

LEGISLATIVE ASSEMBLY OF SASKATCHEWAN
First Session – Sixteenth Legislature
10th Day

Wednesday, February, 28, 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 Members of this Legislature, 27 grade eight students from Regina North West. These young students are seated in the first two rows of the west gallery. They are from McNab school and their principal, Mr. Probe is with them. I'm sure all Members will join me in extending a warm welcome to these young people and in expressing the wish that their stay with us will be pleasant and that the information they gain this afternoon will help them with their social studies.

Some Hon. Members: Hear, hear!

Mr. J.E. Brockelbank (Saskatoon Mayfair): — Mr. Speaker, I would like to introduce to you and to the Members of this Assembly the first group of students to visit this Chamber from the new constituency of Saskatoon Mayfair. They are situated in the Speaker's gallery and they are from a grade seven class in St. Goretta school. They are accompanied by Sister Catherina and Mr. Noonan. I'm sure it is the wish of all Members that these students, once they return safely home, will be able to conclude that this has been an interesting and educational trip to our Legislative Chamber at Regina.

Some Hon. Members: Hear, hear!

Mr. W.E. Smishek (Regina North East): — Mr. Speaker, I would like to welcome and introduce a group of students from Haultain school. They are accompanied by their teachers, Mr. Oliver and Mr. Craig. I wish them a happy stay in the Legislature this afternoon and I hope that their stay here will be both informative and educational.

Some Hon. Members: Hear, hear!

Hon. C.L.B. Estey (Saskatoon Nutana Centre): — Mr. Speaker, I would like to introduce to the Assembly a group of students from Holliston school in Saskatoon, who are in the west gallery with their teacher, Mr. Laziki. I would also like to introduce to the Assembly, students from Brevoort Park school who are here today with their teacher, Mr. Carlton, and are located in both the west and the east galleries. I'm sure that I do, on behalf of all Members of the Assembly, welcome these students here this afternoon and congratulate the teachers for the interest which they have shown in bringing the students to Regina.

Some Hon. Members: Hear, hear!

WELCOME TO LADIES FROM GLAMIS HOMEMAKERS' CLUB

Mr. G.G. Leith (Elrose): — Mr. Speaker, I would like to draw your attention and the attention of the Members of the Legislature to a group of ladies and gentlemen sitting in the front row of the Speaker's gallery. These nine ladies and their two drivers are from the Glamis Homemakers' Club. I should say that the nine ladies are, I can't say that the two gentlemen are, homemakers although they have contributed greatly to the growth of the club also. One Hon. Member asks where Glamis is and I'd like to say to you, Sir, that it is in the Elrose constituency, the home of one of the famous people that have come out of that west part of Saskatchewan and the centre of a very good and enterprising homemakers club. There are nine of the 14 members present today; they have come down to see the Legislature in action. On your behalf, Sir, I welcome them to the Legislature and wish them a safe journey home.

Some Hon. Members: Hear, hear!

STATEMENT FROM PREMIER RE: HELPING ASIAN IMMIGRANTS

Hon. W. Ross Thatcher (Premier): — Mr. Speaker, before the Orders of the Day, I should like to make a brief statement. In recent days, the world has learned of the very difficult problem that has arisen in the United Kingdom with respect to Asian immigrants from Kenya. I think most Canadians are familiar with the plight of these British subjects. Today on behalf of the Saskatchewan Government, I wrote to the Prime Minister of Canada in this regard. We informed him that, if the Canadian Government should endeavor to accept some of these unfortunate people, the Province of Saskatchewan would do all in its power to help. Our Government feels that, with the shortage of workers in our province at the present time, a limited number of these people would be a welcome addition to our population.

Some Hon. Members: Hear, hear!

QUESTIONS

CHARGING CREDIT UNIONS AUDITING SERVICES

Mr. F. Meakes (Touchwood): — Mr. Speaker, before the Orders of the Day, may I direct a question to the Minister of Co-operation (Mr. Coderre). When is the Department intending to begin charging credit unions for auditing services?

Hon. L.P. Coderre (Minister of Labour): — All activities within the Department are being looked into. The decision has not definitely been finalized as yet.

POTASH UNDER U.S. CONTROL

Mr. E. Whelan (Regina North West): — Mr. Speaker, before the Orders of the Day, I would like to direct a question to the Premier (Mr. Thatcher), who is also the Minister of Industry, about an urgent matter which was commented on by a Federal Cabinet Minister in the press two evenings ago. The Hon. Walter Gordon, President of Privy Council, is quoted as follows:

He cited the potash development in Saskatchewan as an example of the loss of Canadian sovereignty of a natural resource to the United States control. Potash development in the province was in the hands of U.S. owned companies and under U.S. law could not be sold to Communist China, he said.

Is the Federal Cabinet Minister correct, Mr. Premier?

Mr. Thatcher: — I would say that if he made the kind of statement the Hon. Member says he did, that that's probably one of the reasons why he is resigning or being forced to resign from the Federal Cabinet.

Some Hon. Members: Hear, hear!

REPORT OF PROVINCIAL COMMITTEE ON HIGHER EDUCATION

Hon. W.S. Lloyd (Leader of the Opposition): — Mr. Speaker, before the Orders of the Day, I want to direct a question to the Minister of Education (Mr. McIsaac), I asked him on February 19 with respect to the report on the Provincial Committee on Higher Education. As I indicated at that time, I think Mr. McIsaac said it would be very soon. The Minister at that time said he expected to receive it next month and I'll repeat my question today, nine days later, does the Minister have a copy of the report? Has he received? If so, does he intend to table it and distribute it to the Members of the Legislature?

Hon. J.C. McIsaac (Minister of Education): — Mr. Speaker, Yes, in answer to the question, we do intend to table it at a fairly early date, I would hope.

LIQUOR OUTLET IN CREIGHTON

Mr. W.J. Berezowsky (Prince Albert East-Cumberland): — Before the Orders of the Day, I would like to direct a question to the Hon. Premier. I've had representations from the Mayor and the people of Creighton — that is the Fish and Game League — in my constituency concerning the need for licensed liquor outlets, which they haven't had for some time. Apparently, I'm told or I have been advised that letters were sent to the Premier, but they have been unable to get any reply to their letters, so I'm asking if the Premier can advise if any decision has been made in providing these people with this very urgent liquor outlet?

Mr. Thatcher: — Well, Mr. Speaker, we are prepared to put an outlet in Creighton if we can find a suitable agent. Up until now we haven't found such an individual. If the Hon. Member would like to help make recommendations, the Government would like to have an outlet in Creighton and would be glad to co-operate. We are not prepared to open a Government store there.

ADJOURNED DEBATES

ADDRESS-IN-REPLY

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

Mr. J.E. Brockelbank (Saskatoon Mayfair): — Mr. Speaker, as the debate on the main motion draws to its conclusion, there are two observations that become clear and can be made at this time. The Throne Speech has a very limited appeal to the constituents in Saskatoon Mayfair. Our Leader (Mr. Lloyd), has shown a keen mind coupled with his strong grasp of the problems that should be discussed in the Throne Speech.

Some Hon. Members: Hear, hear!

Mr. Brockelbank: — Our Leader knew many months ago that this Government was administering a first-class mental health program with second-class financing. The Frazier Report has confirmed his stand.

Some Hon. Members: Hear, hear!

Mr. Brockelbank: — Our Leader many months ago knew that this province was suffering an economic downturn, even though the Premier kept secret the Saskatchewan Economic Report for ten months. This Report and subsequent events have served to confirm our Leader's stand.

In the time at my disposal today, Mr. Speaker, I want to acquaint you and the Chamber with the constituency of Saskatoon Mayfair. Saskatoon Mayfair is in the northwest section of Saskatoon City and takes its name from one of the oldest-established residential areas within its boundaries. The constituency has an industrial warehousing area but is mainly residential, growing very rapidly in the Massey Place and Westview developments.

At this time, Mr. Speaker, I would like to thank the voters of Saskatoon Mayfair for honoring me by allowing me to be their Member of this Legislature. I will, in the time that I serve them, do everything in my power to make sure that their trust is not misplaced. With 16,199 eligible voters, Saskatoon Mayfair's voting population is exceeded by only one other constituency. I enjoy representing 16,199 voters, but some of my constituents wonder why they have only one-third the voting power in this Chamber compared to, for example, Hanley constituency, which lies very close to Saskatoon Mayfair, with 5,506 eligible voters. Three Liberal redistributions in three successive years have served to worsen the situation each time. Like I say, Mr. Speaker, I enjoy representing 16,199 voters from Mayfair constituency.

Some Hon. Members: Hear, hear!

Mr. Brockelbank: — A very severe problem exists in Saskatoon Mayfair regarding the first and only low-rental housing construction in

Saskatoon, all within the boundaries of Saskatoon Mayfair. It is equally distributed in two locations, Leif Erickson and Westview Place. The 100 family units were constructed under a tri-party agreement, that is the Federal, Provincial and Municipal Governments. One year and almost one month ago, the Federal Government, that is the senior partner, agreed to implement a reduction in rent schedules all across Canada. I attempted at the time to discover why our Provincial Government had not implemented the new rent schedules, at three different times, with two different Ministers of Municipal Affairs, but as of this time, Mr. Speaker, I have not received any satisfaction on behalf of my constituents. I understand that the reductions have been implemented in other provinces with some retroactivity involved. The average reduction calculated at \$16 per month would have meant approximately, on average, \$192 per year for each tenant. Many of these tenants are on fixed incomes or low incomes and faced a drastic increase in the cost of living last year. Lest the Members of this Legislature believe that I am asking for special treatment for my constituents only, perish the thought. The problem is not confined to Saskatoon Mayfair, but it exists in 548 housing units throughout the province. Consequently anything I say about Mayfair equally affects the balance of the 548 units. This plea for action by the Government is also on behalf of people in the cities of Regina, Moose Jaw, Prince Albert, North Battleford, Swift Current, and the constituencies of Souris-Estevan, Weyburn, Kelsey, Melfort-Tisdale, Kerrobert-Kindersley and Meadow Lake. Mr. Speaker, I know many people renting accommodations comparable to the low rental units in Saskatoon City for considerably less. For example, I know a family with an income of \$400 per month that pays \$120 month for a three-bedroom accommodation, whereas a resident in Edmund Heights, (another development of a different nature in Saskatoon) that same family would pay \$68 per month for the same accommodation. In addition, the people in other provinces in Canada in rent-to-income accommodations would pay \$103 per month compared to Saskatchewan at \$120 per month. This Government has failed the people of Saskatoon Mayfair. This Government has failed the people in the other 12 Saskatchewan communities I have mentioned.

Mr. Speaker, the Liberal Party has an instinctive antagonism toward medicare and hospitalization. Medicare and hospitalization plans instituted by a CCF Government were two of the greatest social goals achieved by the people of Saskatchewan. The Saskatchewan Liberal party has served as the focal point of resistance to these social advancements in each case. They continue to demonstrate their resistance to meaningful social advancement. Another stumbling block will soon be placed in the way of our Medicare plan's advancement. It was hinted on December 6, 1967 that the Government was considering instituting a co-insurance fee on the Saskatchewan Hospital Plan users. Mr. Speaker, those are "weasel" words. At the time I publicly protested the use of the term, co-insurance. The Government intends to introduce a tax on the sick, proof positive that the Government continues to chip away at the social foundations of legislation brought in by successive CCF Governments. The Liberal party's undermining of social legislation seriously affects the people in my constituency. Many, as I have said, are on fixed incomes. There are five senior citizens or nursing homes in my constituency containing about 570 people, low-income families that I have previously mentioned, and many others living in private homes on fixed or low incomes. The Saskatoon Labor Council, representing thousands of employees, had its

February, 28, 1968

annual meeting on January 20, 1968, and unanimously passed a resolution which I believe could as easily have been passed by the constituents of Saskatoon Mayfair. The resolution reads as follows:

Whereas hospital deterrent fees are being threatened by the present Provincial Government as a means of reducing the cost of medicare;

And whereas such fees would obviously not deter middle and higher-income citizens from continuing full use of hospital space and costs;

And whereas, as the name implies, the deterrent fee would bring the question of costs into the decision of the low-income citizens whether they have operations or other care requiring hospitalization;

Therefore be it resolved that this Council protest any deterrent fees being introduced as being class legislation.

Mr. Speaker, if attacks on the sick are instituted, this Government will have failed the people of Saskatoon Mayfair constituency again.

As you have probably gathered, Mr. Speaker, I will not be supporting the main motion.

Some Hon. Members: Hear, hear!

Mr. G.R. Bowerman (Shellbrook): — Mr. Speaker, it is a very honorable and challenging experience to enter this Assembly and consequently to enter this Throne Speech debate. At this late stage of the debate, Sir, I can only re-echo the often stated congratulatory remarks of the Hon. Members of this Assembly for your reappointment, Sir, as Speaker of this House. May I assure you of my continuing co-operation during the deliberations of this Assembly.

