeded with, I want to again draw to the attention of the House that we on this side are having trouble getting copies of the Saskatchewan Economic Review, printed last April. The Premier in reply to a question of the Leader of the Opposition told us last week that the people on this side of the House could expect to have a copy immediately. I want to ask the Premier when we can expect to have a copy of the Economic Review which was printed last April.

**Hon. W.R. Thatcher (Premier):** — Mr. Speaker, I asked the Department to send copies two or three days ago. I am sorry if they have not arrived. I will try and see that they have them before the day is through.

## ANNOUNCEMENTS

### TRANS-CANADA PIPELINES LIMITED

**Mr. Thatcher:** — Mr. Speaker, while I'm on my feet I wish to make an announcement, which I think will be of interest to the House. Trans-Canada Pipelines Limited has informed the Government today of plans to undertake a \$28 million construction program this

year in Saskatchewan. This major expansion program by Trans-Canada will include one hundred and sixteen miles of thirty-six diameter pipeline at a cost of \$21.3 million. This is the third Trans-Canada mainline across Saskatchewan. The new pipeline will be installed along the existing right-of-way at points near Herbert, Moose Jaw, Vibank and Moosomin. Trans-Canada will install additional compression apparatus at Cabri, Regina and Moosomin. This additional compression-house horse-power is estimated to cost \$6.8 million. Approval by the National Energy Board is necessary before construction can commence, but I am informed that this routine will take place on March 5th.

This project will be of great importance to Saskatchewan. Among other things, the Provincial Treasurer (Mr. Stuart) will receive the minimum of \$750,000 in sales tax this year. Another factor is the potential effect on Inter-Provincial Steel and Pipe Corporation. IPSCO presently cannot manufacture 36 inch pipe. However, the Trans-Canada representatives, including Mr. Kerr, the President, who was in my office this morning, assured us that IPSCO would be invited to quote on other sections of the line which they can manufacture. In other words they will be given compensating business in the United States and in the Montreal and Sault St. Marie area equivalent to the distance which this pipeline will be going through Saskatchewan, always assuming that IPSCO's prices are competitive.

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

**Hon. W.S. Lloyd (Leader of the Opposition):** — Mr. Speaker, I join with the Premier in welcoming this addition to the province. It is one more of the kind of developments which Saskatchewan will benefit from over a period of years.

#### **WOMEN'S CURLING CHAMPIONSHIP, WINNIPEG**

**Mr. Lloyd:** — I rise to my feet more particularly, Mr. Speaker, to draw the attention of the Legislature to an important sporting event which is now taking place in other parts of Canada. My reference is to the Women's Curling Championships now being conducted in Winnipeg. I have a particular interest in this, Mr. Speaker. The rink that is representing Saskatchewan in this competition is from Delisle. Delisle is a name known in sporting activities and is in my constituency. Even more important, Mr. Speaker, is that the skip of the Saskatchewan rink is Mrs. Barbara McNiven. Mrs. McNiven has been a winner before. Her husband, I may say, was the Liberal candidate in the Provincial election in the constituency of Biggar.

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

**Mr. Lloyd:** — It seems to me that it is a very appropriate distribution of duties. We'll let Mrs. McNiven look after the duties insofar as representing Saskatchewan in curling, and I'll look after the responsibility for the constituency.

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

**Mr. Lloyd:** — I'm sure that all Members will want to join with me in extending best wishes to the rink. They won two games

**February 27, 1968**

yesterday, they won one this morning and they were well on the way to winning another one at noon. I've wired them expressing best wishes from Saskatchewan in the continuing games.

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

## **ADJOURNED DEBATES**

### **ADDRESS-IN-REPLY**

The Assembly resumed the adjourned debate on the proposed motion of Mr. McPherson for an Address-in-Reply and the proposed amendment thereto by Mr. Lloyd.

**Hon. G.B. Grant (Regina South):** — Mr. Speaker, first of all I would like to extend to you, Sir, on your re-appointment, my sincere congratulations. I know you will continue to give this House your fair and impartial administration as you have in the past.

I must also extend a warm welcome to the new Members on both sides of the House and particularly to the new generation. We all recognize the importance of younger men and women participating in government, but I would remind the Hon. Member for Saskatoon-Riversdale (Mr. Romanow) that the Government also has a new generation member in the person of the Moose Mountain MLA (Mr. Weatherald), first elected some four years ago at the age of 26, somewhat of a record I believe.

Mr. Speaker, I might have been described as one of the new generation members about thirty years ago. At that time my generation inherited the task of remaking an economy after a devastating war and a severe depression. In spite of today's problems I don't think we have completely failed, but at the same time, I must admit, many of our successes fell short of our expectations. Let me assure the Hon. Member from Saskatoon-Riversdale that it will be ever thus. A Utopian world with no problems, no conflict, no failures, no differences would be a pretty dull place in which to live. So I say to the new generation good luck.

I was pleased to have one of my constituents meet with success in Regina South West (Mr. McPherson) and join me as a Regina Member on the Government side of the House.

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

**Mr. Grant:** — I must admit at times I found it somewhat lonely to be out-numbered five to one, and while he has indicated strong independent leanings, I am satisfied he will also be most co-operative.

The Hon. Member from The Battlefords (Mr. Kramer) suggested publicly that I should submit my resignation. I might point out that he wasn't the first one to have done so, and I'll probably have further suggestions as time goes on, but I think I owe it to 6,277 voters who supported me in Regina South to heed their admonitions more than those of the Member from The Battlefords (Mr. Kramer). My constituents once again supported me in a magnificent manner and I continue to be indebted to the good people of Saskatchewan's finest constituency.

Mr. Speaker, I would like now to turn to the subject of

psychiatric care in this province, and of particular concern to us today is the Frazier Report. I would like to say something first of the earlier history of the mental health programs in Saskatchewan.

As Dr. Frazier pointed out in his study, the early history of our psychiatric system was not too remarkable. This was common in most provinces and in many countries. Approximately 20 years ago under the guidance of some outstanding people, we began to create a program which has been a guiding light on this continent.

To give credit where credit is due, Mr. Speaker, the Saskatchewan Plan, as it is known, was conceived and given its start under a CCF or NDP Government. The Liberal Opposition of that day recognized the potential of the program and with few differences supported the principles behind it. It is most significant that in those days, for the most part, the program enjoyed the full confidence of our citizens. This is most important for implementing new programs, it is necessary support be found in all levels.

But it must also be recognized that many citizens of Saskatchewan were not aware of the full implications of a community-based Mental Health Program, nor did they become aware of these implications, until they found themselves living in communities where released patients were living. To some extent that period coincided with the election of a new Government.

Now it must be emphasized, Mr. Speaker, that the Saskatchewan Plan, while conceived under a CCF Government, was never fully implemented nor was it in any way near a complete stage of development. At the same time, there was some honest doubt in the minds of many citizens about community treatment. In essence, the situation was ripe for becoming a political football.

Unfortunately, that is what happened. Some Members of the Opposition abandoned their early enlightened pose toward mental health, to play upon the doubts and fears of some of our citizens. The extent to which public confidence was shaken, because of this, can never be measured, but that was not considered in the scramble for political advantage. I need not identify those who sought political advantage, Mr. Speaker. If the detractors of the Saskatchewan Plan wish to identify themselves, they will do so when it becomes their turn in this debate. But I will say that these attempts to discredit the Government were resented by the professional people who are closely involved with the Saskatchewan Plan.

As a result of an attack from one of the Opposition Members, the President of the Saskatchewan Psychiatric Association, Dr. M.D. Rejskind, made the following public statement in July of 1966. I shall quote it at length because it is particularly relevant to any discussion of psychiatric policy:

A decision to discharge a patient from a psychiatric institution, centre or ward is taken by psychiatrists on medical, psychiatric and social grounds. No member of our Association would accept a Government order to discharge patients, any more than a surgeon would allow a political directive to remove a patient's appendix or gall bladder.

Acceptance of political instructions regarding medical and psychiatric matters would be an extremely serious breach of medical ethics, and no such occurrence has been recorded in Saskatchewan. Also, at no time, in no case, under any Government was an attempt made to influence the professional decisions of psychiatrists working for the Government of Saskatchewan.

Is the patient dangerous to himself or to others, is the first question to receive consideration before discharging a patient. While mistakes are possible, whenever fallible human beings exercise their best judgment, they are extremely rare, certainly less frequent than in the administration of a penitentiary parole system or in the safe design of cars.

Public apprehension about safety is rather an unfortunate outcome of incomplete information. No individual psychiatrist since he is a physician, obligated to maintain the secrecy of a patient's file, is in a position to make a public statement on a specific case.

The statement makes clear the position of the psychiatrist who works for the Government. These are men of skill and integrity, who deserve our support. They realize that problems will inevitably arise in a new program such as ours, but they are willing to see them through.

To put this all in proper perspective, Mr. Speaker, let me state that there are faults in the Saskatchewan Plan, that the Government has been aware, since we took office, that faults existed and we have constantly worked to correct them. However, we had initially expected full co-operation from the Opposition.

We have had two basic concerns. The first is to assess the program and plan its development. The second is to gain public confidence and bring about a fuller awareness of the implication of community-based psychiatric medicine.

The vehicle we have chosen for this is the psychiatric study. Two major studies have been made and both of them have been made public. The first of these was the report of the Ad Hoc Committee on the resettlement of mental hospital patients. It was commissioned by my predecessor, the Hon. Member from Prince Albert West (Mr. Steuart). The committee was made up of both laymen and professional people and it was delegated a wide base of authority, from which it could carry out an assessment and make recommendations. As all Members of this House will recall, their report was made public as we had promised it would be. They endorsed the Saskatchewan Plan and made 17 recommendations which they felt were in keeping with the philosophy of the plan. Most of these recommendations we complied with immediately. Others involved recurrent problems that we are still working on.

Last fall we took another major step and commissioned Dr. Frazier of Houston, Texas, to carry out another study of our mental health facilities. I am sure it is not necessary to go at length into Dr. Frazier's qualifications. Suffice it to say they are substantial. Dr. Frazier has two great advantages which coincide perfectly with the report of the Ad Hoc Committee. The first is that his views are entirely the opinion of a professional man with a great deal of experience in the overall problems of a large scale mental health program. The second

is that he is an outside observer who can take an objective and fresh point of view in his appraisal. We asked Dr. Frazier to lay it on the line, and he did. We promised that his report would be made public. We have kept our promise.

I ask you, Mr. Speaker, if this isn't in strong contrast to statements made by the Hon. Member from The Battlefords in the News-Optimist, where the headlines say, "Kramer Calls Mental Enquiry Whitewash Job." "It looks like a nice whitewash job, it appears to be a nice quick whitewash job to be done by an import from Texas." Well apparently the news people and the citizens of Saskatchewan did not consider it a whitewash job. The Saskatoon Star Phoenix, February 22nd – "Psychiatric Report Hailed as a Masterly Job," by Mrs. W.L. Countrymen, President of the Mentally Retarded Association. I wouldn't call this a whitewash job – a full-page account in detail in the Star Phoenix and a similar story was carried in the Leader Post. I maintain, Mr. Speaker, that the Hon. Member from The Battlefords was trying to confuse the public and mislead them as to the intentions of this Government.

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

**Mr. Grant:** — Mr. Speaker, we promised that Dr. Frazier's Report would be made public. We have kept our promise in quick order. One of the Hon. Members of the Opposition said that he hoped that it would not gather dust. I'll demonstrate that it is not gathering dust. We are doing everything possible to implement this report.

We at this stage are asking the united support of both the Opposition and the public in upgrading what we consider is a good program. The cost in dollars will be substantial and the Provincial Treasurer will state in his Budget Speech what we are asking as this year's increase in our Psychiatric Services budget.

I'm sure all Members will be interested in the program changes that will result and I shall run through them in some detail. If you wish you may follow them in your report which you have.

Recommendations 1, 3, 4, 6, 11, 13, 14, 15, 16, 21 and 22 deal with essentially admission, discharge and treatment policy in the various areas administered by the Psychiatric Services Branch. All the recommendations in the Frazier Report have already been drawn to the attention of the Unit Heads in the Psychiatric Services Branch and in particular the above noted recommendations. It has been impressed upon Unit Heads that they are to give immediate attention to the contents of these recommendations.

In addition to this, Dr. Colin Smith, Director of Psychiatric Services, has issued several memoranda concerning the handling of patients and patient discharges in treatment centres.

On Monday, Dr. Frazier himself met with Unit Heads to discuss the Report in detail and in particular these recommendations cited. Preparation is now under way to establish a committee to review present policies and procedures concerning the admission, treatment and discharge of patients.

In the light of the recommendations of the Frazier Report

and of a review of present policies and procedures, revised policies and procedures will be instituted where necessary.

Recommendations 2, 5, 8, 10, 20, 34, 40, 41, 42 and 43 deal with the organization of our Mental Health Program. These are general recommendations and further study is required. With this in mind, the Government is now in the process of engaging a management consultant who will further assess adequacy and recommend appropriate administrative changes in the program.

Dr. Frazier himself has expressed approval of this idea and said that, since his Report was just an initial step in the evaluation of the program, further study would be needed in areas such as this. We can, therefore, look forward to further improvements in our program.

Recommendation 7 advises that the renovations in the Munroe Wing should be rushed to completion. This was done early in January. The Munroe Wing in the General Hospital here in Regina has a modern out-patient unit attached to the in-patient unit. The congestion in the in-patient unit has been relieved and the facility has been upgraded considerably. I ask you, Mr. Speaker, what the Opposition did when they were the Government as far as the Munroe Wing was concerned. Absolutely nothing! I would invite these Hon. Gentlemen to visit the Munroe Wing and see the improvements that have taken place there in this past year.

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

**Mr. Grant:** — While we note Recommendation 47, namely that further construction be suspended until the personnel crisis is resolved, we are very much aware of the need to develop facilities in Saskatoon and in Regina and to extend our facilities to provide services for such groups as children, adolescents, alcoholics and addicts. The establishment of the Alcoholism Commission should do a great deal in the further development of programs in this area.

Concerning Recommendation 37, for the past year discussions have been underway between the University, the Attorney General's Department, the Department of Public Health and the Federal Government, with a view of establishing a maximum security institution for the criminally insane and psychopaths, in Saskatoon. This institution will be a regional one, serving the three prairie provinces. It is hoped that plans will move forward rapidly in the next few years in this regard.

We endorse Recommendation No. 45 concerning the development of a Research and Training Institute in Regina. It has been the Government's intention to expand and relocate the Psychiatric Research Unit in the new Base Hospital to be constructed here. This unit will be incorporated in the Research and Training Institute, as recommended by Dr. Frazier, and it is intended to be affiliated with the University.

Dr. Frazier has said that he considers this the most important long-term recommendation of his Report. He emphasized that we cannot continue to look outside the Province for our health personnel but must train them here. Through affiliation with the University we can give post-graduate training to psychiatrists, psychologists and social workers right here in our own province.



As far as the continuing review of approved homes is concerned, Recommendation 24, this is continuing with the Department of Welfare carrying out periodic audits on homes approved by the Psychiatric Services Branch.

Recommendations 9, 17, 19 and 25 to 33 inclusive deal with staffing problems and remuneration of our professional personnel. Salary adjustments have already been made in the case of nursing personnel who have received an increase of approximately 13.5 per cent. The Frazier Report recommended raises of from 10 – 15 per cent.

Salaries of social workers have also been revised upward between 10 – 15 per cent depending upon the category of the worker. Dr. Frazier recommended salary increases in the region of 15 per cent. Under our completed agreement, the B.A. honor graduate gets 15 per cent and the other categories will receive 10 per cent.

Psychiatrists' salaries are presently under review, and effective January 1, additional payments have been made to psychiatrists to compensate them for call-back duty. This is an area that the previous Government did nothing about, namely the call-back on Saturdays or Sundays or holiday calls that they have made on their services.

The Government is extremely concerned about the personnel shortage and will take all necessary measures to augment our staff until our own training program is in operation. Plans are being worked out for Dr. Smith to visit Britain to recruit psychiatrists and other professional personnel. With the new salary scales being introduced, it is felt that staffing problems will be greatly reduced and recruiting will be much easier.

We are also working to raise the numbers and skills of community supervisory workers as set out in Recommendation 17.

Mr. Speaker, consideration is being given to the establishment of new positions within the service, to develop formal orientation and training programs for foster home personnel.

Mr. Speaker, Recommendations 36, 39, 44 and 46 involve large expenditures and they are being given careful study by the Government.

I would also like to draw to the attention of the House the fact that a new Psychiatric Centre modelled after the Yorkton Centre will open this fiscal year in Prince Albert. Very generous provision is being made in the Budget for this centre which will augment the program and particularly relieve pressures in the North Battleford area and present better and complete services for the people of Prince Albert, Melfort and Tisdale areas, as well as the Northern Administration District.

Recommendation 18 of the Report was that an attempt should be made to adjust boundaries of Health Regions and Mental Health Regions so that they more nearly coincide. The Government is cognizant of this problem as are the members of the Health Regions. While we recognize that a complete adjustment is difficult, we shall attempt to comply with the recommendation. A recent study done by Regional Health Services has come up with proposals which will help to overcome difficulties in this area.

The Attorney General's department is extremely interested in Recommendation 38 which was:

The statutes which permit what amounts to an indefinite sentence, upon a finding of not guilty by reason of insanity or upon a finding of mentally unfit to stand trial, should be changed to prevent what appears to be an unjust and discriminatory situation.

Unfortunately, the question raised in this Recommendation is not quite as easily resolved, as it may appear, since Federal legislation is involved as well as Provincial legislation. Quite obviously, public safety has to be weighed very carefully in the introduction of any changes in the statutes. Periodic reviews are carried out of persons falling into the category in the aforementioned. This is a safeguard to ensure that the civil liberties of people are maintained even while they are under psychiatric care. They are carried out by a Government-appointed review panel which will, on request, review each year the case of any mental patient.

While Dr. Frazier did not deal specifically with the relationship between the law and psychiatry, I am happy to announce that we are forming an Ad Hoc Committee to encourage a better understanding in this complex area. Consideration is also being given to the establishment of a position of a psychiatrist consultant in forensic medicine so that better liaison and services can be developed between lawyers, magistrates, jails and the psychiatric program. I would like to express the appreciation of the House for Dr. Frazier's efforts. I would also remind the House, Mr. Speaker, that we kept our promise to make the Report public. We kept our promise to bring Dr. Frazier back to personally explain his recommendations and are most appreciative of the time he spent here. We met with the press last Friday, then spent the afternoon with the Canadian Mental Health Association. Then well into the evening we met with the South Saskatchewan Hospital Centre Board. Over the weekend we spent time in North Battleford with the press and city council and met in Saskatoon with the hospital council. He returned to Regina to meet with the College of Physicians and Surgeons on Sunday morning. Sunday afternoon we met with the city council in Weyburn and on Monday we met with unit heads of the Psychiatric Services Branch. As a result of these meetings morale is high with the Branch and the climate is ripe to improve the plan.

Dr. Frazier's Report and visit are a concrete demonstration on the Government's part that we mean business and the Report will not gather dust. It is the Government's desire that these measures and recommendations and further evaluation programs will upgrade our mental health facilities. We have given the public and the Opposition every opportunity to become aware of developments and participate in evaluating and upgrading this program. It is my sincere wish, Mr. Speaker, that Members of both sides of this Legislature will support the Government's program.

Mr. Speaker, in the remaining few minutes I would like to deal with the subject of the Saskatchewan Power Corporation, a subject the majority of the people of Saskatchewan take very much for granted. They probably have every reason to do so because electricity is no longer a mystery to be marvelled at every time one flicks a switch. Natural gas has gained wide acceptance as a clean, efficient, premium fuel. The Corporation

doesn't seek to attract attention to itself except as a first rate service being provided to the people of Saskatchewan, ready at the right place and at the right time to supply energy to those who want it. Perhaps it has not always been thus, but it certainly has been the policy of the Corporation to follow that program the last four years. The Corporation has made great strides in these four years; one might almost say, Mr. Speaker, that the progress made by the Saskatchewan Power Corporation mirrors the change that has taken place in Saskatchewan since the end of 1963.

The annual report of the Corporation, which I will place before you shortly, plainly indicates that this province has moved from an almost purely agricultural-based economy into a healthy mixture of agriculture and industry. In the electrical business last year over 40 per cent of the increase in generation was due to supply energy to industrial customers. In the gas system over three quarters of the increased volume of gas was sold to industry. How does it compare with 1963? Members of the Opposition, Mr. Speaker, claim that there has been an economic slow down since 1963, yet the sales of electricity in 1967, Mr. Speaker, were 100 per cent more than those of four years ago, granted that part of this was due to the acquisition of the Regina City System. I didn't want His Worship (Mr. Baker) to remind me of that – I see he is not in his place this afternoon. He's probably opening a store or something. Sales of natural gas in 1967 were 52 per cent more than in 1963. The revenue of the Corporation in 1967 was \$86 million compared to \$54 million in 1963, even though the city of Regina revenue influenced. One thing the city of Regina addition did not influence too much was that of the profit picture. The profit in 1967 was close to \$11 million. In the past four years the Corporation has more than doubled the accumulated net income total for all the years up until 1963. The equity of the Corporation has increased to 14 per cent, double what we found when we took over office in 1964, namely seven per cent. In the meantime the value of the plant has reached a figure in excess of \$600 million and the return on this investment is now 2.4 per cent compared to 1.5 per cent in 1963. The capital works program in 1967 amounted to \$44 million. I might say, Mr. Speaker, the Corporation required advances from the Government of only \$33 million to complete this program.

I would like, if I may, Mr. Speaker, to quote the words of a learned colleague in the British House of Parliament, The Right Hon. Raymond Gunter, Minister of Labour in Her Majesty's present Government:

I do wish many of my comrades would stop equating profits with incest and lechery. If you have a profitable industry, you have the means for further investment and further development . . .

The simple conditions on which we can have more houses, more schools, better pensions and higher wages are that our industry prospers and expands . . . And it cannot do that without profit.

Mr. Speaker, the Saskatchewan Power Corporation showed a profit of almost \$11 million in 1967. A lot of money. But when one considers the investment in the Corporation – and it is translated to return on investment 2.4 per cent – it shows, Mr. Speaker, that the Saskatchewan Power Corporation has a long way to go before it can be considered to be in a sound financial

position. There is no doubt that the Corporation must play an integral part in the industrial expansion of our province. It must plan its part years ahead, at least five years ahead, if it is going to be ready with the right supply of energy, in the right place at the right time.

I think this House will remember the winter of 1964-65, when the Corporation was forced to curtail gas supplies to many plants and places of commerce. There was just not sufficient gas available from the system to take care of all customers in the depths of winter. It is pointless, Mr. Speaker, to blame anyone for the shortcomings of the plans made in 1963 for the year ahead. But it did teach us a lesson, and the provision of adequate supplies of gas for the future was given, and is still given, top priority. In 1966 the Corporation announced a 25-year agreement with the Trans-Canada Pipelines for the provision of gas at Unity, feeding new gas supplies into the northern part of our gas system. This should help stabilize the price of gas for many years to come. In the second half of last year, the Corporation entered into an agreement with North Canadian Oil Company Limited by which the company will spend approximately \$4 million in the development of the northern portion of the Hatton Gas Field. Again, a firm price agreement with the gas produced to be delivered to the SPC's own system.

The Saskatchewan Power Corporation estimates that it now has sufficient gas reserves held or under contract to take care of the province's need for the next 24 years at the current rate of consumption. That would be fine, Mr. Speaker, if the SPC was to add no more customers to its system for the next 24 years. But there are new industries to add to the system, many new communities to be added and a greater supply of gas to be provided to the existing community. The Corporation cannot stand still and rest on its laurels. It must plan ahead and plan wisely, and it must make the best use of its available money.

