

LEGISLATIVE ASSEMBLY OF SASKATCHEWAN
Second Session — Sixteenth Legislature
9th Day

Friday, February 14, 1969

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

WELCOME TO STUDENTS

Mr. A. Mitchell (Bengough): — Mr. Speaker, it is my privilege to introduce to you and to the Members of this Legislature 72 grade eight students seated in the west gallery from Assiniboia public school. This fine group of students are accompanied by their teachers, Mr. Ellis, Mrs. Adair, Mrs. Reed, and Mr. Brown and also by their bus driver, Mr. Batty and Mr. Kuntz. I am sure that all Members of this Legislature join with me in wishing them an interesting and enjoyable visit, and of course a safe journey home this afternoon.

Hon. Members: — Hear, hear!

Mr. A. Thibault (Kinistino): — Mr. Speaker, I wish through you and to the Members of this House to introduce a fine group of students from Crystal Springs high school. They are grades 11 and 12. they spent the forenoon in the city and they were led here by their teachers, Mr. Graham Guest, Mr. Ike Gillard, their school bus drivers, Mr. Orval Hegg and Mr. Herbert LaRoche. I hope that their stay here will be a pleasant one and a very educational one and I also want to wish them a safe journey home.

Hon. Members: — Hear, hear!

Mr. D.W. Michayluk (Redberry): — Mr. Speaker, it is with a great deal of pleasure that I rise this afternoon to introduce to you, Sir, and through you to the Members of the Legislature, a fine group of 33 students, grades 11 and 12 from the Vawn high school of Vawn, Saskatchewan. They are seated in the east gallery. They are accompanied by their principal, Sister Jeannie Archambault and Sister Theresa Fortier together with the bus driver, Mr. Lloyd Beaudoin. Vawn high school, Mr. Speaker, is in the Turtleford school unit, part of which is in the constituency of Redberry. Mr. Speaker, I hope that their two-day stay in the capital city will be profitable, educational and rewarding. Their presence in the Legislative Assembly this afternoon should be inspiring and informative and will give them a first-hand insight into democratic process of parliamentary procedure. It is my sincere wish that their trip back home tomorrow will be safe.

Hon. Members: — Hear, hear!

February 14, 1969

Mr. G.T. Snyder (Moose Jaw North): — Mr. Speaker, I am especially pleased to welcome a group of students to the Legislature today from Ross public school in Moose Jaw. These are some 60 students accompanied by their teachers, Mr. McLean and Mr. Kelly. Ross public school in Moose Jaw, Mr. Speaker, is in the extreme northeast corner of the city; it falls into the constituency of Moose Jaw North. It is interesting to note, however, that if it were situated another 400 feet further to the east it would be in Moose Jaw South. For anyone who is slightly confused, I direct them to the people who drew the constituency boundaries, separating Moose Jaw North and Moose Jaw South. Ross public school, Mr. Speaker, has an old and proud history of service to the city of Moose Jaw, having served as a military hospital around the end of World War 1 and continuously since that time as an institution of learning. I have many warm feelings about this particular school, having taken my public school there myself, Mr. Speaker, both of my sons attended that school and I have a young nephew who is seated with the group in the east gallery today. I know all Members will want to extend a warm welcome to them and express the wish that their trip back home will be safe.

Hon. Members: — Hear, hear!

Mr. Speaker: — I crave the indulgence of the Assembly to introduce to you a fine group of students from the Saltcoats junior high school, seated in the Speaker's gallery, under the very able direction of their principal, Mr. Kardynal and I am sure that all Members of the Legislature will wish to join with me in extending an extremely warm welcome to this group of students.

Hon. Members: — Hear, hear!

QUESTION OF PRIVILEGE

Mr. D.G. MacLennan (Last Mountain): — Mr. Speaker, before the Orders of the Day I would like to rise on a question of privilege. Yesterday, the Hon. Members fro Regina East (Mr. Baker) the Mayor of Regina, stated that someone other than myself wrote the speech I gave in this Legislature on February 4th. This I categorically deny. Never, Mr. Speaker, in the time I have been in this Legislature have I given a speech prepared, written or authored by any other person than myself. If the Member were in his seat, Mr. Speaker, I would as that the Mayor of Regina apologize for what he said.

Some Hon. Members: — Hear, hear!

ANNOUNCEMENTS

TRUCKING AND FREIGHT RATE INCREASE

Hon. Mr. D.V. Heald (Attorney General): — Before the Orders of the Day, I would like to make

an announcement to advise Hon. Members that the Highway Traffic Board has, effective February 14th today, approved an across-the-board interim adjustment of 3.4 per cent for general trucking and freight rates. This is considered to be an interim measure to make allowances for rising operating costs, such as employees' wages and salaries, fuel prices, tires, repair services and so on. The trucking industry has been operating on a very narrow margin for some time after having experienced a number of years with substantial operating losses. Since the Highway Traffic Board prescribes the freight rates and therefore more indirectly controls the profit margin, the new rates are not only justifiable to keep the trucks rolling, but also in the public interest to ensure the continuation of vital service to all communities in Saskatchewan.

Mr. Speaker, freight rate increases are not necessarily the patent cure for all ills of the trucking industry. I think we would all agree that the industry has to find some ways and means to improve the present situation. I am confident they will do so. They will pull through. There have been drastic changes in transportation and marketing patterns in the last few years and changes are still taking place all the time. Better highways and new regulations for the size and gross weight of truck units have made it possible to cut down in operating costs for long hauls. However, the decrease in freight volume on shorter hauls and the general merchandise routes has created some real problems. Pick-up and delivery costs have risen to a greater extent than any other portion of the overall, operating costs. Of course, increases of any kind are always unwelcome, but we have to be fair and the rates have to be equitable. The Highway Traffic Board took a real hard look at the requests for an adjustment by the trucking industry. They have proven to the Board's satisfaction that the new rate structure reflects the increase in their operating costs which is beyond their control. Therefore the 3.4 per cent, which is really a pretty modest adjustment, was granted.

MEETING RE OFFICIAL LANGUAGE BILL

Hon. D.V. Heald: — Mr. Speaker, while I am on my feet, and before the Orders of the Day I would like to advise all Hon. Members, that pursuant to the arrangements which were made at the Constitutional Conference, which was completed on Wednesday of this week in Ottawa, the Hon. Minister of Justice has called a meeting of the Western Attorneys General for Monday of next week in Victoria to discuss the aspects of the official Languages Bill which we say or feel are unconstitutional. I will be representing the Government of Saskatchewan at this meeting.

QUESTIONS

INTEREST RATE ON DEBENTURES

Mr. J. Kowalchuk (Melville): — Mr. Speaker, I would like to direct a question to the

February 14, 1969

Hon. Minister of Education (Mr. McIsaac). Due to the sky-rocketing interest rates across the whole country, causing extreme difficulty in schools trying to sell debentures, is the Minister and his Government bringing in an amendment to The School Act whereby the mandatory ceiling of 8 per cent interest on the sale of school debentures will be raised, or possibly even removed altogether?

Hon. J.C. McIsaac (Minister of Education): — Mr. Speaker, we will give this consideration in due course.

ADJOURNED DEBATES

ADDRESS-IN-REPLY

The Assembly resumed the adjourned debate on the proposed motion of Mr. Charlebois (Saskatoon City Park-University) for an Address-in-Reply.

Mr. W.E. Smishek (Regina North East): — Mr. Speaker, at the outset I would also like to join with the other Members who have welcomed the students and other guests to this Assembly. On behalf of myself I extend to them a warm welcome and hope that their stay this afternoon will be pleasant.

Mr. Speaker, the Hon. Member for Last Mountain (Mr. McLennan) made some observations a few minutes ago, I did have an opportunity to listen to his speech of February 4th. I am amazed that he takes credit for the paternity of that speech.

Some Hon. Members: — Hear, hear!

Mr. Smishek: — Mr. Speaker, this afternoon I propose to discuss two topics, one is health and the other education. I propose first to talk about the topic of health.

Ever since this Government took office there has been a steady erosion of public health services introduced by the former CCF Government. Time will not allow me to discuss in detail how some of our plans have been undermined and the benefits that have been taken away, or are threatened to be taken away. Here is a brief and incomplete recap: payments of car mileage for doctors attending to patients at their homes, discontinued, payments for minor surgery in non-hospital facilities discontinued, payments of physiotherapy services under MCIC stopped on July 1, 1965. The Government is now threatening to stop payments under the hospital plan for physiotherapy and X-ray services provided in non-hospital facilities. The Hospital Appeal Board was abolished. Our mental health programs were badly mutilated and now it proposed to close the Saskatchewan Hospital at

Weyburn, despite the fact that there are at the present time 414 patients in the hospital. But, even more significant, there were as of January 1, 1969, 558 persons on the waiting list seeking admission to the Moose Jaw Training School. That is almost 1,000 people in Southern Saskatchewan who are in need of psychiatric hospital care, but the Government of Saskatchewan is proposing to close the Weyburn Mental Hospital.

An Hon. Member: — Shame!

Mr. Smishek: — Mr. Speaker, the most serious blow to our public health programs was announced on March 1, 1968, when the Provincial Treasurer said that hospital and medical care deterrent fees would be introduced.

Since April 15, 1968, there has hardly been a day pass by that I have not received a phone call, a personal inquiry, or a letter regarding deterrent fees. Every letter or conversation ended with a complaint. I am convinced, Mr. Speaker, that deterrent fees are working even more serious hardships on the people of Saskatchewan than we anticipated last year. Thousands upon thousands of Saskatchewan residents have been badly hurt by these fees.

Some Hon. Members: — Hear, hear!

Mr. Smishek: — The Minister of Public Health (Mr. Grant) quoted a series of statistical figures when he spoke in this House last week. It would appear the figures are those that would normally be included in the MCIC and SHSP Annual Reports. We are patiently waiting for the Government to table these reports and not wait until March 31. I hope the Government will not enforce the law passed last year, permitting it to withhold these reports until the end of March. We want these reports now, not at the end of session.

Some Hon. Members: — Hear, hear!

Mr. Smishek: — The full information should be made available to all Members of the Legislature, not just to the Minister of Health to make his own interpretations.

The Minister claims that hospital and medical care deterrent fees are saving \$500,000 a month. For whom, Mr. Minister? Certainly not for the people of Saskatchewan, because they are paying that amount plus another 50 per cent in deterrent charges. The Provincial Treasurer (Mr. Steuart), last year in his Budget address, told us the Government estimated that for every \$3 paid by the people directly in deterrent fees, the actual saving to the Provincial Treasury will be \$2. If this assumption is correct and the experience figures quoted by the Minister of Health (Mr. Grant) are accurate, then the people of Saskatchewan

February 14, 1969

are paying \$750,000 a month in deterrent charges. This will amount to \$9 million a year. It also means we are losing \$4½ million in Federal grants. In other words, if we did not have deterrent fees we would get at least \$4½ million additional in Federal hospital and medical care reimbursements or grants. No one will convince me that it makes any economic sense to charge the people \$9 million in deterrent fees, so that the Government can save \$6 million, only to lose \$4½ million.

Some Hon. Members: — Hear, hear!

Mr. Smishek: — The Throne Speech talks about improvement of the various health programs. The Minister of Health has already spoken, and he did not announce a single improvement in any health program. The only announcement he made was that there will be \$180 annual ceiling on deterrent fees. He sang the same old refrain ‘personal responsibility,’ ‘patient participation’ abuse.

The Government argued last year that the sick who use the medical and hospital services should pay a larger proportion of the bills than those who are fortunate enough to be healthy and that there were abuses. It made no effort to pinpoint the abuses, nor has it considered other means of controlling them other than penalizing everyone.

The Minister is not satisfied that deterrent fees have done enough damage. In the February 7th issue of the Leader Post he is reported as saying, let me quote:

I realize that this trend cannot be stopped solely by utilization fees. They will help, but other efforts such as reduction of total number of beds must be continued.

Take note, reduction of hospital beds. Perhaps this is the Liberal Government’s reason for the repeated announcements of delaying the construction of the Regina Base Hospital. The Liberals don’t want to build new hospitals to create more beds. No doubt, Mr. Speaker, such a reduction will save money, but let me tell you what it will increase. It will increase human suffering, it will increase the cost of medical care, it will increase the incidence of deaths that could be avoided.

Some Hon. Members: — Hear, hear!

Mr. Smishek: — The Minister quoted more statistics, but the one statistic he did not give us, is how many people did not go to see a doctor because they could not afford to pay the deterrent fees. How many children or senior citizens had less mild to drink or had to do without a pair of shoes or some other necessity of life because the money went to pay deterrent fees. These are also important facts for us as Legislators, to look at. What are the economic and side effects on people who can’t

afford, but are forced to pay deterrent charges? Perhaps, Mr. Speaker, that story is better told in a letter I received but a few days ago from a family in my constituency. I am prepared to table that letter, Mr. Speaker, let me quote:

I have just added our medical expense for 1968. The total cost to us has been \$386.10. We have a family of six children, two of which are chronically ill and require constant medication and frequent check-ups.

It is most unfortunate that besides having the worry and anxiety of two sick children, we must bear the cost of medical care, when in fact the purpose of medicare is to reduce the burden. I am certain we do find ourselves alone in this situation.

After one has paid exorbitant taxes and medical expense there certainly is very little left, for those on low and middle class incomes.

As a Member of the Legislature, I hope you will do all in your power to discontinue the utilization fee. It is only a hardship on the low and middle class families with small children.

Deterrent fees have two major effects; they are a financial hardship on people with low and medium incomes and they deter people from seeking medical and hospital care when they need it. For these reasons they are unacceptable with or without a ceiling. For these reasons, Mr. Speaker, I again plead with the Government to eliminate them completely and immediately.

Some Hon. Members: — Hear, hear!

Mr. Smishek: — Mr. Speaker, as if the Government has not done enough harm to our health services by reducing benefits and shifting more of the cost onto the individuals, especially the sick, in the Throne Address there is a threat to increase health taxes in the future.

The Minister of Health (Mr. Grant) speaking to the South East Regional Health Council is reported in the Leader Post of February 1st to have said that, "he personally feels hospital and medical care premiums in Saskatchewan are too low." The present Minister of Health has been in the Cabinet for almost five years. During this period he has not been known to be a person who makes radical public statements that would be in conflict with Government policy. I am not criticizing or suggesting that he should. I am merely stating a point of fact. In view of this, one can accurately assume that the minister is in fact expressing the feeling of the Government. Mr. Speaker, if the premiums are going to be increased, then this Legislature should be informed as to when it is to take place and the amount of the increase. The increase should be included in the Budget, so that

this Legislature has an opportunity to thoroughly debate the question.

Some Hon. Members: — Hear, hear!