My sense of humility in accepting this rather honorable office is deepened, when I am reminded that of the 56 years that the Shellbrook constituency has been represented as a seat in this Legislature, I am, Sir, only the ninth person to have received such a mandate. My responsibility to this role, Sir, is born out of a deep sense of conviction that government is an institution for the benefit and the welfare of all men, that every man's stewardship, Sir, is linked with the progressive and equal development of himself with his neighbor and that government can no longer permit the great voids of disparity which exist between men of the world. Much less, they must not be permitted to exist between the peoples of a province. I am reminded again, Sir, that of the 56 years and the nine representing MLAs for the Shellbrook constituency, for 21 of these years five of these MLAs have been Members who proposed the kind of social democracy that identifies myself and my colleagues on this side of the House regardless of our name.

Some Hon. Members: Hear, hear!

Mr. Bowerman: — Our name, Sir, seems to be giving the Government some problems. But may I refresh their memory that the Members on

this side of the House that have come before us began by being called independents, and we moved from this position to a position called, farmer-labor candidates, and from here to the CCF. And, Mr. Speaker, today we sit in this House as New Democrats. We have stayed up with the new generations, and let not the Government Members forget, Mr. Speaker, each time we changed our name, we increased our Members in this House until we took the Government in 1944. We will be at the polls, waiting with new vigor, new ideas, with new candidates and we'll be there with our new name, anytime you want to call the election.

Some Hon. Members: Hear, hear!

Mr. Bowerman: — I want to officially express, Mr. Speaker, my sincere gratitude for the election results of October last in the Shellbrook constituency. Contrary to much of the loose criticism that has been levelled by the Members opposite about the 20 years of CCF Government in Saskatchewan, may I remind them that it took the same people only three and one-half years to be ready for a change from the Liberal Government. And I hasten to add, Mr. Speaker, that it wouldn't have taken us that long, if the Premier had had the courage and the forthrightness to call the by-election in Shellbrook when that election was due.

Some Hon. Members: Hear, hear!

Mr. Bowerman: — I am, Sir, as I have said, both honored and challenged by the results of that event. I am also challenged, Mr. Speaker, by the demands of the new age, those demands which were so eloquently expressed in this House, Friday last, by the Member from Saskatoon Riversdale (Mr. Romanow). I must say that he warmed the enthusiasm of our party and the Members on this side of the House, as he warned the Government for their depressive and antiquated philosophy. Mr. Speaker, through the eyes of this new generation, politics and politicians can no longer subscribe to the shallow and narrow thinking which limits them and their programs to the past and to the current frenzied solutions that exist with this Government from day to day. And I make note, Sir, of The Teachers' Salary Negotiations Act, hospital abandonment, care of the mentally ill and health services with deterrent fees, an economy, Sir, that is tied to the pre-election and the post-election mood of a Premier, a comic strip government, with a boom-boom, doom-doom theme. I suggest, Sir, the new generation is no longer willing to enter the arenas of legislative debate on the basis of political behavior by repetitious words, such as, socialism, stagnation and compulsion. The Liberals did in fact win the Government on these three words and I suggest, Mr. Speaker, they will lose the Government by repetition of the same three words.

In returning to a comment on my constituency, Mr. Speaker, I will use the well-chosen words of my colleague in saying that our Shellbrook constituency is also representative of the great Canadian mosaic, nearly 3,000 of our population are first born Canadians. They, Sir, were the hosts and the guides to the immigrants that later came to our constituency from virtually all lands of the globe. My regrets and my apologies, Mr. Speaker, go to these honorable Neheyawuk (Cree Indians) that it was ever considered wisdom or justice in the eyes of those who governed that the solution to a multicultural social problem was reservation status for the minority group.

February, 28, 1968

There are also in our constituency three well established French-language communities. I do hope, Mr. Speaker, the Hon. Minister of Education (Mr. McIsaac) will consider these communities among some of the first to be incorporated into the French-language schools system. We can assure him that they will not find any better or more deserving French-language communities in which to start their schools program.

There are two projects that would be valuable to our constituency and I would urge respective consideration of the Hon. Minister of Highways (Mr. Boldt) and the Hon. Minister of Natural Resources (Mr. Barrie) and they are: firstly, that a decision for the routing of Highway No. 55 north from Shellbrook to the Shell River be finalized and that reconstruction be negotiated for at the earliest possible opportunity; and secondly, the development of a regional park near the communities of Victoire and Debden at Devil's Lake. I can assure both the Hon. Ministers of the complete co-operation of the Big River Road Tourist Association on both projects and of course, the assistance and co-operation of the residents in related communities. Shellbrook, Mr. Speaker, is a rural constituency. It is also by virtue of The Legislative Assembly Act, a northern constituency and I presume that this defines our economic base as agriculture and natural resources.

Agriculturally, the southern part of our constituency is situated in the black and degraded black soil zones. These classifications as many will recognize include some of the province's better soils classification for production. In the northern end of the farming portion of the constituency are large tracts of grey-wooded soils that provide abundant grazing and pasture lands. This pasture land is very vital to those farming in these less productive soils, and I want to emphasize that much of this land is still Crown-owned and presently being utilized under lease. We are therefore much concerned about the Throne Speech announcement of the Government's intended new policy to sell Crown-owned land by tender. And I want to deal with this a little later in my remarks.

In relation to our natural resources, one of the last major commercial white spruce forests of Saskatchewan lies almost completely within our constituency. This has usually been referred to as the Dore-Smoothstone Timber Block. This timber was the basis for the development of Saskatchewan's Timber Board's high-utilization sawmill at Big River, and I'll not forget to mention that this mill was constructed and operated under the CCF Government until 1964. This forest and sawmill operation, Sir, has continued over the years to be the life blood of the Big River community. And may I suggest to you that the Thatcher Government has continued to produce sufficient doubt about the future of this operation that the citizens of our northern community are experiencing great anxiety and instability relative to their investments in homes, in businesses and in their securities. Mr. Speaker, it is obvious to many that the Premier vainly delights in playing cat and mouse with the rights and livelihood of Saskatchewan people, particularly, Sir, those with whom he may tend to disagree.

Mr. Speaker, my first experience in lumbering and timber operations began in British Columbia. I also marked and cruised timber in the Dore-Smoothstone Timber Block for the Big River mill in 1949 and 1950. During my sixteen years of public service I have been associated by observation and otherwise with

the utilization of our Provincial forests. I want to impress upon the Hon. Members of the Government that I have never, Mr. Speaker, in my experience observed such sheer and utter waste and disregard for forest resources, as I have in this province in the last recent years. Pulpwood cutting is already well-established in the heart of the Dore-Smoothstone Timber Block. I suggest that, if the Government continues to permit the same kind of over-production and waste that it has, then the fears and anxieties of our people are well justified.

Related to our forest and parkland regions we have one of the best big game and upland-game-bird hunting areas in North America. This indicates, Mr. Speaker, that there is a keen interest by our citizens regarding wildlife management and conservation programs that will continue to require wise use for sustained yields of these very valuable resources. We are at the moment concerned over the inflexibility, the apparent inflexibility of big game hunting seasons and season dates which permit the hunting and taking of big game animals at seasons of the year which produce large number of wounded game. These animals once wounded wander into the densely forested regions to die, a very regrettable waste, Mr. Speaker, and one that we believe could be corrected, if hunting seasons and season dates were more closely related to the seasons of snow.

We have in the Shellbrook constituency, Sir, Saskatchewan's only National Park. This recent addition to the Prince Albert National Park by an electoral boundary change seemed to have its greatest significance, I suggest, in the transfer of nearly one hundred votes from my colleague's unbeatable Cumberland constituency. This was considered to be the Thatcher mender touch that was to assure another Liberal victory for Shellbrook. Even with these odds, Sir, three and a half years were too much for us.

I want to make specific mention, Mr. Speaker, of the four Indian reservations in our constituency. Three of these are quite advanced and are progressing favorably and steadily. There is one that is yet in the area of much slower development. I want to honour the Chiefs and people of these reservations, Sir, as outstanding citizens, as men and women of conscious courage and as men and women with a purpose that is beset by very grievous problems. I want especially, Sir, to name Chief Arthur Ledoux and his people of the Mistiwasis reserve, Chief Allan Ahenakew and his people at Sandy Lake, Chief George Whitefish and his people at Big River reserve, and Chief John Charles and his people at the Sturgeon Lake reserve.

Some Hon. Members: Hear, hear!

Mr. Bowerman: — I want to officially express my gratitude to these honourable people for their support on election day. And I want to assure them that I will endeavour to honestly represent them and their people in this Legislature of Saskatchewan.

Mr. Speaker, I would now like to turn my remarks to the Throne Speech. I initially want to commend the Government for the various aspects of their program which if carried to their just fulfilment, will indeed receive my support and I'm sure the support of many of my colleagues.

February, 28, 1968

There are however, Mr. Speaker, many things that are said and unsaid which permit justifiable concern. I refer at this moment to the portion of the Throne Speech dealing with agriculture. The opening sentence of this portion of the Throne Speech, Sir, suggests one of two things. The composer either deliberately distorted the historic facts and the truth of agriculture in this province and did so in order to cover the tracks of this Government's inability to properly handle the economy of the province, or he was referring to what his Liberal Government did for Saskatchewan agriculture in 1967. And in this latter regard we are in complete agreement, Sir, "It was one of the driest years in the history of our province.

Some Hon. Members: Hear, hear!

Mr. Bowerman: — I want to commend the Government, Sir, for their direct assistance to hog and beef enterprises and for the proposal to extend this assistance. However, with regard to the statement on agricultural diversification, it either demonstrates, Sir, inexcusable hate in its composition or very shallow thinking on the part of the Government for the real problems which beset agriculture. To suggest that only by increased agricultural diversification can farmers be assured of a reasonable return for their efforts sidesteps the real issue of the cost-price squeeze. We are in an age of intensive specialization, Mr. Speaker, and the farmer is being forced unilaterally to diversity, because of the seriousness of his economic position. Diversification broadens the economic base for farm income, but it also increases, Mr. Speaker, the per unit effort of the farmer.

We wonder if the Premier and his Hon. Ministers are suggesting to the Saskatchewan farmers that if they add to their grain farming unit a hundred head of beef cattle, fifty brood sows and a poultry enterprise, this would in fact assure them of a more reasonable income for their efforts in producing a bushel of wheat. Similarly, Mr. Speaker, are they saying to Saskatchewan farmers that, if we add another hundred and sixty acres of crop land that this will assure a more reasonable return for farmers' efforts in producing a hundred pounds of beef, or that it will in fact increase the price of milk, eggs or pork to the farmer? No, Mr. Speaker, the agricultural program of the Liberal Governments in Ottawa and Saskatchewan today is one of projected confusion. They have said to Canadian farmers, on one hand, multiply your production, on the other hand, intensify your operations, and today they are saying that we need to diversify. What they are really saying, Sir, is, "Take your pick, Mr. Farmer, we really haven't anything else to offer."

I was amazed to understand the Hon. Member from Shaunavon (Mr. Larochelle) to say in this House Friday last that cattlemen in his constituency were generally well satisfied with the falling price of beef. Mr. Speaker, it has been generally well established in the past number of years that the farm enterprise with one of the narrowest operating margins, is the cow and calf enterprise. It has been suggested that a two per cent calf crop loss is the limit for a profitable operation. That's two calves in a hundred, including the breeding misses and the natural mortality. I suggest it points out how badly out of touch this Government is with agriculture.

I would like to deal for a minute or two with the proposed legislation on the new policy of selling Crown lands by tender. After listening, Sir, to the Member from Regina South West (Mr. McPherson) with his great emphasis on the private sector, it suggests to me that he may very well have been the author of this new policy. If this proposed new policy is carried to its fulfilment, Mr. Speaker, it will seriously reduce, and for many it will eliminate, the last hope for the small and young farmer to acquire a competitive farm unit for himself. I suggest that it plays directly into the hands of those who have an abundance and takes directly from those who have an insufficiency. I suggest, Mr. Speaker, that the Government take Crown land disposition out of the arena where the great exponents of the private sector out-tender the young farmers, and that they maintain some at least control and some conditions which will permit the young farmers to enter into the process of acquiring this lease land. For these reasons and many others which time does not permit me to elaborate on, I am suggesting, Sir, that I will vote for the defeat of the original motion.

Some Hon. Members: Hear, hear!

Mr. T.M. Weatherald: — Mr. Speaker, although I am somewhat belated in speaking in this debate, and although our Speaker is not in his chair, I would still like to thank him. I have a feeling that he is possibly listening on his microphone. Over the past four years I have come to know the Speaker, I have become an admirer of his talent in both learning the rules of this House, and in keeping this Assembly in very strict order, possibly not all the time, but at least most of the time.

I have listened with interest, Mr. Speaker, to the comments particularly of a number of the new Members on that side of the Legislature. Most of their performances have been conducted in quite an orderly fashion. However, some of them seem to have taken on what is the most onerous task of representing all of the young generation, and telling us that at least their ideas coincided with those of all the young generation.

Some Hon. Members: Hear, hear!