The Agreement with the North Canadian Oil Company is perhaps a good example of this type of planning, Mr. Speaker. We are already receiving the benefit from that Agreement. Two billion cubic feet of gas burned by SPC customers in the south of this province this season, will have been delivered as part of that Agreement. Delivery will increase by two billion cubic feet a year, until maximum delivery of nine billion cubic feet of gas per year is reached in the 1970-1971 season. Almost immediate benefit will be taken the SPC will not have to spend \$400,000 this year for drilling new wells in its many fields in Alberta, leaving this money for needed development and investment elsewhere.

Mr. Speaker, I see my time has passed. I now wish to indicate that it must be quite evident that I will not support the amendment, but will support the motion.

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

**Mr. A. Matsalla (Canora):** — Mr. Speaker, as I rise to speak for the first time in the Legislature, my first thought is about the constituency of Canora and its people, whom I was elected to represent. I feel that it is with a great deal of pride and honor that I have been placed in a position to truly represent the Canora people through the democratic process of election. With this, one possesses a sense of security and sureness in his representation.

On this occasion, Mr. Speaker, I'd like to take the opportunity of expressing my heartfelt thanks to the people of the Canora constituency for their support and hard work in the October 11th election, and for placing their confidence in me to represent them and their views in this Legislature to the Government of Saskatchewan. I might say that the people of Canora are happy and proud that they are again represented by the New Democratic party.

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

**Mr. Matsalla:** — They very strongly maintain that, if all the ballots had been counted in the 1964 election, their representation in the Legislature under the CCF and the New Democratic party would have been an unbroken period of 30 years, since 1938.

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

**Mr. Matsalla:** — An enviable record and one to be proud of and boast about.

Mr. Speaker, I cannot help but say a few words here about my predecessors, Mr. Myron Feeley and Mr. Alex Kuziak. Mr. Myron Feeley was first elected in 1938. After serving ten years, he stepped aside to make room for a younger man to carry on the work of the CCF and what it stands for. Mr. Alex Kuziak, in 1948, was elected a Member. He held the post until 1964, when unfair Liberal tactics disfranchised over 300 ballots to defeat him.

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

**Mr. Matsalla:** — Of the 16 years as a Member, Mr. Kuziak served 12 years as a Cabinet Minister. Mr. Kuziak's appointment was a first in the Province of Saskatchewan for a Member of the Ukrainian descent. Both of these men have a firm belief in the philosophy of the CCF and the New Democratic party, and they continue to be active in the movement. I am sure that I can speak for them, if I say that they are proud of the marked accomplishments and progress made by the Province of Saskatchewan under the CCF Government, and they are convinced that the New Democratic party will in the next election form the Government of Saskatchewan.

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

**Mr. Matsalla:** — I might say that both of these men gave their time, effort and energy to unselfishly serve the Canora constituency and the people of this province. I am sure that both sides of this House will join me in wishing them well in future years.

Before I proceed, Mr. Speaker, it would please me to congratulate you, Sir, in your election to the high position as Speaker of this Assembly. This Assembly has high regard for your integrity and fairness in decisions. While I can appreciate that your assignment is not an easy one, I can assure you that I will make every effort to be orderly and abide by the rules of this House.

May I add, Mr. Speaker, to those who already spoke, my

congratulations to all Members in their election or re-election to this Legislature, to those appointed to carry the heavy responsibilities as Cabinet Ministers of the Government, and to the Hon. Member from Kerrobert-Kindersley (Mr. Howes) for his re-election as Deputy Speaker.

Permit me, Mr. Speaker, to say a few words about the Canora constituency which I represent. The constituency is located in beautiful parkland area of the east central part of the province. It is quite densely populated considering that the population is predominantly rural. Full high school facilities are provided in four centres. We are proud of our education facilities and for this, Mr. Speaker, much of the credit is due to the progressive-minded school boards, teachers, the Government of that time, and last but not least the taxpayers of the area who recognize the need and importance of education in our modern society.

The economy of the area, Mr. Speaker, is almost entirely dependent on grain and livestock production, except for the area to the north where lumbering is the industry. During the past year, due to crop failure and somewhat unstable livestock prices, the farmers and the businessmen in the area feeling the pinch. We are in an unfortunate position where we cannot depend on deriving financial benefit to supplement the farm income through direct employment in the manufacturing or mining industry. In other words, Mr. Speaker, when the crops fail, the economy drops, or conversely when the farmers have it, everyone has it.

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

**Mr. Matsalla:** — I believe, Mr. Speaker, that the people of Saskatchewan are more and more convinced of this position, particularly the farmers, and especially so after the October 11 election last year. The sounding economic boom and the great industrial development to keep Saskatchewan on the move, as echoed across the breadth of this province by the Premier and the Liberal Government, came to a sudden halt and vanished like a bursting bubble into the air. The people of Saskatchewan have been fooled! Almost immediately after the election the Premier and his Government reversed their grinding gears and began painting a dismal picture of Saskatchewan's financial position. Announcement after announcement was made calling for restraint in every sector of the economy. Out of the shadow of prosperity, austerity befell Saskatchewan.

I would like to now spend a few moments, Mr. Speaker, to outline to this Assembly and bring to the attention of the Government, some of the needs and problems of the constituency I represent. I would like first of all to make reference to the Frazier Report on provincial mental health. Regrettably, the Government's unwillingness to provide the conditions necessary to recruit and maintain adequate staff has jeopardized the work of Yorkton Psychiatric Hospital. The erosion has been so bad that it has given rise to rumors that this fine institution may close. I am most pleased to note the recommendation of the Frazier Report for the provision of psychiatric treatment there

and for the high praise it has for it. The centre has been providing a very good service to the northeast central part of Saskatchewan. I trust, Mr. Speaker, that the Government will follow Recommendation 9 of the report which states:

There should be instituted prompt, urgent measures to retain present staff and fill existing staff vacancies, so as to preserve this outstanding program.

I must underline "prompt, urgent measures" for the centre, so that it might again fully continue its vital function in the Provincial Health Program.

There is much concern, Mr. Speaker, in Canora over disapproval by the Department of Welfare to proceed with the conversion of the old Union Hospital into a nursing home. I might say that earlier the Board received an understanding from the Department that the hospital could be converted. But when the architect's estimates were received, the costs for the conversion appeared higher than it would cost to build a thirty-bed nursing home. A recent announcement by the Department stated there will be no approvals for new construction until those applied for are completed first. Consequently, the situation now leaves the Hospital Board in a very uncertain and bound position. It would seem that the only way to utilize the facilities of the old hospital and to relieve the pressure for the space in the new hospital, would be to use the old hospital for a nursing home as is on a temporary basis until final plans are decided upon. Mr. Speaker, I urge the Government to give this alternative serious consideration and grant the Hospital Board temporary permission for alternate use of the hospital as a nursing home.

We have areas in the Canora constituency, Mr. Speaker, who are still unserved by a telephone system. It is an accepted fact that a telephone today is no longer a luxury. It has become an essential rural service. The fact that in most of these areas rural telephone companies do not exist, or perhaps are not in a position to extend their service into the areas, makes me suggest that the Government make every effort to accommodate the areas. I submit that the present unserved area program is unrealistic and inadequate, in that it requires approximately 30 interested and potential subscribers within an area, and in that the minimum cost of \$400 is excessive, particularly if the distance between telephones is less than two miles, especially in the cases of easy construction. If we are to preserve the family farm and encourage the people to stay on farms, we must gear our farm program to provide the essential services. I suggest, Sir, that there be an urgent revamping and updating of the unserved area program on a more practical and local plane, essentially by reducing the number of potential area subscribers required and by making a review of the capital cost of the service.

The Highway Construction Program during the past three years was a somewhat confused state of affairs. Many projects started, but not completed. With the possibility of a by-election in the Canora constituency during the Government's last term of office, there has been quite a bit of highway construction in the area, from surveys to paving. The by-election never came and the work was not completed. It is noted in the Throne Speech that the Government will, during the coming year, continue with a heavy program of highway construction. I trust,

**February 27, 1968**

Mr. Speaker, that the Government will continue with the construction in the constituency so as to fully complete its started programs. And I beg that consideration be given to rebuild the No. 5 west, and reshape and dust-free No. 9 north to reserve. I want to impress that these highways are vital links, and certainly in need of immediate attention.

After outlining some of the needs and problems of the constituency I represent, Mr. Speaker, I would like to return to the subject of the present economic position in Saskatchewan. I would like to assist the Premier and his Government in painting the dismal financial picture of Saskatchewan by sharing in giving the true colors for the background.

Mr. Speaker, there seems to be an indication that many of the current programs, providing assistance to the local government bodies, the municipalities and schools, and to the people of small communities, will be cut. It is regrettable that this should come at a time when they are needed more than ever. And to add to the agony, there is every indication that the people of Saskatchewan will have to pay more for less in what they will get.

It is being reported by the municipalities that their maintenance and snow removal grants have been arbitrarily reduced. School units have either reported a reduction or no increase in grants. Payment of land clearing grants to farmers is being unduly delayed and postponed. Projects under the Conservation and Development Branch to assist farmers in draining flooded areas of arable land are receiving very slow attention, and in some cases, deliberately delayed with the excuse that the Department is short-staffed.

Nearly every municipality and every school unit in our area had to steadily increase their tax mill-rate since the Liberal Government took office. To illustrate, during the last three years, the RM of Buchanan No. 304 had a total increase of 13 mills and the RM of Keys No. 303 increased the total rate by 19 mills. I submit, Mr. Speaker, that the sharp increases of local taxes during the last three years of Liberal Government were mainly due to Government grants lagging behind and to keeping pace to meet the costs of providing local services.

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

**Mr. Matsalla:** — Speaking of municipalities and school units, Mr. Speaker, I would like to spend a few moments on local government administration and control of local affairs. A lot has been said about strengthening our local governments and preserving local autonomy. In order that this be done it is vital that local governments are placed in a position of a strong financial base and with the responsibility of making local decisions.

Since the Liberal Government took office in 1964, Mr. Speaker, there has been a tendency towards the removal of control and responsibility from the local level to the Provincial Central Government. This kind of action on the part of the Provincial Government will tend to weaken governments at local levels, and certainly it will discourage participation of people in the process of making decisions affecting local affairs. The gradual erosion of rights and responsibilities, Mr. Speaker, will only lead to the destruction of our local government system.



In one instance, the council of the municipality in my area was forced by the Government to make a change of location in the construction of a grid road. Originally the first location was approved by the municipality and the Government, and construction was started. Through political pressure, Mr. Speaker, the Government demanded that the municipality make the change or else their earned grant on earlier construction would not be paid. The Government literally took over the control of the municipality, ignored the elected representatives of the local people, and dictated in no uncertain terms what was to be done. And this, Mr. Speaker, only for the purpose of political patronage. I submit that this kind of action is most unfair to the council and to the people of the municipality. I ask: what's the use of having a municipality, what's the use of electing a municipal council, if the Premier and his Government are going to dictate to them how to run their business?

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

**Mr. Matsalla:** — I believe, Mr. Speaker, that much of the recent controversy over the Teachers' Salary Act could have been avoided if the Government had encouraged and provided for more consultation . . .

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

**Mr. Matsalla:** — . . . the kind of consultation whereby the teachers and the trustees and the Government would have had the opportunity to discuss and negotiate the kind of legislation that would be acceptable to all concerned. This was done in 1949 under the previous CCF Government and the result was that the Legislature gave unanimous approval to the Bill with the consequence of no ill feelings.

Speaking of consultation and communication with people involved, I would like to commend the Hon. Minister of Education (Mr. McIsaac) for having the forthright courage to publicly correct the irresponsible and inaccurate statements made by his colleague, the Hon. Minister of Natural Resources (Mr. Barrie) when speaking in Canora recently on the controversial teachers' salary legislation. Incidentally, realizing that the Hon. Minister of Natural Resources is convalescing in the hospital, I would like, through you, Mr. Speaker, on behalf of this Assembly, to wish him a speedy recovery and the strength to make an early return to this House.

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

**Mr. Matsalla:** — I believe, Mr. Speaker, that there should be more consultation and communication right within the Government of the day. Perhaps others, including the Premier, would speak more truthfully and with more accuracy.

Another implication of this proposed legislation is the loss of autonomy by school boards. Here again, Mr. Speaker, is a glaring example of arrogance on the part of the Government and its determination to govern over people rather than by people. There is danger, Mr. Speaker, that this is an attempt by the Government to weaken local government, and to gradually erode the basis and structure of our democratic form of

**February 27, 1968**

government and to promote the idea of dictatorship. Mr. Speaker, in view of such extensive interference with individual and human rights through the various governments, particularly by the Liberal-Thatcher Government in the Province of Saskatchewan, I would urge the Premier and his Government to answer the call of the United Nations General Assembly to observe 1968 as International Year of Human Rights by fully defining to the public what human rights are and by conducting itself to fully recognize and respect such human rights.

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

**Mr. Matsalla:** — In the January, 1968 issue of “Canada’s Health and Welfare”, human rights are defined as:

The right of self-determination, to work, to social security, to the highest attainable standard of physical and mental health, to take part in cultural life and other rights, all of which form part of the human environment.

It is suggested that observance of this Human Rights Year could be by intensifying existing programs related to human rights, as well as initiating new programs. Perhaps this is the year when legislation could be passed to cover human rights and the creation of the office of ombudsman.

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

**Mr. Matsalla:** — In view of the fact that this year, 1968, Mr. Speaker, Canada joined other nations of the world in designating this an International Year of Human Rights, I submit that Saskatchewan should be prepared to do its share in carrying out a program embodying human rights. The Throne Speech is silent on this subject. Now because the Government proposes to interfere and remove certain human rights, individual and otherwise, in the field of education, because it proposes to deal in a high-handed manner to close many small hospitals, and because of the Government’s negligence and irresponsible position in the health program, I will not support the motion, but I will support the amendment.

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

**Mr. W.E. Smishek (Regina North East):** — Mr. Speaker, at the outset, I want to join with other Members in extending to you congratulations on your re-appointment as Speaker of this Assembly. I feel that selecting you again as Speaker was a wise decision of this House, because I believe that you, Sir, perhaps more than any other Government Member appreciate the principles of democratic parliamentary government and many of its valued traditions. You recognize that it is both the Government as well as the Opposition that constitute this Legislature and both have rights.

I want also, Mr. Speaker, to congratulate all those who were elected to this Legislature for the first time, especially the young and capable contingent of New Democrats who have joined us on the Opposition side of the House.

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

**Mr. Smishek:** — We have had an opportunity to hear from some of your young and capable Members. Their speeches were well delivered, they were thoughtful, they were full of new ideas. My seat-mate, Roy Romanow, MLA for Saskatoon Riversdale is only 30 years of age. Jack Messer, MLA for Kelsey is younger, he is only 26. A large portion of the Opposition Members are in their 20s, 30s and early 40s. Mr. Speaker, I include myself in this category of young men. These young Members are dedicated to the cause of helping to build a new social order, a brotherhood of man, where each man is free, where people's rights are guaranteed and protected, where no child will go to bed hungry or in want of the best possible health care, where equal opportunities are available in a world united in peace and not divided by war.

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

**Mr. Smishek:** — For these things, we, the New Democrats, shall work inside and outside of this Legislature. Mr. Speaker, as I look across the way, on the Government side of the House, the picture is very different. The majority of the Government Members are in their late 50s and in their 60s. Not only are they aging men but their ideas are old; they are fuzzy and full of contradictions.

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

**Mr. Smishek:** — Mr. Speaker, just to prove the point, these men get tired very soon. The House just opened an hour ago and but a few minutes ago half of them were out of the House taking a rest.

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

**Mr. Smishek:** On the other hand, every Member on this side of the House was in his place.

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

**Mr. Smishek:** — Mr. Speaker, I want now to express my sincere thanks to the people of Regina North East for their hard work and the excellent support that they gave me during the election campaign and on October 11th, election day. It was a comforting feeling to win with a margin of 2,548 votes. It is generally known in the city of Regina that there was a deal between my opponents. Their design was to split our vote. They were unsuccessful. During the campaign, they tore up our signs, sprayed our posters with paint. They resorted to maligning and mud-slinging, but the people of Regina North East were not to be fooled. Out of 56 regular electoral polls, we won 54, we tied one and lost one by a mere seven votes.

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

**Mr. Smishek:** — Mr. Speaker, not bad for a second try. The New Democratic party majority vote in my constituency increased by 1,100 over 1964. To the people of Regina North East I say thank you and I pledge to represent you to the best of my ability.

**February 27, 1968**

Mr. Speaker, in a few minutes I want to talk about some of the needs in my constituency, but before doing this I notice that Government Members are very squeamish and very sensitive any time we start talking about education. There is a good reason for their sensitivity. They must have realized by now that the people of Saskatchewan know that this Government has created in this province an education crisis. The crisis could have been predicted soon after the Liberals took office, when they removed from the top priority the important matter of education. Take the matter of university financing. Liberal spokesmen continue their attempts to mislead the people. Let us set the records straight once and for all, Mr. Speaker. I would like to refer the Members to the Annual Report of the University of Saskatchewan for the year 1967. It notes that the operating budget for the fiscal year, 1967-68 is \$29 million. Of this \$16.5 million is credited as Provincial grants. However, the Provincial Government recovers \$12 million from the Federal Government; \$7.2 million for operating purposes, and \$4.8 million for capital construction. At best, Mr. Speaker, the Provincial share for university operating costs would be \$9.3 million.

In respect to university building construction, last year the Provincial Government appropriated \$3 million for construction, but the Provincial Government received from the Federal Government \$4.8 million for university building construction. In other words, the Provincial Government made a profit of \$1.8 million. Deduct this from the \$9.3 million for operating purposes, and you will find that this Provincial Government's share of funds for university purposes in the fiscal year, 1967-68 is only \$7.5 million. In the fiscal year previous, it did provide almost \$15 million. But you will notice, Mr. Speaker, that it reduced that amount this year by almost \$7.5 million.

Mr. Speaker, it is because of this drastic cutback that the University was compelled to increase university tuition fees to students by \$75 on the average for the coming year. And incidentally, Mr. Speaker, this is the second increase in university tuition fees since the Liberals took office. In the fiscal year, 1966-67, tuition fees had been increased by an average of \$35 per student. Therefore, within a two-year period under the Liberal Administration, university tuition fees have increased on the average by \$110 per student. What it means is that since the Liberal Government took office, university tuition fees have increased by over 30 per cent in some courses. Mr. Speaker, Liberal spokesmen say that tuition fees represent a paltry sum of the total cost of the University budget. Well, in 1967, this amounted to \$4.5 million; this year it is more; next year, Mr. Speaker, when the new increases take effect, it will be well in excess of \$6 million. Had the Provincial Government not reduced its grants after the Federal Government increased its financial responsibility for secondary including university education, not only would there have been no increase, but, Mr. Speaker, it was possible to completely eliminate university tuition fees.

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

**Mr. Smishek:** — Mr. Speaker, I was disappointed yesterday in some of the remarks made by the Hon. Member for Moosomin (Mr. Gardner). His reference to foreign students was very regrettable. He left the impression that our university would be better off

without them. This is unfortunate. Sure, the foreign students take up some space, and it's true it costs us some money to have them in the province. But, Mr. Speaker, have we become so selfish that the only people we care for are those who live within the borders of Saskatchewan? Have we no compassion for others? Have we no feelings for the needs of other people in the world? Mr. Speaker, I want to assure them that we in the Opposition welcome the foreign students at our University. I want also to assure them that they do have friends in this Legislature on this side of the House.

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

**Mr. Smishek:** — Now the Hon. Member for Moosomin also accused the University faculty members and others who have expressed concern about the Government's financial and academic control of the University. He said that they weren't responsible people, they were people with left-wing tendencies. Who are some of these people who have raised their voices in opposition to the Government's proposals? Deans Otto Lang, Barber, Haslem, Begg, Dr. Hilda Neatby; the Student Liberal Association; the University Senate; the Faculty Association. Mr. Speaker, Deans Otto Lang and Barber, left wingers, since when, Mr. Speaker? When did the University Senate have a radical reform? I happen to sit on the University Senate, Mr. Speaker; it represents a cross-section of the Saskatchewan community. The Senate by unanimous vote took issue with the Government's position. The remarks of the Hon. Member for Moosomin were a serious insult, I submit, particularly when it comes from a person who is a graduate from the University. He should know better.

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

**Mr. Smishek:** — Mr. Speaker, also yesterday, the Hon. Member for Moosomin (Mr. Gardner) commended the Provincial Government for the assistance it has granted to the community of Grenfell in the construction of the Grenfell and District Pioneer Home. Mr. Speaker, I have learned that as of yesterday, after the Hon. Member spoke, that no grant has been paid and no word has yet been received in Grenfell that Government assistance would be provided for the construction of this home.

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

**Mr. Smishek:** — Mr. Speaker, I was interested in some of the remarks of the mover of the Address-In-Reply, the Hon. Member for Regina South West (Mr. McPherson). Had he made that speech on his economic beliefs, prior to October 11th, I doubt whether he would have been sitting here today. I note he used the words "independent sector." Being one of the first two award-winning salesmen of the year, he decided to use the soft sell technique. The number one salesman would never quibble with such cowardly words. He would say, free enterprise. The Hon. Member suggested to us that this free enterprise properly organized or mobilized could cure anything. It could cure anything from warts to corns. It could wipe out poverty, resolve all the international problems and we will be able to live in peace and prosperity hereafter. Well, Mr. Speaker, had he consulted the number one salesman, he might have an answer something like this: "Free enterprisers have had a chance for over 100 years in this

**February 27, 1968**

country.” Well, Mr. Speaker, according to the Liberal Government in Ottawa, 20 per cent of Canada’s population live in poverty. Over 100 years of free enterprise rule in this country means that one out of every five Canadians lives below the poverty level. How much longer do they want, Mr. Speaker? They have been mobilizing and organizing such an effective sales promotion scheme that they have sold out two-thirds of our country, of our economy to foreign interests. And this is why, Mr. Speaker, Canada is facing some very serious economic and social problems.

But, Mr. Speaker, this was not the part of his address that aroused by curiosity most – this was to be expected from him. I was more interested in the advice he gave the Government regarding industrial relations. He said:

The right to strike, the right of employers and employees to disagree is in essence a guarantee of the freedom which we cherish.

I agree, Mr. Speaker. He said:

Controlled and managed by Government, labor is not free, neither is management.

He is right and he went on:

Government should stick to conciliation and stop there and permit labor and management to practise free bargaining. Neither side can ever hope to bargain freely when they are hampered by laws binding one side or the other to certain predetermined procedures and conditions.

And he added, “Such a situation exists today at both the Provincial and Federal levels.” He is right, Mr. Speaker. He pointed out that “Labor’s problems have become the football of political careerists.” He recommended that:

Labor leaders as well as management should sincerely concern themselves and jointly request the elimination of all restrictive labor legislation.

This has been done, Sir. Organized labor and its leaders have on many occasions called upon this Government to remove the restrictive legislation enacted by this Government. He then went on to say:

Not until this is done will there be any meaningful and actual free bargaining. It is preposterous to claim that bargaining between two parties is free, when a third party, government, is sitting on the shoulders of the bargaining teams, pointing out that one or the other has certain privileges not available to the other.

Well, Mr. Speaker, I hope that his remarks are taken to heart by the Premier and the Minister of Labour, and the Government. I hoped he would have conclude his remarks by serving notice that at this session, he will be bringing in Bills to repeal the notorious Bill No. 79, amendments to The Trade Union Act of 1966, and Bill No. 2, The Essential Services Act.

