

LEGISLATIVE ASSEMBLY OF SASKATCHEWAN
First Session — Fifteenth Legislature
9th Day

Tuesday, February 16th, 1965.

The Assembly met at 2:30 o'clock p.m.

On the Orders of the Day.

REPORT OF NEWSPAPER ITEM RE HEAVY WATER PLANT

Mr. J.H. Brockelbank (Kelsey, Acting Leader of the Opposition): — Mr. Speaker, before the orders of the day are proceeded with I would like to bring to the attention of the house, and particularly the Premier, an item in the Saskatoon Star Phoenix of February 13th, 1965, under the date line of Edmonton. Premier Manning is being quoted and it says, in talking about the proposed heavy water plant:

Premier Manning said he had no intention to criticize Saskatchewan's Premier Thatcher, who promised to supply power and steam at cost and underwrite construction of the plant.

and again he says:

The Saskatchewan government stipulated in its agreement with Dynamic Power Corporation that the government be allowed to designate the location of the plant and that the company wishing to accept inducement must not bid in any other province.

Now, Mr. Speaker, if somebody else apparently knows as much as this, why hasn't the legislature been informed of some of these matters?

Hon. W. Ross Thatcher (Premier): — Mr. Speaker, this legislature will be informed if, or when, the heavy water plant locates in the province of Saskatchewan. I may say that we have taken every effort to make sure that this will happen.

ANNOUNCEMENT RE FIFTH SERIES OF SASKATCHEWAN SAVINGS BONDS

Hon. W. Ross Thatcher (Premier): — May I, Mr. Speaker, while I am on my feet, announce that the Fifth Series of Saskatchewan Savings Bonds will go on sale March 1st, 1965. The Bonds are to be dated March 15th, 1965 and will have an effective yield of 5.148 per cent to bond holders if held to maturity. They will be redeemable at par at any time after September 15th, 1965. Like previous Saskatchewan Savings Bonds, only residents of Saskatchewan will be eligible to purchase these bonds, including corporations and societies with head offices in Saskatchewan. The bonds will be available in denominations of \$100, \$500, \$1,000 and \$5,000 and the maximum purchased by any person will be limited to \$10,000. The bonds will be non-transferable and non-assignable, except by inheritance. The sale will be handled by agents appointed by the Provincial Treasurer. These agents include all branches of the chartered banks in Saskatchewan, all investment dealers in the province who are members of the Investment Dealers Association, the Saskatchewan Co-operative Credit Society Limited, and a number of trust companies who are members of the Trust Companies Association of Canada.

This year Saskatchewan Savings Bonds will again provide the people of Saskatchewan with a gilt-edged investment for their savings, while at the same time providing the government of Saskatchewan with funds to finance investment in the Saskatchewan Power Company.

Mr. J.H. Brockelbank (Kelsey, Acting Leader of the Opposition): — Mr. Speaker, I wish to compliment the Premier again on carrying out a good financial policy that was established in the past by the CCF government.

Some Hon. Members: — Hear, hear!

Mr. Thatcher: — You will note, Mr. Speaker, the rates we are getting are quite a bit better than we used to get under the CCF.

WELCOME TO STUDENTS

Mr. E. Whelan (Regina North): — Mr. Speaker, before the orders of the day are proceeded with, I am sure all members will be pleased to join me in welcoming twenty-seven students from Imperial School. Imperial School is in my riding. They are seated in the east gallery. They are a Special Interest group and are with their vice-principal, Mel Lindeburg. I am sure that we all hope that their stay this afternoon will be pleasant and informative.

Some Hon. Members: — Hear, hear!

QUESTION RE SASKATCHEWAN CREDIT SOCIETY

Mr. F. Dewhurst (Wadena): — Mr. Speaker, I wonder if I could ask just one short question of the Premier on his statement? When he mentioned the Saskatchewan Credit Society, does that mean that credit unions will be able to sell these bonds?

Hon. W. Ross Thatcher (Premier): — My understanding, Mr. Speaker, is yes. I cannot be positive. I will have to check with my Deputy but I think so, that is the intention.

ADDRESS-IN-REPLY

The assembly resumed the adjourned debate on the proposed motion of Mr. Guy for an Address-in-Reply and the proposed amendment thereto by Mr. Brockelbank (Kelsey).

Mr. Robert H. Wooff (Turtleford): — Mr. Speaker, I would like first of all to convey my thanks to my constituents for the confidence they placed in me and for the honor and the privilege of representing Turtleford constituency in this assembly. I would like to assure my constituents that I will ever, and at all times, place their wishes before the legislature. I would like to deal with constituency matters in some future debates.