Mr. Weatherald: — I think that is considerably open to some dispute. At least some of us on this side would like to question them. I do find, Mr. Speaker, that there is a certain degree of understanding amongst all Members on that side. Just as one observer said the other day, it is just as though all the Members of the Opposition had asked all their constituents what they want and then they proceeded to promise to give it to them.

Undoubtedly the economic theories that are proposed on that side of the House subscribe to the old outworn Socialist theory, that there aren't many things you can do for yourselves, but Government can fix you up and do practically anything that is required for you. All you have to do is put an NDP Government in and we'll look after you happily and you should be darn glad of it.

Mr. Speaker, I want to turn for a few moments to one of the NDP promises that was made in the past election, in regard to free tuition. I don't believe that there is a single member in this Assembly that would say that every single person in

February, 28, 1968

this province or in this country that has the ability and the talent for a higher education shouldn't receive one. This is certainly not open to question. There is no argument about this principle that every person qualified should be able to obtain a higher education. The manner in which it is brought about certainly is open to question. We have been suffering through or listening to, in recent years, the debate on whether we should have completely free tuition at our universities or whether they are really entitled and should be required to pay at least a portion of their education costs.

I submit, Mr. Speaker, that students should be required to pay at least a portion of their education costs.

Some Hon. Members: Hear, hear!

Mr. Weatherald: — Mr. Speaker, I might say that many students in this country realize that they are one of the more fortunate groups in our society, that they are a group of young people that will be the doctors, the lawyers, the professional people and the business people of this country, that eventually many of them will earn the highest salaries in this country. It is time that they accepted this responsibility and their good fortune, because it certainly isn't share by very many people of their age group. I hope that the young people of this country will recognize the fact, particularly those capable of higher education at least, of their good fortune, and not do quite so much whining about all their difficulties.

Mr. Speaker, I thoroughly believe that the manner of interest-free loans is a logical and a legitimate way of financing higher education.

Some Hon. Members: Hear, hear!

Mr. Weatherald: — Statistics today show that a university degree in earning power alone, after the person has graduated from university, is worth approximately \$100,000 in increased earnings. This is \$100,000 more than that person would earn, if he did not attend university or he had finished his high school and then sought a job. This person, if he wants to show a little fortitude, work a little bit harder, and make a little sacrifice, can borrow money at an interest-free rate. He doesn't have to pay it back until he obtains his degree, and in a short period afterwards, with his higher salary he is able to pay off his loan. This is not too much of a hardship to place upon anyone. This is certainly reasonable from the standpoint that many other young people, both women and men, are investing money in their farms, they're investing money in hairdressing shops for the young ladies, in any type of business that you can think of. Nobody comes along, Mr. Speaker, and says, "Look here's the money, go into business and start earning a living for yourself." But there are some people who seem to think that just because you go to university that you should be absolved of all financial responsibility. I do not subscribe to this one bit. I believe there are many other young people in this country, who do not subscribe to this belief that everything for the university student should be free.

Some Hon. Members: Hear, hear!

Mr. Weatherald: — Monetarily an investment in education will return a far greater reward in the future years than will any other single investment that a person can make. I see no reason why a person who is a student in a university shouldn't at least make a contribution.

I want to reiterate what I said at the beginning, and that is, that I do not question the fact that everyone that is capable should have the opportunity of going to university. But I think that other financial means than free university education are perfectly reasonable.

I want to say a few words, Mr. Speaker, about the student press, particularly the Carillon, and my remarks will also be said about the Sheaf, the University of Saskatchewan paper at Saskatoon; the Carillon is located here in Regina. No one here disputes the right to any viewpoint they wish. In this I plead for political, social, anything they wish to write. If they have a viewpoint I will accept that. That's only a good democratic principle. All of us will readily accept that whatever they wish to write, that is perfectly within their means. However, Mr. Speaker, in recent times these papers have both deteriorated to be not much more than a common bawdy magazine that can often be bought at the local drugstore. Although the English language is endowed with a substantial number of words, it seems in recent times that few of the writers for either the Sheaf or the Carillon are familiar enough with them to avoid the perpetual use of either profanity or filth.

A number of years ago such conduct warranted an appearance usually before the student council, but today the action of these writers seems to be accepted by the student council. The effect of these articles in student papers is readily recognized by many of the people on the streets throughout this province. Many of the people are unfamiliar with university life. Many parents have yet to send their first sixteen or seventeen-year-old off to a university. When they read the literature that is being printed in these papers, the profanity that is so common, is it any wonder that they are reluctant to send their students off to that particular institution? Surely we have something better to offer in the way of literature in university papers than terms of sex, narcotics and profanity.

If the students seriously want a university image with the public as they suggest in their student papers – and I don't doubt that they seriously make these remarks – that it can be to the benefit of the University and themselves, then I suggest these two student papers can start printing literature on a somewhat higher intellectual level that can be a credit to both themselves and our society.

Some Hon. Members: Hear, hear!

Mr. Weatherald: — Mr. Speaker, I would like now to take a few moments to talk about my constituency. As we all know, it's very difficult for any Member – and this applies equally to any Member in the Legislature – to know every single person that has done some kindness for him or helped and assisted him in his election campaign. I want to thank those in my constituency of Cannington that worked so very hard for me during the past campaign. I hope that in the next four years that I can prove worthy of

February, 28, 1968

the assistance and the help they gave me. Again I wish to make it plain to the people of Cannington that I will be most happy to hear from any single person in that constituency, regardless of politics, whatever their political faith may be.

Mr. Speaker, I could go into some detail about some of the problems in the constituency of Cannington, but I don't want to take the time of the House to do that this afternoon. I will be making these representations to the various Ministers at the appropriate times. Naturally in our constituency we have all of the usual problems of roads, needs for natural gas, hospitalization and so on. But I think these can be adequately dealt with on a personal basis between myself and any delegation that would like to come to Regina to see the Minister.

Mr. Speaker, during the election campaign I made a few particular promises that I would like to mention for a few moments in this House. The first deals with our municipal road system. During the election campaign and for some time previous I had promised my constituents that I would do everything within my power to urge the Provincial Government to make more finances available to the municipalities to build our municipal road system up to a satisfactory level, so that all rural people will have a road winter and summer. I am thoroughly convinced that we have reached a point in time at which we are wealthy enough that this is certainly a minimum standard level of living that every rural citizen can expect.

Some Hon. Members: Hear, hear!

Mr. Weatherald: — Although the Government's record has been excellent in increasing this assistance, I am still told it will take approximately thirteen years at our present level of expenditure, expenditure by both the municipalities and the Provincial Government, that it would take thirteen years before we would reach the level so that all rural citizens would have a road which would be both satisfactory for winter and summer. This to me, Mr. Speaker, is simply too long. I think this is drastically needed to be shortened to be within the next four or five years. It is a necessity from the point of view of agriculture. There are many young people moving from farms simply because of the need to send their children to school. They have difficult education problems because of poor roads. We are in need of good rural roads for the sake of agriculture so that we can keep many of these people from moving to their town or the closest city. I am convinced of this need, Mr. Speaker, and I will make every effort to urge the Government to implement my promise and make more finances available to the municipality so that our municipal road system will be in good order.

The second promise that I made, Mr. Speaker, was that I am firmly convinced that as a Member of the Legislature, we are long overdue for a complete reform of our property tax system as it pertains to education. In many instances now throughout Saskatchewan the property tax that is going to education well exceeds the 50 per cent level and less than 50 per cent of the tax is going towards municipal services. Personally I have no quarrel with the amount going to municipal services and I feel few other people do either. This is the part of tax which is going to serve municipal roads, to help build streets and sidewalks in the towns or in the cities. In other words the people paying this municipal tax or this portion of municipal tax are getting full value for their money.

There are some tax notices which now show that on land alone, farm land, the taxes are now exceeding \$2 per acre. But the result of raising the much needed revenue for education today, the result of raising it for so many years on the property tax has been for many of our people although they are earning an exceptionally low income, because they happen to be a property owner and a small businessman, that their net income is low, yet they are forced to be fairly substantial and large contributors to our education system regardless of their net income. Conversely a person on a fairly substantial salary, because he isn't a property owner, often makes a small contribution towards education. Many people in high salary brackets are contributing little to the education system through the education tax because they do not make a living through the ownership of property. This person, Mr. Speaker, will contribute education taxes through the consumer taxes and the income tax. But these two taxes also equally apply to any other single person that is making a net income. Essentially the property tax in regard to revenue for education is a very unfair tax and places a heavy burden on many, many low income earners. This has been recognized by all Governments for many years. No Government has had the courage to reform the system. Personally, Mr. Speaker, I intend to urge this Government to go about the reform of the method of raising education revenue through property tax. I would be exceptionally proud if within the next four years it takes steps in this direction.

Some Hon. Members: Hear, hear!

Mr. Weatherald: — Admittedly any relief to the property owner will require other sources of taxation to replace the revenue loss. I am firmly convinced that the large majority of Saskatchewan taxpayers will happily accept any reform which is brought about, because, to be quite blunt about it, I am thoroughly convinced they are fed up with the present method of raising so much revenue through the property tax system.

Mr. Speaker, in the past election the Liberal party stood for a policy of few electoral promises, but promises which were both economically sound and which can be logically instituted. They are in tune with what we can financially afford and what this Province drastically needs. Because of this, Mr. Speaker, I will be supporting the motion and giving full approval to the Government's intention of implementing its program.

Some Hon. Members: Hear, hear!

Hon. D.G. Steuart (Provincial Treasurer): — Mr. Speaker, I would first like to join with others in congratulating you on your election to the high office you have filled so well for these last four years.

Mr. Speaker, I would be very honored to announce to the House that in Ottawa just now the Liberal Government defeated the combined forces of evil, 138 to 199.

Some Hon. Members: Hear, hear!

Mr. Steuart: — I am sure that if the Leader of the Opposition (Mr. Lloyd) was in his seat he would be pleased. It means that he'll have a job for another year or two.

February, 28, 1968

Mr. Speaker, I would also welcome the new Members on both sides of the House to this Assembly and wish them well.

It was no accident, Mr. Speaker, that the subject of economic growth was placed first in the Speech from the Throne. The Saskatchewan Liberal Government has always placed great emphasis on economic growth because we recognize the good that flows from this type of development. Industrial development produces jobs, higher wages and new revenue for the Treasury. This kind of development means prosperity for the people and funds for programs of education, health and welfare. For the most dramatic proof that industrial development works for the benefit of the ordinary wage earner, one only has to look at what has happened in the north these past four years. While Saskatchewan was recognized as one of the have-not provinces in Canada after 20 years of Socialism, the north was the most depressed area in the entire province.

In 1963 the basic wage across northern Saskatchewan was little better than \$1 an hour. Even in the Government Timber Board the basic rate was less than \$1.40 an hour. Year round chronic unemployment was the order of the day as the CCF drove out or kept out industry after industry. Today, Mr. Speaker, the picture is as different as night is from day. Wages are at an all-time high, up 50 to 60 per cent in only four years. And for most of the year full employment has brought new prosperity in northern Saskatchewan. Mr. Speaker, the change was brought about by Liberal industrial policies that have done more for northern Saskatchewan in every one of the last four years than the Socialists did in all of the 20 years they held office.

First we broke the Government monopoly and opened up the timber industry to private enterprise. We bailed out the Wizewood plant in Hudson Bay for example; it was into the Government for hundreds of thousands of dollars and going broke. McMillan-Blodel bought the Wizewood Company, increased its production ten-fold, put 250 people to work at almost double the wages and is now planning a \$4 million expansion.

Some Hon. Members: Hear, hear!

Mr. Steuart: — We brought in the Simpson Timber Company and they opened a \$2 million sawmill, again hundreds of new jobs at good wages for the northern people.

At the same time we instituted a mining incentive program that encouraged over 90 mining companies to come to northern Saskatchewan and spend up to \$5 million a year on mineral exploration. As a result three mines were brought into production, employing over 400 men at the highest wages paid in that part of the province.

Other industries and businesses have followed, but the high point was the Prince Albert pulp mill, giving work to some 1,500 men during construction, 400 to 500 men when it goes into production, and hundreds more in the forest. You know, Mr. Speaker, you might think development like this would make every citizen of Saskatchewan happy and proud, especially those from northern Saskatchewan.

It made most people happy, but not the Socialist, not the NDP. These bitter jealous people have done everything in their power to block, frustrate, stop and even destroy the industrial development in northern Saskatchewan. Led by the Member from Prince Albert East-Cumberland (Mr. Berezowsky), and backed up by the NDP Members from The Battlefords (Mr. Kramer), Kinistino (Mr. Thibault), Shellbrook (Mr. Bowerman), Redberry (Mr. Michayluk), and Kelsey (Mr. Messer), the Socialists have never stopped smearing and downgrading the pulp mill and the other new mills and mines we have brought into northern Saskatchewan.

Mr. Speaker, let me quote some of the statements made by the Member for Prince Albert East-Cumberland:

Timber operations are in a sorry state under the Liberals.