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

**Mr. Smishek:** — Mr. Speaker, I ask him to

do this. If he does, he will get the complete and full co-operation and support of the Members of this side of the House. Now that he has made this speech and expressed his views, I hope he does not absolve himself of any further responsibility. Until the day that he or other Members of the Government side bring in legislation repealing the regressive and oppressive labor laws passed in 1966, I am going to conclude and so will many, many other people, that he really didn't mean what he said. The repeal of Bill No. 79 enacted in 1966, and compulsory arbitration Bill No. 2, now could be Saskatchewan's important contribution to the Human Rights Year proclaimed internationally by the United Nations and observed throughout the world.

Mr. Speaker, I want to discuss in some detail the problems of labor-management relations in Saskatchewan since the Liberal Government took office. In the first three full years of Liberal Administration, 1965 to 1967, inclusive, there were a total of 42 strikes involving 4,586 workers. The number of man-days lost was in excess of 59,000. Compare that with the preceding three years during the CCF Administration, 1962-1964, only 18 strikes, 1,458 workers involved, number of man-days lost due to strikes was 13,600. For that matter, Mr. Speaker, let us compare a 10-year period under the CCF Administration, 1955-64, inclusive, a total of 56 strikes, involving 3,800 workers; number of man-days lost 57,000. Mr. Speaker, in three years, under the Liberal Administration, more workers were involved in disputes and strikes, more time was lost than in a ten-year period under a CCF Administration. Compare it in a different way. In the 1962-64 period the percentage of man-days lost in relation to the total labor force was only .02 per cent. In a 10-year period, .03 per cent. But under the Liberal Administration, 1965-67, the percentage is .09 per cent, three and four times as much time lost due to strikes under a Liberal oppressive labor policy and laws as compared with a free collective bargaining rights policy under the CCF Administration.

Mr. Speaker, let us look at the Government's relations with its own employees. In the last three-year period, there were more disputes, more strikes within the Government service and Crown corporation than during the period of 20 years under the CCF Administration. The other day the Premier condemned the Saskatchewan brickworkers and their union going out on strike. Let us look at some of the facts. The base rate for the Estevan brickworkers was only \$1.88 per hour; the average rate was below \$2. Only two workers earned a top rate of \$2.18 – 22 cents per hour and 33 cents per hour lower than Medicine Hat and Edmonton brickworkers respectively and, Mr. Speaker, about \$17 per week lower than the average wage in the Province of Saskatchewan. Mr. Speaker, I have a feeling, as I'm sure many people of Saskatchewan have the same feeling, that this strike was deliberately provoked.

**Mr. Thatcher:** — Now, Walter . . .

**Mr. Smishek:** — The Government has failed to bargain in good faith. Mr. Speaker, the Premier has told the public on many occasions that he would like to sell this brick plant at any price. A strike may have been a good excuse of finding a friend during that period to sell the plant at a bargain, but somehow, Mr. Speaker, that friend didn't come along. Something went wrong and the Government had to settle.

**February 27, 1968**

I want to tell this Legislature about some of the problems employees are having with the Liberal-appointed Labour Relations Board. But before doing this, Mr. Speaker, I want to quote a news story that appeared in the Leader Post on March 4, 1961. The story is headed, "Thatcher Says Board Is Biased." The story starts:

'Government-appointed Labor Relations Board is heavily biased against business and in favor of labor unions,' Opposition Leader Ross Thatcher said on Thursday.

He then went on to make some accusations against the Chairman of the Board, the story proceeds:

Mr. Thatcher suggested that the Government look over the Board and arrange for fairer representation. The two business representatives are retired, he said, and the two representatives of the public are supporters of the CCF. There are also two labor representatives on the Board.

There were no two retired business representatives – one of them may have been. But, Mr. Speaker, it really doesn't matter, both were nominees of the employer organizations. The public representatives were Mrs. Elsie Hart, well-known for her community and farm work, and Mr. Stuart Thiessen, secretary of the Saskatchewan Farmers' Union. Well, Mr. Speaker, if there were two CCF supports on the Board in 1961, I submit today that there are at least four Liberal supporters on the Labour Relations Board and perhaps five. It is also significant of the two employer representatives, neither has bargaining relationships with their own employees, and the public representatives are chosen for their political loyalties to the Liberal party. They don't seem to have any other specific qualifications. Labor representation on the Board is incidental, because the Board is not going to accuse the present Labour Relations Board of bias – that would be too mild a term. Labor just can't get a fair break. Take a look at the Department of Labour Annual Report – 15 reinstatement applications filed, none granted; monetary loss, 15 applications filed, non granted; a combination of reinstatement and monetary loss, one application filed, none granted. The story is the same for the year previous and the year previous to that.

In the matter of applications for certification, the number of applications dismissed last year according to the Department of Labour Annual Report rose by almost 30 per cent. The number of so-called representative votes by the Labour Relations Board increased by 500 per cent since 1963, but the number of votes won are very, very few. Obtaining automatic recognition of a union has become much more difficult on two counts: 1. because of the over 60 per cent majority rule required, and 2. the freedom given employers under Section 9(1)(a) to interfere with the employees rights to join and organize unions of the choice. Some employers have become so bold in this province that they are conducting their own votes among the employees. Knowing that they are shielded by the Board and the biased law, they have developed new courage. It has become pointless for unions to file unfair labor practice charges; they just can't win, Mr. Speaker. You know, one union applied for certification with 100 per cent support of the employees, but do you think they got certified? They did not, Mr. Speaker. For a union to



win a case before the present Labour Relations Board is a miracle and you know miracles don't happen very often.

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

**Mr. Steuart:** — Just give us the name.

**Mr. Smishek:** — I will give you the name. But to lose a certification, it appears, Mr. Speaker, that all that is required is a piece of paper, it doesn't even have to say to whom it applies. Those opposing the union do not even have to ask to have the application amended to meet the requirements. This Labour Relations Board will do it for them, so as to decertify the union. Company unionism is on the increase. Since The Trade Union Act was amended, the Labour Relations Board has become a haven for company union promoters. I said in 1966 the amended Act is going to create a pension plan for the lawyers. I was right, Mr. Speaker. Some lawyers have become company union organizers and advisors and are raiding legitimate workers unions — legitimate workers organizations. Now, Mr. Speaker, the well-accepted informal procedures before the Labour Relations Board have now disappeared. The Labour Relations Board has acquired a court atmosphere. Costs to unions have increased because it has become almost a necessity for the union to hire a lawyer when it appears before the Labour Relations Board.

Now when it comes to the matter of the exclusions of the people from the bargaining units, all the employer has to do is sneeze, and he will get as many workers excluded from the bargaining unit as he chooses. In fact, at times he can even get more than he asks for. The result is that bargaining strength of unions is being weakened. The Board has handed down rulings on bargaining unit exclusions where, for each employee in the bargaining unit, there is one out-of-scope employee, in the so-called management category. But, to carve out a unit for bargaining, based on precedent and law, such as a craft unit or a sub-division of a plan unit, all the employer has to do is to ask the Board to include additional employees and the Board agrees, so as to reduce the union's majority and thus dismiss the union's application for certification.

This Board does not follow law, Mr. Speaker. It does not follow precedent, it makes its own rules as it goes along. Previous precedents respecting labor-management relations, whether in this province or in other provinces, or in the courts, are not a matter of consideration of the present Board. Yesterday's rulings mean nothing tomorrow.

Let me give you a few specific examples of their inconsistencies. Case (A). A group of workers organized a union. More than 60 per cent signed application cards for certification purposes. The case came before the Board and the employer argued that he had intended to hire more employees at some future time. Mr. Speaker, I have never known an employer who doesn't hope to expand his operation and in some future time hire more employees. He claimed that the number of employees may increase to 50. More than one year has gone by since this case came before the Board, and he still does not employ 50 employees. The Labour Relations Board threw the application out on the grounds that it was premature. Case (B). The Board reversed itself in this case. A company was formed in April last. Two days later an application for certification was filed. The Board gave no

notice to other unions who may be concerned – a practice followed in the past. Apparently the employer had seven employees. This application was not considered by the Board to be premature and the union was certified.

Now, Mr. Speaker, this certification, according to the Premier, may affect 3,000 employees. This is according to his speech of February 10, 1966. This union got a certification order covering an area from the Alberta border to the Manitoba border, all the way to the North West Territories. Now, Mr. Speaker, I note that the Premier has reduced this figure from 3,000 to 650. Somewhere we lost 2,350 potential employees.

**Mr. Steuart:** — They got mechanized.

**Mr. Smishek:** — Mr. Speaker, now Case (C). The initial staff was hired by this new company. The employees formed a union. They made application for certification, but here again the Labour Relations Board rejected their application claiming in this case it was premature. Case (D). Another union made an application for certification where three workers were employed at this stage of the company's operation, of what will be a larger operation in the future. The Board in this case narrowed the bargaining unit initially applied for, and the union was certified. This was not considered to be a premature application. They do one thing one day, they do another thing another day.

These are not all the problems, Mr. Speaker. Consider a union making an application for certification of a craft unit affecting less than 100 employees. The union is notified by the Board secretary to arrange for specimen signatures. The union makes the necessary arrangements with the employer. When signatures are being taken, the employer tells the union representative not to record any names of employees who have given their specimen signature. The union representative objects; this has been a right we have always had. But he finds that he has very little choice. The employer also tells the union official that he will at a future date classify the employees but not in his presence.

Well, Mr. Speaker, the case comes before the Labour Relations Board. The union asks the Board for permission to examine the statement of employment and the Board refuses to give the union lawyer the right to examine this basic evidence. Mr. Speaker, for 20 years it was an undeniable right of either party appearing before the Labour Relations Board to examine the facts. For the first time in the history of Saskatchewan labor-management relations, the Chairman of the Board denied the union the right to examine the statement of employment, the right to examine the facts. For that matter, Mr. Speaker, to the best of my knowledge, this is the first time in the history of Canadian labor-management relations that the affected party was denied the opportunity and the right to examine the facts and the evidence. Mr. Speaker, I have always considered that the matter of jurisprudence and justice should be based on having the facts, but in this case the Labour Relations Board is refusing to give the basic evidence required for the union to be able to argue its case. Mr. Speaker, the only matter that has always been considered confidential before the Labour Relations Board and recognized as such by all Labour Relations Boards in Canada, is the actual supporting or withdrawal cards signed by the individuals.

My information is that in this case the employer listed

some 250 employees, a unit not applied for by the union. They applied for a craft unit, employing less than 100 employees. They did not apply for a plant union. Under the circumstances how can the union argue and present its case when it is denied the basic facts at issue.

Mr. Speaker, reasons for the Board's decisions are hard to obtain and those that are written in most cases are of little help. Board decisions are at times delayed for periods up to six months. More and more cases are being referred to the Courts for review. The legal costs to unions are becoming more burdensome every month. Going to the court is of little relief because of the powers that the Board commands. A recent court ruling said that the Board had jurisdiction in making wrong decisions. Unions have lost confidence in the present Labour Relations Board. There is an urgent need to examine the membership and composition of the Board and to appoint some fair and forward-looking people in the matter of labor-management relations, Mr. Speaker, otherwise there will be a further increase in the number of disputes and labor-management conflicts in the Province of Saskatchewan.

There are more reasons for the increased number of disputes and the number of strikes. The trade union movement has lost confidence in the voluntary conciliation services. Look at the very few cases that are referred to Conciliation Boards. Ask yourself, why? The answer seems self-evident. I submit it is the kind of persons that the Minister of Labour is appointing as chairmen of Conciliation Boards. How would you like to appear before a Conciliation Board, knowing that you are licked before you start, knowing that your case will be judged perhaps by a former president of the Saskatchewan Employers Association or the former president of the Regina Liberal Association. I don't think there is much difference – or the like who recommends that workers in the same community, employed in the same industry, should accept 53 cents an hour less than is provided for in the collective bargaining agreement by a competitor across the street. Based on this experience would you, Sir, would anybody in the future, ask the Minister to establish another Conciliation Board? The rule of once bitten, twice shy, must apply and the result may be a strike. Why doesn't the Minister appoint people with some experience and background in the area of labor-management relations? We have people at our University who have in the past years given excellent service in the labor-management field and have prevented many disputes. Why is the Minister rejecting or refusing to appoint them as conciliators now?

**Mr. Steuart:** — Name one?

**Mr. Smishek:** — Mr. Speaker, I'll give you a complete list, don't get anxious.

**Mr. Steuart:** — I'm not anxious.

**Mr. Smishek:** — Mr. Speaker, I am willing to provide every case. Will you let me finish?

Mr. Speaker, it is becoming more evident that in this province we are entering a new era in industrial relations, an era long forgotten by the workers of the Province of Quebec. I am referring to those unfortunate years of industrial relations under the Duplessis regime, where labor relations were not decided by the Labour Relations Board or by Conciliation Boards, or

across the bargaining table, but in some dark rooms and dark corners in some Government office.

Mr. Speaker, the tragedy of this situation is that other than unions, few people know the facts of the problem, because for some unexplainable reason, since June, 1964, the news media have decided to boycott Labour Relations Board hearings. I remember that prior to June, 1964, during Labour Relations Board hearings, sever newspaper men would appear. They would report on all details and on every situation, but since 1964, Labour Relations Board hearings have become taboo with the press. Somehow I cannot get convinced that this is by accident.

There are other problems in the labor field. While the Premier talks about a belief that he wants to see wages high in the province, the truth is that wages in Saskatchewan are falling behind the rest of Canada. In 1963, the disparity between the average weekly wage in Saskatchewan and in Canada was \$3.95. As of June, 1967, the disparity had widened to \$7.20 per week. Saskatchewan used to have the highest minimum wage in Canada. Today, Saskatchewan's minimum wages are lower than those of any other province west of Quebec. Most of these provinces have taken steps to increase minimum wages to \$1.25 per hour; Saskatchewan still lags far behind with a \$40 minimum wage in the cities and \$34.50 per week in most of the province, for a 44 and 48-work week, respectively.

Certainly the Throne Speech holds out little or nothing for the wage earners. There is a suggestion that the minimum wage may be increased. An increase in the minimum wage, Mr. Speaker, is long overdue. I urge the Government to immediately increase the minimum wage to at least \$1.25 per hour, similar to the Federal standard. The Bills introduced so far by the Minister of Labour (Mr. Coderre) also offer little hope. The Act respecting employment agencies is bad legislation; it will cause a wave of discrimination in employment. I urge the Minister to withdraw it.

Mr. Speaker, I now want to say a few words and bring to the Government's attention and the attention of this Legislature, some of the urgent needs and problems that exist in my constituency. Regina North East encompasses about one-third of the total area of the city. It is the largest constituency, territory-wise, in the city of Regina. It includes the major portion of the downtown business section, almost all the warehouse district in Regina and most of Regina's industrial and manufacturing plants. Primarily our people are wage earners, self-employed, small business men and retired folks. A vast number of them are on low incomes. Many are subject to lay-offs as soon as there is any kind of economic slump. While the Premier boats about economic growth and industrial expansion, facts prove that after four years of Liberal Government in Regina and five years of Liberal Government in Ottawa, we are facing an economic recession. The financial reserves and plans for continued economic growth built up by the CCF Government have been used up and in some instances have been squandered. The Premier finally admits that unemployment is getting serious. He says that four per cent of the Saskatchewan labor force is presently unemployed. In my constituency, Sir, it is much more serious. Perhaps twice that number are unemployed and under-employed, getting only part time employment. This is so because in Regina North East, we have many unskilled and semi-skilled workers. Hundreds have applied for upgrading and technical training courses to acquire new skills and trades, but have been turned down because there is no room in the Provincial Technical Institutes. To give you

an example, Mr. Speaker, a young man in my constituency with grade eleven, went to Moose Jaw to apply for a technical training course. He was told, "Sorry, no room." Technical training courses are such that they are overloaded. This particular course he was interested in could accommodate only 25 students at that time. This was last August. They told him that they had 127 applicants. The sad story is that in Saskatchewan it is even more difficult to become admitted to the Technical Institute than to the University, because of the lack of space and facilities. We know, Mr. Speaker, that last semester, prior to Christmas, at the Regina campus alone, some 40 students were let out in the cold.

**Mr. Steuart:** — They should pass the exams.

**Mr. Smishek:** — In the last few days, I have talked to contractors, architects, garage managers, retail merchants, hotel operators, and others. Without exception each one tells me that business in the city of Regina is on a serious downturn. A contractor told me that he virtually has no contracts for the coming year and this is a large construction firm. Firms are breaking up. Because of the liquor licensing policy of the Premier, a number of small hotels located in my constituency are on the verge of bankruptcy. One has already closed, after spending a large sum of money to modernize his premises. Staffs have been curtailed and reduced seriously.

Mr. Speaker, as I see it, the number one problem in my constituency and in the province, in the coming years is going to be unemployment. I ask the Government to take all the economic measures to prevent human suffering and economic waste caused by unemployment.

I was deeply disturbed, Mr. Speaker, at the Premier's and Education Minister's announcement that the Government had directed a freeze on school building construction. I have already told you that Regina North East encompasses about one-third of the city, with a population of about 30,000 or about the size of Moose Jaw, larger than the city of Prince Albert, but within the borders of this constituency we have no high school. In fact none is located nearby. I have already told this House that this is one of the lower-income areas of our city, yet the parents are compelled to bear a larger and disproportionate cost for sending their youngsters to school than those in the more well-to-do areas of the city. These additional costs include transportation, food, clothing, and other items, because there is no high school nearby.

It has been proven that the school dropout rates are higher among the low-income families than among the wealthy. When you place additional charges on the low-income families of sending their children to school, you multiply the dropout rate. We have all been made aware that in this age of technology and automation, education is the key to preventing a catastrophe. I urge the Premier to lift the freeze on the school plant construction. I urge the Minister of Education (Mr. McIsaac) to immediately initiate talks with the Regina Public Board of Education and the Separate School Board and try to work out a tripartite program of constructing a high school within the boundaries of Regina North East. I propose a tripartite program, because I realize, Mr. Speaker, that a modern high school, properly equipped and staffed, costs a lot of money. This could be a useful experiment, both economically and practical, in

meeting a desperate need in this large area of our city.

The next urgent need is housing, private, public and low interest money for renovation and housing improvement. I will have much more to say on this subject during the other debates. At this point I merely want to comment on the Premier's statement that the Provincial and Federal Governments plan to construct 178 low-cost housing units in the province in the coming year. If the housing situation was not that serious, Mr. Speaker, one might say that the Premier must be joking. One hundred and seventy-eight units to meet the large and urgent need for low-cost rental housing? It is like trying to catch an elephant with a mouse trap. One hundred and seventy-eight units is totally insufficient to meet the needs in my own constituency, but I note that there isn't a single unit being proposed for the entire city of Regina. Mr. Speaker, when the Government was making this decision, where was the Minister of Health (Mr. Grant)? Where was the Member for Regina South West (Mr. McPherson)? Surely they know some of the critical housing problems that this city is facing.

The fourth serious problem is air pollution. No area in the city of Regina is subject to more stench and air pollution fallout than Regina North East. The oil refineries, the meat packing plants, and other manufacturing and processing plants are located either in the centre or nearby the residential areas of the North East. Seldom are our people able to breathe fresh air. Government action in controlling air pollution is urgently needed. The Air Pollution Control Act was passed two years ago. The Government took its time in proclaiming it. I appreciate the problem that the Minister of Health (Mr. Grant) had in recruiting technical staff, but some personnel have been employed. I am glad to see that an Advisory Committee has been appointed. I urge the Minister of Health to work actively with the city of Regina in bringing this problem under control.

Mr. Speaker, while the citizens of Regina contribute in the form of Provincial taxes more than any other community, this Government has forgotten the people of Regina. They have failed to provide adequate grants for education, public health services, library, police protection, street and road construction, and other services for which the Provincial Government has a responsibility. Less than 30 per cent of Regina's education costs are paid for by the Provincial Government. This is gross discrimination. The result is that the City Council and the Board of Education have been forced to increase property taxes. Property taxes, which bear no relationship to ability to pay, have become unbearable since the Liberal Government took office. The homeowner grants represent only a small percentage of the municipal tax increases since 1964. This Government has a duty to return a fair share, in the form of Provincial grants, or some of the tax dollars that it takes out of the pockets of Regina citizens, to relieve some of the municipal tax burden. In 1964, it promised to do this. It is 1968 and facts prove that the Province is assuming a much smaller share year by year of the education and other local costs than were assumed prior to 1964.

The Regina hospital bed problems increase with each passing day. Thousands of Regina citizens requiring hospital care are on waiting lists. All we get from the Government is more promises, more meaningless legislation, enlargement of one committee and dissolution of another. But no action, no new hospital. How many more years do we have to wait to see the first shovel of dirt turned and the first brick laid for the Regina Base Hospital?

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

**Mr. Smishek:** — I am sure that many people in the city of Regina have concluded that so long as there is a Liberal Government in office that day will never come.

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

**Mr. Smishek:** — In 1964, the Liberals promised to build a Provincial technical school in the city of Regina. In 1966, the then Minister of Education (Mr. Trapp), reassured us that the Government was considering construction of such a school. Apparently the Premier slapped his hand and later the Minister retracted the commitment made. The new Minister of Education (Mr. McIsaac) spoke last week, but made no reference to a Regina technical school. Therefore, the citizens of Regina will continue to be denied the opportunity for upgrading and training for new skills so badly needed in this age of technology.

You know, I heard the Minister of Education (Mr. McIsaac) for the fourth year in a row, talk about the construction of technical schools at North Battleford and Estevan. They made that announcement in 1965, in 66, in 67, and here it is 1968 and they repeat the same thing they said in 1965. Mr. Speaker, to the citizens of those communities, I say, don't hold your breath.

Now, Mr. Speaker, in closing I find the Throne Speech has little to offer. I find that it is totally inadequate to meet the needs of today. I have discussed, this afternoon, how the Government has created an education crisis, how the Government and its Labour Relations Board, through legislative and administrative action, have created serious problems in labor-management relations. This requires urgent and immediate attention. I have discussed some of the problems of my constituency; problems of employment; the need for a high school; air pollution; and the need for the Provincial Government to assume a larger share of the costs that are borne by our citizens through municipal taxes; the need for immediate action in regard to the Base Hospital; the need for the construction of an Institute of Technology in Regina. Because this Government has abdicated its responsibilities, I find, Mr. Speaker, that I will have to oppose the motion. I will vote for the amendment.

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

**Hon. D.V. Heald (Attorney General):** — Mr. Speaker, before the Hon. Member takes his seat, I don't know if he wants to answer the question now, but I would like to put on record the question that he indicated that he would answer. I would be obliged if he could indicate to me, now or later, the identity of the first case he mentioned — the 100 per cent one. And then he referred to Case (A), Case (B), Case (C), and Case (D), and I would be obliged if he will indicate to me, at some suitable time, the identity of these cases.

**Mr. Smishek:** — I will.

**Hon. C.L.B. Estey (Minister of Municipal Affairs):** — Mr. Speaker, in rising to take part in the debate on the Speech from the Throne I want at the outset to congratulate

the mover and the seconder of the Address, not only for the content of those speeches, but for the clear and concise manner in which they were delivered before this House. I would be less than human if I did not appreciate the kind remarks which were made by the Member for Nutana South (Mr. Forsyth) and the Leader of the Opposition (Mr. Lloyd) in regard to my father. To both of them, I extend my sincere thanks.

I should also like to express to the voters of Nutana Centre my thanks for electing me as their representative in this Assembly. I believe that the seat that I represent is probably the most densely populated constituency in the province and runs from the beautiful blue Saskatchewan, some two or three miles east, to a golf course.