May I congratulate you, Sir, on your promotion to this high office. I doubt, Mr. Speaker, if there is another member in this legislature who can more sincerely congratulate every member in the house on the success of their campaign and their entrance into this legislature. For twenty years, Mr. Speaker, I have known what it is to taste both victory and defeat, sometimes, Mr. Speaker, on very narrow margins.

On one occasion, Mr. Speaker, I had the honor, if not pleasure, of a visit to my constituency by the present Minister of Public Health (Mr. Steuart), although it was not on my invitation that he came, Sir, he "sort of snuck in the back way". He came in quite regal style, to tell the truth, with a retinue of taxi-cabs, to help me out. Where did he go, Mr. Speaker? Out on the reserves. Isn't, it strange, Mr. Speaker, that for three years now the people in the constituency of Turtleford still ask me, "What came into our constituency on by-election day, 1961, in those taxis, other than the Minister of Public Health? Was it ice cream cones? Was it glassware? Or was it plain old-fashioned crockery?"

I would like, Mr. Speaker, to congratulate the lady member from Saskatoon on her maiden speech. One might not agree with all that she said but it was a soothing presentation following the tornado from Athabaska (Mr. Guy), which by the way, Mr. Speaker, was not the "white cleaning tornado" of television variety. I was particularly fascinated with the lady member's emphasis on standing upon our own two economic legs.

Well, beyond a minority, Mr. Speaker, who always love to be carried, and cow-bird like, love to get their eggs and responsibilities into other people's nests. Most people desire to be independent and to make their own way, and to stand on their own two economic legs.

But, Mr. Speaker, being independent would not be too difficult

a proposition if it were not for the fact that this privileged capitalistic economy that we hear so much about, prevents just that very thing.

Some Hon. Members: — Hear, hear!

Mr. Wooff: — Let us look for a few moments at the division of the national income in this fair land of ours. The privileged top one-fifth of Canada's population get fifty per cent of the national income. The under-privileged one-fifth at the bottom, Mr. Speaker, get five per cent of the national income, the other three-fifths naturally get forty-five per cent. In other words, Mr. Speaker, the top one-fifth, the privileged group of Canada, get half the national income, the other four-fifths are left to divide up the other half amongst themselves as best they can. This is the kind of economy that our friends across the way boast of as being free enterprise. Free — for whom? — as the elephant said as he danced amongst the chickens.

Now let us look at agriculture for a moment, our basic industry, the industry upon which our very lives exist, Mr. Speaker. There was a time when agriculture represent twenty per cent of the population of Canada, and received about twelve and one-half per cent of the national income. Then it dropped to twelve per cent of the population, and we got about seven per cent of the national income, now we are down to nine per cent of the population and we get 4.7 per cent of the national income.

There is one thing that I would like to draw to the attention of the house, that over the years the ratio between the percentages has changed. The effect, as far as agriculture is concerned, means that, the percentage between the population that agriculture represented and the percentage of the national income that they got changed also, but always leaving agriculture on a progressively shorter end of the stick.

I have before me, Mr. Speaker, a copy of Maclean's magazine for February 20th, 1965, and I would recommend, no, Mr. Speaker, I would urge, that everyone within the sound of my voice this afternoon read this issue if they want to get a fair appraisal of where the economy in this fair land of ours is drifting.

Again, Mr. Speaker, it is not a Socialist who is writing, quite the opposite. I think that most of the article is based on the findings of the federal government Agricultural Rehabilitation and Development Administration, and should be politically acceptable even to the Premier. The facts, Mr. Speaker, are simply appalling:

We now have 5,000,000 Canadians in the unemployed group, in disinherited farmers, in trappers whose livelihood is gone because of the synthetic fur trade, of fisherman who cannot compete with modern ways and means of fishing.

This means, Mr. Speaker, that today we have one-fifth of Canada's population relegated to slums, to poverty, to squalor and disease. This doesn't mean something that the hon. member from Milestone (Mr. MacDonald) referred to last night when he accused this side of the house of always referring to the dirty thirties. This doesn't mean tomorrow, or next year, when automation and cybernation takes over. This means, Mr. Speaker, today, this hour, that you and I are sitting in this assembly, there are 5,000,000, one-fifth of the Canadian population that are in these circumstances, and just to make the record clear, that I am not just going off the beat on my own account, I am going to read into the records a few paragraphs from Mr. Phillip's article.