Mr. Berezowsky is quoted as saying in the Prince Albert Herald, and again the same man asks, "Is the Prince Albert pulp mill doomed before it starts production? Are we selling our birthright?"

First, Mr. Speaker, they said that there wasn't enough timber, then the pulp mill would never start, it wouldn't last. When these tactics failed they accuse us of giving away our natural resources. Mr. Speaker, the NDP were not satisfied with just organizing a whispering campaign against the pulp mill. They have actually tried on several occasions to sabotage it. There have been at least 20 or 30 wildcat strikes during construction of the mill. I say that many of these strikes were incited by the NDP labor leaders in Prince Albert and encouraged by the Member from Prince Albert East-Cumberland.

Members of the Saskatchewan Federation of Labour in Prince Albert like Harry Apps, the former NDP candidate, John Norman, an active NDP union member, have worked behind the scenes day in and day out against the pulp mill.

Mr. Speaker, can anyone doubt the Socialist attitude towards our new Saskatchewan mines and mills, when the Member from Prince Albert East-Cumberland stood in this House on Monday night and cried, "All the Liberals worry about is jobs, jobs, jobs." What's his answer and what's the Socialist answer? When a man is unemployed, what do they give him? Cake? No, they give him welfare as they did for 20 years in northern Saskatchewan.

Mr. Speaker, of course we worry about jobs and we have produced more jobs at higher wages for Saskatchewan people in four years than the NDP did in the best 10 years that they held office.

Some Hon. Members: Hear, hear!

Mr. Steuart: — Mr. Speaker, we have done this in the fact of an organized plot to tear down and discredit this province, led by the Leader of the Opposition (Mr. Lloyd) and supported by every Socialist Member opposite.

You know when the Member from Prince Albert East-Cumberland sneers at our new mines as peanut mines, he's just echoing the sentiments of his colleagues. Unfortunately Bill suffers from hoof and mouth disease and he hasn't learned to work quietly in the background yet like the rest of his Members do.

February, 28, 1968

You know Mr. Barry Richards, a former CCF MLA and the manager of the Rotten-Stone mine took an ad in the Prince Albert Herald just before the last election to announce that his mine was in production in spite of and not because of our Liberal Government. Mr. Speaker, what a typical Socialist backbiting, cowardly, lying action!

I was present when this man and his partner pleaded with our Premier and the Minister of Industry for financial help to build a road into the Rotten-Stone mine so they could move into production. We gave him financial help, and as a result their mine came into production.

This is the kind of thing we have seen all across the north ever since we took office and brought new life and new prosperity into that part of Saskatchewan. That's the fellow they kicked out of the CCF. I think he was even a little too left-wing for them.

I had hoped that some of the NDP Members might bring a fresh and enlightening attitude to this House and to the Opposition.

An Hon. Member: — Better late than never.

Mr. Steuart: — So far, Mr. Speaker, I have been disappointed. The new ones are still peddling the same tired old something-for-nothing garbage that we've heard for 20 years from the Socialists. The middle-aged Member from Saskatoon Riversdale (Mr. Romanow) by his first speech showed that economically he doesn't know where babies come from anymore than the tired old Socialist front benches he so freely ridicules in public and private.

He also did his little best, Mr. Speaker, to downgrade Saskatchewan's own pulp mill by quoting from an article by Mr. R.M. Fowler, President of the Canadian Pulp and Paper Association. You know, Mr. Fowler is against the pulp mill like the one we have in Saskatchewan, and he predicts a difficult time for it. He also suggests that we may be giving our resources away to the Americans. So our new Member from Saskatoon Riversdale gleefully helps him spread his message and thus puts another roadblock in the way of Saskatchewan industry. Mr. Speaker, Mr. Fowler is a paid employee of the existing Canadian pulp mills. He is paid to discourage competition. Why wouldn't he do his best to discourage our Saskatchewan pulp mill? It isn't going to help the pulp mills in Ontario and British Columbia. It may even hurt them for a while.

So here we have a Saskatchewan MLA playing into the hands of eastern and western pulp interests at the expense of his own province.

Some Hon. Members: Hear, hear!

Mr. Steuart: — Let me say, Mr. Speaker, that if our pulp mill does encounter difficulties, and if the men and women of northern Saskatchewan lost their jobs, they can thank the Members of the NDP who profess to be their friends, but they'll take the very bread out of their mouths for a little political gain.

You know, Mr. Speaker, the most charitable thing that I can say about the new Member from Saskatoon Riversdale is that

I hope he made this blunder from inexperience and a slightly over-ambitious way rather than from malice.

It's no wonder our Minister of Welfare (Mr. MacDonald) said in this House that the NDP put politics ahead of people. He said this in an answer to the Leader of the Opposition's (Mr. Lloyd) accusation that our Government was chiselling the senior citizens out of \$1.50 a month. Mr. Speaker, I can hardly believe that the Leader of the Opposition would dare to mention the treatment of the old and the needy when one considers the record of his Government in this regard. It is a record that when put to the test of action performance was a betrayal of all the needy people in this province.

An Hon. Member: — Come on up to Pioneer Village.

Mr. Steuart: — Let me review it briefly. On May 1, 1948 the CCF reduced their contribution to the pensioners of Saskatchewan from \$11.25 to \$7.50. They chiselled \$3.75 from the old people of this province. Well you don't like this because it's the truth.

In the session of 1948, the Socialists all voted against a Resolution that said, "This Legislature regrets Your Honour's Advisors decided in 1947 to discontinue the payment of supplemental allowance to old age pensioners." But most shocking of all, the Leader of the Opposition who now weeps crocodile tears also voted against this Resolution.

Mr. E. Whelan (Regina North East): . . . Cut off their medicare . . .

Mr. Steuart: — When the Dominion Government raised the pension to \$40 in 1949, these humanitarian Socialists reduced the supplementary allowance from \$5.00 to our old age pensioners to the magnificent sum of \$2.50 a month. Most shocking of all at the same time, in 1948 the Socialists introduced to Saskatchewan the most vicious means test anywhere in Canada before the old people could get this magnificent sum of \$2.50.

An Hon. Member: — Politics before people.

Mr. Steuart: — It actually deprived 40 per cent of the pensioners in Saskatchewan of all or any part of their supplementary allowance.

Then again, Mr. Speaker, in 1962-63 when the old age security payment was raised from \$65 to \$75, they refused to adjust the allowances for persons lying sick in nursing homes. This humanitarian first party that cries for the sick, refused to help those poor unfortunate old people in nursing homes, even refused to raise the per diem allowance of unfortunate children in foster homes all during his tenure as Premier, despite the rise in the cost of living. Mr. Speaker, he ignored the pensioners, he ignored the sic, he ignored the needy, he even ignored the unfortunate children.

Let's talk about that \$1.50 increase, it comes to a little over \$28,000. What are we doing with it? It is being multiplied many times over and will be spent on increasing the maintenance rates in our nursing homes. This, Mr. Speaker, is what the Liberal Government is doing with the \$28,000. We are adding hundreds of thousands of dollars to it and helping those in real need.

February, 28, 1968

Some Hon. Members: Hear, hear!

Mr. Stuart: — Mr. Speaker, we have heard a great deal in this House about campaign funds, about advertising agencies, and about the CCF changing their name to the NDP. You know in the case of the Socialists I believe these are all related. I think the people of Saskatchewan should know the truth about what goes on behind this sanctimonious front put up by the CCF, NDP Socialist party in this province.

Well to begin with, the Socialists love to accuse us of hiring an advertising agency, of having bands and even dancers at some of our political rallies. You know the Leader of the Opposition (Mr. Lloyd) stood in his place three years ago, after he had once again brilliantly led his party to its fifth straight defeat, and cried about how we had lowered the level of campaigning with our bands and dancers in the 1964 election. He and his colleagues accused us of using the gray flannel boys of the advertising world to create a new image for our party.

Mr. Speaker, we do have bands at some of our political rallies, and we do use an advertising agency, called MacLaren's — as a matter of fact they have a branch right here in Regina. We don't think there is anything wrong with a lively political meeting or having expert help draw up an ad once in a while. Now, Mr. Speaker, it is 1967 and a new provincial election campaign.

Something strange has happened to the holier-than-thou Socialists. They put ads in the paper. Let's look at one of these ads in the Regina Leader-Post. What does it say? It starts off here, "Woodrow Lloyd Victory Rally." Now there is a statement for you. No wonder the Opposition are always complaining about misleading advertising. Well anyway the ad continues: "Ivan McNab and his guitar", Ohley! "The great Mexican Sound of the Tijuana Seven", "The Intensely Vigorous College Nine" and then it says, "Who says politics have to be dull?"

Well Woodrow never said it had to be dull, but he succeeded in making it that way, every time he led the party.

What were the College Nine for? I guess that was to get the youth vote; the Mexican sound was to put a touch of the ethnic in their campaign. I understand they swept the Spanish vote in South Regina.

Some Hon. Members: Hear, hear!

Mr. Stuart: — Mr. Speaker, similar ads ran in newspapers throughout the province wherever the Member for Biggar's hopeless campaign wandered. But that was only the beginning. Here's another one. "Blow your mind with the CCF youth dance and rally." That was Regina Leader-Post September 30. Well I think that any of the youth that showed up there with the CCF, must have blown their minds . . . Blow your mind with the CCF! . . .

Some Hon. Members: Hear, hear!

Mr. Stuart: — As I told you in the beginning let's take a look at their youth pamphlets . . .

An Hon. Member: — 35 people!

Mr. Steuart: — Here's something they put out in the last campaign. I quote:

Youth, everyone understands the words, I love you. Everyone understands the words I love you, even understands a kiss and a tear.

Well, the love wasn't for old Woody, but the tear was when the elections were over. You know the strange thing about this pamphlet, put out here and peddled in Saskatchewan, it was printed in Montreal. There is the sign, I know the street. "Le Devoir" right in the centre of Montreal, there's the picture!

An Hon. Member: — How does that . . .

Mr. Steuart: — What does that mean?

An Hon. Member: — Bilingualism . . .

Mr. Steuart: — Well, I'll tell you what it means. It means that they hired an eastern advertising agency to put some life in their campaign. The advertising agency was called Dunsky and that's a good name for them, Dunsky and Associates, who were paid by the Socialists to mastermind their last campaign. Well I presume they were paid, but if they were paid, they were overpaid. But imagine, Mr. Speaker, the Socialists hiring a slick eastern ad agency to touch up their fading old image. How fallen are the mighty! How hypocritical can you get! After taking the sanctimonious attitude for years that they would never hire an ad agency, they would never hire dancing girls or bands, they sold their principles in a desperate bid for power.

Mr. Speaker, that's only the beginning, it's only part of the story . . .

An Hon. Member: — Topless coming up!

Mr. Steuart: — . . . They sold more than their principles . . .

An Hon. Member: — Wait, boy.

Mr. Steuart: — . . . in fact, Mr. Speaker, they sold their very souls to the American unions for some campaign funds.

An Hon. Member: — Oh, shame . . .

Mr. Steuart: — Mr. Speaker, I have here proof that the New Democratic party gets money on a regular basis from American unions that is sent directly to them from the United States.

An Hon. Member: — From Cuba?

Mr. Steuart: — Well you may get some from Cuba too, if you admitted the truth.

An Hon. Member: — What about Russia?

February, 28, 1968

Mr. Steuart: — There are reports from the United States Department of Labour. They are called Labour Organization Annual Reports and are required by American law to be filed annually with the United States Department of Labour. I'll table them in the House. These reports are from the United Automobile Workers of America. They are signed by Walter P. Reuther, President of the United Automobile Workers of America, Detroit, Michigan, USA. What do they show? They show that this American union gave the NDP or New Democratic party the following sums of money: In 1961 they gave them \$25,000 and another \$18,000 for the founding convention to start the NDP. They were right in on the ground floor. In 1962 what did they give them? They gave them \$23,900, it's all here, right in the Report. In 1964 they gave them \$12,500.

Mr. E. Whelan (Regina North West): — We raised more in Regina . . .

Mr. Steuart: — In 1965 they gave them \$40,000. But you know, Mr. Speaker, they only gave them \$1,000. I guess even the Americans recognize a loser when they see one! In five years from this one union the NDP, straight from Detroit, in the United States have received \$120,000. What does this mean, Mr. Speaker? Well little Tommy Douglas, their revered Leader, always said over and over again, "He who pays the piper calls the tune."

Some Hon. Members: Hear, hear!

Mr. Steuart: — This money came from Detroit from a powerful American union. We just happened to stumble on this damning piece of evidence, but what about the other American unions? Maybe the NDP would tell us how much they get from Seattle, from the Teamsters union. How much do they get from Jimmy Hoffa? Or maybe since he got in the pen things have slowed down a little. How much came from Pittsburgh and the United Steel Workers of America? I'll tell you one thing, they wouldn't let you in on this secret, because you'd just open that big mouth of yours and it wouldn't be a secret any longer. Maybe Mr. Lloyd knows . . .

Some Hon. Members: Hear, hear!