Now yesterday, when the Hon. Member for Touchwood (Mr. Meakes) was speaking to the House, he commented on the lack of assistance which this Government has given to rural municipalities. I see that the Member is now out of the House, but I presume that my remarks may be conveyed to him. I want to assure the Hon. Member that during his three and a half years vacation from this House, the present Liberal Government not only increased the money available for the grid road program, but brought in a program of equalization or unconditional grants which literally put million of dollars into the treasuries of our rural municipalities.

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

**Mr. Estey:** — The Hon. Member for Touchwood stated that the NDP government in 1959-60, made more money available for the grid road program than did the present Government in any year. I want to tell this House that such is not the case. In 1966-67, the present Government provided \$6,100,000 for grid road and regravelling projects, while the largest amount contributed by the NDP government was in 1959 and 1960 when they contributed \$5,500,000. The Hon. Member for Touchwood also referred to the financial plight of the RM of Garry No. 245. It so happens that in the 1967 construction year, the grid road authority approved of six miles of road construction in this municipality, but for some reason only three miles was constructed. In 1966-67, the present Government contributed to the RM of Garry, for grid road construction over \$46,000. I would point out that under the NDP government, the highest annual contribution for grid roads to this municipality was \$26,600.

Now what about equalization grants to this RM? I submit that this is typical of what equalization grants have done throughout the province. The highest equalization grant paid to the RM of Garry, which the Hon. Member for Touchwood is vitally interested in, was \$2,027, and remained at that figure for about six years. We paid equalization grants to the RM of Garry in each of the years 1966 and 1967 of \$14,864.

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

**Mr. Estey:** — Our equalization grant to that municipality represented a 700 per cent increase over any grant paid by the NDP Government. I further want to point out that, so far as these equalization grants to the RM of Garry are concerned, in 1966 our equalization grant paid to that municipality represent 9.39



mills on their then assessment. While in 1967, the same equalization grant based on that municipality's assessment, represented an equivalent of 9.41 mills.

Now there is one other point that I wish to refer to before reporting on a branch of my Department. And that is a statement made by the Hon. Member for Moose Jaw North (Mr. Snyder) when in his address he referred to the fact that Intercontinental Packers closed its Regina Plant and 85 persons lost their jobs. Now it so happens that I took the opportunity this morning to phone the controller of this plant, in Saskatoon. I was told that some three or four years ago, when the Intercontinental plant in Regina was rebuilt, there was a cutback. They have not only completely removed and enlarged the Regina plant, but are now on their third enlargement project. There are approximately 100 people employed in that plant and they hope in the near future to increase the number employed. I am referring to this fact simply because the Opposition continuously put to us that they are the friends of labor and that the only friends of labor sit opposite in this House. I submit that, if the Hon. Member from Moose Jaw continues to make such statements as this regarding Intercontinental Packers, probably one of the leading companies in Saskatchewan, both in the field of labor-management and in the field of productivity, that he is not only causing embarrassment to management but he is causing uneasiness amongst the labor force. And I am amazed that a supporter who claims to be a supporter of the NDP would spread such stupidity as that, when all he has to do is to pick up a phone and phone the head office in Saskatoon and get the truth. He doesn't have to phone Toronto, Montreal or any place else.

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

**Mr. Estey:** — Now, Mr. Speaker, there was another point that was brought up by the Hon. Member for Regina North East (Mr. Smishek) concerning the Labour Relations Board. And what I say about the Labour Relations Board is based on experience. I have appeared before the Labour Relations Board many times – the Member from Moose Jaw was on that Board – and have since appeared before the Labour Relations Board with the Member from Riversdale (Mr. Romanow). We must remember that the Labour Relations Board is at least a semi-judicial body and it is not there to satisfy either labor or management. But I want to point out this, that I do not think there is a more capable Chairman of any Relations Board in the Dominion of Canada than Judge R.H. King. And I say that in spite of the inference made by the Member for Regina North East (Mr. Smishek).

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

**Mr. Estey:** — Without being too personal, I also want to point out the fact that some eight months ago, while I was a candidate in Nutana South, I was appointed by both labor and management to be Chairman of the University of Saskatchewan Employees' Conciliation Board, another illustration of the fact that all friends of labor are not on the opposite side of the House. In spite of what you might consider my background to be, we reached a solution. I am certain that that must be one of the three largest unions in Saskatchewan.

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

**Mr. Estey:** — A statement was made by the Hon. Member from Regina North East (Mr. Smishek) to the effect that there were 175 low-rental houses under construction. He said he had obtained the figure from something the Premier had said. If he obtained it from something the Premier had said, he must refer to one project, because we have approximately 190 under construction, with another 150 going out to tenders. And that doesn't even approach the 1968 program which you will hear about in another week.

Now, I want to say a few words about housing and point out to you that during the past year the Department of Municipal Affairs, which is in charge of housing, has concentrated on low-rental housing, land assembly and land acquisition, and this in co-operation with the municipalities concerned and CMHC. In addition to low-rental housing during 1967, we constructed houses in Green Lake for the Metis population and we constructed housing for potash mine employees, which we subsequently sold to the employees with the co-operation of the mining company concerned. At the present time we have at least 3,000 people in this province housed in low-rental accommodation. The tenants in 200 of these units pay rental at a rate of less than \$50 a month. Indeed the average monthly rental for all units is between \$65 and \$66 per month. At the present time we have units under construction in Moose Jaw, Weyburn, Saskatoon, Moosomin, Meadow Lake, Kerrobert, Humboldt, Fort Qu'Appelle, Estevan and Battleford. When these units are occupied which will be prior to July 1st of this year, we will have approximately 4,000 people accommodated in low-rental housing. I think it is interesting to note that we are now getting our low-rental housing into the larger and growing towns. In the immediate future we will call tenders for a further 150 units so that construction may commence in the early spring. These units will be located in Carrot River, Hudson Bay, Humboldt, Prince Albert and Saskatoon.

We have on hand now a large number of requests from other centres, which are being studied, and will no doubt produce a greater number of low-rental housing in 1968 than has been produced in any one year up to date. As you are aware, the construction costs of these low-rental houses are borne 75 per cent by CMHC, 20 per cent by the Province and 5 per cent by the municipality concerned. The same division is made insofar as contributions to the annual subsidy. The annual subsidy is the difference paid by the tenant, based on that tenant's income and the cost required to service the mortgage and pay the taxes to maintain the unit. I would like to point out to you that the contribution made by the Province of Saskatchewan to the construction, the maintenance, and to the subsidy of low-rental housing, is greater than that made by either Manitoba or Alberta. In the Province of Manitoba the local municipality is required to pay 12½ per cent of the costs of construction and 12½ per cent of the subsidy, whereas in Alberta, the local municipality is required to pay 10 per cent of the cost of construction and subsidy. The net result is that in the Province of Saskatchewan, a municipality can have created within its boundaries a very suitable type of housing and at a cost of only 5 per cent. Even more important than that, is that the municipality is guaranteed its taxes and the people, who occupy these low-rental houses, are in houses which would normally have a much larger assessment than the type of a house which they could ever hope to own or purchase. I submit that this is simply one more way in which the present Liberal Government relieves the municipality of the

burden of providing excellent housing accommodation for those who could not, from their own resources, supply such accommodation. We are today building single-family units and two-family units. These two-family units contain two, three, four or five bedrooms. I think each Member, in whose constituency these units are located, will agree that in appearance and construction they are a credit to the municipality.

I would like to point out to the Member for Regina South East (Mr. Baker) and the Mayor of Regina, and to the other Members of Regina sitting opposite, that, since I have become Minister of Municipal Affairs, we have not had an application for low-rental housing from the city of Regina. And it is rather strange that a person, such as the Member from Regina South East (Mr. Smishek), who belongs to a political party whose slogan is People before Dollars, refuses in 1968 to provide accommodation for those people in the lower income bracket who cannot possibly finance a home under a mortgage and at the same time supply his or her family with the household needs of today. I am of the opinion that for a family of four or five children, where the family breadwinner earns \$425 a month or less and has not an equity in a home, that low-rental housing is the ideal accommodation. I am well aware of the fact that there is a rental schedule which was put out in 1967 – I face right up to this with no apology – which is somewhat less than the rental schedule which we are operating under today. I want to point out that in this Province we are really operating under three rental schedules. One is in the city of Moose Jaw, the other is in Uranium City. In Uranium City we have to make rather large adjustments due to the cost of heating. What we are doing is taking the rental schedule of 1962, which was presented by CMHC, and deducting from there an allowance for the utilities. In the city of Regina, I believe, that reduction amounts to \$15 per month, but it varies in other centres. It is of interest to note that, since I have been Minister of Municipal Affairs, I have received only three communications from tenants all over this province, in subsidized housing, who have complained as to the rent charged.

But aside from this point the policy of the Provincial Government is to increase home ownership wherever possible. And we at the last Dominion Conference on Housing in Ottawa suggested to CMHC that they make an arrangement with the tenants of some of these houses, whereby the tenants could enter into an agreement for sale, and at least acquire substantial equity over a period of years. I think that such a scheme would be acceptable to a large portion of the tenants and at the same time would give them a pride in having either ownership or an equity.

There is another type of housing that we are experimenting with at the present time, and that is economic rental units. We have an economic rental unit in Weyburn, which was constructed by the former Government. Last year we constructed some of these rental units in Watrous, which is a growing town, just to see what the economic rent would be in a developing town and in the hope that our experience would encourage the private builders to get into this field. For as you know under economic rental, the return covers the investment, although there are limitations on what you can charge for rent.

Now, I want to say a few words about dwelling construction in Saskatchewan and starts in 1967. In 1967, the dwelling completions in our province were down about 10 per cent. But during the last four months of 1967, the number of starts

increased tremendously and there were over 4,000 units under construction on December 31, 1967. That is an increase of 27 per cent over 1966. Percentage-wise the increase in housing construction in Saskatoon showed one of the greatest increases in Canada. At the end of the year there were approximately 1,600 housing units under construction in that city, whereas the year before there were 673. I am the first to admit that interest rates under housing mortgages are and have been at a high level and to some extent interest rates may affect the application for mortgages. But I would also point out that two other factors adversely affected the CMHC mortgage picture in 1967. One was that loans to home builders were cut off by CMHC on July 1, 1967, and secondly the lending institutions, such as the banks, were not organized to enter this field under the provisions given to them in the new Bank Act. During 1967 we also constructed homes in Esterhazy and Hudson Bay, which we sold to local residents. And in 1967 we completed the project of 50 houses in Esterhazy and Lanigan, which were constructed under CMHC mortgages.

Now I want to turn for just a moment to the question of land. We have inaugurated in the Department, a Land Assembly Program in co-operation with CMHC and have developed around 2,000 lots, excluding the cities of Saskatoon and Regina. Under this scheme a municipality can come to the Department with its land and the Department and CMHC will purchase the land by paying to the municipality 95 per cent of the purchase price. In other words, the municipality can have land, or can purchase land, and can have it serviced at a cost of it of 5 per cent. These lots are then eventually sold through CMHC to individuals, to municipalities, or the contractor and the purchase price is the cost plus the carrying charges. Another important point under this plan is that when the lots are sold, the purchaser may pay one-half of the servicing costs, the other cost being paid as a local improvement. This scheme merely assures us that land will be available when required for housing development. We are advised by the city of Saskatoon that it will take advantage of this Land Assembly Program, but no such advice has been received from the city of Regina. I submit that no municipality in Saskatchewan, which has a housing program, should do anything else but take advantage of the Land Assembly Program when it can take that advantage for 5 per cent and does not have to get involved in borrowing money at high interest rates or in floating a debenture at an equally high interest rate.

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

**Mr. Estey:** — Now, Mr. Speaker, I want to change to another program which I consider to be one of the most important that we have and was commenced just a few months ago. That is a program which we have in co-operation with CMHC whereby we will relieve a municipality of any raw land which it is holding for development in the next eight or ten years. We will pay out to that municipality 95 per cent of its purchase price. This land can be serviced when it is required. Now, this project in no way is to cut out the private developer. It is simply to give us some assurance that over a period of years certain lots will go on to the market at a reasonable price. I think the time is coming when the increase in housing will be due to land prices, rather than to labor and materials. I want to mention to the House that only two days ago we put through an Order-in-Council whereby the city of Saskatoon turned over to this land bank 490 acres, and not one foot has been received from the city of

Regina.

**An Hon. Member:** — What about it Ed? You cried yesterday.

**Mr. Estey:** — If the city of Regina wishes to borrow money to buy land or float debentures, I would think the taxpayers would have other views. I would also like to point out that I want to co-operate with any municipality that will make land available. But it is rather interesting to note that, as far as I can ascertain from reading the papers and I don't think I have missed very many, only 20 per cent of those cheap lots of \$2,000 which the city of Regina has offered to sell have found purchasers, and those purchasers have to first go to CMHC to see if they can get a loan. I submit that the city of Regina would have been better off financially to have put those lots under the Land Assembly Program.

**Mr. H.H.P. Baker (Regina South East):** — They're a private enterprise program. What's wrong with it?

**Mr. Estey:** — Oh, it is a great thing for the Mayor of Regina to laugh. The truth makes him laugh.

**Mr. Baker:** — I'll get you next week!

**Mr. Estey:** — I'll be here. Now, at the recent Housing Conference, we asked the CMHC to investigate the possibility of giving some assistance to persons, for example, in excess of \$5,500 but under \$7,000 in their income scale. This we feel is a segment of the population who are not available for the low-rental housing and might have difficulty, and would have in some cases, servicing a CMHC mortgage. And CMHC has agreed to give this matter consideration and is calling in our directors in the next month. We are hopeful that this aspect will be further investigated at that time. It is not an easy thing to deal with. The Province of Quebec has one scheme which apparently they are dissatisfied with, and I understand that British Columbia is contemplating a scheme. Mr. Speaker, it is quite obvious, I think, that I am supporting the motion and voting against the amendment.

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

**Mr. F.A. Dewhurst (Wadena):** — Mr. Speaker, it is with different mixed feelings that I rise to take part in this Throne Speech debate. I think this Throne Speech debate can be described in the commercial television ads of Fab, when they say it is like Judy McMurchie's wash water, it is all direct. There is nothing to this Throne Speech as far as I can see and I intend to deal with it a little more as I go along.

I would like to extend, at the outset, congratulations to all the Members in the Legislature, with one or two exceptions which I will deal with later on. I would like to congratulate you, Mr. Speaker, and the new Ministers of the Crown. I realize that their tasks will be onerous and tasks which take a lot of work and energy. I wish them well in their endeavors and I

also wish that the policies they will institute will bring a little more relief to the people of our province, because we have lots of areas where help and assistance are needed for the people of this province.

There is one thing that I did note at this session, Mr. Speaker, that has been somewhat different except on one occasion than what they have been for many years now. For many years, this Legislature has invited the students at the University, from the Regina and Saskatoon campuses, to be our guests at our Legislature, half of them on the day that the Leader of the Opposition spoke, the other half on the day that the Premier replied. We have, too, met with them in the café and have had lunch with them and have been able to discuss with the students the affairs of the Legislature, so that they in turn would understand some of the work and problems better. But this year the students, on those two days, were conspicuous by their absence. Consequently the students were not invited here and they were not able to take part, or listen to the debates of this Legislature. I see that the fellow from Souris-Estevan (Mr. MacDougall) is still bawling. Maybe someone should get him some milk, Mr. Speaker.

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

**Mr. Dewhurst:** — I would like to say a few words on the opening of this debate. The mover of the motion made a number of comments – I am not going to deal with all his statements, because they have been dealt with by other speakers – but I would like to comment on a few of them. I would like to say, in general, his remarks to my way of thinking, are of the 19th century concept. Listening to his remarks on how he felt, that governments, whether they be small or large, should not take too much responsibility, that things should be left to private monopoly, I wonder how did he reconcile his position on the Regina Hospital Board, if he feels that public bodies should not have responsibility. His remarks seemed to me, Mr. Speaker, that everything was for the strong and let the weak and the beggars depend on charity.

He mentioned that this Government has had balanced Budgets since it took office a little over three years ago. Three years ago when this Government took office in 1964, the sinking funds that were set up were enough to take care of the dead-weight debt of this Province. There was a \$33 million cash surplus in the banks. In addition to that the Budget of the day inherited from us, from the last Budget which was brought down by a CCF Government, in round figures a \$25 million surplus. Since then they have taken some of the money from the Student Aid Loan Fund and from other funds which had been set up, at one time or another and put into revenue. All this is between \$90 and \$100 million that they have had to spend more than was budgeted for.

When we hear comments made that the Province today is in better financial shape than it was three or three and half years ago, I would like to see them give the proof of that statement, because as I have mentioned, there were the sinking funds and the cash on hand to take care of all the dead-weight debts; and for self-liquidating debts such as for power and telephone, the assets were there. That same self-liquidating debt for power and telephones has increased since 1964. I am not condemning the Government for it, I'm not condemning it for increasing

the self-liquidating enterprises such as power and telephone. We need those types of services. But I am going to have a little bit to say about the way that they are charging for them.

So I am trying to show that the balanced Budget that the mover talked about was only made possible due to the surplus and the good financial condition that was inherited from us three and one half years ago. If it hadn't inherited a financially sound Province, Mr. Speaker, we would have been in trouble today, because we are fast headed for that position now.

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

**Mr. Dewhurst:** — But what has it done with taxes? It has increased taxes, Mr. Speaker. The Hospital and Medical tax in the past four years is up by over \$20 million more than it would have, had it not increased that rate. Vital statistics are up, insurance rates have gone up, gas tax is up, telephone charges are up, power charges are up, grazing fees are up, registration fees are up, tobacco tax is up, soap tax up, hay permits are up, sale of Crown land is up, the surcharge on driver's licence is up, driver's licence fee for young people is up, liquor taxes are up, auto insurance up, hospital revenue — which is a new tax — that's up. I'd like to see where it has reduced them. There are so many places where it has increased them. There's no place where it can show where it has reduced the taxes which help the common man and woman.

Well over \$50 million of an increase of new taxes per year, Mr. Speaker, and then the mover has the audacity to say that it has a business-like Government which has reduced taxes and maintained a balanced Budget. The forecast, Mr. Speaker, is for more taxes. This province is broad. This is what it called the new Saskatchewan, I guess. We heard a lot last fall about the new Saskatchewan, this must be the new Saskatchewan, new, by turning it back for thirty or forty years.

On the other hand we see the grants for the University are down. The Leader of the Opposition (Mr. Lloyd) quoting from the official records of the financial statement of the University, in his speech and again the Member from Regina East (Mr. Smishek) today have given the figures to show that in the last year, the actual money from this Government to the University in round figures was about \$7 million. The balance of the money the University had last year was either Federal money which was paid by way of the Provincial Government or it was a loan. They had to borrow the money.

At the same time while holding money back from education, holding money back from the University, increased taxes, we see at the same time the cost of living going up and up. Yet we see them taking \$1.50 off the old age pensioners, the people who can least afford to pay. At the same time we see where it is advising the pensioners that they must pay their own medical and hospitalization bill this next fall. They will no longer qualify for a free health card like they have enjoyed in the past. They are going to have to pay out of an already deficient budget, an extra \$72 a year in the case of a married old age couple.

This, Mr. Speaker, by the actions of this Government, is not only a tax on the sick, but it's also an attack on the sick. Mr. Speaker, this surely must be the new Saskatchewan that we

**February 27, 1968**

heard about so much last fall. You have heard of and have all read the novel Round the World in Eighty Days, but in this province we went from boom to bust in seven days. This province was a booming province prior to October 11 last. Everything was milk and honey, everything was proceeding so rapidly that they couldn't even keep up with the expanding industry and production. Within seven days we had gone from boom to bust.

The Premier, in order to try and shelve the plight on to somebody else, put his seatmate (Mr. Steuart) in as Province Treasurer, and the Provincial Treasurer sits there quite nervous because he has the Member from Milestone (Mr. MacDonald) breathing down his neck all the time.

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

**Mr. Dewhurst:** — Now in the Speech from the Throne he says he is going to raise the living standards during 1968. For whom is he going to raise the living standards? It's not for the old, not for the widows and their dependents. No, they're not going to get any increased living standards. They are being reduced. The sick are going to be charged deterrent fees, so they're going to have no increased living standards. We know what has been promised to the teachers, a freeze on wages, compulsory arbitration. There is no increased prosperity for teachers.

**An Hon. Member:** — There's only one man believes it.

**Mr. Dewhurst:** — There isn't any for students. A \$75 increase on student fees. There are no increases for students so they are not going to share any increased prosperity. The workers are not going to share in increased prosperity.

Incidentally I heard a radio newscast here last week, where it was announced that the Government had increased the Civil Service pay by 11 per cent over two years, 5 per cent one year and 6 per cent the next. Or else 6 per cent and 5, whichever it went. He said this would cost the Province \$1,500,000. He said it was the highest increase in the history of the Province for the civil servants.

**Mr. Thatcher:** — The in-scope, the out-scope is on top.

**Mr. Dewhurst:** — He also went on to say that the Civil Service payroll bill would now be \$25 million. Well, Mr. Speaker, if it is now \$25 million, gone up by \$1,500,000, it must have been \$23,500,000 before. From \$23,500,000 to \$25 million is not 11 per cent increase.

**An Hon. Member:** — Ah, Fred, Fred . . .

**Mr. Steuart:** — You only said it for one year.

**Mr. Dewhurst:** — The farmers are not enjoying any increase of living standards. When they were talking about increased standards for 1968, we saw the price of wheat fall last fall by 22 cents a



bushel. Not one word of protest was mentioned by this Government. On no occasion, according to the records of the House of Commons, did it either write, telephone, wire or any other way . . .

**Mr. Thatcher:** — We telephoned, Mr. Member. We telephoned on numerous occasions and got action. We got a frozen price of \$1.95.

**Mr. Dewhurst:** — Ah, Mr. Speaker, how ready that guy was to get up on his feet and say, “We telephoned.” You can’t record a telephone conversation.

**Mr. Thatcher:** — It’s a fact!

**Mr. Dewhurst:** — The Hon. Judy LaMarsh, Secretary of State at Ottawa, says there was no communications. I wonder what the facts are. But we saw the price fall by 22 cents and nothing was done.

**An Hon. Member:** — Why would we see Judy about wheat for? The Prime Minister . . .

**Mr. Dewhurst:** — Nothing was done by this Government to help to try to urge for a new wheat agreement in order to guarantee the farmer a little security on farm products. We know that the grain that is being sold this year is being sold at a lower price than it was last year. We expect that the final payments this year will be of a fair amount. But one year from now the final payment will be very low. From the amount of wheat that is being sold, the market conditions look very disturbing. The farmers are really going to be in for a shaking before 1968 is over. No wonder this Government called the election in 1967 rather than waiting until 1968.

Also, Mr. Speaker, when you analyze the situation there is no increase in here for the small businessman. This Government is only interested in giving tax exemption, royalties and so on to big corporations. But it is not the friend of the small businessman, it just gives lip service to them. The small merchants, in the towns like I represent or the majority of the Members of this House have in their constituencies, do not receive any of the prosperity that this Government so glibly talks about. Their taxes are going up; they are asked to pay more and more taxes for their own services within their towns, villages and hamlets. They are asked to pay a higher school tax, they are crying to get more school facilities and other facilities. Yet they are being turned down, being denied those facilities. They are being told it would be cheaper to delay those buildings for two years. They were told that a couple of years ago. Now the cost of construction has gone up, the interest rate has gone up. They have been denied the two years’ use of these facilities. They are no nearer the facilities now than they were two years ago, but they do know that the cost has gone up considerably from what it would have been two years ago to build those buildings.

Right in my own constituency there are several different schools which for over two years have been trying to get approval to go ahead and build or enlarge their school facilities.

With one or two small exceptions they have all been refused. They cannot go ahead and expand.