Mr. Smishek: — Mr. Speaker, this Government on taking office increased the premiums by \$10 to single persons and \$20 to the families, a \$5¼ million annual tax increase. It imposed the deterrent fees that is going to cost the people of Saskatchewan about \$9 million a year. It has imposed the 5 per cent Education and Health Tax on thousands of items previously exempt. Liberals in Ottawa have also as of January 1st, imposed a 2 per cent so-called “Social Development Tax” with a \$120 annual ceiling on the rich. It will cost every man, woman and child in Canada an average of \$22 a year. It will cost the people of Saskatchewan about \$22 million a year or more. About \$15 million of this will be returned to the Province in cost-sharing of medicare. Over \$35 million of new health taxes since the Liberals took office and during their term of office many benefits have been reduced, and no sign of a public drug plan promised by the Liberal in 1964.

Mr. Speaker, Liberal Governments, whether at Regina or Ottawa, believe only in imposing and constantly increasing taxes, but not increasing services. Mr. Speaker, on January 17, the Minister of Health announced that payment of physiotherapy and X-ray services in non-hospital facilities will be discontinued because the Federal Government refuses to share the costs. Consider the fate of medicare if the Liberal in Ottawa and Regina were permitted to remain five years from now. I doubt that the people of Saskatchewan and of Canada will allow this. Obviously our Hospitalization and Medicare Plans would go down the drain. I want the people of Saskatchewan to keep reminding themselves that Prime Minister Trudeau announced on November 5, 1968, that the Federal Liberal Government will get out of sharing the cost of medicare. In a press story of the same day, Premier Thatcher is also reported as saying,

We have had indirect indications that the Federal Government will phase out the shared-cost hospital care program, we well as the medical care program.

Four months after the Federal Medical Care Plan was started Prime Minister Trudeau announced that the Federal Government will pull out of the national medicare programs. This is the same man who just 4½ months prior to this announcement was making speeches across Canada, during the Federal election campaign, promising to build a just society, promising all Canadians an equality of opportunity, promising the people a fair share of the wealth of our nation. It appears more obvious now that he was not proposing a just society for the ordinary people. It was just for the few, a just society, just for the rich, the ones the liberal party and liberal governments have always coddled and protected.

The Hall Commission which studied in great detail and in depth the health needs of Canadian people recommended and said:

Federal financial participation is the most effective practical means of introducing new programs in the health field to give all Canadians an equality of opportunity essential to make unity and progress as nation.

One thing for which the liberals can be counted on, they don't believe in publicly financed and administered health programs. If they promise it during an election campaign, don't believe them, they will never act on it. Remember the drug plan promised in 1964! If they inherit a plan, they will wreck it! IF they are forced to legislate one, it is a temporary measure and they will get out of it before it fully takes effect.

Some Hon. Members: — Hear, hear!

Mr. Smishek: — Mr. Speaker, I now want to turn to the second topic and that is the question of education.

I am deeply concerned about what is happening to education in this province under the Liberal Government.

The Economic Council of Canada in its second annual review recommended that the advancement of education at all levels be given a very high place in public policy, and that investment in education be accorded the highest rank in the scale of priorities. Since 1964, the Premier of Saskatchewan and his Government have been short changing education in terms of public policy and short changing education in the amounts of Provincial money made available to all levels of education. This Liberal Government attaches a low priority to education. This is reflected in the way it has treated our schools and university. They way it has treated our teachers, trustees, school boards, administrators and the way it now treats our students. The Premier and his colleagues have been allocating less than enough money to provide the education our children need. This Government has done practically nothing to increase the number of technical institutions. Hundreds of applicants are denied admission each year for lack of space, though 75 per cent of funds are available from Ottawa for technical school. Still no sign of any community colleges.

Our high schools are overcrowded, additional facilities are badly needed in our urban communities. Rumor has it that even less Provincial funds will be available for school construction this year than last.

Our universities do not have enough money to do a decent job for the many students who want a university education. Many young people with ability from low-income families do not have an equality of opportunity to finish high school and take university or other training.

At the same time, the Government is trying to make scapegoats out of educational institutions receiving grants. The Government's attack has been: teachers' salaries are too high, they are a selfish lot, now they want more; the University is squandering money, place it under scrutiny and greater government control. Remember the so-called grants plan of a few years back? The Government's answer to rising education cost was that those who cut programs, reduce costs at the expense of our children, shall be rewarded. Indeed, Mr. Speaker, the Liberal Government has invented an ingenious approach to divert attention from the real issue. It is a master at manufacturing side issues, red herrings to detract from the fact that it is shortchanging education.

A little more that one year ago, the Premier and his Government managed to get two side shows going at the same time to divert attention from the inadequate education budget it was preparing to present to this Legislature. One of these side shows involved the elementary and high school systems and the educators working in those systems. The Government got this pot boiling by proposing area bargaining and by denying certain other teacher rights. Many of us will not forget the furore that this raised throughout the province. This succeeded very nicely in getting the teachers, trustees, school boards and the public so involved in this issue that the low level of school grants to finance our elementary and high school education proposed by the Government last year almost lost sight of by the public.

Government spokesmen were telling the people that area bargaining legislation is going to solve the teacher-trustee bargaining differences. The legislation was passed at the last session and so far, Mr. Speaker, not a single agreement has been settled for the current year, not to mention the next school term. The conflict is far from over, but as usual, the Minister of Education is threatening further legislative action. This I suggest is less than welcome by the teachers, trustees or the public. It looks as if the Minister has been directed to re-stage last year's side show in the teacher-trustee dispute. He is starting to inflame it by legislative threats. This is designed to again distract the public attention from the real issue of school grants for education which will likely be inadequate and will again force local taxes to rise substantially.

Mr. Speaker, the other side show the Premier got going last year was the University issue, to divert people's attention from the paltry sum of Provincial money allocated for the University, and from the fact that the Government was using Federal funds intended for education for other purposes. Not long after the Provincial election the Premier went to Potashville and made one of his screaming speeches. He screamed about university costs rising at an alarming rate, that the University was squandering money; that his Government intended to control university spending. "It will be treated like any other Government department," he said. That was well premeditated. He concluded in his mind that this kind of a speech would get those egg-heads, those

radicals, and those hot-heads, so upset it would detract their attention from the inadequate money he intended to allocate for the University in the 1968-69 Budget. So, last year we had the university-government autonomy battle. As the Premier had hoped he got the pot boiling. At times various parts of the University began to fight among themselves. "All the better to smoke screen the real issue," the Premier gloated.

This year the Government, to start with, took a different approach, not quite as direct but nevertheless effective. This Government, since its election in 1964, has not exactly encouraged political criticism. It struck almost immediately to silence dissent in the Civil Service. Firing Mr. C. Basken was designed to serve as a warning to all Government employees. Criticize the Liberal Government and you've had it. It is well known that anyone who wants to do business with the Government not only doesn't criticize but is required to support with contributions the Liberal war chest. Any criticism of the Government in this province has to be whispered.

But the Premier had a problem, Mr. Speaker. He and his Government were being criticized and exposed continually by the student newspaper on the Regina campus. Clearly this could not be tolerated, not in an institution which depends upon the Government for funds for building and operating costs. But how does a Premier muzzle a university student newspaper, was the big question. Well with another round of budget negotiations coming up with the University Board of Governors, our Premier had a brainwave. The Premier decided this was the time to lower the boom. But his brainwave had a small flaw in it — how to tell the Board of Governors to get rid of The Carillon. Mr. Speaker, such things never bothered our Premier so he made a decision. The Board of Governors acted. This got the Board fighting with the students, students fighting among themselves, with the administration and the faculty caught in between. Then came the accusations from Government spokesmen against the students, against the students' union, its leadership and their newspapers. Arguments were manufactured that big money contributors would not donate to the University building fund. I suggest that the action of this Government in maligning and attacking the University for the last two years has hurt the building fund raising campaign more than anything the students could have done.

Some Hon. Members: — Hear, hear!

Mr. Smishek: — And especially contributions from our Saskatchewan citizens who have had a special pride in our University and have always supported the University generously with contributions when called upon. Just last Tuesday, Frank Lovell, Director of Development at the University, noted that the reason for the fund-raising campaign being behind in its objective at this time about \$600,000 was because of the economic conditions in Canada, not anything the students may or may not have done. The people of Saskatchewan are deeply concerned about this

February 14, 1969

Government's mishandling of our University.

Some Hon. Members: — Hear, hear!

Mr. Smishek: — Take note, Mr. Speaker, the present Government-sponsored side show is timed again in the period the 1969-70 University budget comes up. The timing is no accident. This is the real reason for all this fuss going on at the Regina campus.

All this might be funny, if it weren't true and if the consequences were not so tragic and disastrous. Mr. Speaker, the accusations by Liberal Government spokesmen against the Regina University campus prior to the opening of this Legislature were bad enough. But since the opening of the session what we have heard is unbelievable, from the very first day the mover of the Address-in-Reply spoke. I have been in this Legislature for almost five years and I have not known this Assembly at any time in the past, to be so degraded and disgraced as it was last week. We have been subjected to the worst and most vicious name-calling of students at the University. Who are these people, Mr. Speaker, who have been the subject of such malicious attack? They are the sons and daughters of our Saskatchewan farmers, Saskatchewan businessmen, wage earners, professional people and so on.

Some Hon. Members: — Hear, hear!

Mr. Smishek: — Mr. Speaker, they are your sons, your daughters or those of your friends, your neighbors or your relatives. They have been called every imaginable name you can think of: radicals, agitators, anarchists, communists, kooks, hippies, hot-heads, disrupters, irresponsible, so on and so on.

Some Hon. Members: — Hear, hear!

Mr. Smishek: — Mr. Speaker, let us take a look at some of these students and the student leaders: There is Dave Sheard, president of the Student Representative Council. I have never met the young man, Mr. Speaker. I have seen him, a mild-spoken person, I saw him on a television program. I was quite impressed with him, Mr. Speaker. Mr. Sheard attended the Federal-Liberal Leadership Convention last year in Ottawa . . .

An Hon. Member: — Oh, a Liberal.

Mr. Smishek: — At the last Provincial Liberal Convention he served on a panel. Is he the radical, agitating anarchist?

Some Hon. Members: — Hear, hear!

Mr. Smishek: — Well, Mr. Speaker, there is Ken Sundquist, first vice-

president of the SRC. I don't know him personally either, but I know he was the leader of the campus Conservative Party Parliamentary Forum. If he the irresponsible, kooky, hot-head?

Some Hon. Members: — Hear, hear!

Mr. Smishek: — Then there is Ron Myhr, second vice-president of the SRC. He sat with the Liberal party in the last Parliamentary Forum and was a card-carrying member of the Liberal party during the last parliamentary election the students had at the University. What name did they attach to him?

Some Hon. Members: — Hear, hear!

Mr. Smishek: — Mr. Speaker, then there is Hugh Peck, SRC Councillor. He was a card-carrying member of the Liberal party, attended the Regina Lake Centre Liberal nominating convention, worked for the Liberal candidate in that constituency during the last Federal campaign.

Some Hon. Members: — Hear, hear!

Mr. Smishek: — Well, Mr. Speaker, there is Don Mitchell, SRC Councillor. Just listen to this. A fourth-year student. He has been called every conceivable name by the Premier and the Minister of Public Works (Mr. Guy). Who is he? Well, let's ask Uncle Alex Mitchell, Liberal MLA for Bengough.

Some Hon. Members: — Hear, hear!

Mr. Smishek: — I believe Don Mitchell's father farms out of Moose Jaw in the Morse constituency. I know Don. He is a very intelligent young man.

Mr. Speaker, you will remember the 1968 opening of the Legislature. There was a student protest. The entrance of the Legislative Buildings were full of students. They were protesting against the Government's proposed economic and academic control of the University. That parade was led by who? Young Jim Gardiner, son of Wilf Gardiner, present Deputy Minister of the Department of Co-operatives, and former Minister of Public Works, grandson of a former Saskatchewan Premier. The parade marshal was Herb Padwick, son of H.W. Padwick, Manager of Kramer Tractor. Neither father nor son is known to be supporters of the NDP. Mr. Speaker, the father, however, was well known in circles of the KOD. Remember that organization?

Some Hon. Members: — Hear, hear!

Mr. Smishek: — Mr. Speaker, have any of these men who have

February 14, 1969

criticized and subjected our students to so much abuse stopped to talk to the students? Have they ever listened to their grievances? Well, Sir, I have. They are concerned about the amount of money our University will be getting for operating costs and building programs. They are desperately overcrowded for space at Regina. There is need for more classrooms and more teachers. There is a shortage of books at the Regina campus library. They have housing problems.

More than two years ago the Premier of Saskatchewan announced that “the Provincial Government will provide \$700,000 in the next financial year to begin construction of student housing to accommodate between 200 and 300 Regina campus students.” He said, “The complex, likely to cost \$2 million will provide dining, classroom, library and office facilities for up to 800 students.” Not a thing has happened, not a penny spent since the announcement. The students were promised a students’ union building for their activities, to be opened in 1968. It has been postponed for a period of 10 years.

They are concerned about the universal accessibility, that is, everyone who can benefit from university education should have the right and opportunity for university training. They are opposed to controlled student enrolment. They want the university tuition fees eliminated. But according to the Minister of Public Works (Mr. Guy), anyone who advocates elimination of tuition fees is a Communist.

They want the status quo, Mr. Speaker. Surprised? You shouldn’t be. They want the administration to continue collecting student activity fees, so that they can operate an effective student union activity program, so they can have an economically sound students’ union. They want the right to run their student newspaper without interference. They want a right to have some say as to what and how they will be taught, some say of how the University will be administered and how it will function. Remember, Mr. Speaker, they are a very important part of the University. Without the students there would be no university.

Students at the Regina campus like students in every other university, to a larger or lesser degree, are asking to be part of the decision-making process. They are asking for the right to help plan their studies. They want to be recognized and be part of the administrative authority. They want to help plan their educational future. For the University administration or the Government, or this Legislature to say No is very, very wrong.

Perhaps, Mr. Speaker, the attitude of this Government can best be described by a student of another University, at California, when he told the Board of Regents: “we have asked to be heard; you have refused. We have asked for justice; you have called it anarchy. We have asked for freedom; you have called it licence. Rather than face the fear of hopelessness you have created; you have called it communistic. You have accused us of failing to use the channels, but you have closed those channels

to us. You, and not us, have built a university based on untrust and dishonesty.” Mr. Speaker, this deception is very applicable to the Saskatchewan scene at this time.

Mr. Speaker, there is another area where many students and young people question and express serious concern. It is the kind of society, this generation and the ones before have built, a society of greed, hate and war. They express concern about the poverty in the midst of plenty. They are asking and talking about a new society, a better society, a society where people can be free, where all people have enough food to eat, where the best of health service are available to all and above all a society free from war. The late Senator Robert Kennedy in his book, “To Seek a Newer World,” takes in some depth about this concern of the young people.