Mr. Steuart: — Maybe Mr. Lloyd knows, I don't know, maybe he'd tell us how much do they get from Los Angeles and the United Woodworkers of America. Mr. Speaker, only the NDP can answer these questions. But we know without a shadow of a doubt that the NDP Members of this Legislature, especially those farm Members, are only puppets controlled by the big labor bosses who pay the shot. "He who pays the piper calls the tune."

You know, Mr. Speaker, this is why a leading Member of the New Democratic party in eastern Canada said publicly last year, "To hell with the farmer. This is a labor party."

An Hon. Member: — Shame, shame!

Mr. Steuart: — A Member of the NDP, one of the executives said that at your convention down east.

Hon. W.S. Lloyd: — It's western Canada.

An Hon. Member: — You're all mixed up there, Davy.

Mr. Steuart: — That's why they changed their name from the CCF to the NDP. Well, Mr. Lloyd might think it's a joke, that one of his officials says, "To hell with the farmers," but I know why he isn't the Government, I know why he's led his party to seven successive defeats, he's led it because he lost the confidence of the farm people and the people of small towns in this province. He did sell out to big labor. The labor boss is sitting there calling the tune and pulling the strings and he jumps. Mr. Lloyd never says, "Where should I jump?" He just says, "How high?" That's why they changed their name . . .

An Hon. Member: — You can tell better lies than that.

Mr. Steuart: — . . . They were ordered to change their name by the union leaders. You know, Mr. Speaker, how can we judge the sincerity of the NDP Members who continually rail and shout against American domination of our business and our economy when they have been bought lock, stock and barrel by American labor bosses.

Some Hon. Members: Hear, hear!

Mr. Steuart: — You know I believe the farm Members of the NDP in this Assembly should stand up and denounce their leaders for this sell out to the American unions. I think if they did this they would win back some of the respect of Saskatchewan people, if they had the courage to take this action.

Mr. Speaker, there are thousands of good union men and women who don't want the labor movement tied up to any political party. There are thousands of farmers who sincerely supported the old CCF, who have become disillusioned by the labor takeover of their party. I don't think Eiling Kramer has the brains to become disillusioned, and he wouldn't be sure of the truth if it stared him right in the face.

The Liberal party, Mr. Speaker, has only one goal. We are not owned by anybody, we don't owe anything to anybody, we've only got one goal and that's to help the ordinary people of this province. Mr. Speaker, the Liberal party is not against any group; we're just for people. I appeal to those people who have been sold down the river by a few power-hungry people in the NDP to join with us and help build a better province and a better nation. Mr. Speaker, the Throne Speech indicates another year of progress for this province and I will be proud to support the motion.

Some Hon. Members: Hear, hear!

Hon. D.V. Heald (Attorney General): — Mr. Speaker, in rising to take part in this debate, I'm not sure that I can promise you as much entertainment as you've had in the last half hour, but I'm pleased that you sat there and listened with a great deal of interest, and I hope with some effect, to those truths that my colleague, the Deputy Premier and the Member from Prince Albert West (Mr. Steuart)

espoused this afternoon.

Some Hon. Members: Hear, hear!

Mr. Heald – You know, Mr. Speaker, the sure barometer of the reception of a speech in this House is to look at the Hon. Members opposite and see whether or not they can sit in their seat. If it is hitting them where they live, then of course they heckle a very great deal. This afternoon they set a new record, I think, for heckling. They were all talking at the same time; they reminded me of a flock of hens.

My first words this afternoon must be words of congratulations to you, Sir, on your election once again as Speaker of this House. In the Sixteenth Legislature as in the Fifteenth in has been my very great honor and privilege to second your nomination. In your position as the First Officer of this Legislature since 1965, you have demonstrated a distinctive flair for impartiality and objectivity, both of which characteristics are necessary in a good Speaker. You have at all times discharged the duties of your high office with a sense of fairness, which has earned for you the respect and admiration of Members on both sides of the House. On countless occasions you have demonstrated that expertise and sound knowledge of the rules and procedure which is so essential to the proper discharge of your duties. So I join with all those who have congratulated you in my personal congratulations and to wish you well.

Now, Mr. Speaker, I would like to say a word or two, a word of thanks to the members of the constituency of Lumsden who on the 11th of October last did me the honor of re-electing me to represent them in this Legislature. You know, Mr. Speaker, the constituency of Lumsden was one of the constituencies that Tommy Douglas, when he was here last fall, said formed a part of the blue-print for the re-election of the NDP-CCF in Saskatchewan. He was asked by the press how the CCF planned to once again become the Government of Saskatchewan. Mr. Douglas at a press conference in Regina said, "It's very easy, we'll hold the seats we have and then we'll win back the 14 or 15 seats we lost in 1964." The constituency which I have the honor to represent is one of those seats which we wrested from the NDP-CCF in 1964. It gives me a great deal of personal satisfaction, Mr. Speaker, to report that far from losing the constituency of Lumsden, this Government – we increased our majority from 350 to 700. I think that speaks very well for the people of Lumsden constituency. I was never more proud of them than I was on the night of October 11, because they refused to be bribed by their own tax dollars. They were promised a new heaven and a new earth, free services, no taxes, but they were not bribed by this kind of a propaganda campaign on the part of the NDP-CCF.

I think one of the highest compliments that the people of any constituency can pay to a member is to elect him and certainly to re-elect him. We in the Lumsden constituency have had a good three or four years. Last year was an exciting year. There were many Centennial celebrations, many signs of progress in the constituency, new Centennial halls, new rinks, new paved roads, new paved streets, gas, water and sewer and so on. I don't have time to go into all the details, but the progress in this constituency is of course due to a very large extent not to the efforts of Government, or to my efforts as a Member, but to the efforts of the people themselves.

I was at Bethune the other day engaged in opening a new curling rink. The people of the Bethune area constructed this rink; they put it up in two days. They got together entirely in volunteer labor and they put this rink up in a two-day period last summer. I was telling them when I was opening the rink that perhaps they should have come down to Regina when His Worship the Mayor, the Member for Regina South East (Mr. Baker), was trying to get the auditorium constructed. I think the kind of knowledge that they have in that area to get jobs done probably would have stood the Mayor in good stead when he was putting up those monkey bars four or five years ago and left them stand there.

Now, Mr. Speaker, before I get into the main burden of my remarks, I would like to deal with a few of the remarks made by some of the Members opposite in this debate. It seems to me that every year it becomes more of a burden when you speak near the end of the Throne Speech debate to correct some of the mis-statements and inaccuracies made by the Hon. Members opposite. I am going to do that today, I am going to set some of them straight a little bit I hope.

The Member from Regina North West (Mr. Smishek), in complaining about the number of things that the city of Regina needed, said that the Provincial Government made no contributions at all to policing or to the cost of policing in the cities of Saskatchewan. This is not right, and I want to set him right and I want to set the records straight. He said that we pay the entire cost of policing in the rural areas. This is true. We do pay the cost of policing in the rural areas of our province and in towns and villages up to 500. Over 500 we don't. The towns are responsible and many of them are new having RCMP protection. I would remind the Hon. Member and all Hon. Members that in the cities of Regina and Saskatoon and the other cities of the province these cities by statute and by arrangement with the Provincial Government receive all the fines and penalties from Provincial Statutes. I would remind the Hon. Member who spoke about this the other day that in 1964, for example, the city of Regina received over \$200,000, \$208,568 by way of revenue. I notice the Mayor is taking notes down. He knows this. He wasn't here. I am sure if he'd been here, he would have corrected the Hon. Member. So the city of Regina in 1964 received \$208,000 towards their cost of police protection by way of fines. In 1965, they received \$235,000, in 1966 they received \$245,817, so it's certainly not correct to say that the Provincial Government is not making any contribution to the cost of administration of justice in the cities of Saskatchewan. Now in addition to that since November 1, 1965, at the request of the city of Regina we added another prosecutor to our staff, and effective November 1, 1965, we have taken over all preliminary hearings in respect to criminal matters in the city of Regina, without charge to the city of Regina. This of course results in additional costs to my Department, but it is a partial easing of the burden insofar as the administration of justice in the city of Regina is concerned.

Now, Mr. Speaker, the Member for Saskatoon Riversdale (Mr. Romanow) made a speech the other day. It was a good speech from a technical point of view, well delivered. I was interested in his reference to pussycats. He said that the Members on this side of the House were "a pussycat Government" and I took it from that he meant that we weren't decisive enough, that we were too meek and mild. I was glad he made that speech and I was glad that most of his own Members stayed in the House while he

was making it, because I can't think of a group of individuals who more needed that speech than his seatmates over on that side of the House, because for 20 years, Mr. Speaker, many of the Members who are still sitting opposite and were Members of the Government of the day, sat as pussycats, or if not pussycats as ostriches, with their heads in the sand, and failed to grapple with the problems of the people of Saskatchewan.

Mr. C.G. Willis (Melfort-Tisdale): — How about medical care and hospitalization?

Mr. Heald: — Alright medical care and hospitalization. Let's talk about the rights of individuals and people and let's talk about some of the problems of people. For the edification of the Member from Riversdale who was back in those happy days practising law when all these things were happening in the last three or four years, I am going to send over to him the Citizen's Protection Code which was passed by the Legislature last year — I'll do it afterwards, I'll do like the Member for Regina North East — I will remind him that, when we became the Government of the day in 1964, there were fewer citizen protections measures on the Statute Books of the Province of Saskatchewan than in almost any Province in Canada.

Some Hon. Members: Hear, hear!

Mr. Heald: — I am proud to say now, Mr. Speaker, that we probably have more than most provinces and I am only going to mention a few today, because later on in another debate I will be giving a progress report to the Legislature on the way in which some of these statutes are working. I would remind you, Mr. Speaker, that The Direct Sellers Act which we passed in our first term of office is now the model for all direct selling legislation in Canada. We were the first Province to conceive the idea or at least legislate the idea of a four-day cooling off period. This has worked very effectively in our Province and has now been adopted by nearly every other Province in Canada.

I'll mention some of the other Acts that we passed. We passed The Credit Disclosure Act last year, and the Member for Regina Centre (Mr. Blakeney) was good enough to tell me the other evening that he thought it was working quite satisfactorily. You know it's a funny thing about the Government that was here for 20 years prior to 1964, Mr. Speaker; they did a lot of thinking about some of these pieces of legislation but they didn't pass such legislation. The Credit Disclosure Act is an example. When I became Attorney General I found all sorts of draft Acts in the files, and all sorts of reasons why this legislation couldn't be passed, but the sad fact of the matter is they didn't choose to pass this kind of necessary legislation. Now the rationale and the need for The Direct Sellers Act, The Garage Dealers Act, The Credit Disclosure Act, The Unconscionable Transactions Act, The New Securities Act, The Inclusion of Scholarship Agreements under The Companies Inspection and Licensing Act, all the need for these Acts was there long before we became the Government in 1964. All they did was plan and perhaps plot, I don't know, but there certainly wasn't any legislation passed, effective legislation passed to benefit the people of this province.

I would like to mention one or two other Acts that were passed last year, The Criminal Compensation Act, the first one in

Canada, Mr. Speaker, probably the first one on the North American continent, is now operating. The Criminal Injuries Compensation Board had its first hearing the other day under the chairmanship of Mr. James Eremko, President of the Law Society. It has two other members, Mrs. Joyce Moxley of Regina, who was recommended to us by the Canadian Association of Consumers, and Mr. Harold Gronnerud of Lewvan, Saskatchewan, the other member who is Vice-President of the Saskatchewan Association of Rural Municipalities. This Board is going to hear applications from people who have been injured as a result of crimes of violence and from the dependants of people who have been injured as a result of crimes and violence. This is a good new piece of legislation which this Government passed last year, so I think, Mr. Speaker, that I can be forgiven, if I wonder where all the raging lions on that side of the House were when they were over here, when they had the responsibility for Government. What did they do about it? I suggest to you they did very little about it except talk. We have passed concrete legislation which is working and working well in the interests of the people of Saskatchewan.

Some Hon. Members: Hear, hear!

Mr. Heald: — I would like to mention one other piece of legislation which I think is a pretty sordid story really, and I do this mainly for the edification of the Member from Riversdale (Mr. Romanow) because he wasn't here. But a number of years ago we had some problems in this province having to do with commercial cemeteries, and the gentlemen who are now sitting on that side of the House decided that it would be alright to have commercial cemeteries in the Province of Saskatchewan and probably it was. There was only one thing that they did wrong. They let these highbinders and quick-buck artists come in from Eastern Canada to set up commercial cemeteries without making adequate provision for the public interest. They allowed these people to sell prepaid cemetery plans at a cost of \$500 or \$600, without requiring that they put at least some of that money in trust, so that when the people needed the services, when somebody died in the family the money would be there. And you know the result. We had to pass legislation last year taking over some of these commercial cemeteries.