This, Mr. Speaker, is a crying shame in a province that is considered to be one of the most prosperous provinces of Canada. We have the national wealth here, we have the resources. We have better resources I believe than any other province in Canada. We have our land resources and our mineral resources. Yet we don't have a Government with imagination enough to organize these so that our boys and girls will be able to have the school facilities in which to get an education in this province. They are being driven out to other provinces to get technical training and other types of education. A lot of our students have to go elsewhere because the course isn't available, one of the Members of the Government objecting, because people come here from other places to take university courses in our province. I cannot understand the thinking of this type of mentality when we are out to try, or should be, to build a brotherhood of nations throughout the world and build better understanding and not to destroy and tear down.

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

**Mr. Dewhurst:** — Now I would like to go on to the Throne Speech documents before us. It talks about agriculture in here. It says it is going to have increased agricultural diversification. I think what it should have said is an increased agricultural liquidation, because that is what its program is doing. It is liquidation and not diversification. This is a new Saskatchewan alright. In here it says it is going to have a new policy for the sale of Crown owned land by tender instituted. What is this going to do to our farmers in this province, Mr. Speaker? When you put the land up for sale by tender, the small farmer, who is farming a half section and hoping to be able to buy an additional quarter or additional half, is not going to have the money to buy. He is going to be squeezed out. The land is going to become more and more in the hands of fewer and fewer people.

A short while ago I was reading an account of the Kern County Farm Company in the USA. This company is not only in the farming business. They are in the manufacturing business, oil wells, machinery and wholesale processing business. But the Kern County Farm Company has 3,750 sections of land. That is an area of land which is considerably larger than the average rural constituency in this province. It is an area of land that is equivalent of the width from there to Moose Jaw and a hundred miles long. It is more than the entire state of Rhode Island, that is controlled by the Kern Farm Company. This is going to be the thin edge of the wedge which makes it possible for those companies to come in here. They can buy up the Crown land, they can get possession of it. The individual small farmers around that Crown land will not be able to compete with them on the bidding price. Consequently the freeze will come on them and they will have to sell out. If it isn't for economic reasons, it may be for age. Once they go to sell out, the only ones there to buy them will be the big land company and it will be at their price.

If this Government had wanted to do something for agriculture, it would have done so by retaining and expanding the AMA which we had here four years ago. The AMA, the Agricultural

Machinery Administration, was an organization which the farmers of this province appreciated, not only the farmers of this province, but the farmers of Manitoba and Alberta who were also getting pamphlets from our AMA here, to show them what type of machinery was the best suited for their operations as well as the stress and strain that this machinery would stand. But for some unknown reason this House has never been fully acquainted with, the AMA was liquidated. We were told it was turned over to the University, and the University would operate the AMA. But from that day to date not one pamphlet has been issued, not one bit of help has been given to the farmers of this province as far as the AMA is concerned. Yet every farm organization passed resolutions asking for the re-instatement of the AMA. But as usual it falls on dead ears when we have a Government who does not have the philosophy of looking after the little people.

The Throne Speech also mentions education. Now it's going to be interesting to see what type of legislation the new Minister of Education (Mr. McIsaac) will bring down after the long battle he has had with the teachers and trustees. It was a battle of its own creation. It created the battle itself, then set out to fight it like Don Quixote fighting the windmills, and tried to make big heroes of themselves because they were righting the monster which it created.

But I would suggest to the Minister of Education, if he is going to make some changes in education, he could do some right in our history books. I feel this country of ours, in this province and the country, we should be studying more Canadian history and less of other countries. The boys and girls of this province – I know from their school books – must take the history of every state south of us. I am not objecting to them knowing something about other countries, but they must know state capitals, the main commodities and everything else of the USA. Yet when you travel across the line into the States and they see the licence plate on your car, they want to know where you are from. You come from Saskatchewan. Well what state is that in? They don't even know where the province is. That's how little history they take of our province. I feel we should have more concentration on our own history, and above all the history that we should be developing is the history of our Indian people.

This country could never have been opened up like it has been if it hadn't been for the Indian people being guides for our explorers. The Indian people brought the white man from the Atlantic across the various water courses clean to the Pacific. Yet every time we turn on TV we see in the programs there, the wild west shows that the Indian is always the bad man and the white guy is always the good man. We are trying to build a mutual understanding and goodwill between ourselves and people of all other races, creed and cultures, yet we continually persist in having history in our books, which in my opinion is not true to fact; and we depict pictures on our TV which create prejudice and hatred. I think those are some of the things which should be changed.

Now, Mr. Speaker, there are a number of other things I wish to say and I will try to get a few of them in before 5:30.

Another thing the Department of Education can do is quit playing politics. I had a young fellow from my constituency, a fellow who is highly respected in his own town and his own

February 27, 1968

community, a fellow of outstanding character and ability. He came out of University last spring with his B.A. in Sociology. This winter he was telephoned by the Department of Indian Affairs and asked if he would take a job. Now the morning of Tuesday, January 9, he received two phone calls by long distance. The first from the Saskatchewan Regional Superintendent of Vocational Training, Department of Indian Affairs, the second from the Vocational Counsellor at Fort Qu'Appelle Indian Agency, both offering him a position in the Branch as an instructor in a four-month vocational upgrading course at the Peekesis Reserve near Balcarres. He arranged to call back the next day to let them know if he would accept the job. He called them back and he accepted the job. He was told to go to Regina on Friday, January 12, where the Vocational Counsellor had arranged for him to see the Department of Education and pick up a teaching certificate and be briefed on the procedure involved in the course. When he got to the Department he was met by the official of the Technical and Vocational Branch, who briefed him on the course and gave him an application form for the necessary teaching certificate. After about twenty minutes discussing the course – it was not an interview – both of them assumed that he had the job, after being telephoned twice. He assumed that he had the job and all that was necessary was to fill out the two forms. The officials noticed that he had been employed by the NDP. He had been employed during the summer by the Youth Organization, the NDP doing some organization for the New Democratic Youth. So the official of the Department told him that it would be difficult for him to get the job because of his previous affiliation with the NDP. So he advised him not to fill the form and put that down. So he thought about it for a while, then he told him to fill out another form, and not to include the work for the NDP. While he was doing this, the supervisor or the person he met went to see his superior. When he came back, my friend was told he couldn't have the job because the Department wouldn't accept a former NDP worker as an employee – an applause over there. He protested and asked for clarification, but received none. So he left.

Now it had been arranged, when he called the Vocational Counsellor to accept the job, that after picking up the teaching certificate and the other material from the Department of Education on the Friday he would go to the reserve on Sunday, the 14th of January, to meet the people involved and would start work on Monday the 15th. In other words, the stuff at the Department of Education was more or less a formality. Both the Counsellor and Mr. Cooper expected no problem at all, and he had the job as far as they were both concerned and would start on the Monday. But evidently he didn't get the job and was told afterwards that the job had been filled a week previously. During the week that it was supposed to have been filled, he had received these two phone calls. Yet on checking up, the person who was supposed to have had the job was at home sick and someone of the supervising staff of the Indian Agency was holding down the fort during the sickness of this other person.

I wonder at this time, Mr. Speaker, if I should call it 5:30.

**Mr. Steuart:** — I wonder, Mr. Speaker, if I could ask a question? He made a charge which I don't think anybody really believes, that someone in the Department of Education turned someone down because of political reasons. Will you give us the name of that official of the Department of Education? We'd like to set him straight. If this happened – we don't believe it happened – he

might still think he's working under the CCF to turn people down for political reasons. Will you give us the name?

**Mr. Speaker:** — Order, order!

**Mr. W.S. Lloyd (Leader of the Opposition):** — Let the Minister ask the Department of Education for it; they're the ones responsible.

**An Hon. Member:** — No, they would deny it, they say it's just a bunch of lies.

**Mr. Speaker:** — Order, order! The Minister has asked a question. The Member may reply or not, as he chooses. That will be the end of the matter.

**Mr. Dewhurst:** — Mr. Speaker, I do not have access to the Department files. I know the report that was given to me and I know what happened. They can search their files. And I think their files should be put on investigation and they will show the same type of results as the Frazier Committee Report showed on behalf of mental patients. Put on an investigation, you'll find out who they are.

**An Hon. Member:** — We don't believe you.

**Mr. Speaker:** — Order, order!

**Hon. A.C. Cameron:** — The Member has made a pretty serious accusation. He made an accusation against a civil servant in the employ of the Government, in the employ of the Department of Education. He said that this civil servant informed an applicant that there was little need of his putting in his application because of the fact he had worked for the NDP, it wouldn't be accepted. Now this has cast a serious reflection on the Civil Service of this Province. I think that the Member owes it to the Civil Service of this Province to divulge the name of the official that was given to him, and give the Minister in charge an opportunity to take it up with this official. If he hasn't got the facts and the figures, and he's not prepared to substantiate these charges in the House, then I say he must withdraw these charges, Mr. Speaker, unless he is prepared to substantiate them.

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

**Mr. Dewhurst:** — Mr. Speaker, I asked if you would call it 5:30.

**Mr. Speaker:** — This is a question of charge and counter-charge that always takes place in debate. It is not the responsibility of the Speaker to adjudicate the authenticity of charges and counter-charges made in a debate. This is for the Members of the House in the first instance and for the people of our Province in the final instance to decide. If the Member thinks that there is a question of privilege, then it is open to him or to any other Member to move a formal motion on the question of privilege.

In regard to charges concerning alleged illegal acts, the proper way to make charges of that nature is to move a formal censure motion, so that the subject can be debated in the proper way by all those Members of the House who wish to take part in the debate and then in due and proper course be decided by a vote of the House one way or the other. If a Member thinks that there is an infraction of privilege in the House, then he will have to raise this as a matter of privilege on a formal privilege motion.

If was agreed earlier that we would defer questions and revert to them later this day and I would, therefore, ask leave of the House to deal with this item of business now, particularly as this will help to facilitate the prompt printing of tomorrow's Votes and Proceedings.

**Mr. Dewhurst:** — I am also pleased to see in the Throne Speech a line saying that legislation would be brought in to give the Indian people representation on the school boards, the schools of which their children attend. I think this is a step in the right direction. I believe our Indian people have a great contribution to make with a lot of ideas towards the betterment of education for their children. So I think that this is a step in the right direction, and I shall be pleased to see what the Minister has to say along this line when it comes into the House.

I think that a lot of other things should be done to assist the Indian people. One of them is better construction of their homes. I have here, Mr. Speaker, a small piece of board that came out of one of the homes, Indian homes, from my constituency. Their homes are built with two-foot studdings, lined on the inside with this particle board. It is a very thin board, I don't know what material it is made of, but I could describe what it looks like in farmer's language, but you, Mr. Speaker, might object. But it does look like chewed-up hay, to say the least. It is very porous and there's no strength to it. The children, when playing in the home, bump this board and a hole is broken into it immediately. The top of their cupboards around the sink and so on, is covered with this material. When water spills on it, it is very absorbent like a blotter, and consequently it doesn't stand up. I believe that the ordinary plywood, or the aspenite chip board, would be much superior and I would ask the Government to use their influence in building the Indian homes, to see that this very cheap-grade material is not used. I would like to table this piece of material in order that the other Members could have a look and see what is put into the Indians' homes. When that type of material is used in the homes, and the homes don't stand up, sometimes I think that we make a big mistake by condemning those people in saying that they don't know how to look after a home, because the material is just not in the home to be looked after.

Mr. Speaker, I have one or two other items left that I would like to mention before taking my seat. I would like to mention that on or about the 12th of May last year, I had been into the city here, and 12 miles north of Southey I picked up a man on the road, thumbing a ride. He said that he was headed for Carrot River or Arborfield. After getting into the care and talking to me, he was worried about some cheque he had to make good, and he said that he had to get up to Tisdale and make it good. While in conversation with him, he said that this

cheque had been from the Government Insurance Office, but the police wouldn't let him have it. He said that the police were persecuting him and that the police were threatening to cut him up in bits and leave him on the side of the road for truckers to laugh at. He also said that the police were trying to get the Salvation Army to take him across the line and have him done away with. It was plain to see that he was a patient that had come out of Battleford and was very much perturbed. He was the type of a patient that I don't think was too harmful as long as one didn't get him riled, but it was the sort of thing that could have easily happened, if he went into a home and asked for a drink of water and somebody threatened to call the police. The name of the police was the think that really riled him up. I think that this is another case of a lack of follow-up on behalf of our mental patients. I am glad to see the Frazier Report in this House. I hope that the Government will take action on that Report and see that these types of people aren't left wandering, running like hunted animals, and afraid of everyone that comes along, for fear that it might be the police. I felt sorry for that poor fellow and yet there was nothing that I could do for him. He rode as far as Dafoe with me, then was going to thumb a ride on to Tisdale. I haven't heard of the man since. I don't imagine that he got into any serious trouble or otherwise we would have read about it in the papers. But things like that do perturb one, when one sees that type of person turned loose on the mercies of society and not able to cope with it for themselves.

**Mr. Grant:** — Mr. Speaker, I am just curious as to why the Hon. Member didn't bring this to my attention at the time. He said there was nothing he could do about it, but I am sure that if it had been brought to my attention, I would have done something.

**Mr. Dewhurst:** — He was a patient that had been discharged, the same as many other patients, Mr. Speaker, he asks why I didn't bring it to his attention. Over the past two sessions of this House, cases were brought to the attention, not by myself, but by other Members, and they received a lot of personal abuse over it.

**Mr. Grant:** — That is not correct. I can cite many cases of Members of the Opposition, and one of them is present here this evening, who brought cases to my attention and I investigated them personally, every one of them. I resent that observation made by the Hon. Member.

**Mr. Dewhurst:** — Mr. Speaker, it is plain to see that the Hon. Minister is touchy on these questions which he knows have been a source of public concern for the past two and a half years or so. I hope that steps will be taken in the future to see that follow-up care is given to these people and not leave them wandering around. Now, before I take my seat, I would like to present the Minister of Public Works (Mr. Guy) with a key to a door that exists no more. I am not going to save it. I am going to give it to you, Mr. Minister. When this session started we had a room assigned to us and I was given the key to Room 273. I locked the door one night and went home, came back the next morning and found that there was no door there. The door had been taken away and had been filled with cinder blocks.

**February 27, 1968**

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

**Mr. Dewhurst:** — Absolutely no door existed. I didn't have as good shoes as our Premier has, or I could have kicked the door down. But I didn't have that type of shoe on, Mr. Speaker.

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

**Mr. Dewhurst:** — Evidently, the Minister of Public Works was going to make sure it wasn't kicked down because he filled it full of cinder blocks and that door exists no more. So I would the page girl to take this key and give it back to the Minister, because it is no longer of any use to me.

**Mr. D.G. MacLennan (Last Mountain):** — You were lucky you weren't in it.

**Mr. Dewhurst:** — So, Mr. Speaker, you see the amount of change and alternations in this building even after the session starts and Members are assigned a room, and then find their door locked up. I am sure that the Member would have liked to see me locked up in it. I am sure of that, Mr. Speaker. But it is plain to see that there is no regard for the accommodations of Members of this group here, or they would have delayed blocking that door off or else have had an official tell us ahead of time when it was going to be closed off, rather than have the door torn down in the middle of the night and blocks put in there, when we have our materials in those rooms.

So for those reasons, Mr. Speaker, you can see that I am not going to support the motion, but will support the amendment.

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

**Mr. Speaker:** — Order, order! I wonder if possibly we could get the questions over with at the present time, because of the printing of the Votes and Proceedings for tomorrow. Will the House agree to this?

**Hon. A.R. Guy (Minister of Public Works):** — Mr. Speaker, I really hadn't planned to take part in this debate. But since I got the key to the Chamber, I might as well make some use of it. I would like to thank the Member for Wadena (Mr. Dewhurst), and I'll have comments in regard to his speech a little later on this evening.

First of all, Mr. Speaker, I would like to take this opportunity to congratulate you on your re-election to the post of Speaker. The impartiality and the color that you brought to this position during your first term of office brought honor to our province. I am sure that this will be continued during the present session.

Like the Member for Prince Albert East-Cumberland (Mr. Berezowsky), I am going to try and follow your direction a little better than I have in the past. I hope, though, that I will be able to do it for a longer period of time than the Member for



Prince Albert East-Cumberland was able to last night. I also promise, Mr. Speaker, that I am going to try, at least, not to call my friends opposite, Reds or Communists, or anything like that during this speech. But if I should fail, I hope that you will call me to order very quickly.

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

**Mr. Guy:** — Next I would like to congratulate our Premier for the outstanding job that he did for the Liberal party in the last election, as well as for his own resounding victory in the constituency of Morse.

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

**Mr. Guy:** — By scooping the scoop he proved once again that honesty and integrity are the best policy. I would also congratulate all MLAs on their election or re-election, as the case might be. I hope that they will find their stay in this House challenging and rewarding. I am sorry that the voters did not see fit to return some ladies to our Legislature, as they have a tendency, as you have noticed in the past, to keep our debates on a very high level. I am sure the Member from Swift Current (Mr. Wood) – I am sorry that he is not in his seat – will concur with me that our present seatmates are not as charming and delightful as the ones we had last session. I'm sorry for the Member for Melfort-Tisdale (Mr. Willis) but when it comes right down to it, he really isn't quite as charming as the seatmate the Member from Swift Current had last year.

**Mr. Willis:** — You are not going to do that again.

**Mr. Guy:** — I notice again tonight, as last night, the MLA for Regina South East (Mr. Baker) is not in his seat. I hope that he will arrive later on, as I have a few comments that I would like to make in regard to my Member. But I believe that he agrees also that it is desirable to have Members in the Legislature and also on city council. I would also like to welcome the Member for Pelly (Mr. Barrie) and the Member for Touchwood (Mr. Meakes) back to this House. I am sure that you will join with me in wishing my seatmate a very speedy recovery from his illness.

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

**Mr. Guy:** — I regret that the Member for Touchwood did not spend at least part of the time, that he was not in this House, a little more fruitfully. The least he could have done was to take the time to write a new speech instead of giving the same one that he gave when he was here in 1964.

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

**Mr. Guy:** — I would be greatly remiss if I did not take a few moments to thank my constituents in Athabasca for the overwhelming victory which they provided for me. In spite of the dire predictions that I would be defeated by a large majority, it was an honor to have my majority increased from 170 to 643. It was more gratifying to see the NDP candidate lose his deposit and finish a poor

third.

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

**Mr. Guy:** — In 1964 he lost by 370 votes; this time he lost by nearly 800. The free enterprise supporters in my constituency cast 2,150 votes compared to 602 for the Socialists, which shows the absolute opposition to Socialism in northern Saskatchewan. This is not surprising when one considers the way the north was treated under the Socialist Government. They have shown by the election results that they appreciate the development that has taken place and the assistance they have received from the Liberal Government. New roads and airstrips have been built where the Socialists refused to build them. New schools replace the old barns that existed under the CCF. New mines are fact and not fiction as they were under the former Government. Emphasis has been placed on providing job opportunities and training programs for our Indian and Metis people, that they may assume their rightful place in our society. At my meetings, speaker after speaker got up and said, “The Liberal Government was the first Government to keep its election promises to the Indian people.”

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

**Mr. Guy:** — Although my workers and supporters did an outstanding job during the election campaign, for which I am most grateful, I must admit I received considerable assistance from the Socialists, particularly the Member from Cumberland and the Member from Shellbrook (Mr. Bowerman). Both visited my constituency during the campaign and did a great deal to assist me. Although no one knew of the nominating convention for the NDP until after it was all over, it was reported in the Prince Albert Herald that Mr. Berezowsky had been the guest speaker. He used the same time-worn phrases as he had been using for 20 years, trying to tell the people of La Ronge that no development had taken place since 1964. One specific reference was made to the building of Highway No. 2, where he charged that it was at a virtual standstill. He was trying to press these charges at the same time that the people of La Ronge had just seen the re-building and paving of 20 miles north of Prince Albert and were also beginning to travel over the cut-off to Waskesiu that the CCF had promised for three elections but had never been carried out. From that, the local people took it that, if this statement of Mr. Berezowsky's was false, then probably most of his other ones were also. I want to tell you, Mr. Speaker, that they have never forgiven and never will, his statement about Anglo-Rouyn being a peanut mine.

The Member for Shellbrook (Mr. Bowerman) did me a great service, for which I wish to thank you most sincerely, through his fishing operation on Reindeer Lake, where he has tried to destroy the co-op movement, the very movement that he was instrumental in setting up when he was working for the Socialist Government. Needless to say, they rallied around the Liberal candidate who protected their interest in this regard. Throughout the campaign they promised all the things they didn't do for 20 years and then expected the people to believe them. They criticized so severely all the good things the Liberals had done that it became easy to convince them that if the NDPs ever formed a Government again, all these things would be destroyed. As was

true in most constituencies throughout the province, the NDP carried out a personal smear campaign which has become an integral part of their election strategy. With no program, I guess they really haven't anything else to depend on. As usual, during the campaign, a great deal of misleading material was published, but the biggest joke of all was the slogan of the candidate which ended each pamphlet with, "Vote for the man who lives in your constituency." People would read this and then ask, if this is true, why does he have an Alberta licence plate on his automobile.

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

**Mr. Guy:** — After my appointment to the Cabinet, it became necessary to move to Regina and I had to determine which constituency I would make my home in. Since I would be representing the Government, I decided it would be wise to have somebody on the Opposition's side of the House. It was not too difficult a choice to decide which constituency to move into. I ruled out Regina North West due to some of the unfavourable comments about me that have appeared in the Elizabeth column of the Commonwealth. I ruled out Regina North East due to the weakness of the Member (Mr. Smishek), which he proved again today, so this left Regina Centre and Regina South East. If I had known that, when I was speaking tonight, neither one of them would be in the House to listen to me, I think that maybe I would have settled for Regina North East. However, I selected Regina South East, represented by our Mayor and MLA (Mr. Baker), because I had been told confidentially that he would be the next leader of the NDP. It seemed to be borne out, for shortly after the election, when the MLA for Biggar (Mr. Lloyd) announced that after two successive defeats at the hands of the Liberals, he thought that the leadership should be assessed. And a lot of other people thought so too. This didn't come about due to the Member for Regina Centre (Mr. Blakeney) threatening to leave the Provincial party and go Federal if his colleague from Regina South East became the leader.

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

**Mr. Guy:** — And I knew that I had made the correct choice when I read in the Leader Post, January 29, 1968, "Bake Biggest Spender in Provincial Election." You know I always like big spenders, especially during the last four years, after being here in the Government where you have had a Premier and a Provincial Treasurer who kept close watch over the spending of public funds and saw that everyone got full value for their money. It was rather refreshing to have a Member who is a big spender, particularly when other people's money was involved. I only hope that his election spending wasn't the cause of the increased transit fares and parking meter hikes that his municipal government brought in recently. I was somewhat disillusioned with my Member when I read of his activities in regard to the operation of Pioneer Lodge. I hope when he becomes the leader of the NDP, and if he should become Premier, that he won't be tampering with tenders and threatening his colleagues and officials with dismissal the way he did the members of Pioneer Village Limited. In view of these activities, I am not surprised that it was curtains for him, if he doesn't mind me using that expression. I am glad that his council finally realized that a man can only do so much and relieved him of his membership on the Wascana Centre Authority, Regina General Hospital Board and the

Regina Pioneer Village Limited, so he will at least have some time to work on behalf of his constituents. I think the fact that he isn't here tonight – he wasn't here last night, he was only here part of the time this afternoon – proves a point that you can't carry two jobs and do a good job of it. I cannot agree with the principle of being a mayor of a city this size, and trying to serve as one of its MLAs at the same time. In an attempt to serve two masters, it is unfortunate that my Members serves neither one well.