But there are those who ask: why do the students act and do things in such an unorthodox way? I admit that on occasion I have difficulty in understanding some of their approaches. Mr. Speaker, but this MLA from Regina North East is prepared to listen and try to understand. I am not prepared to close my ears and my eyes nor will I ever condemn the young people, my children and the children of our Saskatchewan citizens, to some hopeless future. I am prepared to listen and consider their problem and proposals. The young people are the light, the hope and the future of Canada and the world.

Mr. Speaker, I strongly disagree with the kind of condemnation the students were subjected to last week by the Liberal MLAs. In saying that, I also want to say that I cannot accept the deliberate destruction taking place in Montréal this week. This type of destruction is not justified and cannot be condoned.

Mr. Speaker, this Liberal Government is seriously endangering the quality of education at all levels in this province and, indeed, is threatening the very existence of the Regina campus as a university institution worthy of the name. I warn the Premier of this province that he is playing with dynamite if he thinks he can get away for very long with trying to win votes by attacking education and the educators.

Mr. Speaker, as a Member of the Legislative Assembly for Regina, I can tell you that I am very disturbed as to what is happening at the Regina campus. I wonder if the time has come to have a serious look at the question of a separate and autonomous university for the city of Regina and southern Saskatchewan. Mr. Speaker, there are people who have asked the same question and are making the same proposal. I intend to pursue the matter further. I believe that this proposal is worthy of consideration. Mr. Speaker, it is obvious that I will not support the motion, I will vote against it.

Some Hon. Members: — Hear, hear!

Mr. A.E. Blakeney (Regina Centre): — It’s Mitchell and Gallagher today.

February 14, 1969

Mr. A. Mitchell (Bengough): — Mr. Speaker, as I rise to take part in this debate, I join the previous speakers in congratulating the mover and the seconder of the motion on their presentations. I also congratulate our Assistant Legislative Clerk on his appointment. I am sure Mr. Barnhart will perform his duties worthy of the position. I am sure pleased to note our Premier has been discharged from the hospital and we look forward to his return to this House.

I would like, while it is in our minds, to differ from the former speaker. I agree with his statement, we need more university buildings and I think everyone else in this Legislature agrees. We need more of a lot of other things in this province and we'll get the university buildings when the taxpayers of this Province can afford to build them. Now, is the Member from Regina suggesting we should cut back on highways, welfare or perhaps the base hospital in Regina?

Some Hon. Members: — Hear, hear!

Mr. Mitchell: — Nevertheless it is in there. On highways, hearing some of the city Members speaking or I should say some of the city Members from the Opposition speaking these last two years, suggesting that we are spending too much on highways, I think they would think differently if they lived out in the rural areas of this province. The rural people of this province are very, very pleased with the highway program these last few years.

Some Hon. Members: — Hear, hear!

Mr. Mitchell: — I'd like to also remind the Member from Regina North East (Mr. Smishek) that I am not responsible for my relative's political beliefs but I can assure you that Don's parents are still damn good Liberals.

Some Hon. Members: — Hear, hear!

Hon. D.G. Stuart (Provincial Treasurer): — Comes from good stock.

Mr. Mitchell: — I see, Mr. Speaker, that our friends opposite have returned, following a recess earlier this week, a bit happier and more cheerful than they were previously. I somewhat suspect that their joy is due to the fact that earlier this week the ringleader of Socialism in Canada was elected to the House of Commons . . .

Some Hon. Members: — Hear, hear!

Mr. Mitchell: — . . . this following his third flight to a new Federal constituency where he hoped he would be able to fool

people into electing him.

Some Hon. Members: — Hear, hear!

Mr. Mitchell: — Well, Mr. Speaker, we remember what happened to Tommy in Saskatchewan. We all know that the people in this province finally got so fed up with Socialism and Socialist double-talk they threw Tommy and his cohorts out. They threw them out because they realize that the NDP always put politics before people.

Some Hon. Members: — Hear, hear!

Mr. Mitchell: — They threw them out because they realized that a Socialist will say or do anything if he thinks it will get him a vote. We have seen this practice at work in this debate by our friends opposite, and I just received proof this morning, Mr. Speaker, that the NDP used this same practice to full advantage in securing a cozy chair for Tommy in the Federal riding in the Nanaimo-Cowichan. I have here, Mr. Speaker, the January 24th edition of the Nanaimo Daily Free Press which contains a letter supposedly written by one of Tommy's admirers. Its content is ridiculous enough and misleading enough that it could well have been written by one of the Members opposite or Tommy himself. Let me read, Mr. Speaker, what the NDP told the people of Nanaimo through the medium of this letter. The letter contains a great number of mistruths and false statements, but I want you to get this part of it, and I quote:

Sure, the CCF Government in Saskatchewan borrowed money but it didn't have to give the province away to speculators and land grabbers.

The people of Saskatchewan reaped the benefits. The money borrowed by Tommy Douglas was invested in revenue-producing Crown corporations that returned to the people a 9 per cent profit.

Get this one:

If you exclude the hydro and telephone . . .

And these were the only two that ever did show a profit and they were started by the previous Government before they got in there.

then the Crown corporations made a 16 per cent profit.

I am sure, Mr. Speaker, the people of Saskatchewan will certainly wonder which Crown corporation made the 16 per cent profit. Perhaps the box factory or the brick plant or the tannery or the woollen mill. The STIO claim they don't make profit. Several days ago, Mr. Speaker, this House listened to a long, loud harangue by the Leader of the Opposition regarding some of the

February 14, 1969

major and critical problems facing many of our farmers in Saskatchewan today. He spoke at great length as how he and his cohorts had travelled here, travelled there, studying the problems. We heard how he and his cohorts had written to this person, telegraphed that person, asking for help in this crucial situation.

Well, Mr. Speaker, I don't think any of the farmers on this side of the House, and I don't think any of the farmers in this province were surprised to learn of the manner in which the NDP have approached this problem. Twenty years showed everyone in Saskatchewan that the NDP Socialists are great at studying the problem, superb at talking about it, but when it comes to acting with concrete and constructive solutions they are as still as a post.

Some Hon. Members: — Hear, hear!

Mr. Mitchell: — And, Mr. Speaker, no one exemplified these traits and traditions more than did the Hon. Leader of the Opposition (Mr. Lloyd) in his speech last Monday. He was quick to make a number of recommendations in his usual unimaginative, free-spending fashion. I say unimaginative because 50 per cent of the things he suggested had already been done by this Liberal Government. I say free-spending because the balance of his suggestions required expenditures on the farmer's behalf with money that has already been collected from him as a taxpayer. I think our Minister of Agriculture, in his speech last week, exposed the inconsistencies and impracticalities of the Hon. Member's suggestions.

You know, Mr. Speaker, in the Leader of the Opposition's suggestions, one of the basic NDP principles they practised so fervently when they were in office, shone through clearly, that is, the practice of fooling people with their own money. Give it to the farmers on one hand for political gain, and turn around and take it back when they aren't looking. Well, Mr. Speaker, the fact that Hon. Members opposite are sitting where they are, indicates most clearly that the farmer and taxpayer in Saskatchewan know where governments get their money. They know that governments have one source of funds. They know that whatever the Government spends on them collectively first must be collected from them collectively. The hard, bitter experience of 20 years of Socialism has taught them a lesson in government finance that even the Socialists haven't yet learned. And I doubt, Mr. Speaker, if ever again, the people of Saskatchewan will be hoodwinked and fooled by impractical and unworkable Socialist economic fairy tales! They run at the mouth at great length about the unfortunate problems facing Saskatchewan farmers today, but their record of action, in this regard, when they were the Government is a sad tale of disinterest, inaction and unconcern. Their interest in making political gain out of other people's hardships — the usual doom and gloom, you know — has always been their stock-in-trade and their interest in political

gains has always superseded their interest in agriculture and agricultural problems.

As a farmer myself, Mr. Speaker, and I know many farmers feel the same, I think it is high time that the farmer in this province ceased being the political football for our Socialist friends opposite. Mind you, Mr. Speaker, I supposed they are only doing what their labor bosses tell them, and when the NDP ceases to kick the farmer around, labor steps in to finish the job. Mr. Speaker, again this past year we have seen a series of strikes and labor disputes in Canada and at whose expense in most cases? – at the farmer's expense in every case. And then the Members opposite in their sanctimonious, holier-than-thou attitude, rise to their feet and fake concern for the Saskatchewan farmer. That's right, Mr. Speaker, these puppets of American and Eastern labor bosses, have the gall to travel throughout the province of the Western farmer. Well, as a Western farmer, Mr. Speaker, I won't ask the Leader of the Opposition (Mr. Lloyd) his labor-control squad, where they were last June when the St. Lawrence sea workers went on strike. Where were they, Mr. Speaker? Well, I don't know but it's a cinch they weren't travelling around the province then telling our farmers what great friends agriculture had in the NDP. Their labor cohorts in Ontario cost the farmers in Western Canada thousands of dollars last June and July. Not to mention the damage the Canadian trading reputation suffered internationally by tying up ships and delaying grain delivery to our customers. Where, well, where were the NDP then, Mr. Speaker? Where was the Leader of the Opposition who earlier in this debate raved and roared so vociferously about the problems of Western agriculture?

Some Hon. Members: — Hear, hear!

Mr. Mitchell: — What did the Leader of the Opposition have to say then? Not a whisper, Mr. Speaker. Not a word from the NDP in support of the Western farmer when he's been held at the point of a gun by Eastern labor bosses. Mr. Speaker, the attitude of the NDP towards the Western farmer in all this comes through loud and clear. We have all heard the saying, actions speak louder than words. Well, Mr. Speaker, the action of the NDP, while the Western farmer has been robbed and held up by United States and Eastern labor bosses, only serve to amplify their famous statement, 'To hell with the farmers, this is a labor party.'

Compare the hypocritical and misleading statements made by Opposition Members in this debate with the positive, progressive approach taken by the Liberal Government in the Throne Speech.

The Throne Speech announced this Government's intention to proceed with further measures designed to diversify our agricultural economy: 1. Assistance to expand livestock production in this province. 2. Assistance with construction costs of swine barns and equipment. 3. Expansion of our crop insurance

program to provide more security and stability in the agricultural industry. 4. The expansion of the South Saskatchewan River irrigation project in the Broderick area.

Mr. Speaker, the minister of Health (Mr. Grant) last week revealed details of the family ceiling for utilization fees which this Government is introducing. Now we have heard the Opposition again criticize our utilization fees. They know full well, Mr. Speaker, the problem of over-utilization has been with us for a long time. They themselves were well aware of the costs of abuses and over-utilization of these plans. They themselves made the provisions and legislation for utilization fees. In their traditional fashion, however, they lacked the courage to do what was right. They lacked the courage to do something that was necessary but politically unpopular and they therefore shunned away from such action.

The fact is, Mr. Speaker, that these fees have worked. They are helping control medical costs in this province. The fact that some type of action was necessary was proven to the House last week by the figures presented by the Hon. Minister of Health. We realize, however, that the purpose of our health plans is to guard against the threat of financial hardship because a person has the misfortune to be ill. As a result we are introducing a realistic ceiling on utilization fees in order that the security and assistance provided through our health insurance programs may be maintained. The ceiling of \$180 will provide a reasonable and fair maximum that a family can spend on health care in one year without destroying the effect of the utilization fees in holding rising costs.

Mr. Speaker, this Liberal Government has a proud record of highway construction and improvement throughout all areas of Saskatchewan. The Throne Speech has announced that large expenditures will again be made in this Department. In my constituency of Bengough in 1968, on Highway No. 36, we got 26 miles of oiling completed and another 15 miles of oiling on Highway No. 34, to complete all of Highway No. 34 from Highway No. 13 to the United States border. And by the end of the 1970 construction year, every single mile of Provincial highway in the Bengough constituency will have a dust-free surface. Compare this to the narrow, dusty, cow-paths which we inherited from our Socialist friends.

Some Hon. Members: — Hear, hear!

Mr. Mitchell: — One item in the Liberal program which has met with widespread approval and popularity is the homeowner grant. You know, Mr. Speaker, here again the NDP Socialists rant and rave about tax levels and the heavy tax burden carried by property owners in Saskatchewan. Here again they studied and talked, but what did the property owner get from the Socialist to relieve this problem? What did he get from the Socialists, Mr. Speaker? The same as usual. A lot of wind and sympathy but that's as far

as the Socialists would go. The Liberal Government's homeowner grant was designed specifically to assist the property owner with his tax problem, designed specifically to relieve the tax pressure bearing down on the property owner. Mr. Speaker, it is bad enough that the Socialists did nothing for the property owner under their regime. That was bad enough, but now they have the gall to criticize the progressive and constructive action designed to assist in the problem they talk and squawk about so much. They criticize it, Mr. Speaker, and bicker amongst themselves as to whether it is good or bad.

This Liberal party is committed to expanding the homeowner grant program and I am sure that in time this will be done. In the meantime, what effect has the homeowner grant had throughout the province? Mr. Speaker, in the fiscal year 1966 – 1967 there were a total of 171,401 applications; which totalled \$83,980. In the fiscal year 1967 – 1968, 176,543 applications which totalled \$8,577,239 and for 1968 - 1969 to January 31, 1969, a total of 177,718 applications, for a total of \$8,683,617. That total of \$25,44,837 was rebated to the Saskatchewan property owner in three years. Compare that to the hot air and sympathy and the big goose egg which the Socialists gleefully rebated them.

Mr. Speaker, I said earlier that the Throne Speech represented a progressive, constructive approach to the affairs of this province. The people of Saskatchewan elected this Government because they were sick and tired of the irresponsible, free-spending, and yet depressing policies of the Socialists. They elected a Liberal Government because they wanted responsible, business-like government. The Throne Speech contains the responsible, business-like qualities requested

Mr. Speaker, I wholeheartedly support the motion.

Some Hon. Members: — Hear, hear!

Mr. B.D. Gallagher (Yorkton): — Mr. Speaker, at this late stage most of what I might say has been rehashed many times before in the last seven or eight days. However, Mr. Speaker, I do want to say a few words about several things, one of which has been dwelt on quite extensively by the Opposition. And after that I want to refer to some of the things that were in the Throne Speech.

I want, first of all, to talk about the damp grain situation. Many people in the Opposition have said a lot of words during the course of the debate about the damp grain problem. I suppose you can't blame them when you watch how this Opposition works. It seems to me by what has been said by Opposition speakers, and in view of their record, that this Opposition is more concerned with alienating people from the Government of this province than they are with the actual damp problem in Saskatchewan.

An Hon. Member: — That's right.

February 14, 1969

Mr. Gallagher: — I certainly, Mr. Speaker, am not trying to minimize the problem. I am quite aware of the problem. What amazes me is how their solicitude for the farmers differs today from the days when they were the Government of this province.