I was interested in the speech from the Member for Touchwood (Mr. Meakes) the other day, when he was complaining bitterly about renovations going on in this building. He implied that it was a waste of money. Well, I don't know. The Minister of Public Works (Mr. Guy) gave a good explanation of why it was necessary to put in the new floors and do some work on the walls. Everybody I think is happy with the basement. At least we are improving something, Mr. Speaker, we are renovating and maintaining for the benefit of the people of Saskatchewan this building which belongs to the people of Saskatchewan.

What did my Hon. Friends do, Mr. Speaker, with respect to these cemeteries? They failed to protect the people of Saskatchewan, with the result that we had to take over these cemeteries and the cemeteries are now being run by the Government, by the Department. It is one of my departments, and it's costing the taxpayers of Saskatchewan about \$50,000 a year to maintain these cemeteries. Now I hope before too long we are getting them in shape — that it may be possible to sell these cemeteries, or make a deal with some of the civic authorities

February, 28, 1968

involved in some of these places. But at the present time the fact of the matter is that in the next five or six years it is likely going to cost the taxpayers of Saskatchewan anywhere from \$150, \$200 to \$250 to \$300,000 because of negligence on the part of my Hon. Friends opposite when they were the Government of the day. They failed to protect the people of Saskatchewan and the people who entered into these contracts.

You know, Mr. Speaker, it's interesting to look at who showed up in Saskatchewan, the haven of the quick-buck artist back in the good old days of the NDP-CCF. Many of you have read Pierre Berton's book, "The Big Sell." I am not going to quote from it extensively, but on page 194 there is a reference to prepaid funeral plans. This is one of the rackets in Ontario that Pierre Berton disclosed. He hired a girl called Operative 67, and he has a very amusing little chapter on the frustrations of Operative 67. She tells that she answered an ad about becoming a family counsellor. Well when she got there it turned out that all this family counsellor was, was selling pre-arranged funeral plans, which cost \$604. When you read the fine print, you find all the family got back for the \$604 was \$556 after two or three years. Then it says:

The Operative was forced to conclude that, attractive as the proposition might be, she just did not have the stamina to handle the job of family counsellor. If you can take \$604 from a man over a four-year period simply by promising to pay his survivors \$556, then you are indeed a Houdini among counsellors.

Mr. G.T. Snyder (Moose Jaw North): — The independent sector.

Mr. Heald: — That's right, the independent sector. The fellow who ran that company, Mr. Speaker, was a man by the name of Wesley Chowen, president of Archmount. And where do you suppose Wesley Chowen showed up after he left Toronto as a result of these exposés? One guess, Mr. Speaker. He showed up in Saskatchewan as president of the three cemeteries that are now broke and the people of Saskatchewan are now paying for.

An Hon. Member: — One of Clarence's boys!

Mr. Heald: — That's Mr. Chowen.

An Hon. Member: — Where is June Stavelly?

Mr. Heald: — Never mind about him. Mr. Chowen, Mr. Speaker, is the man who came to Saskatchewan. Because he wasn't required to put up the proper trust funds, these cemeteries went broke. These are my friends, and I say for the edification of the Member for Riversdale (Mr. Romanow) I am so delighted that you gave your sermon yesterday because it should have fallen on very fertile ears. These are the people who were the Government of this Province, and if you want to talk about pussycats you had a lot of pussycats in the Government for the years 1944 to 1964.

Hon. A.R. Guy (Athabasca): — Bobcats!

Mr. Heald: — Now, Mr. Speaker, there were a number of other statements made by some of the Members opposite that I would like to correct.

The Member for Canora (Mr. Matsalla) I thought made a statement that really couldn't go unchallenged. I don't know, he seemed to be sowing the seeds of doubt, mistrust and fear about the future of the Yorkton hospital. Now I just happened to read, and I know this will be dear to the hearts of my friends opposite because I know it is required reading on that side of the House, the Canadian Magazine. If you haven't read this last issue there is quite a stinging indictment of the mental hospital system in Alberta. It is entitled "Five Days of Degradation." Then there is a little footnote on the next page – she is indicting the Alberta system that says:

And then there is Yorkton, a giant step forward. Shocking conditions that I found while posing as a patient in the Alberta hospital can be found in other provinces too. There is one hospital, however, where I found something being done, it is in Yorkton, Saskatchewan.

Then it goes on to say:

Heartened by Yorkton's success the Province has recently completed a similar unit in Prince Alberta.

Now you can't claim that one. And yet my friends over there, the Member for Canora says that there are things wrong with the Yorkton hospital and that it is in bad shape. Well, I don't know. These reporters usually dig out the facts of these situations. This is a good program. You started it, you built it. We've operated it for four years and we are now going to expand it. We've got another one in Prince Albert.

Mr. Willis: — What about the personnel? Frazier asked the question about personnel.

Mr. Heald: — Mr. Speaker, there were other remarks by other Members that I think should be challenged. I was quite disturbed by the remarks of the Member for Regina North East (Mr. Smishek) in which he spent quite a bit of time in his speech in a rather stinging indictment of the Labour Relations Board in this province. First of all the Labour Relations Board is an independent Board. It is appointed by the Government, but the Government hasn't anything to do or anything to say about the decisions which it makes. I have talked to a number of trade union representatives in the past three or four years, and have specifically asked them about the Labour Relations Board, what they felt about the policies of the Labour Relations Board. I have never until yesterday – and I told the Hon. Member outside the House this afterwards – I have never heard anybody indict or criticize or complain about the decisions of the Labour Relations Board. I find it strange, Mr. Speaker, the Hon. Member from Regina North East attacked quite viciously, really, the fairness and objectivity of the Labour Relations Board. I find it quite strange that the Saskatchewan Federation of Labour, which presents an annual brief to the Government has not protested. I have here the briefs for the last three years, 1965, 1966, 1967 and you would think, Mr. Speaker, since the Government appoints, the Lieutenant Governor-in-Council appoints, many of the members of this Board, all actually on the recommendation of organizations, that, if organized labor in this province

February, 28, 1968

were so upset or so outraged by the activities of the Labour Relations Board and by the judgements of the Labour Relations Board, the Saskatchewan Federation of Labour would have seen fit to make this point in their submissions to the Government. I have the last three submissions here. There isn't one word about the activities of the Labour Relations Board. The last brief was submitted on November 29th, 1967, released to the press ahead of time with a great deal of fanfare as always, but not one word about the judgements or activities of the Labour Relations Board. Now for this Johnny-come-lately, the Member from Regina North East (Mr. Smishek) I don't know – does it make better political capital to stand up in this Legislature and have the benefit of the press and attack an independent Board in a forum where this Board doesn't have an opportunity to defend itself? If the Member for Regina North East is really serious, and if the Federation of Labour are really serious about the allegations about the Labour Relations Board, I would think that they would make representation to the Minister of Labour (Mr. Coderre) in this regard.

Mr. Smishek: — You can be sure that they will.

Mr. Heald: — Well, you have had three or four years to do it and you haven't done anything about it.

Now, Mr. Speaker, this Legislature is going to have an opportunity, and all Members of this Legislature are going to have an opportunity, before too long to stand up and be counted on many issues which vitally affect the people of this province. Then we will see where the pussycats are. We'll see for example what the view of the Members opposite is on area bargaining in this province. I would like to just quote if I might the view of a teacher about area bargaining from Alberta. This is a principal from Brooks composite high school, Alberta. He says:

In recent years the question of a provincial salary schedule has reared its head several times, and each time it strikes terror in the hearts of the teaching profession in this province.

This is Alberta.

I for one would like to know why the teachers react this way. What's wrong with a provincial salary schedule? Is this opposition the true reaction of the profession or is it coming from a few who are momentarily on control of the profession's power to speak. I have been teaching for five years and during that time I have spent four years on various economic policy committees as chairman, recorder and negotiator. From this brief exposure to negotiating salaries I am drawn to one conclusion, the present system of local control needs changing. The only other alternative open to us at the present time seems to be a provincial salary schedule. I think we should have a look at it rather than fainting every time it is mentioned.

Mr. Speaker, this is the view of one teacher. Nobody on this side of the House is trying to deprive the teachers of this

province of any rights that they have now. But this Act has been in force for 20 or 25 years. Surely it's about time that we had a look at it. I invite the Members on the other side of the House to have a good honest look at it. Look at it divorced from politics, look at it from the point of view of what's right, not with politics.

Some Hon. Members: Hear, hear!

Mr. Heald: — And if they do, Mr. Speaker, I am convinced that they'll vote in favor of area bargaining.

Much has been said about universities. Mr. Speaker, this morning I had two very fine professors from the University come to see me and we had a very useful and informative discussion for about an hour about university financing. Mr. Speaker, am a graduate of the University of Saskatchewan, I spent five years there and many other Members of this side of the House are graduates of the University of Saskatchewan. I would not long be a Member of any Government that took any steps which would affect the academic freedom of the University of Saskatchewan.

Some Hon. Members: Hear, hear!

Mr. Heald: — But there is a great difference between academic consideration and economic consideration. The Member for Moosomin (Mr. Gardner) the other day put his finger on one area. Can it be said that 600 or 700 or 800 students from outside the Province of Saskatchewan should receive the same benefits as the residents of Saskatchewan without paying higher tuition fees? I put this to the University people that were in my office this morning, and they agreed without question that this was a matter of economics rather than academic. Now I don't say that this is what should happen but this is an example. The Member for Moosomin put his finger on the kind of thing that is economic rather than academic. I think that is a clear example of an economic judgement and I think that the Members of the Legislature and the Members of the Government are entitled to make that economic judgement. I don't know why you are complaining – if you are complaining – about any change in the procedure in the Estimates of this House which will enable you to obtain further information about your University, your University and mine, the University of all the people of Saskatchewan. You are the elected representatives of the people, you have an obligation not only to maintain academic freedom, but you have an obligation also to scrutinize expenditure of public funds. This is really all that this university matter is all about.

Now there are other items that are not so black and white. There are other items that are grey, where you get into the matter of economic judgement and you also get into the matter of academic judgement. In these matters I am convinced that it has to be a matter of communication, a matter of committee work, where there are representatives from the academic side and representatives, perhaps, from the Government side to sit on these committees when these judgements are made. But surely to goodness, Mr. Speaker, we have reached that degree of maturity in this province that we can discuss a matter of vital interest, a matter involving the expenditure of millions of dollars of taxpayers' money without immediately trying to make political

capital out of something, when the Government is trying to do something that needs to be done in the interests of all of the people of Saskatchewan. So, Mr. Speaker, I say this will be an interesting session. I say that the Throne Speech is indicative of the concern of the Government over many areas. We are trying to solve some of the problems of our society in Saskatchewan at the present time. I think the Throne Speech comes to grips with the problems of this province and, therefore, I will support the motion that was moved a week ago by the Hon. Member from Regina South West (Mr. McPherson), and seconded by the Member for Nutana South (Mr. Forsyth).

Some Hon. Members: Hear, hear!

Mr. E.I. Wood (Swift Current): — Mr. Speaker, in rising to take part in this debate, I would like to first congratulate you upon your re-election to your office. Having myself had some slight acquaintance with your duties, I do feel that I can sincerely compliment you on the manner and the accuracy with which you fulfil your duty. I cannot honestly say that I wish you another re-election to your position, but I am sure I speak for all the Members on this side of the House in saying that we respect your fairness, and wish you well for the completion of this term.

I would also like to congratulate the new Members in the House on their election. I do think that being a Member of the House is an honorable position to take. I think we do not need to be ashamed that we are politicians and that we represent the people of our constituency, especially if you are like some of us who represent the majority of the people from our constituency.

Some Hon. Members: Hear, hear!

Mr. Wood: — The Hon. Member from Saskatoon City Park-University (Mr. Charlebois) the other day mentioned that he was thankful that he made it inside the door. Well, I would like to tell the Hon. Member that when the Hon. Member from Touchwood (Mr. Meakes) and I were elected that we sat in just about the same position, and that Tommy Douglas told us one day that the CCF party had never had such solid backing. I would also, Mr. Speaker, like to tell the Member from Saskatoon City Park-University that, if he is re-elected another time, he can be assured of having a seat well to the front — on this side of the House.

I would also like to congratulate the Ministers who have been duly appointed to the Cabinet. I am sure that the Minister of Public Works (Mr. Guy) will be a worthy successor of the former Member from Melville (Mr. Gardiner). I would also like to congratulate his seatmate, the Hon. Member from Pelly, the Minister of Natural Resources (Mr. Barrie). I became a little better acquainted with the Hon. Member from Pelly when we were co-members on a Liquor Commission back in 1958. Looking around the House I think that he and I are about the only ones that are left in the House that were on that Committee. I cannot but wish the Member well and hope that he has an early recovery and is soon back in the House.

I would also like to congratulate the new Minister of Municipal Affairs (Mr. Estey). I am sure that he will find that Department of which he is now the head is a very fine department

with which to work. He'll find the staff very co-operative and also that the organized bodies of SUMA and SARM, with which he will be working, are very fine people, and I can congratulate him on the position which he has come to there. I am sure he is not to blame for the number of changes that have been made in the Ministers in this Department over the last few years. I know that Mr. Murphy, the head of the SARM, was complaining about this at the Municipal-Provincial Conference a few years ago. We hope that this Minister does stay on in this Department for the rest of this term. I won't make any good wishes beyond that.