Under our system of government there is almost continuous conflict between municipal and provincial governments, over the financing, the distribution of provincial and municipal authority as well as in many other areas. A person who is Mayor and MLA cannot possibly serve both bodies without abdicating his responsibility to one or the other of them. I hate to suggest this, but at the present time it appears that decisions are made on the basis of what is the most profitable politically and support wavers to one or the other government body, depending upon whether a municipal or provincial election is in the offing. During this session it will be noticeable, I am sure, that he will be supporting the city, seeing there will be a mayoralty election this fall. However, in spite of these weaknesses and after weighing all the aspects, I am pleased to have the Member for Regina South East as my Member. He is a friendly fellow. He has been clocked at shaking 92 hands a minute and he has the ability to kiss one and a half babies a second and he is always willing to attend every dog fight in the city, whether he is invited or not.

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

**Mr. Guy:** — Now, Mr. Speaker, I would like to refer for just a few minutes to the NDP Convention that was held last fall. As usual confusion reigned supreme for the whole of the convention. The confusion this year resulted mainly from the fact that they didn't know what their name was. The main resolution at the convention dealt with the proposal to change the name from CCF to NDP. There was considerable disagreement. As mentioned by the Premier, Mr. I.C. Nollet, former Minister and MLA for the CCF, led the support for keeping the name by which the party had been known since its inception. He claimed that it was only a few frustrated people who seemed to think that it would bring about some kind of magic. Perhaps the best speech of all was made by the Member for The Battlefords (Mr. Kramer) who got himself and everyone else confused. He said he would not run as an NDP candidate, as he had never liked the word NDP. But he said also that he would be in favor of dropping the name CCF, provincially. He is not in favor of NDP, he is in favor of dropping CCF, so what I would like to know is what label he is going to run under in the next election. Perhaps he has decided to call it quits. When the final vote was taken, only 50 delegates of the total supported the name CCF. The rest sold out their souls to those who wanted to be known as the NDP. Members opposite must be proud of themselves sitting there as NDP Members after burying the last remnants of the CCF at their convention. The founders of the CCF movement, I want to remind you, Mr. Speaker, must be turning over in their graves to see their farm-oriented party sold out to the labor unions and intellectuals. It was only a matter of weeks after the farmers repudiated them, before the union members exerted enough influence to completely exterminate the term CCF and all they stood for. It was significant that the present Leader, the Leader of

the Opposition (Mr. Lloyd), who was elected as a CCF in 1964, was one of the first to repudiate the name CCF at their convention, in a feeble effort to maintain control of the party, that was becoming restless under his leadership, and in favor of the unions that had paid his expenses during the last election campaign. If Members opposite had been honest enough to tell the party faithful, before the election, that they were eliminating the CCF label, there would be many that wouldn't be sitting across from us today. It was the worst kind of deceit to use the term CCF throughout the campaign and then, within days, utterly repudiate it. I think it was the Member from Kelsey (Mr. Messer) who asked, how come there's 12 farm members if the Opposition is dominated by labor? The truth is there wouldn't be 12 farm members if they had the courage to tell the truth before the election.

**Mr. R.H. Wooff (Turtleford):** — I'll tell you after a while.

**Mr. Guy:** — One only needs to look at the executive of the NDP which has only four of 16 of their executive that are connected in any way to farming, to see that their concern for the farmer is a thing of the past. Their resolutions were all in support of labor. There were one calling for the end of strikes that were hurting the farmers. They no longer care whether they have farm support or not, they are prepared to win or lose as a labor-oriented party. I feel sorry for the farm Members opposite, who must try to convince the rural supporters that the NDP has the same objectives and aims of the old CCF. Labor members, with their unreasonable, narrow approach to problems of the day, will destroy the party in a few years, while the true progressives will return to the Liberal ranks.

The NDP also had a great time determining what their program really was. In the election, as we know, they had no program. A candidate in one constituency would support one thing, while candidates in the neighboring constituencies would say just the opposite, depending on their own political expediency. The question of homeowner grants was a typical example. Some NDP candidates said that it was the worst thing that had ever happened to the province. Others, who wanted to get re-elected, said they would certainly keep them going if they were re-elected. But again my Member came through and said not only was it a great thing but he would extend it to renters as well should he be a Member of an NDP government. At the convention the fight was continued. A resolution from the Wilkie constituency asked for the legislation to prohibit the use of purple gas. However, it was defeated also, as they knew they would not dare oppose such a popular measure; and if that was the program they carried on in their constituency, it is no wonder that my friend and colleague is sitting here today as Minister of Education (Mr. McIsaac) with one of the largest majorities in the province.

Confusion is a typical characteristic of the NDP and I see their Federal and Provincial leaders are still at opposite poles. Following the dilemma in Ottawa last week, on the same page in the Leader Post, February 21st: "T.C. called for Liberals to resign." "Wrong method said Lloyd." I don't suppose that his own personal plans had anything to do with influencing his decision in this regard. I gather that his bargain with his caucus was that he would resign when convenient and go federally if they wouldn't dump him at last fall's convention, as they wanted to do, and we are glad that they didn't, I might add that.

Now I was pleased to hear that the New Democratic party is in the black financially. But I was sorry to see that their party newspaper, The Commonwealth, had a deficit last year. The truth is, Mr. Speaker, The Commonwealth has been losing money ever since we became the Government, as they were no longer able to channel public money to sustain it. Members that were here last year will recall – and this is mainly for the enlightenment of those Members who have come into the House since the last election – that before the session ended last year the facts came to light whereby the former CCF Government, under Tommy Douglas, their present leader and other shareholders opposite, channelled \$465,000 of the taxpayers' money into their own printing company for the use of their political party. Since that time the printing company has not fared so well and again this year my friends opposite, the MLAs from Redberry, from Wadena, from Biggar, from Melfort-Tisdale (Messrs. Michayluk, Dewhurst, Lloyd Willis), did not receive a dividend on their investment in the printing company. It would also appear that the party faithful have become disgusted with their CCF Commonwealth because a resolution from Regina South CCF Association, says that the paper is overly partisan, and tends to alienate those persons not strongly committed to the party. A resolution suggested that an attempt be made to be more objective, less partisan in their approach to Saskatchewan political news. Now, Mr. Speaker, I have recommended this on several occasions over the past few years, but to date there seems to be no improvement. For this reason I would advise new Members opposite that their newspaper is not a good investment at the present time, if they are considering the purchase of a few shares.

Now, Mr. Speaker, it is unbelievable that speakers opposite could be as weak as they appear to be. After speaking for two hours the Leader of the Opposition (Mr. Lloyd) said nothing new or worthy of comment. However, there were a few comments made by the Members opposite that I would like to refer to at this time. The Member from Regina North East (Mr. Smishek) today gave his usual pro-labor speech, weeping crocodile tears for the working people of this province. I have said before, Mr. Speaker, and I say again that the workers of this province are being short-changed by their labor bosses and will continue to be until they change their attitude. Leaders forget that unions are made up of people of all political beliefs and by trying to affiliate local unions they do their workers a great disservice. One example will prove my point. In Prince Albert the International Wood Workers of America, Local No. 184, had an annual meeting and the President called on the members to join with the CCF-NDP. (Star Phoenix of August 23rd, 1967): "We must join with the CCF-NDP their leader said." Mr. Speaker, if these leaders and SFL members would spend more time trying to promote better relations with the Government instead of recruiting members to the NDP party, they would be serving the members of their organization at a much higher level.

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

**Mr. Guy:** — Last night, the Member for Prince Albert East-Cumberland (Mr. Berezowsky) as he's done in the past, had a fine few words to say about the educational system in Russia. He said Russia has a better system of education. They provide free education. This is true, Mr. Speaker, maybe they do provide free education but it is at the expense of freedom of speech. I just happened to read in the paper last night that a Canadian student was accused by *Isvestia*, the Soviet Government newspaper, of spreading

anti-Soviet ideas at Moscow State University and demanded his expulsion. He got free fees but he was also told to keep his mouth shut. At least here in Canada we let the pro-Communist students and staff of any university spread their anti-Canadian ideas and anti-American ideas with no fear of reprisal. This is the difference between the philosophy of the party opposite that they continually refer to and the philosophy of the majority of the Canadian people.

Now last night, as I listened to the Member for Cumberland (Mr. Berezowsky), it seemed to me that his words had a rather familiar ring. You will recall that he referred to our Government as robber barons living in the days of the feudal system. The term 'feudal system' reminded me of where I had heard that expression before. It was a letter that appeared in the Prince Albert Herald, November 29th, 1967. I would like to quote a little from that letter. It said: "MLAs' attitude are based on the old feudal system."

How do you keep a positive attitude toward a character like Bill Berezowsky (NDP, MLA for Prince Albert East-Cumberland)? How do you search for good in a person with such a negative destructive personality?

Then it goes on a lot stronger than that and I am not going to put that on the records of this House because I don't altogether agree with that. He's not that bad a fellow when it comes right down to it.

**Mr. W.J. Berezowsky (Prince Albert East-Cumberland):** — You probably wrote the letter.

**Mr. Guy:** — But it says — this is the point that I think really bears listening to and this part of it isn't a personal attack against anybody —

The policies of the NDP have many, many good constructive policies for our province and for our country. But Mr. Berezowsky stands for the very opposite. His statement, his attitude, his outlook on Saskatchewan are the very opposite of constructive criticism.

His views are based on the old feudal system that the English-speaking world gave up about three centuries ago.

This type believes in dictatorial Socialism; his type destroyed the God-created competitive system which man will always return to; his type would like us to return to the state of farm animals, only with the state being the controlling agent; his type is the type who continually turn back the hands of time; his type destroy the positive, upward advance of mankind.

Now this isn't particularly a condemnation of one particular individual although it is written that way. What it is, is a condemnation of a party they subscribe to. The worst of it was that it came from one of his constituents. After the election this was the reply written into the annals of the Prince Albert Herald, November 29, 1967. What is more important, these are the views not only of the Member from Prince Albert East-Cumberland but of those who sit opposite in this House.

**February 27, 1968**

They have espoused them ever since they took their position in this House either on this side or over there.

Now the Member from Cumberland (Mr. Berezowsky) also shows some concern in the possible loss of teachers in our province. I share that concern with him. He suggested that we withdraw the legislation which he knows nothing about and in its place he says we should negotiate with teachers on a provincial basis. Now I had three calls today from teachers asking what is the position of the NDP Opposition. Do they favor a provincial salary scale, or don't they? Was the Member from Prince Albert East-Cumberland speaking on behalf of himself or was he speaking on behalf of the party that sits opposite? Before the vote at 9:30 tonight, Mr. Speaker, I think it is absolutely essential that Members opposite stand on their feet and say if they are in favor of a provincial scale as suggested by the Member from Prince Albert East-Cumberland or whether they aren't. That will tell whether they are pussy cats or what they are.

Now the MLA for Touchwood (Mr. Meakes) showed great concern last night for our people of Indian ancestry. He took great exception to statements of the Premier regarding these people, but before he concluded his remarks he made perhaps the most degrading statement that has ever been heard in this House. He said: "The population explosion is caused by white men sneaking on the reserves at night." The aspersions and reflections he has passed on the men and women of Indian ancestry is not becoming to this House. His insinuations show his low regard for the Indian girls and women in his constituency, and I am sure that his words will be recalled many times during the next election campaign.

As I said earlier, Mr. Speaker, it is unfortunate that Members opposite have been so weak in their replies to the Throne Speech, but it was with interest and pleasure that we heard two of the new Members speaker last Friday, the MLA for Cutknife (Mr. Kwasnica) and the MLA for Saskatoon Riversdale (Mr. Romanow). I wish to congratulate both of them on their maiden speeches. It is unfortunate that they are relegated to the back benches instead of replacing the deadwood so apparent in the front row. However, I am sure that time will come when these fellows will be replaced.

The Member from Cutknife (Mr. Kwasnica) particularly is refreshing after listening to the former member from Cutknife give his speeches over and over again. I would hope that he will have a new speech each year. You all know, those who have been in the House for any length of time, the former member for Cutknife had two speeches, one on wheat, one on nuclear disarmament. A couple of years ago he got mixed up and gave his nuclear disarmament speech on an agricultural Resolution, but even at that it wasn't that bad because it wasn't too different from his agricultural speech.

I enjoyed the Member from Saskatoon Riversdale's speech (Mr. Romanow) concerning his generation, as he calls it. I am sorry that the press and news media misinterpreted it. I'm sure if they go back and analyse it more carefully they will realize it was not as much an attack on the Liberal Government as it was a condemnation of his own party, particularly the doctrinaire Socialists sitting in the front benches. This same condemnation and unrest among the new generation of Socialists were apparent at the NDP National Convention, when at the last moment a ground swell developed to swamp the candidate for National President



from the old establishment. The Member of the old guard, J.H. Brockelbank, who provided tremendous service for his party had no chance against the young radical intellectual of the new revolution that ran against him. The same reaction was apparent at the Provincial NDP Convention last fall. It was the new generation that wanted the new name. I suppose they thought it might cover over some of the difficulties and failures of the old name. But I was anticipating, Mr. Speaker, after his opening line referring to a new generation and what they expected, that we were going to be presented with some brand new philosophies in tune with his generation, as he likes to call it. But I was most disappointed to find that he kept asking: what is the Government going to do for the old, what is the Government going to do for the sick, what is the Government going to do for the young, what is the Government going to do for the well? It was the same old Socialist dogma of protecting the individual from the cradle to the grave, only now he's expressing it in a hippie beat.

**An Hon. Member:** — Go, go!

**Mr. Guy:** — I would like to remind the MLA from Riversdale (Mr. Romanow) that the problems of today's generation didn't begin with the Liberal victory in 1964, they developed steadily since the end of the Second World War. They appear significant today because his Government for 20 years did nothing to alleviate them. The Socialists are not only out of touch with today's generation, but were out of touch with yesterday's. The question today is, as it was 50 and even 100 years ago, not what the Government will do for today's generation, but what today's generation are prepared to do for themselves. Socialism, which strips the individual of initiative and self determination, and subjects them to the will of the state, is not the answer to the problems of today's or any day's generation. As the Premier (Mr. Thatcher) has stated, Socialism has been found wanting in every area of the world where it has been tried, and only survives in those countries where free elections have been done away with. Just imagine what progress we would have had to show the world during our Centennial Year if our parents and grandparents had subscribed to the Socialist philosophy. It was the independence and initiative of our pioneers that made our country great during our first hundred years, and it will be the same characteristics working in a free enterprise society that will make significant contributions to our second century.

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

**Mr. Guy:** — There is no better proof of this than the election in October when Saskatchewan youth supported the free enterprise parties and repudiated the NDP. I contend, Mr. Speaker, that the majority of our youth today have the same initiative, the same determination, the same willingness to work hard and the same desire to control their own destiny that they ever did. They want a minimum of Government interference while doing it. At the same time they are not prepared to subsidize a bunch of drones and parasites that result from the Socialist philosophy of share and share alike, regardless of whether they contribute anything to the productivity of our society or whether they don't.

It is true that there is a very small minority of today's generation that do not subscribe to our philosophy, and thank heavens they support the NDP and other radical and extreme

organizations. Most are found on university campuses and in hippie jungles where they demand the freedom to think, as they call it, to smoke pot, take LSD trips and indulge in their own physical and emotional desires. They want freedom, but will they accept responsibility? They have no courage to face reality. They are to be pitied rather than condemned, but these are the people who will be moved by the Member's speech the other day. I am glad that our Government is out of touch with that philosophy, but they are in touch with the majority of our youth who are still the respecters of law, order and authority, and who will accept the responsibility of providing a good life for themselves and their families under a Government that provides the opportunity and the freedom to accomplish it.

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

**Mr. Guy:** — Like most Socialists, the Member for Saskatoon Riversdale (Mr. Romanow) was long on theory but short on action. He made several references to government's investment in man but he forgot to mention this must be balanced by man's investment in his own future. He condemned us for four years of failure to provide necessary programs for today's age. If this is true then he must condemn his own colleagues five-fold. He referred to a Throne Speech that made no reference to other ethnic groups. If he had been around with the older generation he would have listened to 20 Throne Speeches that made no mention of any ethnic groups. At least for four years the Liberal Government has shown concern for our first Canadians, and this year we are acting on behalf of our second founding race. This amounts to two more ethnic groups than were helped by his Government. He desires free tuition fees and economic means to give full social and economic independence to our students. Great suggestion! But again he didn't mention where their responsibility will be to help themselves.

He suggests our economic development philosophy is so old that it is only discussed in history classes, ancient history classes. By this I presume he rejects the philosophy of fiscal responsibility, for the NDP philosophy of economic development, which saw his Government set up a shoe factory, a woollen mill, an airline, a box factory, to name only a few, and then saw them close their doors after losing millions of the taxpayers' dollars. He claims the resources of the Province should be marshalled to benefit all people through a co-ordinated Government leadership plan. Mr. Speaker, we had one of these plans before in this province, under the leadership of T.C. Douglas, Clarence Fines, J.H. Brockelbank and W.S. Lloyd, that gave oil and mineral rights to their friends for less than one cent an acre. We don't need anymore of that kind of economic development. So I would suggest that, before the new generation yonder become too caught up in the philosophy of the 20th century Socialism, that they look back over the 20 years from 1944 to 1964. The Members says he can't remember them, but I think it's a case of he doesn't want to remember them and I don't blame him. He should acquaint himself with the failures of the former Government. Mr. Speaker, Saskatchewan can't afford another Socialist revolution even if it is done to a modern beat.

Now, Mr. Speaker, I would like to refer to some of the renovations that are taking place in this building which have been criticized severely by Members opposite. As usual their statements show complete ignorance and distortion of the facts. As the Indian people say about the Socialists, "They speak with a

forked tongue.” This was clearly evident the other day when one moment the Leader of the Opposition (Mr. Lloyd) was criticizing us for the waste of public funds in remodelling the Legislature, and in the next breath he was paying tribute to us for the fine job we have done in remodelling the public galleries on the basement and the first floor. I wish he would make up his mind whether he wants a building we can be proud of or a building that is a disgrace to our fair province.

When the Liberals became the Government in 1964, our buildings were a disgrace. When visiting delegations came to visit us from other provinces or other countries we were ashamed to show them through the building. In the Executive Council Chamber the rugs were threadbare and the wall tapestries were hanging in shreds. The original plaster in the corridors, applied some 55 years ago, had separated from the block wall leaving unsightly bulges. The tile of the backing wall had deteriorated so badly that entire wall sections were structurally unsound and presented a significant hazard. The electrical distribution system was severely overloaded, presenting a significant fire hazard and the fire protection system was practically non-existent. The old fire doors were not equipped with the proper closers and are being replaced. The fact that they were moved a couple of times was due to the fact that in the summer we moved them to the wings to provide better security during the tourist season. Then when one went down to the basement, one found a dungeon of cracked floors, dirty exposed mechanical piping, much of which was no longer operational, insufficient lighting and semi-finished space. A serious threat to the structural soundness of the entire building was created by a collection of water and sewage around the footings which took us a period of two months to pump dry. It is bad enough to think this area was used for storing old files and records, but to think the NDP had their civil servants working in these cellar-like conditions is hard to accept. For 20 years the Socialists ignored the deterioration of the building and had no concern for the people forced to work under the conditions that I have mentioned. The Members opposite who were Ministers of Public Works should hang their heads in shame. I notice that one of the former Ministers is doing a lot of writing. I hope he will come up with something more constructive than he did when he was trying to work on the buildings of the Legislature. Until 1964 not one project was carried out within the building except where it was a complete necessity. Other Governments in Canada have remodelled their buildings continuously but not the Socialists here in Saskatchewan.

In 1965 we started a program of renovation aimed to renovate this building from top to bottom, and I am pleased to report that it is progressing favorably. A building we can be proud of will result, as well as providing additional first class office space which we badly need. It is not true that we are spending money on this program that should be spent elsewhere. When we started we intended to complete it in three years, but because of the need to expand expenditures for education, health and other top priority programs, we have now extended the program over an additional four years. At our present rate we expect to complete our renovations by 1972.

Special criticism has been made of our new floors and our furnishings. The original terrazzo floors in the corridors were placed in 1912 and showed severe cracking and crumbling wherever deflections in the structural subfloor occurred. It

is true we have replaced it with marble, which, as well as being much more beautiful and durable, allows the subfloor to deflect without causing ugly cracks. It is also true, Mr. Speaker, that the marble used was not expensive, as we were fortunate to obtain it from the original quarry when a major changeover in quarry operations was taking place. Our order enabled the quarry to use a labor force otherwise idle and resulted in us getting the marble at \$4.50 per square foot compared to the average of \$12 which is the normal price.

In regard to the teak tables, the Leader of the Opposition (Mr. Lloyd) shows that he knows as little about wood as he does about anything else. It isn't teak, it is pecan and it is cheaper than either walnut or mahogany. He also criticizes the new committee room, as does the Member for Wadena (Mr. Dewhurst), but I notice he didn't call it a waste of money to provide additional space for the NDP Members during the session, even though they have fewer Members this year than they had before.

So, Mr. Speaker, we are proud of the new look which is materializing in our Legislative Building. This is important when one realizes that tourists and visitors to our Legislative Building doubled last year. In fact since we became the Government there has been a phenomenal increase in people who visit our buildings for business or for pleasure. A bright, clean, well-kept modern appearance, that our visitors and citizens of our province can view with pride, reflects the progressive forward-looking approach of the Liberal Government.

Mr. Speaker, I would like to make a few comments about our Centennial Year. Our Centennial Year just drawn to a close, I think you will all agree, was a good one for Saskatchewan. I wish first of all to pay tribute to my former colleague, the Hon. J.W. Gardiner, for the tremendous job he did as Minister-in-Charge of the Saskatchewan Centennial Corporation.

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

**Mr. Guy:** — At the same time I wish to thank our Board of Directors, our Executive Director, Mr. W. Klein, and the members of his staff for a job well done in promoting Saskatchewan interests during the Centennial Year. I would also congratulate all the communities and individuals that participated through Centennial projects, Centennial celebrations and so on, on the contributions they made to our birthday party. Not including the three cities of Regina, Saskatoon and Moose Jaw, there were some 550 Centennial projects in our province. Total funds from per capita grants available were \$2,332,500, of which 60 per cent was provided by the Provincial and 40 per cent by the Federal Governments. When this is added to other Provincial grants and local funds, the total estimated expenditure is some \$14 million.

The program has been responsible for a large and wide-spread amount of enthusiastic activity by the people of the province in their own respective communities. In fact the most important happening of Centennial Year was the total involvement of people in the activities of 1967. Constantly the nation was reminded of this involvement through events like Expo, Pan-Am Games, Confederation Train and Caravan, the Voyageur Canoe Pageant, Festival Canada, Gala Nights, and Special Centennial

days, projects and dedications. Almost every Canadian became involved either as a spectator or participant and because they participated it was a success. One of the best summations of our Centennial Year, I believe, Mr. Speaker, is a quote from a recent Royal Bank of Canada newsletter:

Another benefit – a great one – was that Centennial year not only gave Canada confidence in her ability to do big things when everyone lent a hand, but revealed that she is not so stodgy as general repute led us to think. There was a lot of sparkle in the show we put on. We have ended our birthday celebrations more confirmed in our good opinion about Canada as a homeland, as a nation, and as a world figure, but what has happened in our country during 1967 has given us rather more intelligent reasons for this opinion. We have had a fresh and valuable look at ourselves alongside all the rest of the world.