Five years ago when the Wabanna mine which takes iron ore form an underseas tunnel at Belle Island, Newfoundland, met the problem of low grade ore with newer machinery, I reported this as another step ahead. Like most people I assumed that higher production benefits everyone. Last year I was asked again to report on Belle Island. Twelve square miles of thin soiled rock. Production was up, I want you to remember this, but there were 1,400 miners out of work and some badly needed medicine, warm clothes, and even bedding.

Some houses were boarded up and abandoned, but most of the jobless were still there, without money to leave and without hope, for the nearest employment office in St. Johns, 12 miles away listed 30,000 people unemployed.

This group of dispossessed, unemployed and poverty stricken people are not confined to one area. The A.R.D.A. organization has a colored map and it is printed in MacLean's magazine and it shows you these depressed areas. But I would like to remind the house of one thing. Just about a year ago now, the federal government stated that Saskatchewan, under a Socialist government, (if you want to use this term, as you are doing over and over again) was one of the only areas in Canada that didn't have a deeply depressed area.

Some Hon. Members: — Hear, hear!

Mr. Wooff: — These depressed areas are scattered from coast to coast, through every province and that means under so-called private enterprise, I call it a privileged capitalist economy. What is happening?

Existing at this level, by A.R.D.A.'s latest count, are 500,000 rural families, who with our city poor, add up to at least one-fifth of the nation. In the thirties we knew poverty, we could comprehend their existence, not now, we have lived too long with the myth of progress.

These people, Mr. Speaker, are on the move, some of them, and I am of the opinion that this so-called increase in Saskatchewan's population may be nothing more than an influx of these people seeking some of the 80,000 jobs that have been advertised so much by the Premier.

In a steady stream these rural poor are migrating to the city, competing with the city poor for cheap housing, between 1956 and 61, almost 2,500,000 Canadians moved across provincial boundaries.

What is happening when these people move into the urban centres and when they move across provincial boundaries? They are beating down the wages of their fellow man. Actually there is no intention of lowering wages but the employers are taking advantage of it. In the city, the rural surplus becomes surplus labour, forcing down hourly wages, and permitting exploitation. Employers read in the papers that unemployment is rising, says an officer of the National Employment Service. They call us and ask us for one hundred men, and the men arrive and the employer wants fifty. Because he has a surplus, he can get the ones he wants for 80 or 90 an hour and sometimes less. This is what is happening today, Mr. Speaker. Not tomorrow, not yesterday, and not ten years ago. And the rich are becoming richer and the poor are becoming poorer.

As our rising gross national product shows the average Canadian becoming richer, more than four million Canadians are growing poorer. Four-fifths of us earn salaries tied to rising production and prices. But as we raise our standard of living we inexorably lower it for one-fifth who must pay the higher prices with shrinking incomes. Poverty creates a health problem, an alcohol problem, a crime problem an education problem and an Indian problem. The list goes on and on, yet we continue to govern a nation as if we had only one problem, an economic problem that the gross national product can solve.

Mr. Speaker, there are nations in the world today that have solved this problem and have coped with the very blight that is crossing our land at the present time, but there is only one answer and that is a planned economy, an economy where it is needed, and where there is an educational program and a training program and a re-training program that keeps abreast of our fast changing economy. Only the provincial governments and the federal government working together on a large scale effort, Mr. Speaker, can meet the situation. The Throne Speech that we have been considering now for some days, Mr. Speaker, doesn't even recognize the situation, let alone bring in measures to grapple with this horrible condition of poverty blighting the lives of five million people in a land of plenty.

Ill fares the land,
To hastening ills a prey,
Where wealth accumulates
and men decay.

I will support the sub-amendment, the amendment, Mr. Speaker, but I will not support the motion.

Some Hon. Members: — Hear, hear!

Mr. Donald G. MacLennan (Last Mountain): — Mr. Speaker, the high office that you occupy represents many traditions and qualities that I know you very deeply respect. I have great confidence that you will honor the position of Speaker of this house because of your qualities of fairness and honesty. I want to congratulate you on your election as its speaker. As a newly elected member, I want to congratulate all members of this legislature on their respective elections and I want to say that I am looking forward to my personal association with them in the weeks that lie ahead.

I wish to congratulate the mover of the Speech from the Throne, the hon. member from Athabaska (Mr. Guy) and the seconder of the Speech, the hon. lady member from Saskatoon (Mrs. Merchant).

Some Hon. Members: — Hear, hear!

Mr. MacLennan: — Their magnificent addresses are compliments to the intelligence of the voters that chose them to be their representatives.