Mr. Michayluk (Redberry): — Six months.

Mr. Wood: — Well, this term isn't going to last for ten years, I hope.

The Hon. Minister of Social Welfare (Mr. MacDonald) in speaking the other evening in this House spoke in ringing tones about the shame that under the CCF administration we had sent mentally disturbed children out of the province for them to receive treatment. I cannot see that there is anything too reprehensible about this so long as the children received proper care and treatment, which I am sure they did. I would like you to think back again, Mr. Speaker, to a few years ago at the closing of Embury House and what was said at that time by the then Minister of Social Welfare. He indicated it was closed because of the scandalous high cost of operation in regard to the number of boys that were treated there. I find that the present Government is paying approximately the same amount for treatment in Brown Camps and Camp Erhlo, so all this bluster about the high cost of Embury House has turned out to be absolutely nothing, a lot of 'sound and fury signifying nothing'. Also at the present time I find that there are many emotionally disturbed children throughout the province who cannot get treatment because of the cost. The Government isn't prepared to help them to pay for the high cost of treatment in these centres such as Camp Erhlo or Brown Camp. Mr. Speaker, I find that there is money for fancy trimming for the Legislative Buildings, there is money for formal balls, there is money for four-lane highways, and, let's face it, there is money for increased salaries for MLAs and Cabinet Ministers, but nothing for the little tykes whose lives are being ruined, if they don't get expert treatment and quickly at that.

Some Hon. Members: Hear, hear!

Mr. Wood: — The Hon. Minister of Social Welfare also dealt in an heroic manner with the record of the CCF in regard to welfare in this province, but there were a lot of things he didn't tell us. He didn't tell us, Mr. Speaker, that the CCF Government of this province was the first Provincial Government to give supplementary payments to pensioners, payments over and above the amount required to meet Federal requirements for sharing. No Liberal Government of any other province did ever get around to paying such supplementary allowances. He didn't tell us that Saskatchewan was the first Province paying from Provincial revenues for medical drugs, optical and hospital costs for pensioners and those receiving Mothers' Allowances.

Some Hon. Members: Hear, hear!

February, 28, 1968

Mr. Wood: — He didn't tell us that the CCF Government first introduced a plan for assisting communities, church groups and others in providing houses for senior citizens. We gave a grant of 20 per cent of the capital cost and the necessary guarantee to repay the remainder to the Central Mortgage and Housing Corporation, without which guarantee there would have been no loan. So far as I know while we were in office we were the only Province that did this. The Hon. Minister talked the other evening as though his Government had built many such facilities. In fact all they have done is carry on the program that we started and they put up only 20 per cent, not 100 per cent of the cost of these buildings he was talking about. The Hon. Minister of Welfare (Mr. MacDonald) said that we did not pass on a \$10,000 raise in the pension to patients in geriatric centres, but he did not tell us a word about the fact that his Government had raised the charge to patients in these centres from \$10.00 to \$50.00 per month.

Some Hon. Members: Hear, hear!

Mr. Wood: — Everybody else in the province up to this time, Mr. Speaker, has had access to hospitals free, but these pensioners are charged \$50.00 a month in geriatric centres which are considered as hospitals under the Federal-Provincial Hospitalization Agreement.

Mr. E. Kramer (The Battlefords): — Shame on you!

Mr. Wood: — That's right. \$50.00 a month to these pensioners just because they are pensioners. He didn't say anything about the shift of responsibility that has caused many pensioners to be now forced to buy their own medical care cards.

Mr. Speaker, the other day the Member for Hanley (Mr. Heggie) was asking a question: why did the Liberals win in central Saskatchewan? Well, I would like to say one thing, I believe that gerrymandering helped an awful lot.

Mr. Steuart: — What a terrible thing to say!

Mr. Wood: — That's right. If the present boundaries had been in effect in 1964, the Liberals would have had 40 seats instead of the 32 they had. That's how the gerrymandering helped. In this last provincial election our vote rose by 4 per cent, and the Liberal vote only rose by 2.3 per cent. In spite of this they got more Members in the Legislature than we did. No, you figure it out yourself. I mean their numbers increased, but ours didn't.

I am sorry that the Hon. Member from Hanley is not in his seat, because I would like to tell him a few things that apparently he didn't maybe realize. I can tell him why he won in Hanley. In 1965 all of the area of Saskatoon City was taken out of the Hanley constituency, making it numerically the smallest constituency in the province, except for Athabasca. Now there is a good reason for the far-flung constituency of Athabasca being a constituency, even though it has a small population. But why Hanley should be cut down to this size is hard to determine — hard, that is, until you consider the potential vote as indicated in the 1964 general election, or the by-election vote as indicated by the 1964 general election, or the

by-election held the same fall. (I am glad to see that the Hon. Member for Hanley is back). According to the general election's vote at the polls that were left in the butchered hands in the constituency, the Liberals after this gerrymandering could now count on a majority of over 200 votes. According to the by-election they could count on an even break. There was that much difference between the by-election vote and what there was in the original 1964 general election vote. After the kind of Government which they have given the last three years, the Liberals were afraid that the people of the tiny constituency might not even vote as strongly for them as they did in the by-election. At any rate they turned around and took another cut at it. This time they added some and took some away, with the net result that the Hanley constituency was reduced in size still further, now being cut to only 5,252 voters. I think I heard someone talking this afternoon about 16,000.

An Hon. Member: — Pocket borough!

Mr. Wood: — Pocket borough! It's a kind of burrow of some kind. On the basis of 1964 voters' list, this was pretty small, but on the basis of the 1964 general election they can now count on a majority of 300, and a majority of 159, on the basis of the by-election. It was very fortunate for them that they did take this second cut, Mr. Speaker. When the votes were counted on the October 11th election last fall, the present Hon. Member from Hanley (Mr. Heggie) only won by 137 votes, not the 300 that they should have had on the basis of the 1964 general election, or even the 159 which they should have had on the basis of the 1964 by-election. If the Hon. Member for Hanley is actually in doubt as to why he was elected, I think he can thank those who wielded the shears, in chopping down his constituency to the size and shape, that he could win.

Some Hon. Members: Hear, hear!

Mr. Wood: — In his speech yesterday, the Hon. Minister of Municipal Affairs (Mr. Estey) fell into a pattern that has been established by Liberal speakers throughout the province in the last couple of years, when speaking of grants to rural municipalities. The Government in the last few years has increased grants to the rural municipalities considerably. There have been such good times throughout Canada and Saskatchewan, with the burgeoning economy left by the CCF that the municipalities could scarcely help but get in on some of it. Finances have been buoyant. It would have been strange indeed if the Provincial Government had doubled the expenditure on highways without giving some consideration for municipal roads. They have increased the equalization grants, given snow clearing assistance and maintenance grants, which were not given before, for which I will give this Government full marks, and I know that the rural municipalities are pleased. But, as the Hon. Member from Touchwood (Mr. Meakes) pointed out the other day, the grants for grid roads remain much the same as they were under the CCF Administration. So when the Hon. Minister talks about the 700 per cent increase in the equalization grants, while he is undoubtedly speaking the truth, he is simply ignoring the millions of dollars that have been given to the rural municipalities over the period of programs by the CCF Administration, to build grid roads, which have meant so much to the people of this province. It is true that overall grants to rural municipalities have increased under this Administration, but by only a small fraction of 700 per cent.

February, 28, 1968

In this matter I want to compliment the Minister in his statement. He did say that equalization grants have been increased by 700 per cent. I cannot be so charitable towards some of his Liberal friends on the hustings. They went around simply talking about grants, period. They said the percentage was very close to 700 per cent, and this was close to a straight misrepresentation of the fact.

While I am speaking in regard to municipal affairs, I would like to note the way the Members opposite talk about cutting taxes. In their promises in the election campaign of 1964, they said they would reduce property taxes as well as other taxes. The records show that from 1957 until 1963, the last full year under the CCF Government, municipal taxes rose by a total of only two mills on the whole six-year period. Since the Liberals came to office, in the Department of Municipal Affairs' Reports, that were available to me when I was composing this speech, Mr. Speaker, a rise is shown of two mills per year. I had little doubt that, when the 1967 Report was given to us, this rise would be repeated. Well, the Report was put down on our desks this afternoon and I did have an opportunity to look at it. In 1965 we had a rise of some \$8.9 million in property taxes from the year before. The 1965 taxes were \$8.9 million higher than what they were in 1964. This year, looking at the new Report, I see that on schedule 5, under taxation, real property, business and occupancy taxes, the total for the Province now is \$123,708,802, which is a per capita tax of \$134.00 each person of the province. In 1965, the last Report, there was only \$113,112,418, making an increase, Mr. Speaker, of not \$8.9 million as we had shown in the last Report, but \$10,584,384. Property taxes are rising at a more accelerated rate than what they were back in 1965.

I as saying earlier, Mr. Speaker, that in the last six years of the CCF Administration, property taxes only rose a total of two mills of the complete six years, but they rose two mills each year when the Liberals were in office. And this year, I find, that the municipal mill rates have risen from 29 to 31 which makes two mills of a raise, and the school taxes have been raised from 35 mills to 36 mills, which is another mill in raise, making a property tax raise this year of three mills. Mr. Speaker, while the CCF were in office in the last three years, they only rose two mills in six years. This last year, they have risen three mills in one year. They talk about keeping down property taxes. This is a real joke. And looking at the records you will find, Mr. Speaker, that there is much more here than is covered by homeowner grants, which don't come close to keeping up with the mill rate, with the increase in property taxes in this province. When you realize that this is the much vaunted, political tax reduction that is given here, when you realize that this is gobbled up and more too, and a good deal more too, in regard to the municipal taxes, it makes the position of this Government look pretty sick indeed in regard to the other tax pictures in this province.

The Hon. Minister of Municipal Affairs (Mr. Estey) said yesterday that he had had only three complaints with regard to not passing on to those people in subsidized housing the benefits of the new schedule. He had only three complaints. Well it reminds me of the man, an optometrist, selling glasses. He told the customer well that would be \$25.00. The customer never blinked so he said, "That's for the frames, the glasses will be \$25.00, too." The man never blinked so he said, "Each". The idea is to keep on going as long as no one complains.

Mr. Speaker, in regard to some of the things that have been said in this debate, I would like to say a few more things. The Liberals won the 1964 election by promising the world with a little red fence around it and reduced taxes as well. The Hon. Leader of the Opposition (Mr. Lloyd) in this debate pointed out the amount of increase in total taxes under this Government. What it was he showed very clearly from public accounts and Estimates, the other day. And besides this a compilation of the amount saved by tax reductions such as purple gas, homeowner grants, the cut in education tax, or the cut in income tax, compared with tax increases such as in the Medical Care and Hospital Insurance premiums, the soap tax, property taxes, the tobacco tax and in auto licences, shows that the increases far outweighed the tax reductions. They still talk about tax reductions. But they are far out-balanced and the figures are showing it more clearly every day that they did not keep this promise.

The Liberals claimed that industry was flocking to Saskatchewan because of the free enterprise climate and that we were entering an era of prosperity unknown under the CCF regime. We pointed out that this was just not so. Instead of increased prosperity, we showed that the rate of economic growth was actually slowing down, as evidenced by decline in the rate of retail sales, and personal income. And we were not keeping up with the rest of Canada.

During the campaign, Mr. Speaker, I talked to a business man in Swift Current. He said, "Everett, today I was listening to Mr. Thatcher and Mr. Lloyd on the television, on the same public affairs program. Mr. Thatcher said that Saskatchewan was going ahead as never before while Mr. Lloyd said that we had slackened our rate of growth and were not keeping up with the rest of Canada. They can't both be right. Who is telling the truth? It is very confusing to the other people and weakens our faith in politicians." Well, a week after the election there was no doubt as to who was telling the truth.

Some Hon. Members: Hear, hear!

Mr. Wood: — The cat was out of the bag and the Provincial Treasurer (Mr. Steuart) was polishing up a new speech. I have in my hand, Mr. Speaker, a copy of the October issue of "Saskatchewan, the Growth Province." In it is a table setting out economic factors. It's rather noticeable possibly I really don't attach anything to this but the fact is that I did receive this after the election. I didn't get it before the election or I would have used it. Well, I know if I had we would have gotten a better majority in Swift Current than what we did, I think. It shows here the economic factors. The first one is the estimated value of manufacturing shipments, January to April, 1967, as compared to those of January to April, 1966. It shows that there was a decrease from \$137,600,000 in 1966 to \$133 million in January to April, 1967. It shows in regard to gas production that there was a decrease in gas production from 28,000 cubic feet in the period January to May, 1966, to 26,949 in January to May, 1967. Estimated retail trade was down from \$604 million in January to June, 1966, to \$502 million in January to June, 1967, a drop of very close to 20 per cent, Mr. Speaker. It shows that the estimated farm cash income was up from January to March, 1967 when it was over \$300 million, whereas in January to March, 1966, it was only \$246 million. So any of the troubles that have fallen

upon Saskatchewan up to that date at least could not be credited to a drop in farm income.