I well recall the 1951 crop, much of which was left unharvested in my area of the province. The CCF Government of that day did nothing about the problem. I shouldn't say they did nothing. They did what they usually do. They cried to Ottawa. Then again in 1959 much of the Saskatchewan crop was harvested damp and much more of it was left under the snow. What did the CCF Government of that time do? The Minister of Agriculture (Mr. McFarlane) last week told you what they did. If they didn't do nothing, it was the next thing to nothing. Mr. Speaker, I have heard suggestions from the NDP speakers from the other side of this House during the past week, suggesting to the Government that both Provincial and Federal Governments have a responsibility to the farmers of this problem with damp grain that they should make at least a 10-cent a bushel cash grant to the farmers to help them to dry their grain.

I am not quite sure how they arrived at this figure of 10 cents a bushel because according to the Member for Prince Albert East –Cumberland (Mr. Berezowsky), the other day – and I don't question his figures either – it cost some people in his area of the province upwards of 30 cents a bushel to dry grain. I know, Mr. Speaker, that it sometimes costs three, four or five times as much to dry grain when it's 30 degrees below zero and wheat tests 22 or 24 per cent moisture than what it costs to dry grain testing 20 per cent moisture when it is 50 above zero.

If cash grants were paid to the farmers to dry grain on a per bushel basis, some farmers would receive one-third of the cost of drying the grain while other farmers would receive two or three times the cost. NDP Members must realize that the bulk of damp grain in this province is in the hands of larger grain farm operators. The smaller operators in the mixed farming areas of this province have fed or are feeding much of their out-of-condition grain. It follows, if payments were made on a per bushel basis, that the larger operators would be the benefactors of any such policy. I think most Members should know that there are parts of Canada where every year much of their crop is harvested in the same condition as our crop was harvested in 1968. It follows from this that, if the Federal Government should pay cash grants for drying grain on the Prairies in a year like 1968, then it should pay the same grants every year in the Atlantic provinces and in Central Canada. In these parts of the country, farmers are prepared to either buy grain dryers or store their grain in shallow piles in large granaries so that it won't spoil.

I want to remind my friends in the Opposition that, after the experience of the 1951 and 1959 harvests, many farmers equipped themselves either with larger combines to take advantage of the short harvest season that might be an eventually or

with grain dryers to dry grain that has been harvested in a damp condition.

Mr. Speaker, I suggest to NDP Members of this House that those people who have provided for themselves might not be too happy, if the Government of Canada asked them to pay \$30 or \$40 million in taxes to help their neighbors to dry their grain because the neighbor hadn't looked after himself.

Mr. Speaker, I have to agree with those people. I don't suggest for one moment that farmers couldn't use the money or that there is no farm problem, I suggest that cash payments to farmers to pay for drying damp grain, if they were to be justified, it would be the same as the Government paying the hail insurance to the farmer who had forgotten to put hail insurance on his crop and had his crop hailed out, while his neighbor had his crop insured and collected from the insurance company. It would be the same as to say the Government should buy grain dryers for farmers providing of course they hadn't bought a dryer before the Government got into the business. Then it must follow that the Government should supply fertilizer, or harvesting equipment or spray chemicals or any other item of expense the farmer incurs. From this I can well realize why the brave and more outspoken wing of the NDP are advocating nationalizing the farms. The people who sit opposite, Mr. Speaker, may believe in the same philosophy as their younger brethren, the boys that the Minister was referring to the other day, who suggest that we should nationalize the land in this country. Why don't they come out and say so?

Some Hon. Members: — Hear, hear!

Mr. Gallagher: — Mr. Speaker, I am quite aware of the farm problem. The damp grain problem in 1968 was only one more thing complicating the farm problem, but mainly our farm problems is two-fold; one is sales and the other is proves.

In regard to export sales, we all realize that our basic farm commodity, wheat, must be sold in the world market for what the world importers are prepared to pay. What has aggravated our surplus problem in the last year or two, is that Australia, United States and France, in particular, chose to unload their surplus wheat at cut prices that cost Canada several hundred million bushels of sales. I don't think the NDP would have agreed if, in September, 1967, the Canadian Wheat Board had cut the price of wheat 50 cents a bushel to sell another 100 or 150 million bushels of wheat. Every Member in this House who represents a rural seat will recall that in the 1067 election that on every power post or telephone post in the country you saw these large signs saying, "Thatcher wheat drops 22 cents a bushel." Yes, Mr. Speaker, we could have sold another 100 million in 1967 if we were willing to take \$1.40 or \$1.45 a bushel for wheat. I wonder what our NDP friends would have said if the Wheat Board had cut the price in order to sell some wheat.

February 14, 1969

I am not suggesting, Mr. Speaker, that we should have sold the wheat for \$1.40 a bushel. What I am saying is that you can't have it both ways. We asked the Government to set up the Canadian Wheat Board many years ago. During the past few decades it has worked reasonably well. The Canadian Wheat Board is now the sole marketing agent for our principal grains. It has tried to maintain our position in the export market while at the same time it has tried to maintain a reasonably decent price for wheat.

It seems to me that whenever the Wheat Board had adjusted prices downward to be able to compete in the world market, such as was done between December, 1966 and September, 1967, the NDP screams that the Liberal Government was cutting the price of wheat. When the Board holds the price, as it has in the past nine months, the NDP cry is the Government is not selling wheat.

Mr. Speaker, I would like to know what the NDP answer really is or if they really have any concern for their farmer friends. If they were sincere, then surely their leader (Mr. Lloyd) might have intervened when the railway workers or the dock workers or the Great Lake shippers, or any other people that are his buddies, were on strike asking for more money. They were noticeably silent, Mr. Speaker, on these occasions and this was a time when, if they had any influence, they might have saved the farmers a few cents a bushel on his wheat and helped settle strikes that cost us millions in export sales.

I noticed the Mayor of Regina (Mr. Baker) yesterday. He is still promising the farmers \$3 a bushel for their wheat. I wish he would tell this House who is going to buy the wheat, and where the money is going to come from.

An Hon. Member: — Henry will buy it.

Mr. Gallagher: — If he thinks the Government should buy the wheat and resell it, then why doesn't he tell us this. I am sure he will have a new program tomorrow, or next week when the Budget Debate comes down. Every year he has a new grandiose scheme. He reminds me when he gets up to speak in the House of about 25 years ago when Foster Hewitt used to open up the hockey broadcast and he would say, "Hello Canada — this is Foster Hewitt. Hello Canada and hockey fans in the United States and Newfoundland." And this was hockey for all North America, and Henry says, "Hello radio audience, this is happy Harry with his bag of goodies."

Some Hon. Members: — Hear, hear!

Mr. Gallagher: — Mr. Speaker, it is getting to be a joke around Saskatchewan. Here is a man, Mr. Speaker, who a few months ago suggested that he might be the man who should lead the New Democratic party in Canada.

Some Hon. Members: — Hear, hear!

Mr. Gallagher: — I notice, Mr. Speaker, that some of the more enlightened Members or the Opposition don't venture into the field of economics. Not that my friend from Regina South East (Mr. Baker) is much of an economist, especially when you look at the financial statement of the city of Regina which has been under his jurisdiction for quite some time. I think the other Members who are not economists and realize that they are not, realize that the Socialist answer to our economic problems is not acceptable or it is not feasible.

I would like to turn, Mr. Speaker, for a moment to a matter that I have never discussed before in this House, firstly because it was never a serious problem in my constituency and secondly because I had little experience with the problem and I did not pose as an expert on it.

The question I refer to is welfare and particularly as it affects our native people in this province. I want to recognize some of the people from the Department of Welfare up in the Speaker's gallery today, particularly the former Regional Director from Yorkton who is now in the city of Regina, and I hope that he and the Minister (Mr. MacDonald) consider my suggestions very seriously this afternoon.

Mr. Speaker, I have listened with some interest to speakers in the Opposition describe this Government as miserly and without feeling toward our Indian and Métis people. I can only say that this Government is trying to approach a serious problem and making an honest attempt to solve that problem. If we had done nothing it would have been as much as the CCF did in their 20 years in office.

I cannot agree that all of the approaches that the Government is using are the right approaches. I think the problem the Government is faced with, our native people have been neglected too long and it is going to take at least another generation to even approach a solution to this problem. During the past several years a considerable number of Métis people have moved into the city of Yorkton, Mr. Speaker, from a reservation in your constituency. This is all to the good because if there is one thing that must be done, it is an attempt to integrate these people into white society. But I have a complaint that I want to register here to the Government and particularly to the Minister of Welfare (Mr. MacDonald).

I have seen a goodly number of Métis people having moved into the city of Yorkton, have made themselves gainfully employed and have held the same jobs for the last three or four years. Because these people were unskilled, the wages that they earn are not very high. Some of them in fact work for minimum or near minimum wages. On the other hand, others with large families draw more in welfare payments than the man who works for

February 14, 1969

a living. This doesn't do very much for the morale of the man who works for his living, Mr. Speaker. Fortunately for the Government some of the people who work for a living have too much pride to accept charity.

I suggest, Mr. Speaker, that where a family, for example, qualifies for \$400 a month in welfare payments and the head of this family is able-bodied and can get a job paying \$250 a month, the welfare payment should be the difference between what the person would receive in welfare payments and that which he can earn. I will be accused by the Opposition of being hard-hearted and without feeling for the poor.

Mr. Speaker, I believe in the principle that I should be my brother's keeper but not if my brother is just too lazy to look after himself. I see too many people working for low wages who are helping to pay the taxes that are keeping other people on welfare at a better standard of living than that which they themselves can afford.

Another problem, Mr. Speaker, that is too prevalent with recipients of welfare is the matter of having landlords or grocery creditors left with unpaid rent and unpaid grocery bills. I can see, Mr. Speaker, where there is some merit in having people receiving welfare payments handling their own personal finance, but I will suggest here that any time people, who receive their living from the Department of Welfare, fail to pay their rent or their grocery bill because they cannot manage their own affairs, that rather than have some innocent landlord the victim, a trustee or guardian should be appointed to managed their welfare cheque.

Mr. Speaker, I have several incidents in my constituency where good-meaning grocers and good-meaning landlords have trusted people who were the recipients of welfare and have been left holding the bag. I think, Mr. Speaker, that this is not right. I believe, Mr. Speaker, the Government has made an honest effort, whether it is enough or not, to help the Indian and Métis people to solve a problem that has been with us too long. I expect to be called mercenary by the Opposition, Mr. Speaker, but when I see people who are living on welfare blowing their money on liquor or cigarettes or any other luxuries, I say the Minister of Welfare (Mr. MacDonald) and the Government have some obligation to the taxpayers of this province to protect innocent people from becoming the victims of people who will take advantage of their generosity.

I repeat that, until such time that people become more tolerant and we see that the integration of our native people with our white population, we will solve nothing.

I would like, Mr. Speaker, to turn for a moment to say a few things about my constituency. Sine the Liberal Government came into office in 1964, most of the highways in my constituency have either been built, rebuilt or resurfaced. With the completion of No. 14 Highway from Yorkton to Insinger and Yorkton

to Saltcoats, just about all of our highway needs will be looked after. I hope that the Minister of Highways (Mr. Boldt) can find some money this year to dust-free No. 8 Highway from Wroxton to Kamsack and from Wroxton to Churchbridge in your own constituency, Mr. Speaker.

The only problem that we have had in the Department of Highways, Mr. Speaker, is some interference with some very ardent NDPers, particularly some of these associated with the Farmers' Union. I want to make reference, Mr. Speaker, to a meeting that was held in my constituency about this time a year ago. It was in connection with land acquisition by the Department of Highways on that portion of highway between Yorkton and Saltcoats. It seems that the Farmers' Union got very active and very concerned about some of the farmers and what they were going to get for their land on that particular stretch of highway. So they called a meeting. Well, the Department of Highways has enough problems, Mr. Speaker, as you are quite aware in getting acquisition to land. It is taxpayers' money that pays for the right-of-way for a highway, for severance damages, etc. But in this particular instance, the Farmers' Union decided to hold a meeting in the town of Rokeby which is in my constituency on the border of yours, and called in the farmers that were going to be affected by the new No. 14 Highway. Who should they call in? A man who was supposed to be, I believe, a public relations man. They called him in to work for the interests of the farmers. His name was Fred Gudmonson. Now, I think the Member for Wadena (Mr. Dewhurst) might know something about Mr. Fred Gudmonson. In fact, I have been told that his father very nearly got that constituency back in 1944 for the CCF. Mr. Gudmonson, incidentally, ran for an NDP nomination in Yorkton in 1962, I believe, and again in 1963 in the Federal election.

Now this man came down there for the Farmers' union, I understand, to help the farmers out and I am told, although I was not invited to that meeting, that in one instance where a party asked for \$7,000 for the right-of-way and damages caused by the Department of Highways in the construction of this new highway. Pardon me, where the Government had offered \$7,000 where the party asked for \$12,000, Mr. Gudmonson suggested that he should have asked for \$20,000 or \$25,000. Now, Mr. Speaker, we have many problems in this province in connection with the Department of Highways. We passed legislation last year to try and make it more amicable and more fair to settle problems with the farmers and the people who own real estate along highways. I think that the legislation that we passed last year was good legislation. But surely, Mr. Speaker, people like Mr. Gudmonson and the Farmers' Union, are not helping the public or the Government when they hold meetings such as this.

Mr. Speaker, while I am talking about the Department of Highways – and I want to thank the Minister (Mr. Boldt) for what he has done in my constituency – I want to commend him for seeing fit to build a new Claims Centre and Salvage Division in my city, the city of Yorkton. I know that all the people in that

February 14, 1969

area are going to appreciate this very much. During the past year we were able to open the new Parkland Regional Library which is located in Yorkton. I am sure that everybody in the Parkland area of the province will benefit from this library distribution centre.

The Government's policy of paying part of the cost of arterial streets has benefited Yorkton as well as all the other urban centres in this province. I was glad to hear the announcement that help to urban municipalities will be increased in 1969.

The Speech from the Throne gave notice of the Government's intention to put a ceiling on utilization fees. I am sure all Members are very happy about this announcement. We will be criticized for not having it low enough. I only want to say in this connection that, if utilization fees are to accomplish the desired effect for which they were intended, the ceiling must be high enough to curb abuses in both Medical Care Insurance and the Saskatchewan Hospital Services Plan. Much has been said by Members of the Opposition regarding the tax on the sick, or the tax on the dying or whatever other name they call utilization fees. I would like, Mr. Speaker, at this time to quote from an article in the Canadian Medical Journal of 1962 by Dr. C.J. Houston of Yorkton. Rather than take all the time of the House, Mr. Speaker, in regarding this article, I want the page boys to distribute these articles to the Members of the Opposition. I have a few copies left to give to the Members of the Government, and I only want to say I will read the conclusion of the article, but I hope that all Members of the House read this article because I think it is a very worthwhile article. Some Members might recall that Dr. Houston was one of the members of the Thompson Commission on Medical Care, set up by the former CCF Government. Before writing this article, Mr. Speaker, he made a trip to Norway and he went over there on his own expense to study health care in all its aspects in this country; hospitalization, medical care, public health programs and all that he might learn over in that country. At that time we were pioneering medical care in Saskatchewan. Yes, I noticed the former Minister of Health, but he is not the Minister anymore, thank goodness. He was one of the people responsible in 1962 for what we ran into July in the strike of the medical profession in this province, because he wouldn't listen to the Opposition or the people who were on the Thompson Commission like Dr. C.J. Houston. If he had listened to people like Dr. Houston the Government of that day wouldn't have had the problem that they had.