Before I conclude, Mr. Speaker, I want to refer for just one moment to a few comments made by the Member from Wadena (Mr. Dewhurst). I must say, Mr. Speaker, that as a former Speaker in this House, the Member from Wadena should know better than to make statements that he has no shred of evidence to back up. He was asked to give the names or to withdraw. He didn't even have the courtesy or the courage to do either. We all know that as a former Speaker he left a great deal to be desired, but certainly with his background he should have more knowledge of the procedure of this House than he showed before 5:30 tonight. There's no mystery in regard to this teacher that didn't get the job of teaching on the Indian reserve that he referred to. Indian Affairs and the Department of Education were both involved in trying to arrange for instruction for upgrading courses. But the final responsibility was the Department of Education's to make the appointment. Now it was Indian Affairs that had phoned this chap that was referred to and asked him to come in for an interview, which was perfectly proper. And his suggestion that two phone calls mean guarantee of a job is completely contrary to the fact, both in this case or any other case. If I had got a job every time I received two telephone calls, I would have had ten jobs to work at instead of four, as my Members opposite like to point out on occasion. The point was that this chap was phoned and asked to come in for an interview, which he did. In the meantime the Department of Education also had somebody that they were interviewing for this position. The interview with the Department of Education was completed. The person in question was fully qualified and had considerably more experience than the person that the Member from Wadena (Mr. Dewhurst) referred to. And for that reason, the person was given the job. There is no question of what his politics were. The question was that the job was filled before his interview was over and that's all there was to it. For his own political expediency, he tried to raise the matter in the House. When he was called on it, he didn't have the courage to stand up and be counted.

**Hon. D.V. Heald (Attorney General):** — Slandering civil servants.

**Mr. Guy:** — That's nothing new, Mr. Attorney General. That is one of their basic principles. If you can't join them you've got to try and beat them down with a club. Now, Mr. Speaker, it has already been mentioned that the October election was a good one for the Liberal party. They were returned on the

**February 27, 1968**

basis of action in the past, rather than on the promises of the future. I think it was Tommy Douglas who struck the keynote of the election campaign in Kindersley, when he stated, as was reported in the Prince Albert Herald of September 30: "The promises a party makes today are only as good as their performance yesterday." This is true and that is why the promises that had been made by Mr. Douglas and his successors over a 20-year period returned to haunt them in the elections of 1964 and 1967.

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

**Mr. Guy:** — As the Liberal Government entered the election campaign it had no fear of political reprisals from the voters, because it had had the courage to do what was right.

For the past four years the Liberal Government in Saskatchewan had been the most responsible Government in Canada. It took the Federal and other Provincial Governments four years to realize what Premier Ross Thatcher had been saying regarding fiscal responsibility was true. Thank heaven the Federal Government found out before it was too late, mainly due to the urging of our Premier.

The other Provinces of Canada are finding now that one cannot spend indefinitely without it catching up on them. We could have made good fellows of ourselves by deficit financing to cover increased costs, but this only delays the day of reckoning. Alberta is finding this out as they have a deficit of more than \$100 million this year. The Socialists delayed it for 20 years and look at the mess we took over in 1964.

Mr. Speaker, we will be back after the next election for the same reason we are here now. People want responsibility and they will get it. Sometimes it means actions are taken which are unpleasant to certain groups and a certain area, but the average taxpayer and the people concerned, when the emotion dies down and reason prevails, soon recognize what is right and what is good, not for himself but for his fellowman.

Radicals, reactionaries, political antagonists will have their day with misleading statements, half-truths and such, but they cannot shake our position because what we are doing is right.

We have put political expediency aside. We are facing up to the problems that face the Province at the present time. We have a responsibility to keep our Province in a strong financial position and to provide services based on the ability of the people to pay for them. This was a policy and principle that the Socialists never heard of during their term of office and would never follow because political expediency was always placed ahead of people.

It takes courage to act in the public interest at certain times and our Government has shown for four years that we have that courage and a sense of responsibility. We are showing it with this year's Throne Speech, and I am hoping that our new Provincial Treasurer (Mr. Steuart) will continue to follow this principle of doing what is right when he brings down his Budget later in the session.

In conclusion, I wish to congratulate the mover and the seconder of the Address-in-Reply, who have in their addresses outlined the policies we must follow, if we are to keep faith with the people of Saskatchewan, who have placed their trust in us for the next four years. I will not support the amendment because it reeks of Socialism, but I will support the motion.

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

**Mr. W.G. Davies (Moose Jaw South):** — Mr. Speaker, I have been listening for the last hour to the Minister of Public Works (Mr. Guy). At the beginning of his remarks he put on his halo, but it didn't take very long before the halo slipped, as I'm sure everybody noticed. And after listening to the Minister of Public Works, I can only say, Mr. Speaker, that I don't envy the Mayor of Regina, the Member for Regina South East (Mr. Baker) his new constituent. I don't intend this evening to dwell too much on what the previous speaker had to say. I think a large part of what he has had to say this evening was, as usual, a fabric of distortions and nonsense that we've come to know from him in other years. I don't think that I will therefore refer to more than a few of his remarks. One thing I wanted to mention was to his reference to deceit, the deceit of the New Democratic party. I thought to myself, as I'm sure many others did in this House tonight, that if the squeeze program that was announced by the Premier of this Province, after October 11, 1967, was known to the voters before October 11, there wouldn't have been 15 Members sitting on that side of the House.

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

**Mr. Davies:** — Talking about deceit is very, very queer coming from the Member from Athabasca (Mr. Guy). He incidentally appeared in my constituency during the month of December, speaking to a meeting of some 25 Liberals in the Moose Jaw South organization. The story leads off by saying: "Minister Attacks Campus Faculty," and the lead paragraph says:

The faculty of the Regina campus of the University of Saskatchewan, Moose Jaw's two new Democratic MLAs and Mayor H. Lewry were attacked by Public Works Minister (Mr. Guy) here Wednesday.

He wasn't wearing his halo on this occasion and that's very evident. Later on in the press release, after he had made a number of remarks about the faculty, there's a title to a paragraph that says: "Spotted Press." It goes on,

At the closure of his speech, Mr. Guy, spotting a reporter in the audience, stressed that his remarks were personal comments and do not represent Government policy . . ."

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

**Mr. Davies:** — ". . . but I am prepared to stand by my views."

**Mr. Romanow (Saskatoon Riversdale):** — Now you see them, now you don't.

**Mr. Davies:** — I don't know how much of

**February 27, 1968**

this I should read.

**Mr. Guy:** — Read what I said.

**Mr. Davies:** — Oh, I intend to get around to that, a choice morsel like that, Mr. Speaker, I certainly wouldn't pass that up!

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

**Mr. Davies:** — But still staying with the faculty – after maligning – I think that is the proper word for it – the faculty of the University of Saskatchewan, the clipping says this further report about Mr. Guy:

He said the faculty should clean its own house before starting to worry about finances which are none of their business.

He spoke as one who had long association with the University. Mr. Speaker, does the Minister of Public Works not believe that the faculty, as citizens of this province have the right, as he has, to express himself on any and all occasions? I say this is a most remarkable statement coming from a Member of the Cabinet, which has never been denied, which has never been repudiated by the Premier of this Province, incidentally. The Minister said would I say what he said about me, I don't mind repeating it. It was a very strange thing but he made some remark about my strong bid for the leadership of my party which was news to me.

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

**Mr. Davies:** — The clipping goes on to say, "I hope he gets it, says the Minister. He went on to describe Mr. Davies as completely biased and narrow-minded in his outlook." He went on to say the same thing about my colleague, the Member for Moose Jaw North (Mr. Snyder). Well, you know, Mr. Speaker, I think the public has come to know the statements of the Minister of Public Works (Mr. Guy) so well that when he accuses someone of narrow-mindedness and bias, the person accused is almost automatically absolved of the charge.

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

**Mr. Davies:** — This afternoon, we heard something with respect to the Frazier Report from the Minister of Public Health (Mr. Grant). I'm going to say a few words about that a little later. But I want to remind the House that this speech was made on December 6, only a short time ago. We till have the Minister of Public Works (Mr. Guy) abusing the Member for Moose Jaw North, who, in this House a year or so ago, brought to the attention of this House certain things with respect to the Department of Public Health and mental health and mental care. A paragraph in this clipping says:

The Moose Jaw North MLA makes one contribution of the Legislature each year, a speech in which he picks on a group less fortunate than himself and tries to urge it to embarrass the Government.



And I'll come back to that one later.

May I just say a word about another excessive statement by the Minister (Mr. Guy) who has just spoken, with regard to these Legislative Buildings. The buildings he said were a disgrace in 1964. I want to say this, that the building in 1964 was not a disgrace. It was a well-kept, a well-thought of building in the minds of most reasonable people. A matter of \$650,000 had been spent by that time in renovations and very necessary renovations for drop ceilings, for air changing, air conditioning, lighting and the like. I want to tell the Minister of Public Works that the renovations in the Executive Council Chamber were plans that were in the Budget in 1964. He well knows this, and if he doesn't then he displays an ignorance of his own Department. I want to say this, though, that the renovations that were carried on in the Executive Council Chambers would not have been carried out in the manner in which they have been carried out by this present Government. The décor of the Executive Council resembles more the suite of some big-shot, Texas millionaire than anything else that I have seen in a long time. I do regret that the décor that had existed from the time the building was constructed has not been maintained. I think that there was a reason for the motif that was represented in those three rooms; and I think that the renovations that were carried through did neglect that kind of tradition. The main point I want to make here this evening, Mr. Speaker, is that we did not at that time, (1964) plan for marble floors; but there was a full-scale job of renovation going on. A great deal of money had been spent and it is simple absurdity to say that the buildings were a disgrace in 1964. They were attracting, as they are still attracting, more and more visitors each year and I have no doubt that this will continue. Now I think with that, that I can properly dispense with the Minister of Public Works (Mr. Guy) and go on with the subject of my discourse this evening, Mr. Speaker.

May I say, Sir, that in common with those who have spoken before me in this debate, I want to offer my congratulations to our newly elected Speaker of this Legislature. I know that he has a difficult task, I also know that he has given a great many hours of study and attention to the rules that govern us in this House. I am sure that our Speaker will try to continue to help us by interpretations that will assist our procedures and the cause of a democratic parliamentary Assembly.

Now, I also want to take a minute to voice appreciation to the citizens of my own constituency. I have had the privilege of representing Moose Jaw now as a MLA for the fourth term. Before that I served four terms on the Moose Jaw city council. I do want to say without dwelling on this for too long that I am most grateful for the confidence that I have been given by the voters of Moose Jaw.

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

**Mr. Davies:** — And at the same time, Mr. Speaker, I want to say too, how glad I am over the re-election of my colleague in Moose Jaw North (Mr. Snyder).

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

**Mr. Davies:** — You know, two years ago, I

**February 27, 1968**

warned the Premier and the Cabinet that their one-sided and publicly resented gerrymandering in Moose Jaw would nevertheless get them nowhere. Subsequent events have, I think, proved me to be right. I suppose it's too much to expect that the Government pay heed to the voice of the electorate and that they therefore return Moose Jaw to a two-member, one-constituency area. But if they won't listen, Mr. Speaker, the Government should at least draw a dividing line between the two constituencies on a straight, east-to-west line basis, recognizing an equality of voting numbers in each section. The present zig-zag lines, which wander about simply to enclose as many Liberal voters as possible, are an enormity in themselves. The great disparity that now exists between the number of voters in Moose Jaw South and Moose Jaw North is just another unfair example of the flagrant misuse of power by this present Government. I say that in all conscience this should be rectified.

This afternoon, Mr. Speaker, the Minister of Public Health (Mr. Grant) rose to tell us about a number of things. He, in the course of his speech, again repeated the kind of charges that we have heard from others and his colleagues, when he said:

Members on this side of the House had played on the doubts and fears of the people when they levelled criticism against the Government for their ineptness in handling the Mental Health Program.

A great deal has been said about this already, but I don't think there is any doubt whatsoever that the contents of the Frazier Report amply confirm the concern that was expressed by Members on this side of the House, such as my colleague (Mr. Snyder) the Member for Moose Jaw North, and my former seatmate, the former Minister of Health, the Member for Regina Centre (Mr. Blakeney), made a year or two ago. I say that, in an effort to cut costs, this Government moved in a patient-discharge policy far quicker than was dictated and indicated by the community situations that they faced.

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

**Mr. Davies:** — The whole question of the placement of patients, the development of auxiliary forces to facilitate the final restoration of patients to full health and, of course, the large question of full and proper rehabilitation had not been taken into consideration by the Government. I think that from this stem a great many of the difficulties that the Frazier Report is now attempting to remedy. I say the fact that this Government is now moving to meet some of the Frazier recommendations further illustrates that the Government, instead of abusing and maligning the Members of the New Democratic party should be apologizing to them at this time, apologizing to those who brought this matter to their attention two years ago. I say, if my friends from Moose Jaw North and Regina Centre had not spoken out, as they did when they did, there is a strong likelihood that there never would have been a Frazier Report and the Government would not now be correcting the grave and serious errors into which it has fallen.

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

**Mr. Davies:** — There are, Mr. Speaker, a good number of Members, new Members amongst us in this session and I want to tender them my

very good wishes at this time. I've been most impressed by the content of talks, especially those made by a number of the New Democratic Members. I think they made a real contribution in their maiden speeches, and I am sure that as time goes on that we are going to see much more of this great performance.

In offering congratulations to my old schoolmate, the Member for Regina South West (Mr. McPherson), I must also say that he did his very best with the pallid and dispirited message that he had to deal with, when he led the discussion on February 19. But, however, I also want to say that I must frankly ask him to pose some of the general questions that he raised to his own Leader and to his own Government.

Let's look for example at his remarks about the management-labor sector. I think, in context, they were most ironic. Summed up, he said that government should stick to conciliation and permit free collective bargaining. Mr. Speaker, when were conciliation, mediation, free collective bargaining practised more successfully in Saskatchewan than in the 20 years up to 1964? In this period, Saskatchewan had a rate of strike-time lost that was less than half of the Canadian average. Mr. Speaker, the present Government is the direct antithesis of what the Member for Regina South West says a good Government should be in labor relations. It has introduced more of the compulsion that the Member deplored in his speech, while it hasn't even practised conciliation and mediation in the disputes in which it is itself most directly concerned.

When, for example again, the dispute between the Government and the unionized power workers came about in 1966, a situation was created which simply begged for the entrance of a truly impartial and knowledgeable mediator. Not once, not once, did the Premier or his colleagues as much as suggest a mediator. They simply rushed a session of this House to bring in legislation which featured all of the kinds of compulsion that were featured in the remarks of the mover of the Address-in-Reply and which he professes to worry about. But worse, it made the Government the central and arbitrary figure even to the extent of crudely by-passing and usurping the authority of the very Labour Relations Board it had reconstituted to administer its own revamped labor legislation and Trade Union Act.

Mr. Speaker, the Minister of Labour (Mr. Coderre) yesterday, rose to deliver a characteristically unconvincing speech at least as it related to several matters. It was full of ghastly examples and deathly prose. Some of these seem so badly mixed up that they had to await dissection in Hansard; others came through clearly enough for me to try and reply to them.

The Minister said on Monday that there had been a great increase in union membership in Saskatchewan so how could this Government be judged anti-labor. He cited various figures to try and prove his point. Mr. Speaker, if he thinks these figures prove his point, he should look at them again. Let's take the figures from January 1, 1966 to January 1, 1967. In this one year period, union membership in Saskatchewan increased by 1,513 persons – 2.9 per cent. But the Canada-wide increase in union membership was far higher in proportion, because in that year the membership in Canada rose 185,000 or 10.6 per cent. This, I want to remind the House, was accomplished with varying kinds of mostly mediocre and scarcely satisfactory labor

relations law. But, in any case, the rate of 10.6 per cent was more than three and one-half times the rate of growth of membership in Saskatchewan in the same period.

If you want to contrast the situation under a CCF Government, from 1946 to 1964, union membership in Saskatchewan rose by 102 per cent – more than doubled – and it isn't likely to do that under the Liberals. In a time when 75 per cent of the employees of this province could benefit by union organizations, the frustration and the interference of the amendments that they have created will make it most difficult for them to do so.

Mr. Speaker, going on to the speech of the seconder of the Address-in-Reply (Mr. Forsyth), I must compliment him for attempting to introduce a few thoughtful references to current problems, even although I fear he may have misconstrued his own points in some places. I think he may be pardoned for stating, "We in the Liberal Party are more modest in our protestations" since he, of course, preceded the Premier, whose own address evidently failed to fit the phrase of the Member for Saskatoon Nutana South (Mr. Forsyth). I think the fairest thing that I could say that would meet with almost universal agreement here in the House and outside of it, is that our Premier is not precisely the epitome of self-effacing reticence. In any case the Premier's contribution to this debate was full of mistakes, inaccuracies and exaggeration.

The Premier bragged, for example, that the Saskatchewan unemployment rate at 4 per cent in January of 1968 was very low. Why didn't he tell us the whole story? The tables in the Saskatchewan Economic Review show that in only one year since 1951 has the Saskatchewan rate been at four per cent. That was in 1961, a year of heavy unemployment when the Canadian rate was seven per cent. The Premier did, by the way, admit that the Saskatchewan unemployment rate of January, 1968 was lower in Alberta. Now this is actually a deviation from the normal because Saskatchewan for many years has had the lowest level of unemployment indicated by numerous measures.

We hear a great deal about employment from the Premier, and I don't want to go back to that old record about 50,000 new jobs which never transpired. No, it was 80,000 – I am as usual underestimating the Premier. But it is interesting to look at the labor-force figure in the Economic Review in this regard. I want to point out that most of the data in the Review are taken from the Dominion Bureau of Statistics, but not the latest labor-force table. This one comes from the Department of Labour. Now, Mr. Speaker, I challenge its accuracy, since this Department has nothing near the method or the facilities of DBS; nor has it carried out enough surveys or basic research that would produce its own estimates with any degree of reliability. The dominion Bureau of Statistics data by the way show the Saskatchewan Labor Force to be the following: In 1964 there were 334,000 in the labor force; in 1966 this figure was 329,000; in 1967 this had slipped to 332,000. Now these figures show a decrease of 2,000 people in the labor force in the four-year period. But even if you take the inflated Department of Labour figures, they show an increase in the four years of only 8,000, or 2,000 a year. What a record! The Premier has very little to crow about and a great deal to worry about in the lean rise in our labor-force numbers, even as they are deduced from the non-DBS, pro-Department of Labour figures.

Well, where are the jobs? Where is this new prosperity for workers? In the midst of the burgeoning potash industry over the past four years, initiated not by a Liberal, but a CCF Government, the conclusion has to be, to any reasonable person anyway, short of all the ballyhoo and all the blether blather that we have heard so much about from Government supporters and its loyal support, that the Province is not really supplying employment to the thousands of young people who are emerging each year from our education institutions; let alone the adults.

Mr. Speaker, one of the factors which cause people to move from Saskatchewan is the earnings level. It's only common sense that good workers aren't going to stay where wage rates are much below those of other areas. Now, what are the facts about wages in Saskatchewan under a Liberal Government? I don't want to repeat the figures that were given this afternoon by my colleague in his talk to the House. I will take, however, another figure and that is a fairly recent one at October, 1967. In October of 1967 the disparity between the average Canadian wage and the average weekly wage in Saskatchewan was \$8.13 a week. In that same month, Mr. Speaker, there were only eight out of 39 major urban areas in Canada that had lower wages than Regina and Saskatoon – our two biggest Saskatchewan cities. Mr. Speaker, we have a Premier (Mr. Thatcher), who now, as when he was Leader of the Opposition, likes to yodel and trumpet everywhere about Socialist stagnation in Saskatchewan under the CCF. Now I think it is high time that he was asked by the more responsible news media in this province why it is that the gap between Saskatchewan and Canadian wage rates was twice as high for the last DBS figures, that are available, as it was in 1963, the last full year of responsibility under CCF Administration. You come to this conclusion that, if we were stagnating in 1963, we have reached a stage of economic decay in 1968.

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

**Mr. Davies:** — Now one of the reasons why the Saskatchewan wage relationship has slipped so badly behind may well lie, I think, in the Government's own labor policies and in its administration too. We all know that this Government has made damaging amendments to The Trade Union Act. Because of these, Mr. Speaker, and the administration of the Act by the Labour Relations Board that it chose in 1964, it's apparent that something has happened to the rights of people to bargain and to organize. All down the line in this province you can get complaints about greater difficulties in employee organization because of these new restrictive amendments and their administration. But whatever you may attach to these developments, it is a simple fact that employee income has lagged far behind that of other areas in Canada; and part of this, at least, must be because of the hamstringing of union effectiveness in organization and in bargaining. This must be to a large degree ascribed and charged to the abominable ways in which this Government has met the positive challenge of solutions to management-labor disputes and problems. There is no doubt about it. Put it another way if you like. If the sons and daughters of both urban and farm people have to leave Saskatchewan, part of the cause, in any case, rests with the inadequate earnings which can't be improved, because of the Government's interference and biased handling of labor relations.

Mr. Speaker, it is a sad commentary on the Speech from the Throne that the only message of hope, the only message of any kind for labor in Saskatchewan was offered in one single line which should not have formed part of the Speech from the Throne at all. The one sentence said: "That the Government would take steps to increase the minimum wage." Well, Mr. Speaker, everyone in this House well knows that minimum wage regulations and Orders never come before the House. The procedure is that the Minimum Wage Board recommends wage rates and other minimum conditions to the Government. When these are sanctioned by the Cabinet such regulations may become Orders of the Board. But they have got nothing to do with this House, and if the Government, when making this reference in the Throne Speech, acted for any reason at all it must have been out of a guilt complex, because action to increase the minimum wages in Saskatchewan, which are also very badly out of line with those in other provinces, which we once led in the whole field, should have been taken months ago. The Government well knows that this is the case. By including this very meagre reference in the Throne Speech it attempted to escape the well-deserved criticism of its failure to act sooner.

The Government, Mr. Speaker, has previously rejected resolutions placed before the Legislature by Members of this side of the House calling for \$1.25 per hour minimum wage. Alberta and Manitoba, our two neighboring provinces, have this rate now or they will have it sometime this year. The Premier is back yodelling again from his place about minimum wages. I want to tell him this, that we had the highest minimum wages in Canada in this province under a CCF Government when there were no Federal minimum wage. Now that your colleagues in Ottawa have acted to implement a \$1.25 per hour minimum wage, it is your duty to do the same thing here and you haven't done it.

Mr. Speaker, the Premier was speaking in my constituency during the last election campaign and said Liberals were committed to halting (he had a new expression for it this time), what he said was a "terrible population hemorrhage" in Saskatchewan. I think it's plain to anyone by this time that the rate of bleeding in these terms has increased, because of Liberal policies over the last four years.

**Mr. Thatcher:** — Full employment, Bill.

**Mr. Davies:** — And I say to that, the failure to act to provide minimum protective legislation for thousands of Saskatchewan workers who don't enjoy the benefits of union organization as well as being the cause of the population drain, is a living illustration and indictment of Liberal indifference and opposition to raising these rates to something approaching bare rates of human decency.

Mr. Speaker, I hope before the end of this session we'll discover what's happened with respect to the 1967 issue, No. 21, of the Saskatchewan Economic Review. Now, in an answer tabled yesterday we learned that they were circulated to libraries and to MLAs. Well speaking as one MLA, I never got a copy, I don't know any Members of this side of the House who did and I would judge that perhaps Members on the other side of the House didn't either, although they may very well have done. If they did it was a simple case of discrimination.