These things that I have here, Mr. Speaker, are put out by the Department of Industry and Commerce. I see that the name on it is G.B. Grant, Minister. It is an honest setting forth of the facts, and it shows from its own documents that the Liberal Government, in charge of the economy of the province in the last year, has not been keeping abreast of what had been going on earlier. At the time of the election, there was an actual drop in the economy of the province, instead of the booming situation that the Liberals tried to talk about before the election.

Some would say that this is just a reflection of what is happening across Canada, that there are hard times all across Canada. Therefore we are having a tightening up here in Saskatchewan. Well, this is possibly so, but I do believe that it is worse here. We haven't been keeping up with the rest of Canada during the boom. Saskatchewan has not been keeping up and if this is a reflection of what is happening across Canada, any prosperity which we have experienced under the Liberals, is also only a reflection of the national prosperity. If the bust is a reflection of national conditions, the small boom that we have had is also a reflection of national conditions, and the outcome of the buoyant economy and the full treasury that was left here by the former CCF Government.

Indeed, Mr. Speaker, the Government opposite reminds me of a profligate who inherited a fortune and a responsible position. The Liberals made big fellows of themselves and talked boastfully about increasing expenditures and cutting taxes, even while they were in fact raising them. But they have come to the end of their tether. The Speech from the Throne, which we are supposed to be debating for the past eight days, shows nothing of the brag and bluster that we have been listening to for the last three years. They have used up their patrimony, and they know it. Their maladministration is now bearing fruit. Their policies are exposed for the time-worn and discredited doctrines, that throughout the years have brought the countries of the world into one depression after another. It's just the same old thing. That's all they have. Talk about pussycat Government! They will hang it onto the old time-worn theories that have gotten nobody anywhere.

In this debate, Mr. Speaker, we have spoken of this Government's action of attempting to clamp surveillance on the University above the adequate control that had been experienced for years. We do not at this stage know what eventual legislation the Government has in mind, but we do know that it has talked about heavy-handed controls that would encroach upon the autonomy of our centres of learning. It has talked about treating them as another department of the Government. Well, some of us who have been Ministers in the Government know just what controls the Treasury Department does exert over a department, and it's plenty. At least they did in the past.

Mr. Steuart: — We are more democratic.

Mr. Wood: — I'd like to say that this Government has destroyed the spirit of co-operation that has existed for years between the University and the Government and the people of this province. The harm that this has done to higher learning in this province is becoming evident and it may take a long time to heal. the

responsibility for this trouble, Mr. Speaker, lies with the Members opposite. They were the ones that started this, and the whole trouble lies with them and no one else.

There have been difficulties, Mr. Speaker, for some years between teachers and school boards over salary negotiations. A committee was set up, headed by Judge Moore of Swift Current. This committee studied the situation carefully and heard reams of briefs and evidence. They came up with certain findings. Instead of proceeding from this base, the Government went ahead and proposed new legislation without adequate consultation of any kind. You would think that it was out looking for trouble and, indeed, it got it! Again it backed away from their position, but again it has caused a great deal of hard feelings between teachers and school boards that could have been avoided.

I don't wish to make any odious comparisons. Indeed, I want to say, Mr. Speaker, very clearly and plainly that the situation in Nazi Germany was certainly very, very different from what we have here today.

Mr. Steuart: — Oh, you hypocrite!

Mr. Wood: — You think it is not different? I say that it is. I say that it is very far different from Nazi Germany.

Mr. Steuart: — Why weren't you doing something about it?

Mr. Wood: — I am making this statement. I am saying that the idea of endeavoring to win popular support by heaping censure upon a majority is the same here. First it was the employees of the Saskatchewan Power Corporation, then the workers in the provincial brick plant, then the University and then the teachers. Who is going to be next?

I think, Mr. Speaker, one of the main things that disprove the statements made by the Liberals concerning economic progress in this province is the slowing down in the increase in population. If we are going ahead with so many new jobs, so much increase in the industrial activity of the province, where are all the people to operate these new industries? The rate of population increase has dropped off markedly under the Liberals to what it was under the CCF. Figures have been given during this debate showing this and the Hon. Members opposite know better than to dispute them. The Premier now only talks about population figures increasing when he is outside of the country.

I would like to point out, however, something else in regard to population statistics. There were 70,412 children born in Saskatchewan between June 1, 1964 and January 1, 1968. There have, of course, been thousands of other people come here by other routes, but even counting births only, if no one had died and no more had left the province than had come in during that time, our population should have increased by at least 70,412 people. There were some 26,4456 deaths, but still, if there had been no more people leaving than came in, we should have had a population increase of 43,956 instead of the 17,000 that we had. For every 100 children born in the province in the years mentioned, 38 people left the province, plus a number equal to those who came in.

February, 28, 1968

The Premier says that 46 per cent of the young people in Britain want to leave. During his Administration for 100 children born in this province, at least 38 persons have wanted to, and they have left the province. They are gone.

Mr. Steuart: — That was our line.

Mr. Wood: — One thing that has come out during this debate is the cavalier way in which the Government treats the people of this province. It fails to give them the truth and actively propagates that which is at least, being conservative, short of the truth. Look at the grants to the University. The Premier has gone up and down the length of the country talking about the huge sum the Provincial Government has had to find for the University. Even in this debate, he has said that it has given it \$28 million in the past year. The facts given out by the University itself prove differently. Of this \$28 million, \$9,300,000 was only a loan which the University is expected to pay back with funds received from other sources. \$12 million came as a grant from Ottawa that this Government did not have to put up at all. This Government actually did give them some \$6,700,000 of Provincial money through the present fiscal year. This falls short, far short, of the \$9,700,000 of grants given to the University in 1963-64 by the preceding CCF Government. Besides this, we paid directly for the agricultural machinery administration and the teachers' training, making a total of some \$11 million as compared to the \$6,700,000 of Provincial money given to the University by the present Government in the present fiscal year. Instead of the Government scrutinizing the University's accounts, we apparently need to have the University scrutinize the Premier's statements.

These are definitely misleading statements that were being disseminated for the people of Saskatchewan. Not only have misleading statements been given, but this Government has suppressed the facts in other ways. Look at what was done with the 1967 Economic Review. According to an answer tabled in this House, there were 5,000 of these reports printed. The Hon. Leader of the Opposition (Mr. Lloyd) asked what distribution had been made to MLAs, Government departments, agencies and Crown corporations, libraries and other institutional requests and the public. The answer tabled was simply, "No record is available of specific distribution. Review was distributed on request."

And look at the timing of last year's election. There isn't a doubt in the world that if the election had been held in its normal time, next June, the actual state of affairs in this province would have leaked out. The Members on this side of the House would have been asking too many questions in the Legislature and the true state of our economy would have been sure to come out when the Budget was brought down. This would certainly have dashed the Liberals hopes of winning any general election in this Province for years to come. So they had the election lat fall, while they were still able to sit on the lid, and the people of the Province were still not informed as to the true state of affairs. Even so, they barely squeaked through.

Mr. Steuart: — When did you have your last election?

Mr. Wood: — Mr. Speaker, it is a pretty rough statement to make, but it becomes apparent that the Government opposite rules this province through some pretty sharp practices and suppression of the facts.

Mr. Speaker, I think that you have maybe gathered from some of these remarks that I will not support this vote of confidence in this Government and I will not support this motion.

At 5:00 o'clock p.m., Mr. Speaker interrupted the proceedings under Standing Order 30(4) and put the question on the Motion.

Motion agreed to on the following recorded division.

YEAS — 31

Thatcher	Howes	McFarlane
Cameron	Steuart	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
		Heald

NAYS — 24

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

Hon. W.R. Thatcher (Premier): — Mr. Speaker, I move, seconded by the Hon. Member for Prince Albert West (Mr. Steuart):

That the said address be engrossed and presented to His Honour the Lieutenant Governor by such Members of the Assembly as are of the Executive Council.

Motion agreed to.

Mr. Thatcher: — Mr. Speaker, I move, seconded by the Hon. Provincial Treasurer (Mr. Steuart):

That this Assembly will, at the next sitting, resolve itself into a Committee to consider the Supply to be granted to Her Majesty.

Motion agreed to.

**ADJOURNED DEBATE
MOTION – SASKATCHEWAN FLAG COMMITTEE**

Mr. A. E. Blakeney: — Mr. Speaker, when I adjourned debate a few days ago, it was with the idea that we ought to attempt to compose our position

on this, so that we might not emulate our brothers at Ottawa, whose example is not always worthy of emulation, and have a long flag debate. I take the position, and Members on this side of the House, take the position that we ought to try to arrive at a consensus with respect to a Saskatchewan flag, a consensus that would in fact be the consensus of the House. We don't think this ought to be a matter of a dispute. There can I think be legitimate differences of opinion, but we doubt whether those differences of opinion should be along party lines. We think that this is a matter of tradition, aesthetics and those other considerations which should go into the choosing of a flag. Party lines perhaps should not be one of them.

We are prepared to support this motion. We would have wished, as we earlier indicated, that it might have spelled out a little more fully the procedure. However, that's simply a point of procedure. What we would like to see with respect to this, Mr. Speaker, is the following. We would like to see a Committee selected which would be representative of the numbers in the House and upon which the Government would, of course, have a majority but not a preponderant majority. We would think that the Committee should be chosen by the Whips through the usual channels and that the Committee should meet and report back to the House fairly promptly on the procedure which it proposes to follow, so that we might have an opportunity to comment on that if we wish. Thereafter the Committee would go about its business.

And by the way of making some comment which might be made later, when the Committee reports back, if the procedure which we are proposing meets with favor, we would like to see the Committee have power, if it wished, to sit inter-sessionally, the Committee to go about finding a design or soliciting designs for a flag in any way which it thought proper. We wouldn't want to see the Committee take the position that necessarily, let us say, the Jubilee Flag would be adopted. May I say that on this side there is some support for the Jubilee Flag and some support for the idea that we should at least look at some other designs before we necessarily choose that one. Therefore, from our point of view, we would like to see the Committee have an opportunity to solicit other designs and to consider some other possible flag designs which might commend themselves to some Members. This is by no means to preclude the possibility of the selection by the Committee of the Jubilee Flag. This design might well be the choice of the Committee, but we would not wish to preclude any other design, which someone might think would be an appropriate and fitting design for a flag in Saskatchewan. Accordingly we would like to see the Committee sit without any preconceived ideas; we would like to see it have, as I indicated leave to sit inter-sessionally; if it wished, to invite submissions, to have the modest amount of funds which might be involved in that – and it would be a trifle – and generally to see the Committee have some measure of freedom in preparing its recommendation to the House.

I doubt whether these proposals we're putting forward are very controversial. I will, however, just recap them. We would like to see the Committee selected in the way I've earlier indicated and to have it report back to the House on the procedure it proposes to follow fairly promptly, so that Members might have an opportunity to comment on that. Then we would like to see the Committee at least be free to proceed in the manner in which I have suggested. Now I would hope that the Committee will be able to report this session and we certainly have no

wish to prolong this matter or agonize over it. However, the selection of a flag is a decision which is going to be binding on our heirs and successors for some hundreds of years, we suppose, and therefore, there is no immediate need to select a design. If the Committee felt that they wished to explore alternative designs, we would think that that ought to be open to them. With these general comments, Mr. Speaker, I am prepared, and, speaking on behalf of Members on this side of the House, we are prepared to support and vote for the motion put on the Order Paper by the Hon. Premier that we select a design for a distinctive flag for Saskatchewan.

Mr. Thatcher: — Mr. Speaker, I think this is one matter in the current session on which there will be a degree of unanimity on both sides of the House. I concur with most of the recommendations made by the Hon. Member for Regina Centre (Mr. Blakeney) who just spoke. The Government hopes that a Committee of 12 may be set up immediately if this resolution is passed. We rather had in mind 8 Government Members and 4 Opposition Members. But if the Opposition would rather have it 7 and 5, that would be agreeable, because, as I say, I don't think there is going to be a particular difference in this matter. The Government would like to propose the name of the Hon. Member for Moosomin (Mr. Gardner) to be chairman. I think the idea of a free vote, when the time comes and not a party vote, may have a good deal of merit. Symbols sometimes can be much more important than a lot of people realize. Whether we adopt the Diamond Jubilee Flag or some other flag with the Union Jack in a corner is a decision we have to make. I have my views on that matter. I would hope that the Committee might be able to report in the current session. However, if they find this is not possible, of course there will have to be inter-sessional sittings. My thought would be that when the Committee is established, members would pretty well set up their own procedures. I think that in a few weeks perhaps the Committee could report back to the House on how they propose to proceed. If this motion passes today, I shall ask the Committee to hold its first sitting next Monday. I hope they may find such a date feasible.

Motion agreed to.

The Assembly adjourned at 5:18 o'clock p.m.