I want to just quote from this article the conclusions that Dr. Houston came to after his trip to Norway. And I quote:

What is suitable in one country is not necessarily desirable in another. One must acknowledge that Norway's method of accomplishing a particular objective may be the way of meeting the needs of the country, and yet may not be suitable in many other countries. In some instances

the Norwegian method works only because of the universally high level of native intelligence and co-operation. This might be impossible to obtain in Canada. If some of my comments seem critical of Norway's Health Care Plan, I trust the reader will understand that such criticism is offered only on the basis of its suitability to the Canadian scene. However, I do feel that the experience of other countries can teach us a good deal. For this reason I consider that it is worthwhile to give some personal conclusions about the lessons that we in Canada can learn from Norway. We can learn that, first, flexibility is necessary in order to make a Health Care Plan serve both urban and scattered rural populations. 2. Genuine local controls, interest and participation have great value. They are vital in keeping costs at a reasonable level, in emphasizing special local needs in maintaining the public's concern and interest in preserving the democratic approach and in avoiding the potential of abuses and evils of centralized state control. 3. Methods based on local control are workable. 4. A fee-for-service method of payment for physician services is acceptable to the people served by such a plan. 5. Partial payment by the patient for the service is essential. Administrators, doctors and professors all volunteered that this feature of participation by the patient is essential. Surprisingly patients agreed and used the same arguments when questioned on this point. The emphasis of this feature as essential by the countries who have experience with it should do much to relieve the doubts of Canadians who are unfamiliar with the idea.

It works, Mr. Speaker.

6. It is possible to organize a plan which provides a complete health service not under the direct control of a central government and to organize it directly under the control of the people who paid for it and who receives its services. 7. Inclusion of drug costs in a medical care scheme is too costly in relation to the benefits conferred on the patient. 8. Finally, the most important lesson that we can learn from Norway is that a country-wide comprehensive compulsory medical care coverage can be given without the state assuming control of the service.

No one who knows Dr. Houston, as you know him, Mr. Speaker, and I know him, will question his integrity, his sincerity or his knowledgeability I am sure. I am sure that the former Minister of Health and the Member from Regina Centre (Mr. Blakeney) will agree with me on this. This article was written after Dr. Houston made an extended visit to Norway to study that country's medical care plan. He spoke to doctors, to people running the plan, to government and to the public. His conclusions in this article as I have just read show one thing, that if, this Medical Care Plan is to work, there must be some patient participation. Over there they called it patient participation.

February 14, 1969

Here the NDP calls it a tax on the dying. Mr. Speaker, this Medical Care Plan in the country of Norway, I think, was instituted about 1936. Over there they have what the Member for Prince Albert East-Cumberland (Mr. Berezowsky) called a Social Democratic Government. But the Social Democratic Government over in Norway realized at the inception of this Plan that, if it was to be workable, it had to have what the NDP call the tax on the sick and tax on the dying.

Surely Dr. Houston's comments are worthy of real consideration, especially so when the country that he visited and referred to was Norway.

In conclusion I want to congratulate all Members who have taken part in this debate, Mr. Speaker. I will have a few more things to say in another debate. Particularly I want to congratulate the Member for Saskatoon City Park-University (Mr. Charlebois), I think they call the constituency, and the Member for Cannington (Mr. Weatherald) for the job they did in moving and seconding the motion.

It seems unfortunate that some Members in speaking in debates in this Chamber get carried away with themselves. Members on both sides of the House, I am sure, in their enthusiasm and their exuberance, say things that I often wonder, if a little late, they might not think are a bit uncharitable if they them on a phonograph. I know many of us are guilty of this including myself. When you reflect on the purpose of this Legislature we should realize that such personal and sometimes vicious outbursts add no dignity to this Chamber.

I suppose, Mr. Speaker, that I was a little bit charitable when I congratulated all Members who have taken part in this debate because I think that I must exclude the Members for Regina North West (Mr. Whelan). I am glad to see that he is in his seat. All I will say is that he might be well advised to hire a new script writer. We all know who his script writer is, I am sure. If there is any doubt in his mind about my future intentions, politically or otherwise, I will only say that as long as there are people like him around the Opposition that he can be assured that I will feel that it is a duty to fight against what he stands for.

Some Hon. Members: — Hear, hear!

Mr. Gallagher: — Mr. Speaker, the Speech from the Throne indicates to me that the Government is following a sound course. It outlines sound future policies that will serve this province best. It may not be packed with goodies to buy votes but the philosophy that I believe in, Mr. Speaker, is that governments should not provide for people that which they can provide cheaper and better for themselves. From the remarks of the Leader of the Opposition (Mr. Lloyd) one would be led to believe that the Liberal party believes in unbridled free enterprise. One would

think from his remarks that Liberals have no conscience and have no feeling for their fellowman. I can assure my friends in the Opposition, Mr. Speaker, that Liberals have just as much conscience as Socialists. We think that governments should use the instrument of taxation to equalize opportunities for all our citizens and to lessen the burden of the unfortunate in our society. We don't believe in the philosophy, as the Leader of the Opposition seems to, that governments should be involved in every facet of your life. To be a prosperous country, to maintain or improve our standard of living, we think that people who are industrious, inventive or ambitious should not have their ambitions impeded or their talents locked up because they are ruled by a government that believes in the philosophy that government and government alone shall decide what men shall do. The philosophy of our Government, Mr. Speaker, is working in this province. It will provide more for our citizens in the future. I will support the motion.

Some Hon. Members: — Hear, hear!

Mr. J.E. Brockelbank (Saskatoon Mayfair): — Mr. Speaker, it comes rather late in the debate but we have had the first admission that the Throne Speech contains no goodies. Now it happens that the Provincial Treasurer (Mr. Steuart) a short while ago when talking to the media said that there were going to be some goodies in the Throne Speech.

Hon. D.G. Steuart (Provincial Treasurer): — Budget.

Mr. Brockelbank: — Oh, budget is coming. Good, I am glad to hear that it is still coming. Mr. Speaker, last week when this House was adjourned for the purpose of some Members attending the Federal Conference on Constitution I had some time to do some reading. At that time I just happened to pick up a book that my son had brought home from the library. This book dealt at length with the recovery of fossils and it mentioned the LaBrea tar pits in California. It went to great lengths to describe how a prehistoric monster would get trapped by lumbering into the tar pit and would gradually sink lower and lower in the tar. This prehistoric monster would thrash about and grab at everything that it could to try to sustain itself a little longer. I thought to myself, since I had heard the speech of the Hon. Member from Athabasca (Mr. Guy), that we have here a prehistoric monster that is thrashing about in his own private little tar pit.

Some Hon. Members: — Hear, hear!

Mr. Brockelbank: — He is sinking lower and lower in this tar pool and the contents of this tar pool, Mr. Speaker, have been dumped from garbage cans. There are elements of character assassination

February 14, 1969

in them. There is innuendo and there is that little bit about how a guy gets a loan. As he thrashes about and grabs for something to hold him up, to hold up the whole weight of himself, this prehistoric monster sinks slowly lower and lower into his own private little tar pit. And, Mr. Speaker, some more tar was added to this pit last week. I want to quote, rather extensively from an article that appeared in the Leader Post of February 6, 1969:

“C.U.L.F. Leaders Criticize Government”

Here is the little bit of tar as it was added to the tar pit of the Member of Athabasca and I quote:

A provincial government has served to undermine the confidence of the people of Saskatchewan in the University. They have persistently criticized university spending and labelled student leaders with derogatory terms, he said. The Government has played an obviously bad role. Obviously they are politically motivated. Mr. Burns said that the Saskatchewan Liberals get little support from students or union people and are using these groups as a political scapegoat.

Some Hon. Members: — Hear, hear!

Mr. Brockelbank: — Eventually the bulk of this prehistoric monster will sink into the tar pit and not a ripple will mar the surface.

Since I last took part in this House, some changes of note have been made here. The Government has a new whip and we wish him well in the performance of his duties, but at the same time we are extremely disappointed, as I am sure the voters of Kelvington are, that the Liberal party strategies have seen fit to put the constituency desire for representation secondary to the Liberal party desires.

Some Hon. Members: — Hear, hear!

Mr. Brockelbank: — There have been some rumblings of discord in the Liberal party caucus and these were reported in a reputable Saskatchewan newspaper last year.

Mr. D.G. MacLennan (Last Mountain): — If it is reputable . . .

Mr. Brockelbank: — Mr. Speaker, it seems like every time I pick up The Commonwealth everybody says, “My, that is not a reputable newspaper.” I assure the hon. gentlemen opposite that it is, and even one of their Members last year thought that I should disclose where the particular matter that I was referring to came from. This reputable Saskatchewan newspaper in this instance is not The Commonwealth. The newspaper article reported

that Liberal Back Benchers have been disappointed in the lack of participation in decision making in their party and in their caucus. Some Members even went to the extent of planning to leave the Liberal caucus. We believe that we know who one of them is and I want to assure him that he can settle back and relax because I don't intend to blow his cover. The second person – and I see some knowing glances over there – could be anyone of a number.

An abortive plot among the palace guards took place in 1967 in the fall and it had its effect about a year later. In the fall of 1967 there seemed to be some pressure exerted through a Prince Albert constituency organization to have the Premier run as Leader of the Federal Liberal party. There are two northern Liberal MLAs whose ambitious motives may have led them to propose the Premier for Federal Leader. These two MLAs', Athabasca and Prince Albert West, plans went afoul, when the Premier sampling the Federal waters with a tentative toe, found that the populace thought it too much of a burden to force him on Ottawa. Consequently he threw cold water on the proposal. This shroud of mystery was lifted somewhat at the Liberal Association Convention in Saskatoon, December, 1968, when the Attorney General lauded the Premier no end and I quote:

The Saskatchewan Liberal party is receiving honest dedicated leadership and it reflects the personal integrity of Premier Thatcher.

This is according to Attorney General D.V. Heald. Within 18 days, Mr. Speaker, it paid off, when it was announced that the Attorney General would be the new House Leader.

The press release in the Star Phoenix, regarding that matter, December 24, 1968 contained in the second paragraph more written between the lines than on them. The Premier is quoted as saying:

The Provincial Treasurer, D.G. Stuart, House leader since the Liberals took office in 1964 asked to be relieved of the House leadership because it was more than he could handle along with his other responsibilities.

Mr. Speaker, it is said that a convert can be more fanatical in his actions and beliefs than anyone else. The reason is obvious. The convert to justify his decision sometimes feels impelled to discredit and attempt to destroy those from whom he is parted. It is unfortunate that a public figure is compelled by force such as I have described. However, I believe the facts bear me out. The Province of Saskatchewan has been subjected to a continuous parade of abusive speeches given outside the province by the Leader of the Liberal party.

Some Hon. Members: — Hear, hear!

February 14, 1969

Mr. Brockelbank: — In June 1966, in the speech to the Edison Electric Institute in San Francisco, the body of the speech contained the usual comments about industrial stagnation, dozens of oil companies pulling up stakes and moving out, oppressive taxation, major depopulation, etc., etc. In August, 1967, to the Directorate of the Canadian National Exhibition in Toronto – the usual story. Industrial stagnation, oppressive taxation, major depopulation, etc., etc.

July 1968, speaking to the Kiwanis International in Toronto, industrial stagnation, oppressive taxation, major depopulation, etc., etc. The fall of 1967 speaking to the American Farm Bureau Federation in Chicago – and for those of you on that side of the House who don't know about the American Farm Bureau Federation, they are the only major farm organization in the United States which opposed the International Grains Arrangement and its predecessor the International Wheat Agreement – the Liberal party Leader spoke of stagnation, oppressive taxation, major depopulation, etc., etc.

Hon. C.P. MacDonald (Minister of Welfare): — Did they get the message?

Mr. Brockelbank: — Ad nauseum. In April 1968, speaking to the Christian Freedom Foundation Incorporated, New York – and for the benefit of those who don't know anything about the Christian Freedom Foundation Incorporated of New York, I am told they are a group of people who believe that John Birchers are a bunch of Communist sympathizers.

Some Hon. Members: — Hear, hear!

Mr. Brockelbank: — The Leader of the Liberal party, along with his old worn out comments about industrial stagnation, oppressive taxation and major depopulation, had some interesting comments for the Christian Freedom Foundation Incorporated of New York. He is quoted as saying:

Far too often we find political parties which pay lip service to the principles of private enterprise but at the same time for the sake of political expediency endeavor to neutralize Socialism by adopting large segments of their program.

Then he proceeded to tell them how he is allegedly preserving hospital and medical services by putting on deterrent fees.

Some Hon. Members: — Hear, hear!

Mr. Brockelbank: — In May, 1966 while preparing for a guest appearance on the CBC television show, Front Page Challenge in

Toronto – Isn't it terrible, Mr. Speaker, some of the stuff we see on the CBC television, especially before we can get the children to bed –

Some Hon. Members: — Hear, hear!

Mr. Brockelbank: — the same charges about industrial stagnation, oppressive taxation, major depopulation. In addition he said – catch this, Mr. Deputy Leader (Mr. Steuart):

I don't claim to be an expert very much on politics but I am on Socialism.

Some Hon. Members: — Hear, hear!

Mr. Brockelbank: — I believe, Mr. Speaker, that this statement would have been more near the truth if the Premier had reversed it and said, "I do claim to be an expert on politics, but I am not on Socialism." However, be that as it may, let us examine for a moment his fanatical, muddled thinking on the topic he claims expertise. In a news report in the Saskatoon Star Phoenix, January 14, 1969, Mr. Thatcher was commenting on Mr. Benson's estate tax proposals. Quoting one complete paragraph from that report, as follows:

One would think some Socialist had dreamed up this piece of legislation. I would suggest Mr. Benson better get his office cleaned out of Socialists because even a Socialist couldn't have thought up something as kookie as this.

Mr. Steuart: — If he cleaned them out he would have room for . . .

Mr. Brockelbank: — Another little gem that the Leader of the Liberal party used on his speaking tours was reported in the Financial Post of July 13, 1968. Premier Ross Thatcher went all the way to Toronto to tell the Kiwanis International Convention this:

Some say a little Socialism is all right but I warn you that Socialism is like a little pregnancy, once it develops you can't control it.

Some Hon. Members: — Hear, hear!