**Mr. Lloyd:** — Probably gathering dust.

**Mr. Davies:** — This may be. They may have been gathering dust, to use a popular expression. I checked with the Regina Public Library this morning and they never received one. I got in touch with the Moose Jaw Public Library. They never received a copy. They got the 1966 issue alright. Most of us got all the other issues of the previous years, but not the 1967 one. Now I wonder who did get them in reality. How many of the 5,000 copies that were allegedly printed are now gathering dust somewhere? This volume of the Economic Review appears to be one of the most surreptitiously circulated documents on record in this province; and I think perhaps the reason is there for all to see. The Government just wasn't anxious to have it around during election year or apparently thereafter either. But, Mr. Speaker, I draw to your attention that this is a very serious situation. It amounts almost, I suggest, to an outright suppression of public facts for which this Government also must be held fully responsible.

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

**Mr. Davies:** — Mr. Speaker, my own constituents and the whole of Moose for that matter, want to see new development in the terms that this Government has boasted so much about, but has done so little to fulfil, I say, especially in the Moose Jaw area. Mr. Speaker, this self-proclaimed free enterprise Government has been singularly ineffectual in preventing large corporate concerns from closing down branches both in Moose Jaw and elsewhere.

**Mr. Thatcher:** — Moose Jaw . . .

**Mr. Davies:** — Would the Premier also say this about the Quaker Oats plant in Saskatoon? I doubt it very much.

**Mr. Thatcher:** — It's not closing down.

**Mr. Davies:** — You know, Mr. Speaker, of our economic reverses as illustrated by the closure of the Moose Jaw Robin Hood Mills plant. One would have thought that with a Liberal Government at Ottawa controlling wheat and flour sales policy, and a Saskatchewan Liberal Government here, as the professed bosom friend of the largest corporate entities, some policy, expedient or otherwise, could have been devised to keep the Moose Jaw flour mills, which began by the way before the start of this century, continuing to operate. But this wasn't the case.

Moreover, the Government has not seen fit to help the Moose Jaw construction situation as well as to improve service to the public by commencing the building of the long-delayed Moose Jaw Provincial office building. We have seen no construction whatsoever at the Saskatchewan Technical Institute for the first two years of office of this Government and only a very small and meagre addition following that. I might say, Mr. Speaker, the fact is that the Thatcher Administration has not served Moose Jaw well. Worse, it hasn't evolved a policy whereby communities, that are in the position of Moose Jaw, can be given the brand of genuine and practical aid that is designed

to help an enterprising and able centre. At the moment, both Federal and the complementary Provincial Liberal Government policies give some help only to the so-called depressed community. It is not realistic policy in the present-day context which sees dozens of centres across Canada contracting or static, although their rates of unemployment are comparatively low. I want to suggest here, Mr. Speaker, that, if the Government is sincere in its numerous pronouncements, announcements and protestations, it should be prepared to evolve a special program to aid a community like Moose Jaw, which, through no fault of its own, has become a victim of the untrammelled effects of modern-day technological advances.

Mr. Speaker, I think this Government has a particular obligation in view of the cruel disappointment suffered by Moose Jaw citizens with regard to the Tree Island steel plant which was announced with absolutely no reservation by the Premier on December 30, 1966, as a firm undertaking for which the Government was responsible. There was a front-page streamer headline on the Moose Jaw Times Herald on December 30th, "New Industry Coming," it said. The lead paragraph in the story said:

Moose Jaw's industrial drought came to a dramatic end today with the announcement by Premier Ross Thatcher that a \$1,600,000 Japanese steel wire products plant will locate on the city's west side in 1967.

The story then went on to say:

Premier Thatcher this morning made it clear that Moose Jaw was chosen as the site of the proposed \$1,600,000 plant because of Government pressure to locate here.

The Government is advancing funds for the operation under its industrial development plan and for this reason was able to exert influence in the choice of site . . .

And the story went on in that laudatory vein. The story said that the plant would be developed in two stages which would bring the capital outlay to \$2,500,000.

Premier Thatcher said:

Construction should begin in early spring and production may start by July, achieving full potential by fall of 1967.

The story added that fifty men would be hired to start with and up to 150 in the second phase.

Well, Mr. Speaker, the City Industrialization Office in Moose Jaw co-operated in every way. Land was made available, I understand, at a particularly attractive price. Then, a deep, long silence prevailed. In the election campaign of September and October not one word was heard about any difficulties. In late October, after the election, some disquieting rumours began to drift through Moose Jaw. Finally, on December 15th, almost a year to the day, the community was stunned with the news that Tisco would not be proceeding with its plans to build. What had begun as a very firm commitment, with not the slightest indication that there were any snags or obstacles, ended in a charade and a fiasco. The announcement incidentally was made by a Moose Jaw lawyer, Mr. Murray Dubinsky, Moose Jaw



representative of the company, and also incidentally, the president of the Liberal Association in Moose Jaw South. Now, many citizens have suggested to me that the whole affair was handled in a way that local Liberal political fortunes would be helped in the election. It has also been suggested to me that the deal was not going through long before election day, some even say, from the very, very beginning.

Mr. Speaker, I say that people are legitimately entitled to speculate in view of the history of events and the subsequent explanation supplied by the Government. The most charitable thing that can be said is that the whole exercise was a pitiable and unfortunate reflection on the Premier and his Cabinet. There is little practical use in pursuing this. My one and only point at this time is this. The Government should see to it that a meaningful program is adopted with the co-operation of every Saskatchewan Government department and agency, to provide Moose Jaw with assistance and stimulus in overcoming the economic setbacks that it has endured for so long and about which the Government has done so little to remedy.

As a background for a project of this character, I would like at this time to recommend a seven-point program which I publicly discussed with my constituents prior to the last election day. Among other things, it recognizes that certain additions and changes can greatly increase Moose Jaw's capacity to gain more tourist visitors and dollars. I am going to place this on record, if I may, Mr. Speaker, in very brief form: My No. 1 point is that there should be a concentrated Provincial Government program to end the job and manpower drain in Moose Jaw. No. 2, action to sharply increase home building in Moose Jaw, offering special consideration to young families. (Here I point out that the Moose Jaw housing starts have been very badly down in recent years.) As a No. 3 point I would ask the creation of a Moose Jaw River Valley program: (a) to create an adequate, fresher water supply for the river; (b) to eliminate pollution on the river and (c) to beautify the valley area, including the Wild Animal Park, for both appearances and recreation. I think this should become part of the project from Moose Jaw to Buffalo Pound Lake. As a No. 4 point, I would ask the beginning of the construction of the Moose Jaw Provincial office building to improve public service, staff morale and stimulate the local construction industry.

Just at noon, Mr. Speaker, I listened to a newscast that said that 136 employees of architectural firms in this province had lost their employment in this last year, and that great concern was being expressed by both architects and construction leaders over the train of events. Moose Jaw certainly is one place where the Government can do something, not only to encourage construction but to eliminate the peaks and the valleys of the construction season in that community and others that may have a good argument too. For No. 5 point, I would advocate that we expand the Saskatchewan Technical Institute building, facilities and programs in Moose Jaw, and that we should create new and more adequate facilities at the Saskatchewan Training School. There is certainly plenty of staff advice and expertise that have pressed for that particular program. For No. 6, I would like to see an intensification of the development of Buffalo Pound and Besant Parks. We should include here the construction of a swimming pool at Buffalo Pound Park and we should do something to eliminate the very aggravated algae problem at

Buffalo Lake. As a sub-point under this heading, Moose Jaw should be assisted in getting maximum advantage in developing opportunities for industry, tourism and recreation at the Qu'Appelle and Saskatchewan River Dams. No. 7 point, Mr. Speaker, is to encourage and if necessary financially assist the development, already begun, of a Moose Jaw Management-Labour Consultative Committee to encourage management-labor understanding.

Mr. Speaker, I can assure you that whether the Government acts to follow either these, or other recommendations that I have suggested elsewhere in this talk, that it will find a ready and co-operative response in Moose Jaw, if a sincere and positive program of Government aid is offered. Just a few weeks ago, 200 Moose Jaw citizens turned out at a local conference to discuss their economic and social problems. They displayed an immense understanding and enthusiasm. You can be sure that they and many others, will respond well to policies which recognize the difficulties I have tried to describe here tonight.

Mr. Speaker, the Speech from the Throne might very well have paid recognition to the needed policies of the kind I have enumerated, especially in that section which dealt with the economy of the Province. Very obviously, it did not do so. Further, Mr. Speaker, it gave no hint that these matters are even being contemplated for consideration. From the viewpoint of Moose Jaw people, the Throne message is most notably deficient in this spectrum. We can only anticipate what awaits us in the Budget. It is not too late for the Government, Mr. Speaker, in the preparation of this document, to constructively recognize the urgent necessity of coping with the kind of difficulties that are encountered by constituencies like mine, which to this moment the Government has largely ignored.

I can't, Mr. Speaker, support the very limited program we have now been presented. I shall support the amendment and register my vote against the main motion.

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

**Hon. L.P. Coderre (Minister of Labour):** — Will the Hon. Member from Moose Jaw permit a question before he takes his seat?

**Mr. Davies:** — I will.

**Mr. Coderre:** — You stated that in the Speech from the Throne that the Government had no reason to mention the minimum wage because the Board made the recommendations or something to that effect. Then you also mentioned that on several occasions some of the Opposition side had made Resolutions to this House to raise the minimum wage to the Government. How can you be so inconsistent, saying that the Board makes the resolution and then you recommend to the Government to raise it. There seems to be some inconsistency which carries throughout this speech.

**Mr. Davies:** — Mr. Speaker, I don't know whether the Minister of Labour is asking a question or making a speech. I suspect it's the latter. The answer to his question is this, Mr. Speaker, that the \$1.25 per hour rate which has been advocated in Resolutions is not inconsistent at all. Everyone well knows that

the Government not only approves the minimum wage regulations but alters them. Everyone also knows in this House I am sure, being realistic, that the Minister of Labour has a great deal of influence on the Minimum Wage Board.

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

**Mr. J.E. Brockelbank (Saskatoon Mayfair):** — Mr. Speaker, in rising to take part in this debate on the Throne Speech, my first comments must be naturally to congratulate you on your re-election to the position of Speaker. If you don't mind me observing, Mr. Speaker, this time it appeared that you exhibited just a little less resistance when being led forcibly from your position on the floor to the Speaker's dais. I can only conclude that you enjoy your work.

As the senior Member for Saskatoon City, I feel I must take this opportunity to welcome all junior Members from the city of Saskatoon to this Chamber.

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

**Mr. Brockelbank:** — Yes, indeed, Mr. Speaker, I want to take this opportunity to welcome all new Members to this Chamber, the young, bright ones on this side and the older fellows over there. To those who attempted to return to this 16th Legislature but didn't make it, we can only say, "Hello there, out in radioland, we'll miss you for a variety of reasons."

Mr. Speaker, I might ask you indulgence, I have a rather long comment here. At the beginning of each session, Mr. Speaker, we offer our condolences to relatives of former Members of this Chamber. With no less respect to their memory, I feel that I must mention the passing of an outstanding Saskatchewan citizen, who never occupied a seat in this Chamber. This citizen, Dr. Violet McNaughton, passed away on February 2, 1968. At the time, she resided in the city of Saskatoon. Born in England in 1879, she and her father settled in the Harris-Zealandia area, west of Saskatoon. In 1910 she married John McNaughton, homestead farmer in that area.

Mrs. McNaughton waged successful campaigns on behalf of women's rights in many different areas of endeavor, the franchise of women, women's participation in rural life, in the provinces of Saskatchewan, Alberta, Manitoba and Ontario. She can be best remembered by Saskatchewan women as the foremost advocate and activist for medical aid for prairie mothers. Her leadership and direction eventually led to the establishment of municipal hospitals in Saskatchewan.

Although she didn't become a Legislative Member, she did sign the Charter of the Progressive party of Saskatchewan. Mr. Bert McClure, former MLA whose passing we remembered a few days ago in this Chamber, was a member of that political party. Dr. McNaughton's leadership and involvement naturally led her to participation in national and international conferences. In 1934, she was awarded the Order of the British Empire, "For her rural women". When she retired in 1950, it was from her position as the first women's editor of the Western Producer.

Mr. Speaker, the main accomplishments of the mover and the seconder in this debate, in the Address-in-Reply, for which they must be congratulated, consisted only of beginning and ending each of their addresses. The main weakness in their presentations serves to show that they had precious little to move and second. The junior Member from Regina (Mr. McPherson), established the fact that he had a much closer philosophic bond with the Premier than the seconder. I suppose that's why he was the mover. Near the beginning of his address, he offered a number of excuses as to why the Province was in serious financial trouble and lagging in resource development. Tight money and weakening markets seems to be the order of the day. As an example, let's have a look at oil production in the Province of Saskatchewan.

**Mr. Speaker:** — Order, order!

At 9:30 p.m. Mr. Speaker interrupted the proceedings under Standing Order 30(3) and put the question on the amendment.

Amendment negatived on the following recorded division:

**YEAS — 23**

Lloyd	Wooff	Kramer
Willis	Wood	Blakeney
Davies	Dewhurst	Meakes
Berezowsky	Romanow	Smishek
Thibault	Whelan	Snyder
Michayluk	Brockelbank	Pepper
Bowerman	Matsalla	Messer
Kwasnica	Kowalchuk	

**NAYS — 31**

Thatcher	Howes	McFarlane
Cameron	Steuart	Heald
McIsaac	Guy	Loken
MacDougall	Grant	Coderre
Bjarnason	Estey	Hooker
Gallagher	McLennan	Heggie
Breker	Leith	Radloff
Weatherald	Mitchell	Larochelle
Gardner	Coupland	McPherson
Charlebois	Forsyth	McIvor
Schmeiser		

The Assembly resumed the interrupted debate on the proposed motion by Mr. McPherson (Regina South West).

**Mr. Brockelbank:** — Mr. Speaker, as I was saying before the slight interruption that we have gone through, let's take a look at the oil production figures in the Province of Saskatchewan. The conclusions of the Bank of Montreal Business Review — my Hon. Friend, the Hon. Member from Regina South West (Mr. McPherson) will, of course, classify this as an organ of the independent sector of our economy — can be used as a firm foundation on which to base my conclusions. Evidence contrary to the speeches of the Premier is shown in this particular Review. This is the estimated daily oil production as shown in the Bank of Montreal

Business Review for the period of December, 1966 to December, 1967, in comparison with the previous year. Over the period of 13 months, the province of Alberta showed a gain in oil production 12 out of 13 months. Over the period of the same 13 months, the Province of Saskatchewan showed a loss in oil production in nine of the 13 months. The result is this, Mr. Speaker, Alberta gaining 12 out of 13 months – the net gain was 1.358 million barrels of oil; Saskatchewan a loss in nine out of 13 months – a net loss of 38,558 barrels of production. At this point, in the speech of the mover of the Address-in-Reply (Mr. McPherson), I tuned out, Mr. Speaker. I am sure that many people in Saskatchewan tuned out as well. It was perfectly evident that the balance of his address was a mixture of private enterprise palliatives, interspersed with numerous references to Socialism. Just because the Regina Junior Member is located physically far out in the seating plan does not mean that his conclusions should be so far out. I can only conclude that a further performance of that type in this Chamber will add little but tediousness to the debates. Creaky, old, mental gymnastics of the past will not serve to solve the problems of today and the future. Mr. Speaker, my exclamation at the conclusion of his speech would have to be, Shades of Senator Phogbound! In conclusion, I offer him this advice. Private enterprise is a fine theory, except that it doesn't work.

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

**Mr. Brockelbank:** — In regard to the seconder (Mr. Forsyth), I must say that he has taken a middle way in his maiden speech. To placate the Premier, he included symbolic references to private enterprise and Socialism. To hide his lack of grasp of the chameleon-like Liberal program, he has said in effect that he is all things to all men. His minimal grasp of the Liberal program is unfortunate but understandable. After the election campaign it is reported in the Sheaf – and for the enlightenment of those who don't know what the Sheaf is, that is the student newspaper of Saskatoon campus of the University – on October 27, as follows:

With regard to the Government's handling of the University crisis, the headline is, Government always had control, Forsyth.

And the concluding paragraph reads as follows:

When asked why the University expenditure control policy was presented so soon after the election and not during the campaign, Mr. Forsyth replied that he did not know. It wasn't him that had written the campaign platform.

Mr. Speaker, that could mean that the Hon. Member was miffed at not being given a hand in writing the campaign program, as we in the New Democratic party had an opportunity to do, or for political reasons he wanted to disengage himself from any hint of parentage of that platform. I say, mark him well, Mr. Premier, for he has an independent streak in him, and when he finds out what that program is he may assert that independent streak.

The star attraction from your right, Mr. Speaker, had to be the Premier's presentation in this Chamber. The Premier should have been a Shakespearian actor, and I underline the word actor. He smiles, and he cajoles, thrusts and retreats, protests and compliments. There is a line in Hamlet when paraphrased comes comfortably close to picking a weakness in his

armor. "Methinks thou protest too much." His vigorous protest camouflages an ulterior purpose. For example, his protestations attempt to hide his Government's shabby performance as regard to the University of Saskatchewan. Tuition fees under a CCF Government were the lowest in Canada. Today, under a Liberal Government, our university fees are the fourth lowest in Canada. Newfoundland and our sister provinces of Alberta and Manitoba have lower fees. Whenever the Premier is put on a spot, he protests that the Socialists raised the student fees X number of times, in X number of years. Mr. Speaker, he is living in the past. If the Province of Saskatchewan is unfortunate enough to have a Liberal Government after the next Provincial election, the Premier will still be using the same smoke screen. And probably university tuition fees will be in a relatively less desirable position than they are even today. Yet, during the election campaign, the Liberal candidates took full credit for holding tuition fees down. Today the Premier claims the Board of Governors raised tuition fees. Hypocrisy, Mr. Speaker. The Member for Saskatoon City Park-University (Mr. Charlebois) chose to talk about the University of Saskatchewan because the campus is located in his constituency. About 330 students attend the campus from Mayfair constituency in Saskatoon. In his remarks about the University, the Member for City Park fell strangely silent about university construction during the period 1944 to 1964. I would like to believe that it was just an oversight on the part of the junior Member. But the magnitude of the error leads me to believe that it was otherwise, Mr. Speaker. He remarked that at the end of the Second World War – for the young fellows on our side of the Chamber that was 1945 – the huge influx of students to campus caught the University unprepared to handle students in anything but temporary accommodation, which would not be acceptable today. Mr. Speaker, the reason the University wasn't prepared in Saskatchewan in 1944 was that we had just got rid of a Liberal Government in the Province of Saskatchewan.

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

**Mr. Brockelbank:** — And that Government had bankrupted this Province and the last three years in office, of a six-year term, Mr. Speaker, they had only one thought, that of perpetuating themselves in office. The record of construction at the University of Saskatchewan should be complete and accurate . .

**An Hon. Member:** — Don't you try to . . . in here.

**Mr. Brockelbank:** — . . . neglected by the junior Member from Saskatoon City Park.

**Mr. Charlebois:** — Those kind of remarks are uncalled for.

**Mr. Brockelbank:** — And here is the capital construction of the University of Saskatchewan, 1944 to 1964.

**Mr. Charlebois:** — You have a lot of nerve talking that way about the

University after what I said.

**Mr. Brockelbank:** — From 1944 up to 1960 when the Medical College was built, then an extension to the Engineering College, Soil and Dairy Laboratory, School of Agriculture, University Hospital, Nurses Resident, gymnasium, Virus Laboratory, power houses No. 1 and No. 2, Murray Memorial Library, Memorial Union Building, Agricultural Building, grain elevators, Isolation Buildings, Biology Building, Arts Building, Medical Research Building, Regina College improvements, Saskatchewan Research Council Laboratories, land acquisition, improvements to existing buildings, Mr. Speaker, numerous miscellaneous things such as new boilers, road paving, storm sewers, lighting tunnels for water and steam, electricity, tennis courts, sewage lift station, maintenance buildings, water-main connections, improvements to the grounds; from 1960 to 1964, Mr. Speaker, an extension to the Engineering Building, food services building, Marquis Hall, an extension to residences, extension to gymnasiums, construction on Regina campus, addition to Chemistry (Thorvalson Building) started, addition to Arts Building started, addition to the Physical Education Centre, addition to Darke Hall in Regina, planned for other major projects and numerous minor projects. I think, Mr. Speaker, that should take care of the oversight by the junior Member from City Park-University.

I am sure, Mr. Speaker, that you have noticed a pattern emerging in this debate. The Members to your right are regularly attacking university students, their newspapers, university faculty. Why, Mr. Speaker? It was never more evident than when the Member for Moosomin (Mr. Gardner) spoke in his capacity as an expert on campus. He detected a small pressure group of professional agitators, directing the defences against the Liberal Government attack that provoked the University crisis. I say to the Government that it should, in its usual manner, give the big smear to some of the ring-leaders. For their information, some of the ring-leaders were mentioned earlier today: Otto Lang, Dean of the College of Law and former Liberal Party organization in Saskatchewan.

**An Hon. Member:** — A dangerous fellow!

**Mr. Brockelbank:** — Lloyd Barber, Dean of the College of Commerce and a known Liberal sympathizer; John Egnatoff of the College of Education, former MLA and fellow traveller.

**An Hon. Member:** — How about Tommy McLeod?

**Mr. Brockelbank:** — In this debate, Mr. Speaker, I do not intend to defend or attack the students' newspaper. But it is interesting to notice that their attacks on the double standard, as they see it, and occasional kicks at the sacred cows of the establishment, do seem to antagonize the Government Members no end. With regard to some of the remarks that went on earlier today, I couldn't help notice that the Minister of Public Works (Mr. Guy) was his old self, skating on thin ice. He has definite suicidal tendencies, Mr. Speaker.

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

**Mr. Brockelbank:** — He brought up the fact that

**February 27, 1968**

we had a convention this fall, and I hate to talk about him when he is not in the Chamber, Mr. Speaker.

**Mr. Heald:** — Shall we send for him?

**Mr. Brockelbank:** — At that convention, Mr. Speaker, delegates attended from all over the Province of Saskatchewan and we made democratic decisions. And we are proud of those decisions.

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

**Mr. Brockelbank:** — Mr. Speaker, what happened this fall with the Liberal Convention? We are waiting, and we are waiting. The reason the Liberal Convention wasn't called, Mr. Speaker, was because it was inconvenient for the Premier to have it called, and he cancelled it. Why did he cancel it? Because he knew that he would get a little ribbing for that election campaign that he ran. And then the Member for Athabasca (Mr. Guy) in all his verbosity was talking about us not being able to get along with our counterparts at Ottawa. Well, Mr. Speaker, how ludicrous can a Cabinet Minister be! We see the spectacle of the Premier of this Province bickering and fighting with the Prime Minister of Canada at every turn of the road and with his Cabinet Ministers as well. And then, to top it all off, Mr. Speaker, we have the sad spectacle in Ottawa of almost total incompetence in the House of Commons by the Government and by the official Opposition. It is too bad that the Premier isn't in his seat right now, Mr. Speaker, because I had a matter I wanted to deal directly with him in this House. I was expecting that he would feed the proper information to the proper sources at Ottawa, so that my Liberal opponent in the election campaign would become a Senator. I say he would be a logical successor to the late Senator Hnatyshyn. My opponent's third political defeat, I felt, marked him as a logical choice for the Senate. The appointment of Mr. Sparrow is a very expensive step for the Canadian people and I just don't understand it, Mr. Speaker. From now to his retirement age he will draw \$550,000, just over one half a million dollars from the public purse, whereas poor Senator Hazen Argue will draw just under one half a million dollars from the public treasury. Since my opponent was considerably older than these two young Liberals, I can logically conclude that a young man is preferred in the Province of Saskatchewan for the heavy organization work that has to be done on behalf of the Liberal party.

I think, Mr. Speaker, there may be some shreds of doubt in some people's mind about my position on the Throne Speech and I will beg to adjourn the debate at this time, and speak later.

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

Debate adjourned.

The Assembly adjourned at 9:55 o'clock p.m.