I want next to state how pleased I am to have been given the opportunity to represent the people of the constituency of Last Mountain. Last Mountain constituency is, as you know, Sir, located geographically in the centre of the province. We share in almost all the blessings of this province, good farm land, natural beauty spots, wealthy mineral deposits, thriving communities, successful manufacturing plants, skilled commercial fishermen, and most important of all, people representing almost all the cultures, races and religions of the world. These people share in all the bounties that this province and this nation of ours have to offer. As well as sharing in all the good things of this province they also have shared in the problems that have faced the people of Saskatchewan in the past.

Mr. Speaker, the Speech from the Throne dealt concisely with twenty-seven different topics. The language of the Speech itself is not colored with fanciful platitudes nor is it littered with meaningless phrases. It is a business-like document. Previous speakers in the debate on this side of the house have already dealt at some length with almost all of the topics. I want for a very few seconds to comment on highways and tourism as they affect the constituency of Last Mountain.

I ask, Mr. Speaker, that the government of this province consider as top priority the dangerous, disgraceful dust conditions that develop in the summer months because of the holiday traffic on highways no. 22 and no. 5. These two highways bring the people of central Saskatchewan to one of the main tourist areas of this province. In the summer thousands of people annually enjoy boating, fishing, swimming, and in the fall, hunting on or near Last Mountain Lake. One of the new provincial parks in this province is Rowan's Ravine. To get to this park one must travel over an unpleasant dusty road. This, Mr. Speaker, is no way to attract tourists.

The Throne Speech refers to the government's dissatisfaction with the progress Saskatchewan has been making in developing the tourist industry. The best way, in my opinion, Mr. Speaker, to attract tourists to our resorts and parks is to have decent roads for them to travel on. Two of the tourist routes used, Mr. Speaker, are highways no. 22 from no. 6 to highway no. 20, and highway no. 15 from no. 6 to highway no. 2. These short distances of highways should be oiled or paved. I feel they should have top priority. The people of Last Mountain constituency have watched Canada grow as a nation. They worked as hard as any people in the province to make this country grow.

They regretted that Saskatchewan was not keeping pace with the growth of its sister provinces and that their sons and daughters, brothers and sisters, aunts and uncles were migrating to other provinces. They

were dissatisfied to see Nova Scotia, Alberta, Manitoba and British Columbia, getting heavy water plants, pulp mills and other industries, while Saskatchewan was not getting any. They were dissatisfied to see Saskatchewan get government-owned box factories, woollen mills and shoe factories which they would not wish on anyone. They were dissatisfied to have huge quantities of oil remaining where the good Lord left it. They were dissatisfied to have their minerals unexplored and undeveloped. They were dissatisfied to see their timber uncut and unharvested. They were dissatisfied to see their beauty spots and tourist attractions not enjoyed and unused. They were dissatisfied with a government that all but ignored the development and encouragement of agriculture, their main source of wealth.

They were dissatisfied to see the powers of local government and local school boards snipped away by big government ideas of Socialist leaders. They were dissatisfied to see a government preoccupied with socialist dreams of a Utopia.

On April 22nd, Mr. Speaker, the people of the province of Saskatchewan took appropriate action. They dismissed the conductors of the socialist experiment, and indicated their desire to return to the time-tested and time-proven system of individual initiative and free enterprise.

Mr. Speaker, the people of this province asked for new leadership, new ideas, new development, and new reasons for pride in their province.

Some Hon. Members: — Hear, hear!

Mr. MacLennan: — It is fitting, Mr. Speaker, that in 1965, the year of our Diamond Jubilee, that all this will be realized. Saskatchewan has a new dynamic government, a government headed by an aggressive forceful leader, a man who injects enthusiasm, life and action into all phases of our lives and economy, a man who can meet with the leaders of industry, and of other governments and can convince them that Saskatchewan has a new spirit, that Saskatchewan wants another chance to catch up with the rest of Canada. The great interest that exists all over Canada and in the United States, in the new free enterprise government of Saskatchewan, has been reassuring to the people of Saskatchewan that elected the present government. This interest is resulting in the greatest influx of capital, the greatest exploration of oil and minerals and the greatest general boost to our economy that this province has ever realized. This was all made possible by the good judgement of our people in last spring's election.

In the constituency of Last Mountain, there were three important issues. One was leadership, — the people witnessed the NDP Premier who was portrayed by his party as a calm, solid, pipe smoking intellectual. With these qualities they had no quarrel, but there was a choice. There was another man representing another party, that party being the Liberal party. His qualities were brought to their attention, and what were they? They all could be summed up in one word. That word is "success". He was successful as a youth in his academic life, successful in civic politics, successful in the House of Commons, successful in business, successful in farming and ranching, and successful in provincial politics.