Mr. Brockelbank: — How profound! An interesting sidelight in the Premier's running battle with the Ottawa Liberals who he refers to as fuzzy-headed Socialists concerns a CBC television news item on January 5, 1969. It is reported that Joey Smallwood, the Premier of Newfoundland said and I quote:

Pierre Trudeau's fast rise to the leadership of the

February 14, 1969

Liberal party was divinely inspired.

Does that mean, Mr. Speaker, that all Socialists are subject to divine inspiration?

Some Hon. Members: — Hear, hear!

Mr. Brockelbank: — The answer is probably no, Mr. Speaker, it just seems that way. The most current example of the maligning of the Province of Saskatchewan occurred in October 1968, when the Liberal Leader was speaking to the Association of American Physicians and Surgeons in New Orleans, Louisiana. The same old tattered worn-out speech was given, industrial stagnation, oppressive taxation, major depopulation. Well, Mr. Speaker, the Hon. Member from Biggar (Mr. Lloyd) in his address the other day effectively demolished the Premier's claims about population.

Some Hon. Members: — Hear, hear!

Mr. Brockelbank: — I have just one more example that I would like to put before the House. It is from a clipping that appeared in the Saskatoon Star Phoenix, a reputable paper of Saskatchewan, on May 17, 1968. Quoting from the Dominion Bureau of Statistics for the 12-month period ending April 1, 1968, it shows that Saskatchewan gained 4,000 people, that Manitoba gained twice that amount and that our sister province, Alberta, gained nine times that amount. So much for the population statistics, Mr. Speaker.

I would like to deal specifically with one more point in the Premier's address to you all in Louisiana:

Dozens of oil companies pulled up stakes, lock, stock and barrel and moved out of the province because of discriminatory legislation.

Mr. Speaker, this charge has been made over and over and over by the Premier. The earliest airing of that charge by the Premier that I have knowledge of is March 5, 1960. In a report in the Saskatoon Star Phoenix the headline screams, "Dozens of oil companies leaving Saskatchewan because of CCF policies." In the body of the article it states:

Under our CCF Government the oil industry has not advanced in Saskatchewan. In Regina alone 14 exploration companies which recently had offices in the capital have moved out of Saskatchewan entirely.

When presses for the oil companies names he was referring to, the Premier produced a list. Upon checking it was found that two oil companies never had offices in Regina. Another one has not had an office in Regina for five years. Two of them are still here, lock, stock, barrel and offices. Three of these

companies have increased their holdings since December 1, 1958. All of the 14 companies which held Crown land here two years ago still hold Crown land. So much for the Premier's charges about oil companies pulling up stakes and leaving the province, lock, stock and barrel.

I want to assure this House, Mr. Speaker, that, each time that I find evidence that the Premier has given a speech I will again produce these facts in the House and put them on the record.

We in the New Democratic party fully expect the Premier and his fellow MLAs to attack our political party. We do not believe that it is proper without foundation or fact to blacken the name of our province and cast reflections on honest decisions of voters made in past years.

Some Hon. Members: — Hear, hear!

Mr. Brockelbank: — Examination of some of the present day facts of life in our province supported by statistics would be more appropriate than the path followed by Saskatchewan Liberals in blackening our province from without.

You know, Mr. Speaker, I have dealt with the matter of industrial stagnation and the matter of major depopulations. I haven't said a word about the oppressive taxation, but an interesting incident arose in the city of Saskatoon last winter. There was a private enterprise attempt to get more people to listen to the radio station. They put on a program that was called "Sock it to me." The whole format of this program was to get some mystery voice. He would say, "Sock it to me, sock it to me, sock it to me," and then the people would phone up and guess who's voice it was. You know when I heard this voice say, "Sock it to me, sock it to me, sock it to me,": several times, I couldn't figure out who it was. The jackpot built up away over \$100. Finally somebody guessed that it was Premier Thatcher.

Some Hon. Members: — Hear, hear!

Mr. Brockelbank: — In retrospect the simplicity of the whole thing was the obvious best feature because the people couldn't see the forest for the trees. Here was a person who has been socking it to them ever since he got elected and they couldn't catch on because it was so obvious. So Premier Thatcher has been socking it to them on the tax field and no doubt we will hear more about that when the Budget comes down.

In dealing with the matter of oil production, last year in this Chamber I reviewed this matter of falling oil production as compared to the Province of Alberta. Those figures were from the Bank of Montreal Business Review as follows: From 1965 to 1966, over a 12-month period, Alberta Oil production went up a net amount of 1,358,444 barrels while Saskatchewan oil

February 14, 1969

production fell by 38,558 barrels. Since then between 1967 and 1968 Alberta estimated daily production was up by 77,436 barrels per day. Saskatchewan estimated daily production was down by 3,835 barrels per day. The Province of Saskatchewan's income from royalties and land sales dipped down 11.5 per cent; capital expenditures, no change; oil refinery through-put, down 5 per cent. The plain truth is that under this Government reserves are falling, exploration is moving away. It seems only logical that this would happen. It is the same old Liberal party who said when they sat here in Opposition that a commercial oil well would never be developed while we were the Government. For the record over 5,000 oil wells were developed. That negative attitude still prevails in their ranks. And it may be responsible for our present stagnant conditions.

Saskatchewan's position during the last five years shows that oil production has slipped drastically in relation to the other three Western Canadian areas: Manitoba over the five-year period up 65 per cent; Alberta up 58 per cent; British Columbia up 70 per cent; Saskatchewan up only 28 per cent, less than half the Alberta production figure increase. Mr. Speaker, this burden of a Liberal Government has become too heavy for the people of Saskatchewan to bear.

It is necessary, I feel, that I make some comment about crude oil refineries in the Province of Saskatchewan. The people of Saskatchewan are concerned about the situation regarding the continued operations of Saskatchewan oil refineries. Citizens of Saskatoon and Moose Jaw are extremely concerned about the possible closing down of Saskatchewan oil refineries. Let me assure the Members of this Chamber that employees of those refineries are even more concerned about the situation. We should be concerned in this Chamber. I will illustrate what the subtraction of 100 industrially employed workers means to a Saskatchewan community. It means \$360,000 less in retail sales; four less retail establishments; \$270,000 less bank deposits; 174 less workers employed in other supporting industries; 107 less passenger cars; \$590,000 less personal income; 112 less households; 296 less people. This information, Mr. Speaker, is arrived at after studying the brochure entitled "Saskatchewan Open for Business, a Plan for Action" published by the Saskatchewan Development of Industry and Commerce.

The oil company involved states that the closing down or disposal in some other manner will coincide with the construction and operation of a completely new, large oil refinery located in, of all places, "free enterprise" Alberta. An application is presently before the Alberta Government for permission to build a finished product pipeline from Edmonton to Calgary. Make no mistake, Mr. Speaker, that pipeline will come to Saskatchewan to serve the area now serviced by the present refineries. One line of a press release from the Financial Post, January 25, 1969, will cause those acquainted with the industry to sit up and take notice. That article deals with the construction of the pipeline from Edmonton to Calgary. The quotation reads as

follows:

Discussions are going on with other possible participants in the pipeline.

This could mean the shut-down of more Saskatchewan oil refineries.

I want to refer for a brief moment to an article that appeared as a red headline on the topmost line of the Edmonton Journal on February 1, 1969. I will read two complete paragraphs and if anyone requests it I will submit the article to the table:

Imperial Oil Limited is planning to build an \$85 million refinery in the Edmonton area according to Journal sources. The 100,000 barrels a day refinery would be the biggest in Western Canada putting Edmonton in an unassailable position for years to come as the city with the greatest refining capacity west of Ontario. According to the Journal sources Imperial will announce its plan to build the refinery within the next six months. After the refinery comes into operation during the early 1970s Imperial would phase out its other plants across the prairies. The company would distribute its products by pipeline in the same manner as Gulf Oil Canada Limited proposes.

Well, Mr. Speaker, that line in the press release by Gulf Oil Company that they are negotiating with other possible participants in the pipeline is rather ominous in the view of that headline.

Mr. Speaker, good government would be on top of this situation with long-term plans to ease the plight of the people who will be affected by this drastic situation that's approaching us faster than we realize. Unfortunately, we have to judge this Government by their actions in face of other emergent situations. For example, the cost of living and the Batten Report, very little action; the wet and damp grain situation, very little action, mental health care and the Frazier Report, very little action; medical and hospital deterrent fees mean restricted access to those plans, wrong action. From the manner in which the Government handled these situations we can only conclude that it is not prepared and will not be able to provide necessary technical training and re-training and new jobs. Jobs will be lost, people will flee this province.

It was shown by previous speakers that 549 students were turned away from our technical institutes in 1968 and, in addition, more than that were turned away the previous year. I have a current example that I would like to add to that sorry record of performance in the field of technical education. Recently a person in Saskatoon contacted me. He said that someone had read an advertisement placed in the Saskatoon Star Phoenix, January 18, 1969, saying that the Technical Institute in

February 14, 1969

Moose Jaw was accepting applications for a new program offering training in instrumentation. The young person that I am speaking of read the article on Saturday. He drove to Moose Jaw on Monday because the Saskatoon Office of Canada Manpower could not advise him about the course. When he got to Moose Jaw on Monday, he was advised that the course was full up. This young man has grade 12 and a partial year of university, and according to the advertisement would be well qualified to take the course. He is presently on unemployment insurance.

The present Canada Manpower training is inadequate in some ways and other ways it is discriminatory. The whole problem, Mr. Speaker, will come to a head in about 1971, that will be the same year that this Government will be voted out of office.

Some Hon. Members: — Hear, hear!

Mr. Brockelbank: — I haven't taken time to discuss other industrial departures from free enterprise Liberal Saskatchewan. Some were previously mentioned, some are fait accompli, others are pending. Here is a short list to refresh our minds: Robin Hood, Moose Jaw, closed down; National Film Board offices moved from Saskatoon to Calgary last fall; Cominco fertilizer plant closed down, and others; imaginative rumors that were used politically and later petered out were the Wire Plant, Volkswagon, Heavy Water, Ammonia Plant and others.

I would like to speak about potash, Mr. Speaker. I am sorry that this subject didn't appear in the Throne Speech. I will have to make some comments based fully on the serious condition this industry is in today, this industry forced to operate, burdened by a Liberal Government whose attitude toward the development and expansion of the potash industry is just as negative as its attitude has been shown to be towards the oil industry.

In 1961 the Leader of the Liberal party said at a Liberal party meeting near North Battleford that the potash area east of Saskatoon would never be developed under the Socialist Government. You will have noticed, Mr. Speaker, when the Member from Saskatoon City Park-University (Mr. Charlebois) was moving the Address-in-Reply, he said he went down the shaft of a potash mine and travelled two miles in a straight line underground. That, Mr. Speaker, was the Potash Company of America mine at Patience Lake, east of Saskatoon, and I am his witness. I went down with the Member for City Park-University in that mine and if we check the bulletin put out by the Department of Mineral Resources, the "Chronological Record of Mining Events in Saskatchewan," we find that in 1958 the Potash Company of America, Saskatoon, commenced production of potash.

As far as the potash industry goes, I think it is unfortunate that our Government hides behind the suggestion that selling potash to China, for example, is a matter for academic discussion only.

In the Throne Speech I noticed that the Government proposes cash grants to industry. In June 1965, the Premier said the best role Government can play is to let industry run itself. That was at the official opening of the fertilizer plant which incidentally closed its operations down in the fall of 1968. And, of course, the remarks of the Manitoba Cabinet Minister in February, 1966 as follows:

It appears, he (meaning Thatcher) has declared open season on the taxpayers' pocket book and incentives are too juicy to pass up.

Mr. Speaker, even the free enterprise system is going Socialist.

The listing of electoral reform in the Throne Speech is a welcome conversion, following the pressure that the New Democrats applied in 1965 regarding our suggestion that the Federal Electoral Boundaries Commissioners act as commissioners to establish Provincial electoral boundaries; in 1966, our Resolution asking for disclosure of contribution to the political parties; in 1967, our Resolution regarding control of election expense; in 1968, our Resolution asking for review of The Election Act by an Inter-sessional Committee; in 1968 also, a Resolution asking for an independent commission on the establishment of electoral boundaries in the Province of Saskatchewan.

I might volunteer to the Hon. Members that our understanding of reform that will be carried into the Committee will insist on the broadest approach to complete electoral reform. It has been the consistent boast of the Premier and his inner circle that they would wipe out the New Democratic party. That seemed to be the limit of his understanding of electoral reform. He and his party have by and large been unsuccessful in their boast. However, it appears that they have eradicated the Conservative party by a combination of deals and bribery. That party now has no leader, no MLAs, and presently very little chance at the Provincial level.

It was interesting to note that at last some Members of the Government opposite must have come to their senses and done a flip-flop from the unfortunate position they took last year on the matter of the value of graduate students to this province.

With regard to the Saskatchewan Power Corporation, Mr. Speaker, I think it is unfortunate that the Saskatchewan Power Corporation's users of gas and electricity are going to be liberally taxed to support the Provincial Treasurer's (Mr. Steuart) alleged balanced budget.

With regard to pension ceilings for civil servants, I am glad to see that the ceiling will be raised.

It appears also that the Minister of Labour (Mr. Coderre) will make some changes in The Workmen's Compensation Board Superannuation Act regarding pension ceilings for Workmen's

February 14, 1969

Compensation Board employees. I find it extremely unfortunate that there is not anything in the Throne Speech indicating an upward change in the ceiling on pension benefits paid out to Workmen's Compensation Board pensions. The second greatest number of complaints I received are about dissatisfaction with the Workmen's Compensation Board procedures and the small, inadequate Workmen's Compensation Board pensions.

In conclusion, Mr. Speaker, I feel that by and large the Throne Speech document is a failure, just as the Liberal party failed in carrying out its election promises. It is too bad that the Liberal party doesn't give a guarantee with its election promises similar to the guarantee given by the Provincial Treasurer (Mr. Steuart) with Saskatchewan license plates. I am referring, of course, to the news item which appeared in the Saskatoon Star-Phoenix of June 24, 1968, headed, "New plates free if original fades." The Liberal election promises have definitely faded and this Throne Speech, Mr. Speaker, is a washed-out faded document.

I am unable to support the Throne Speech, but I did support the amendment offered by the Leader of the Opposition (Mr. Lloyd) and the Hon. Member from Regina Centre (Mr. Blakeney) because it attempted to get at the root of the main problem.

Some Hon. Members: — Hear, hear!

Hon. C.P. MacDonald (Minister of Welfare): — Mr. Speaker, my first comment in winding up the Throne Speech today I want to say that I have been in this House for five years and the Opposition's remarks are without question the quietest, the weakest, the most pathetic presentation by the Opposition that I have ever heard. It started with the Leader of the Opposition (Mr. Lloyd) in his opening speech. He was going to drop a bomb shell and it exploded like a cream puff. He was going to talk about the damp grain situation, but his remarks have fallen on deaf ears, not because there is no understanding of the seriousness of the problem, not because the farmers aren't concerned, but because the farmers of Saskatchewan know that the Socialists sold their souls and their political integrity to the labor union bosses. Mr. Speaker, they know that, if there was a transportation strike today, the NDP would say nothing despite the fact that they would be unable to haul their grain. If labor wages increased and resulted in increased handling charges they wouldn't say a word. They know their pathetic record in 1961. This is the reason the farmers know that they ignored the situation.

Mr. Speaker, the one speech that really shocked and amazed me, was that of the Member from Riversdale (Mr. Romanow), the shining knight in armor who would come in with a speech on behalf of the youth of Saskatchewan and the youth of Canada. You know we all thought last year that this man was going to make a great contribution to this House, but instead he gave one of the

most inept speeches that have been given in this House.

Some Hon. Members: — Hear, hear!

Mr. MacDonald: — We thought he was going to be Sir Galahad charging in on his white stallion. Instead of that he turned into Mickey Mouse riding side saddle on a pussycat. Mr. Speaker, I have never heard a speech on an important issue in this House where an individual Member pussyfooted to the same extent as the Member from Riversdale. He was like a cat on a hot tin roof. He was afraid to speak, afraid to tread, afraid to discuss the real issues. Mr. Speaker, what he did, gave us a lesson in logic, and what a logician! First of all, he used the faulty conclusion of the earlier premises and started off to say you know that the only thing wrong with the student movement in Canada and in the world today is the Saskatchewan Liberal Government. Mr. Speaker, he refused to recognize the basic issues and the real root causes of this problem. Mr. Speaker, he reduced the real issue and one of the most crucial issues in Canada to a problem of the fact that the Premier of Saskatchewan (Mr. Thatcher) wasn't very polite when he talked to students. Mr. Speaker, I have been disappointed in a few speeches but you know it reminds me of the old quotation,

There is a tide in the affairs of men
Which, taken at the flood, leads on to fortune;
Omitted . . . is bound in shallows and in miseries.

And certainly the Member from Riversdale has reduced himself to the mediocrity of the other Members of his side of the House.

Some Hon. Members: — Hear, hear!

Mr. MacDonald: — By lacking the guts or the courage to talk about the real issues of this problem, the problem that has been on the front page of the newspapers for the past week, or on the television, the problem of student power and student participation, has been presented to the people of Canada. He refused to even discuss it. Mr. Speaker, this is the spokesman for my generation.

Some Hon. Members: — Hear, hear!

Mr. MacDonald: — Mr. Speaker, may I quote him. You know they remind me, Mr. Speaker, of a ship, they make the most noise when they are in a fog. The events of the last few days have brought to a head certainly one of the most crucial issues facing Canada in the last decade — the question of student power. On Tuesday night, Canadians watched with horror, the wanton, useless, unwarranted destruction of the computer centre of Sir George Williams University in Montreal. With disbelief, Canadians watched as 150 or 200 students ransacked, destroyed, damaged and set

February 14, 1969

ablaze university property causing an estimated \$1 million damage. The question that Canadians in every province are asking is; could that happen here? Yes, Mr. Speaker, it could happen here, it could happen on every or any campus in Canada. The same night 50 students at the University of Windsor occupied a university building. A few hours previous, we watched the Governor of California, Ronald Reagan, order troops onto Berkley, California. A day does not go by without news reports indicating violence, unrest, riot, rebellion or destruction occurring on some campus here in Canada or around the world.

It is time for some straight talking and some blunt action on the part of all Canadians to restore law and order on the campuses of our universities.

Some Hon. Members: — Hear, hear!

Mr. MacDonald: — How does the father of the student paying his way through Sir George Williams University feel today, when his son cannot attend classes? How does the student dedicated to getting his education feel at the University when his classes are cancelled? How does the taxpayer of that province feel today when he realized that \$1 million of damages are to be paid for out of his pocket? Today, I want to discuss this issue, to speak to the students not only at Regina campus, but every campus in Canada.

Much has been said about the situation on Regina campus, much has been said in this House about this situation, but, Mr. Speaker, the real tragedy is that much has not been said in this House, in the news media, in the University itself, about the situation in Regina or across Canada. The people of Saskatchewan and, I suggest, right across Canada, have heard only a very small part of the story. We have been subjected to a barrage of publicity generated by a small segment of the university population, publicity generated by five or ten per cent of the students of this University. This is not only true of Saskatchewan, but of the entire problem of student participation in Canada and the world, both east and west. The public has been presented an image of students that advocate violence, disrespect, vulgarity, obscenity in the newspapers and on the radio, a picture of students who insult and intimidate responsible citizens who are charged with management of our higher institutions of learning, of students who resort to violence, of students who foster revolution and anarchy to gain their objectives. These reports have come from Paris, Communist China, Mexico, the United States. Last night according to the news, five universities in the United States were in revolt — Simon Fraser, in our country, the University of British Columbia, a drunken brawl as the students took over the Faculty Club, universities in New Brunswick, Quebec, Toronto, and last, Sir George Williams University this week, and right here on the Regina campus.

Let me quote an editorial in the Winnipeg Free Press that describes this element of our student population:

It is hard to understand the logic behind these actions. But one thing seems clear. There are some students in our universities who, no matter what concessions are granted, are determined not to be satisfied. They seem bent on the destruction of the entire university system and preventing other students from continuing their studies. It is an impossible situation that must not be allowed to continue.

This, Mr. Speaker, is a revolting and disgusting state of affairs. It has generated in the community a new movement, a movement that is still weak, but growing each day. It can be referred to as the taxpayer's backlash. As the lust for power, revolt and control has grown among this small segment of the student population, it has created a response that is clear and unmistakable.

Hundreds of thousands of Canadians in modest jobs, the type of people who make real sacrifices to give their own children a university education, pay taxes to support on the campus the more fortunate offspring of others. Taxi drivers, carpenters, plumbers, farmers are paying to educate the sons and daughters of the more fortunate. These taxpayers who challenge this group of radicals, anarchists, Marxists, are growing in number each day. But the real tragedy, Mr. Speaker, is that it has hindered, damaged, and delayed the legitimate aspirations of 90 per cent of the university population of today. It has tarred with the same brush those students dedicated to responsible reform. It has tarred with the same brush those students consciously questioning traditional standards and methods. It has tarred with the same brush those students whose ideals challenge the community in which they live and work. Let me make it clear that I believe that change in the traditional methods and techniques of university education is necessary and desirable.

The university originated as a medieval institution and in many ways it still resembles the middle ages. Students of 1969 will no longer tolerate professors who can neither teach nor motivate them. They will no longer put up with the antiquated lecture system that prohibits discussion and participation. They no longer will remain still in the formation of a curriculum that does not inspire or interest them. They want a new and imaginative system of student evaluation. Even more important, they want to participate in policy and administrative decisions that control and regulate university life. These, Mr. Speaker, are legitimate and worthwhile goals. They have thrown the ball to faculty, administrators, governments. We must be prepared to listen and evaluate their recommendations. The question, Mr. Speaker, is: how do they achieve these goals? Is it revolution? Is it by seizure of public property? Is it by insult to the Board of Governors? Is it by belittling the president, principal or senior members of the administration?

February 14, 1969

No, it is not. Students must realize that participation in university affairs will be directly related to their demonstration of responsibility. They must recognize the responsibilities of those structures within the university system that have been allocated by law. Changes must be related to these structures and responsibilities. This is the goal of 90 per cent of students of Regina campus and other universities in Canada. This is the principle that I support, and the Government of Saskatchewan supports.

Some Hon. Members: — Hear, hear!

Mr. MacDonald: — Let me make the position of the Government of Saskatchewan very clear on this issue.

The dispute at present between the Board of Governors and the Students Representative Council over the collection of student fees is a university matter and not a government matter. At no time has any members of the Government taken a position for or against either the Board of Governors or the students in this matter. We have confidence in the ability of both sides to settle this dispute around the conference table. We have not interfered in the negotiations and we will not interfere.

Secondly, we have recognized the right of students or any other group to protest or dissent within the framework of the law. The basic right of any individual or group to express their opinion either by meeting, demonstration or marches has not been interfered with. We all watched the demonstration at the Legislative Buildings here last year. We all watched the students march during the visit of the Prime Minister. We have all watched the meetings and rallies presently taking place on the University campus.

However, we have also made it abundantly clear that we will not tolerate actions that go beyond the scope of the law. We have not hesitated to point out to any group, students or otherwise, that we will meet with a firm hand any attempt at violence, occupation of public property or damage to university facilities. My colleagues and I stand firm behind this principle.

Some Hon. Members: — Hear, hear!

Mr. MacDonald: — We will not stand idly by and permit a small minority of radicals to destroy our University, a university that belongs to the people of Saskatchewan, a university that is paid for and operated by the taxpayers of Saskatchewan, a university whose role is to provide education for all the students who attend it and we will not permit the interference of a small percentage of radicals.

Let me now turn to the immediate problem on Regina campus. I am firmly convinced there are four additional causes of the

conflict that exist on that campus: one, the participation and interference of the NDP and its Youth Club; two, the negative attitude and sensationalism in the reporting of the CBC; three, the complete lack of responsibility on the part of the student newspaper, *The Carillon*; four, the lack of leadership on the part of some members of the University faculty. Let me briefly discuss each of these in turn.

First, Mr. Speaker, the direct interference of the NDP and the NDP Youth Club in this conflict. This, Mr. Speaker, is the most serious and blatant cause of the near violence that occurred on Regina campus during the past week.

Some Hon. Members: — Hear, hear!

Mr. MacDonald: — Why, Mr. Speaker, has not one Member of the Opposition stood on his feet to discuss what has occurred on the campus in the past week. The Member from Regina North East (Mr. Smishek) stood up and blamed it on the political interference. The Member from Riversdale (Mr. Romanow) discussed the political reality or the political implication of the Premier's discussion with students. But, Mr. Speaker, did they discuss the harassment of the Board of Governors? Did they discuss the things that are important? This is one of the most potentially dangerous situations that have ever occurred in our University. They have made it completely . . .

Some Hon. Members: — Hear, hear!

Mr. MacDonald: — Be quiet and listen. The answer is obvious. The NDP and its union bed partners have been speaking loud and often but not in this Assembly under the scrutiny of the people of Saskatchewan. They have been speaking on the campus, in *The Commonwealth*, through their Youth Club; through their union partners to stir the conflict, to aggravate the already tense situation; to foster the cause of the radicals; to take cheap political advantages out of the dispute between the Board of Governors and the students. There is not one Member opposite who has had the guts to stand up and defend the actions of his own Members of his party. Let me review them for you:

First, Len Wallace. Union official, dedicated Socialist, allied to the NDP through the marriage of the CLC to the NDP, went to Regina campus to urge students to picket the homes and business premises of members of the Board of Governors. Such attempts by Mr. Wallace repelled the people of Saskatchewan and even members of his own union.

Some Hon. Members: — Hear, hear!

Mr. MacDonald: — Why has not one Member of the Opposition stood on his feet to voice his opinion on the suggestions by Mr. Wallace?

February 14, 1969

Hon. D.G. Stuart (Provincial Treasurer): — Likely agrees, likely agrees.

Mr. MacDonald: — Why, Mr. Speaker? Because MR. Wallace is a member of the NDP.

Some Hon. Members: — Hear, hear!

Mr. MacDonald: — Second, we had the Member for Regina North East (Mr. Smishek) an elected Member of the NDP speak at the campus. I thought today when he rose to speak in this House he was going to tell us about his visit to the University.

An Hon. Member: — Apologize!

Mr. MacDonald: — Did he speak about student responsibility? Did he urge restraint and common sense? Did he voice the concerns of his party for the possibility of latent violence that has occurred across this country? No, Mr. Speaker, he tossed more hot coals on the fire. He brought in a new element into an already tense situation. Yes, the Member for Regina North East spouted forth in his usual manner, a vicious attack on the Senate of the University. In the middle of what could develop into a major confrontation he threw another bomb and attempted to light the fuse. Surely now is the time for common sense. Now is the time for cool heads and now is the time for genuine leadership. Has this come from Members opposite? No, Mr. Speaker, they have cringed in silence, afraid to open their mouths about their own members' actions. Like hypocrites they sit in silence unable to condone and afraid to condemn the members of their own party.

Some Hon. Members: — Hear, hear!

Mr. MacDonald: — They would sell their souls to any group for a few votes. Next we have the unbelievable situation whereby a handful of radical students harassed members of the Board of Governors. They attempted to physically block their exit from the University. They hurled insults and indignities at members of the Board as they departed. They attempted to prevent a member from driving his car from the campus. At this same time, other radicals as reported in the Leader Post and other newspapers were demanding militant action, occupation of facilities.

How, Mr. Speaker, can we expect the students of Regina campus or any other university in Canada to use restraint, negotiation, responsibility, when Members of the NDP are urging them on by attacks on the Senate and suggestions of picketing the private residences of members of the Board of Governors? These actions have brought shame on the heads of all university students. There is no room for this kind of action in Saskatchewan. What did the Socialists say, Mr. Speaker? Nothing,

absolutely nothing. Once again, no leadership. Their silence once again indicated their tacit support of these repulsive actions.

Let me now turn to the NDY, the Socialist youth movement in Saskatchewan. Perhaps one of the most striking features of last year's session was the claim by Members opposite of the allegiance of the young people of Saskatchewan. All of us remember the words of the Member for Riversdale (Mr. Romanow) when he with monotonous regularity referred to his generation. He reminded the House on every occasion that his party was "in tune with the teens," that his party had the response of the young. Well, Mr. Speaker, if the actions of the young Socialists are his generation, thank God they are not young Liberals.

An Hon. Member: — Sit up and listen!

Some Hon. Members: — Hear, hear!

Mr. MacDonald: — The NDY have had a great year. A year of imaginative new ideas; a year of exciting events; a year of major policy decisions. Let me review some of them for you. They burned the American flag at Naicam last summer, an event that sickened Canadians from the Atlantic to the Pacific.

An Hon. Member: — Very challenging!

Mr. MacDonald: — Is this the new generation the Member for Riversdale referred to? At their Convention they called for the nationalization of all Canadian farm land. I wonder if the Member from Kelsey (Mr. Messer) is going to be the first to contribute his farm to the new collective units? Is this the new generation the Member for Riversdale refers to?

An Hon. Member: — Roy's boys again.

Mr. MacDonald: — At the same convention they passed a resolution to support Quebec Separatists. As a Canadian this revolts and shocks me, when Canadians from all provinces are working diligently to build our nation and hold it together. Is this the new generation the Member for Riversdale refers to?

Hon. Member: — There's a busy little boy!

Mr. MacDonald: — They also pledge support for the Viet Cong to create an independent Socialist Vietnam. For the advance of Socialism they would support Moa Tse Tung himself. Is this the new generation the Member for Riversdale refers to? These are only a few of the new and imaginative ideas to take us into the 1970s.