Some Hon. Members: — Hear, hear!

Mr. MacLennan: — This man, the people of Saskatchewan felt, would be successful in the office of the Premier, and Mr. Speaker, they made their choice and they supported the member from Morse.

Some Hon. Members: — Hear, hear!

Mr. MacLennan: — The second issue was taxation, and government services. The Liberal party in its past campaign gave new hope of relief to the people. They promised to reduce the heavy tax burden on the people of Saskatchewan, and as we shall see in the next few days, the new Liberal government will have done just that. The former government refused to give them this hope. They did not even claim to strive for this goal. They just sat back smugly and criticized the Liberal party for having such objectives in promising tax reduction, the Liberal party committed itself to maintain and expand government services. This they are presently doing as was demonstrated in the proposed Department of Youth, and in the new branch of Indian Affairs. We do not intend to look after the Indians for

just one night with ice cream, cash and liquor. We intend to help them in establishing themselves properly in our society, where they will not be approached and influenced on the eve of elections with such tactics. Too long now, has the government of Saskatchewan paid lip service to our Indian people. This government has realized the problem and I am proud to say they are taking action to help solve it.

Some Hon. Members: — Hear, hear!

Mr. MacLennan: — The third major issue in the election campaign was the lack of industrial development and the consequences of not having industry in Saskatchewan and the prospects of having industry bypass Saskatchewan as long as we had a Socialist government in this province. The defeat of the former Minister of Industry and Information (Mr. Brown) was not because he was not a nice man, not because he did not have a charming personality, it was because the department that he headed failed and failed miserably in its role of attracting industry to locate in Saskatchewan.

Some Hon. Members: — Hear, hear!

Mr. MacLennan: — It did not matter who in particular headed that department. It was bound to fail as long as arrogant socialists formulated the philosophy behind that particular department. Speaking of socialist arrogance, Mr. Speaker, let me quote the former Minister of Industry (Mr. Brown) in reference to mines. As reported in the 1964 Debates and Proceedings, page 135, 4th paragraph, 4th line, he said:

These are going to come anyway. They are going to come because the potash is here and they can't find it anywhere else.

This attitude, one of supreme socialist arrogance, was wrong. They are finding potash elsewhere, and it is wrong for a minister to speak and act in this manner when he is charged with the responsibility of creating an economic climate that is designed to encourage the development of our natural resources. It was as if the previous government did not realize the benefits industrialization would bring to this province. We now have, Mr. Speaker, a government that does appreciate the fruits gained from industrial development. We have a government that took immediate action on seeking out industry. Their first step in this regard was to sit down and review their position as a government, as regards to their attitude to industry. They found out what the areas of irritation were between the former government of this province and industry. These irritations were removed by and large and an understanding between industry and government was reached. It is an understanding of mutual aid and assistance. The increased income to government as a result of land sales this year reflect the new interest industry has in Saskatchewan. This government rapidly became aware of the tremendous untapped resources this province has, but more important, it became aware of the fact that there was almost no exploration taking place. A program of incentives was developed to encourage explorations that will lead to the development of our resources. Exploration is taking place now in Saskatchewan as evidenced by the fact that ten times the amount of money will be spent on explorations in 1965 as was spent under the NDP government in 1963.

Some Hon. Members: — Hear, hear!

Mr. MacLennan: — Another area of irritation to industry was the monopoly position of the government-owned Timber Board and of the Saskatchewan Power Corporation. Changes were made in these two organizations that will bring greater development in the production of natural gas in this province and in the development of our vast timber resources in the north. To help develop our mineral industry, this government took concrete steps in evolving a program of providing assistance for access roads to mines in both the north and on the prairie. When this government came to power, there was no set standard for royalty payments for potash companies.

Mr. Speaker, as you well know, the potash industry is a highly competitive one, and to give one company a more favourable deal than another is a very dangerous move. The same treatment of all companies gives security to this most important industry. Fair and similar treatment to all companies encourages prospective companies to come and locate here because they know there is no discrimination by government to them because they were not pioneer companies.

Mr. Speaker, the accomplishments of this government in encouraging exploration are well known and appreciated by all residents of this province. I should not need to say, Mr. Speaker, that I do not support the amendment, but that I do most enthusiastically support the motion.

Some Hon. Members: — Hear, hear!