Some Hon. Members: — Hear, hear!

February 14, 1969

Mr. MacDonald: — However, the place where they are really showing their influence and prestige is on the Regina campus. It is interesting to note that a large percentage of the editorial staff of the Carillon are members of the Socialist Youth Club. It is interesting that the Member for Regina North East (Mr. Smishek) failed to mention their names. The same people that are in the Carillon are extolling revolution, describing Molotov cocktails, belittling and insulting the university administrators, attacking the Board of Governors, are active members of the NDY. You know, Mr. Speaker, the only conclusion that I can come to is that one of the influences must be the environment where that paper is printed. Perhaps if they would move its location it would be a better publication.

Some Hon. Members: — Hear, hear!

Mr. MacDonald: — Is it any wonder, Mr. Speaker, that silence is the attitude of the NDP in this House. They are afraid of the reaction of the people of Saskatchewan if they attempt to defend members of their own party. It is also interesting to note that the radical element of the Students Council are not only members of the NDY, but hold important and key positions in it. It was funny how the Member from Regina North East forgot to mention that President Dave Sheard and some of the others resigned because they refused to permit 400 radicals or those few people who paid their Students Council fees to dominate the Students Representative Council. Is it any wonder, Mr. Speaker, that they are afraid of the reaction of the people of Saskatchewan? Is it any wonder that silence is the only indication on those issues?

An Hon. Member: — They are embarrassed.

Mr. MacDonald: — Surely one of them has the intestinal fortitude to speak on behalf of his party.

Mr. Speaker, the second factor that has contributed to the situation on the Regina campus has been the negative, sensational reporting of the CBC. A university that runs smoothly, a university that grants student participation through dialogue and discussion, a university whose students, faculty and administration unite to work together to promote co-operation and goodwill is not considered to be newsworthy. No single factor contributes more to the cause of the radicals, the anarchists, the Marxists, than the sensationalism generated by instant publicity. Four thousand students working diligently to expand student participation and involvement for a whole year is not worth one minutes of the CBC's time. A group of young hotheads heaping insults on the Board of Governors is worth national television coverage. The CBC has contributed, in my judgement, more to student unrest than any other single agency in Canada.

Some Hon. Members: — Hear, hear!

Mr. MacDonald: — Sensationalism is distortion; sensationalism is misrepresentation; sensationalism is unrealistic; sensationalism is half truths; and here in Saskatchewan, the sensationalism of the CBC reporting over the past few months has been beyond comprehension; the description of Buffalo Narrows as the Mississippi of the North; the report – and I hope that the Press will correct my written notes of the quotation of Howard Adams, the chief advocate of Red Power in Saskatchewan – suggesting that the burning of a boat was caused by radical discrimination. The description of our native people shooting rabbits rather than starving are typical examples of this sensationalism. The coverage of the Regina campus situation is another good example. When the story first broke, the CBC immediately suggested a strike on national television before the student body had attempted to discuss their own actions. When the small group of students harassed the Board of Governors, the CBC exaggerated an already bad situation. Their implication, and I understand it came from the United Press, that snow blowers were used as Saskatchewan's winter answer to the firehose for protection of Board members was not only exaggerated but untrue. It caused a genuine concern among all students. You know I can't help but agree with the former Prime Minister of Canada with his statement made in the House of Commons. Yet, Mr. Speaker, when one moderate student shouts down and challenges a resolution calling for strikes, boycotts, etc., it was not worth mentioning. I have a copy of the resolution presented to the Students Representative Council by the mass meeting held last week. In this it has Clause 1:

A large committee to organize picketing and leafleting at the homes and places of business of members of the Board.

Clause 7 was added from the floor calling for a general strike. Mr. Speaker, before this resolution could be approved, the moderate students of the University shouted it down and it didn't even come to a vote. These two clauses had to be withdrawn. This was the action of responsible students and it was not worth the CBC's time. Yet, Mr. Speaker, if the original motion had been passed, the CBC would have been on the Regina campus in full force in five minutes. They would have telecast to every home in Canada the picture of a very small group of dissidents willing to hinder, disrupt or destroy university life on the Regina campus.

On this campus and on the campus at Saskatoon, much has been accomplished in the area of student participation in our University. Let me give you one concrete example of just one faculty right here on the Regina campus. Here is an example of how responsible students have achieved student participation. In September of 1967, when student power first became an issue in Regina and right across Canada, students and faculty in the College of Administration decided to work things out together in a spirit of co-operation. Here is the system that has evolved.

Numerous student-faculty committees have been set up to deal with many responsible areas. Many of these committees have more students than faculty on them. These committees deal with such areas as curriculum, faculty-student relations, hiring of faculty, post-graduate work and even planning and budgeting. All of these committees report to the Faculty of Administration. This committee for all intents and purposes has the final say in hiring and firing of faculty and curriculum matters. There are three students on this committee with full voting rights. It is interesting to note that originally there was only one student, but by merely requesting, instead of hollering, they received two more representatives.

There is also a Faculty-Student Liaison Committee. This is a six-man committee, three students and three faculty members. The student chairman elected by his fellow students has access to every faculty meeting and is responsible for all liaison. It is an official channel between faculty and students. It is also interesting to note that relations are so harmonious between the faculty and the students that neither side has bothered to appoint members to a discipline committee. This is only one typical example. Mr. Speaker, talk to the College of Education, the College of Commerce and there are many avenues of great and tremendous progress over the past year.

Let me point to another area of student responsibility that is so often not reported. Here are some concrete examples of how the students of Regina campus are participating in the solution of community and world problems: They have contributed 560 units to the Red Cross Blood Clinic; they have volunteered to work in the Indian-Métis Education program; they have taken a collection to aid the unfortunate in Biafra; they have collected to support cystic fibrosis. They have provided volunteers for CUSO. Why doesn't the CBC, Mr. Speaker, put on an education program for the people of Canada, go out to the University and talk to members of the faculty and students about the progress that has been made, about the kind of student participation that is going on in Saskatchewan, in Regina campus and right across the nation.

Some Hon. Members: — Hear, hear!

Mr. MacDonald: — Now, Mr. Speaker, I want to turn for a few minutes to what I consider the third cause that has aggravated the situation on Regina campus, the student newspaper, The Carillon.

To begin with, I want to say that I believe every university should have a student newspaper. I believe every university should have a student newspaper. I believe that because it is a student newspaper, it will be radical and this in no way hinders its function or effectiveness. It should express the students' viewpoint. It should be able to offer constructive criticisms. It should seek reform and it should certainly express the idealism of its members. However, these goals in no way limit its responsibility to report objectively and fairly

the news it publishes. Independence and freedom do not mean license. No special organ has more power to influence for good or evil than does the news media. This only increases their responsibility. Unfortunately, this is not the case with many student newspapers. Let me read to this House an editorial of January 1969 this month from "Campus," Canada's national Student magazine. It comments on the 31st National Convention of Canadian University Press held in Toronto:

This is one legitimate aim of the student press. There are forces both in greater society and in the student realm which are exploitative and unjust. Exposure and change can be possible through the student press.

Nevertheless, the egalitarian rhetoric which flows from the pens of some student journalists was not matched by corresponding action at the convention.

When Bob Verdun, new president of the Ontario region of The Canadian University Press, spoke to delegates about fairness in news reporting he was laughed and hissed at.

This is a direct quotation.

During the voting for the honorary president, serious candidates like Rene Levesque, a symbol of self-determination to many present were passed over for mythical personages and write-ins until whole election sank into absurdity and was abandoned.

Actions like this prompted expatriate Canadian, David Lloyd-Jones, now working with the United States Student Press Association, to call the delegates 'sick.' He said he wouldn't want to attend a university run by these people.

External symbols, such as revolutionary rhetoric, non-conformist dress, and some knowledge of political theory do not necessarily qualify anyone to be a campus spokesman.

What a terrible indictment against student newspapers! These comments did not come from the president of a university, a member of the Board of Governors, the public at large, the government of a province, a right-wing reactionary, they came from Bob Verdun, new president of the Ontario Canadian University Press. They came from David Lloyd-Jones of the United States Student Press Association. Now we can see what he means by 'sick' when we refer to The Carillon. Let me quote another editorial from Gateway, the students' newspaper at the University of Alberta:

Last week, the Gateway received a letter from The Carillon, student newspaper at the University of Saskatchewan at Regina, asking for a telegram of solidarity

February 14, 1969

with their fight against censorship by the Board of Governors.

In a reply to The Carillon editor, Norm Bolen, Rich Vivone wrote that if The Carillon used the code of ethics of the Canadian University Press to fortify its argument, then The Carillon must see relevancy in the code.

The Carillon quotes the section of the code which states that a student newspaper must have editorial freedom.

At the same time, a section of the code states that student newspapers must attempt to be impartial in news stories and print the truth in all cases. Thus, the Gateway could not support it.

This, Mr. Speaker, is an indictment by another student university newspaper in Western Canada. They refused to support them because they refused to print the truth. I have no intention of reviewing the publications of The Carillon that have sickened the people of Saskatchewan. The articles extolling revolution, Molotov cocktails, the attacks on the President and administrators, the attacks on the Board of Governors, the sports article on homosexuality in America, the Christmas insert that shocked everyone who saw it, the letters and articles that verged on near obscenity. These are history and everyone has formed their own judgement about the quality and calibre of a newspaper that would publish them. But as a practical example, I would like to give you just a few comments on the last issue of The Carillon.

First on page two is a letter from Professor W.G. Bolstad, protesting a misquotation and I quote:

Finally I should like to protest the quotation attributed to me out of context in The Carillon report. I did not say to Mr. Neidermayer, 'I don't like this as a place to learn or a place to teach.' If I said this or believed this, I should and would resign. If I ever come to this conclusion, I will resign.

The Carillon was very generous; it apologized for the inconvenience but refused to accept his word that he did not make the statement. Second, on the page is an editorial called "The making of a Regina campus budget." It describes the preparing, presenting and establishing of a university budget. It rationalizes the desired increases and criticizes the Government for its approach. It finished off with this quotation:

The figure the faculty have been given to work with is an increase of about 10 per cent.

It left a clear impression that all the Government offered the University is 10 per cent. When the budget is presented next week, perhaps The Carillon will print the truth.

Third and the most repulsive of all the articles in this particular edition, which was in fact, much better than most. I quote a quotation on President Spinks:

Worked on molecular spectroncopy in Germany in 1933-34, here he is quoted as saying, 'That while Nazism gave a new vigor to the German race, created a society of full employment by providing work camps and generally providing a list of fun for everyone but the intellectuals.' He didn't think he would recommend other countries adopting a similar form of government in spite of its apparent efficiency.

The question is what kind or what purposes would the Carillon have for making an innuendo represented by that quotation? Surely, Mr. Speaker, the very justification of a student newspaper, is objectivity and fairness in reporting to its readers. If it fails it betrays the very students who support it. Because of its record of innuendo, half truths, misquotes, personal attacks, extreme radicalism, Marxist philosophy, The Carillon has destroyed itself. It has destroyed its effectiveness as an instrument of reform and change. Its very purpose for existence has been strangled. Today, the great majority of Carillon end up in the garbage can.

The fourth factor, Mr. Speaker, that has aggravated the situation of Regina campus is the lack of leadership on the part of some members of the faculty of this University. One of the unfortunate results of the Student Power Movement is that the public image of members of the university faculty is at an all-time low. Actions and utterances of a few radical professors have seriously impaired the public attitude of all people associated with the University. This, Mr. Speaker, is most regrettable. The great majority of university professors are dedicated to the University, the students and the community. No group has a greater potential for leadership. It is important that university men provide constructive criticism of the University itself and all modern institutions. It is also important that they work with students for change and reform. However, Mr. Speaker, as men hired to teach, guide and direct the development of our young people attending universities, they have equally grave responsibilities. They must point out today to the students that the end does not justify the means. It is essential that our young people of today recognize that goals and ideals are important, but the method of achieving them is equally important. University professors must demonstrate clearly and positively that in Canada today there is no room for violence, hate, riot or extremism.

Mr. Speaker, the question today is not student power. The question today is student responsibility. This is the leadership that the professors have failed to give. Too many radical professors across Canada are using the student movement for their own end. They are using the students to achieve changes they want for themselves. They are using student movement as a

February 14, 1969

means to gain control and power. Simon Fraser University was a good example. They surely must realize they are playing with fire. The danger signals are out.

Mr. Speaker, it is important that everyone become involved, students, teachers, administrators, members of the Board of Governors and that in Canada they take action to stop the events that have occurred in Canada.

Violence on our campus is no more acceptable than violence in the back alleys of our city. Arson on our campus is no more acceptable than arson in our places of business. Vandalism on our campus is no more acceptable than vandalism in our homes. Rioting on our campus is no more acceptable than on our streets of our cities and it should be handled in exactly the same method.

The great majority of our students are young men and women searching for a better university and a better world. I am confident that here in Saskatchewan reason and temperance will prevail. I urge all students to participate. Do not leave the leadership of your newspapers and student organizations to people who refuse to accept the orderly process of change.

Mr. Speaker, it is with real regret that I don't have an opportunity to make some comments on some of the utterances of the Members opposite. This is the first occasion that I have not had the occasion and there are many things I have looked forward to saying. However, perhaps in the Budget Speech Debate I will have that opportunity. You can see, Mr. Speaker, that I will support the Speech from the Throne.

Some Hon. Members: — Hear, hear!

Mr. J.E. Brockelbank (Saskatoon Mayfair): — Will the Hon. Members permit one short question?

Mr. MacDonald: — No! . . . Make it quick!

Mr. Brockelbank: — Very short. In the context of the confrontation on Regina campus, what has been the position of the Canadian University Liberal Federation?

Hon. Mr. MacDonald: — The Canadian Liberal Federation supports the students.

Motion agreed to on the following recorded division:

Yeas – 29
Messieurs

Howes
McFarlane

Coderre
Larochelle

Radloff
Weatherald

Cameron
Steuart
Heald
McIsaac
Guy
Loken
MacDougall
Grant

MacDonald
Estey
Hooker
Gallagher
MacLennan
Heggie
Breker

Mitchell
Gardner
Coupland
Charlebois
Forsyth
McIvor
Schmeiser

**Nays – 23
Messieurs**

Lloyd
Woof
Willis
Wood
Blakeney
Davies
Dewhurst
Meakes

Berezowsky
Romanow
Smishek
Thibault
Whelan
Snyder
Michayluk
Brockelbank

Baker
Pepper
Bowerman
Matsalla
Messer
Kwasnica
Kowalchuk

Hon. Mr. Heald (Attorney General): — Mr. Speaker, I move, seconded by my seatmate, the Minister of Municipal Affairs (Mr. Estey):

That 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.

The Assembly adjourned at 5:34 o'clock p.m.