Hon. D.G. Steuart (Minister of Public Health, Prince Albert): — Mr. Speaker, in . . .

Some Hon. Members: — Hear, hear!

Mr. Steuart: — . . . in rising to speak in this debate, I would first like to join with the other members in offering you my congratulations. The fair and impartial manner in which you have conducted the business of this house has already proven that your election to that high office has been an excellent choice.

I would also like to congratulate the mover and the seconder. The hon. member from Athabaska (Mr. Guy) made the kind of hard hitting speech that has made him such an able representative of Northern Saskatchewan. The hon. lady member from Saskatoon (Mrs. Merchant) has indicated by her very able presentation that she is and will be a valuable member, and an asset in this assembly.

Some Hon. Members: — Hear, hear!

Mr. Steuart: — Mr. Speaker, to Premier Thatcher go our thanks, not only for leading us to victory in the last general provincial election, but also for the tremendous job that he is doing for all of us on behalf of the province of Saskatchewan.

Some Hon. Members: — Hear, hear!

Mr. Steuart: — Mr. Speaker, in the eight months since the election, there is a new interest about Saskatchewan from outside our boundaries and there is a new optimism about the future within our province. This sense of interest and optimism is reflected in the Throne Speech. This document reflects, in every way, the new approach that now prevails here in Saskatchewan. Now, Mr. Speaker, I intend to discuss the Throne Speech, but there are one or two points I would like to deal with first.

One of the most enlightened programs for the treatment of mental illness to be found anywhere in Canada has been developed here in Southern Saskatchewan. The goal of this program has been, and is, to make available to people suffering mental illness treatment equal to that provided to people suffering from physical illness. The latest and most important development in this program was the opening of the psychiatric centre in Yorkton. I think that credit for this development should be given to many people. The staff of the Psychiatric Services Division, the Department of Public Health, people in the Saskatchewan Division of the Canadian Mental Health Association, former ministers of Public Health, and our own MLA from the constituency of Yorkton (Mr. Gallagher). All these people and many more played a role in the program that culminated in the opening of the Yorkton centre.

Mr. Speaker, this has only taken place in the south. For too long the needs of northern Saskatchewan have been neglected, and we intend to correct these conditions by extending the program to all parts of the province as rapidly as possible. To this end, we will open a psychiatric centre this year in the city of Prince Albert.

Some Hon. Members: — Hear, hear!

Mr. Steuart: — Prince Albert is 103 miles from Saskatoon and 132 miles from North Battleford. These are the nearest centres for people needing in-patient psychiatric treatment, if they come from the north or the north east portion of this province. The staff in this centre will develop local services in the area, thus making a high quality of care available to thousands of people for the first time. This centre will bring, new hope to people suffering mental illness in northern Saskatchewan. It will also relieve the over-crowded and strained facilities in the Saskatchewan hospital at North Battleford, and I am . . .

Some Hon. Members: — Hear, hear!

Mr. Steuart: — . . . sure, Mr. Speaker, that all members in this house will agree with our aim to treat the mentally ill as well as we treat the physically ill.

Mr. Speaker, I would like to turn for a few minutes to the subject of Mr. Ray Woollam. Now, Mr. Woollam worked directly for the government of this province from 1959 until 1963, and has been retained under a contract arrangement since then at the cost of \$12,000 a year. Now letters written by Mr. Woollam have been read in this house, and have been tabled. Letters written about his activities when he was a civil servant have proven that this man was actively engaged in promoting the provincial and national CCF (NDP) political party. And he was doing this, Mr. Speaker, while masquerading as a civil servant and at the expense of the Saskatchewan taxpayer, but a study of other letters indicates a far more serious situation than one political worker buried in the civil service. This proves what we long suspected, that the former CCF government had established an efficient political apparatus scattered through the civil service and the Crown Corporations. This political organization reported directly to the former Premier (Mr. Douglas) of this province and the present leader of the National NDP party. It was carried on by his successor, the present Leader of the Opposition (Mr. Lloyd) and I suspect, Mr. Speaker, that at times it was carried on over the protest of former ministers. The hon. member from Swift Current and the former Minister of Municipal Affairs (Mr. Wood), speaking in this debate, admitted that Mr. Woollam's conduct was, as he put it, somewhat unorthodox. Well I think this has to be the understatement of the year, Mr. Speaker. The former minister also stated that he did not always see eye to eye with Mr. Woollam. Well, he should have dismissed him but I doubt if top brass in the CCF would have allowed him to do this, even if he had wanted to. Now, Mr. Speaker, many of the individuals who made up this socialist organization within the civil service, have left the employ of this government and I can tell you that many more will soon be joining them. We intend to stamp it out and our efforts are, will be applauded by the vast majority of honest, hardworking men and women in the public service of this province.

Some Hon. Members: — Hear, hear!

Mr. Steuart: — Mr. Speaker, in connection with the public service of this province, on Friday last the member from Moose Jaw (Mr. Snyder) irresponsibly introduced before this assembly confidential material in preparation for collective bargaining and negotiations, which will commence one week from today, between the government and the Canadian Union of Public Employees. The member, obviously motivated by a desire to discredit the government at all costs, must have known that his actions have severely prejudiced progress of the negotiations. On the other hand, the lack of knowledge of his subject displayed by the hon. member indicated the possibility that he actually was unaware of the serious affect of his behaviour.

Mr. Snyder: — I have a copy here, if you want to read it.

Mr. Steuart: — I have a copy here too and it was a private document handed over to them and I can tell you that the Union is not very happy about your actions.

Some Hon. Members: — Hear, hear!

Mr. Steuart: — By his desire to seek publicity he has embarrassed the government and the Union Negotiating Team.

Mr. Speaker, this government since assuming office has bargained in good faith with its employee union. It is doing so now and it will do a much better job without interference by members who put their politics first and obviously their feeling for the union and the union membership second.

Some Hon. Members: — Hear, hear!

Mr. Steuart: — Mr. Speaker, I will now

turn my attention to the Throne Speech. This year's Throne Speech was different from any that we have seen for a long, long time. It was concise and to the point and it spelt out a major portion of our government's plans for the coming year. It forecast a wide range of new developments for our province, and has been greeted with enthusiasm by forward looking people throughout this province and across Canada. The only voices raised in protest are those of the Socialists who sit in opposition. Some of them have condemned it, others have ignored it, but all have stated that they will vote against this year's Throne Speech. Mr. Speaker, let us take a look at what the Liberal government is proposing and what the CCF opposition will oppose in this Throne Speech.

Now, it was by design that the opening theme of the Throne Speech was economic development. We have launched a great industrial and business expansion program for Saskatchewan. And we are using every means at our disposal to encourage free enterprise and private investment.

Some Hon. Members: — Hear, hear!

Mr. Steuart: — Now, Mr. Speaker, make no mistake, we will insist that these new industries practice proper conservation policies. We will insist that they pay good wages, that they obey our labour laws and that they act for the common good of all of our people. In fact, Mr. Speaker, we will propose legislation in this session to protect people from unscrupulous business methods that have been allowed to flourish in this province for far too long a time.

Some Hon. Members: — Hear, hear!

Mr. Steuart: — Mr. Speaker, protecting the public and our natural resources against exploitation is a responsibility that we recognize and that we will discharge.

Mr. Blakeney: — Take it is . . .

Mr. Steuart: — Hindering the proper development of our province is a mistaken notion that somehow this protects the rights of people, has been a CCF policy and we will put an end to it. And incidentally when the hon. member from Cumberland (Mr. Berezowsky) rose in his place, and mounted the attack on the development in the Lac La Ronge area, the Anglo-Rouyn mine, we really . . .

Mr. Berezowsky: — Tell us all about it.

Mr. Steuart: — . . . we really weren't surprised, Mr. Speaker, because we have come to know what he is. When the hon. member from Cumberland (Mr. Berezowsky) rises in his place and talks about business, usually you can depend it will be the most unmitigated drivel ever heard. But we were shocked, every one of his colleagues applauded the intemperate statements that he made. No wonder mines and mills and businesses have passed up this province for over twenty years with people with that kind of attitude, and that kind of outlook running the government of Saskatchewan.

Some Hon. Members: — Hear, hear!

Mr. Steuart: — The hon. member from Cumberland called it a peanut mine and said it was only promoted to fleece, as he put it, some of his friends who bought some shares. I would like to see some of those friends and he will live to eat those words about the peanut mine development in Northern Saskatchewan.

Some Hon. Members: — Hear, hear!

An Hon. Member: — Don't worry about that.

Mr. Steuart: — Mr. Speaker, I can tell you that if we have to build roads in the north to open mines, we will build them. If we have to give temporary tax incentives to get gas wells, and oil well, we will give them and if we have to break government monopolies or Crown Corporation monopolies to get a real timber industry into Saskatchewan, we will

gladly break them. We are taking . . .

Some Hon. Members: — Hear, hear!

Mr. Steuart: — We are taking this positive action, we are offering these incentives, and we are breaking down these artificial barriers because we have to, if we want to put Saskatchewan on the road to real development and real prosperity.

Mr. Speaker, let us never forget the timber that burns and rots every year for want of cutting and harvesting is no asset to our people. The minerals lying undiscovered in Northern Saskatchewan do not produce a job or a nickel in revenue. The untapped oil and gas wells are not any better than a pipe dream until they are brought into production. During all these last twenty years of industrial boom in the rest of this nation, most of our tremendous resources have lain idle, their development hampered by short-sighted socialist policies. We know that total cost in jobs and in revenues to Saskatchewan would be hard to calculate, but unfortunately we can measure some of our losses, 260,000 people lost to this province in the last twenty years . . .

Hon. W. Ross Thatcher (Premier): — And you will hear more.

Mr. Steuart: — . . . many of them are young people, forced to leave here to find jobs and opportunities and, whether you like it or not in the opposition, the highest tax load of any people in Canada.

Some Hon. Members: — Hear, hear!

Mr. Steuart: — And the province that was once one of the leading provinces in this nation, has lost its place under your government. This is why the Throne Speech places major emphasis on industrial and business development. This is the only way to more jobs, the only way to produce higher wages. It is the only way to produce government revenue without increased government taxes.

Mr. Speaker, we have every confidence that Saskatchewan has a tremendous future. It just needs to be given the opportunity to grow and to prosper and we're giving it that opportunity.

Some Hon. Members: — Hear, hear!

Mr. Steuart: — Now, Mr. Speaker, we know from twenty years of bitter experience that the CCF will oppose our free enterprise approach to the industrial development of this province. But what will interest many people in this province will be the attitude of the opposition to other proposals in the Throne Speech.

For example, we proposed major tax reductions. We are doing this because we believe no government has the right to take one more dollar from the wages and the earnings of the people than is absolutely necessary. Now so far our friends, the CCF, have belittled these proposed tax cuts and they have indicated that they will further oppose them and that they will vote against them.

Mr. Speaker, the question has been asked and I think fairly asked, how a government can cut taxes and increase expenditures. There are two ways that this will be accomplished. First an increase in the number of industries, mines and businesses means an increase in revenues to the province and this is now taking place. For example, every new potash mine that comes into this province means about an additional million dollars revenue to the provincial treasury. Second, by improving efficiency of government departments and crown corporations, we can and we will save tax dollars. To ensure that this will be done, we set up a Commission to study ways and means of improving efficiency and the practice of economy in the administration of this government. This has become known as the Johnson Commission . . .

Mr. Berezowsky: — . . . by a Liberal.

Mr. Steuart: — It has almost completed its studies, and its first reports are now in our hands. These reports show where a great deal of money can be saved without harming sound and necessary programs. It has been stated in the Throne Speech that we will act on these recommendations because we believe in the principle of sound business-like administration, not only of government but of crown corporations as well.

Mr. Speaker, a quick review of our highlights in the Throne Speech show why it has been called a blue print for a better Saskatchewan. New growth and new development call for more roads and better roads. This year we will spend fifty per cent more on highways than at any time in the history of this province. We intend to establish a new youth agency to promote culture, recreation and athletics and to promote opportunities for young people, right here at home. And I am pleased to announce that we have obtained the services of Professor Howard R. Nixon, to head up our Youth Agency. Professor Nixon . . .

Some Hon. Members: — Hear, hear!

Mr. Steuart: — Professor Nixon, a resident of Saskatoon, was born in Saskatchewan and received his early education in this province. He is a graduate in physical education of the University of British Columbia and holds a masters degree in physical education and recreation from Indiana University. His experience included one year in Edmonton, Alberta, as a director of youth activity, where he had the responsibility for twenty-two teenage centres. He worked six months in Alberta as director of recreation and youth activities, and in 1952, he worked in the physical education department of the University of Saskatchewan. Professor Nixon has served as a consultant for the Alberta Recreation Division. He is expected to begin his new duties on May 1st.

Some Hon. Members: — Hear, hear!

Mr. Steuart: — Mr. Speaker, with a man of this calibre, an excellent start is assured. We can look forward with confidence to this agency playing an important role in the development of our youth programs.

It has been stated before, Mr. Speaker, and I think it is worth repeating, that we will increase expenditures for education, give financial assistance to private high schools, and extend technical school facilities, and, to solve the problem of ever increasing enrolment in our universities, that we will substantially increase both operating and construction grants to the University of Saskatchewan, both in Regina and Saskatoon.

Pensions to teachers and public servants who retired years ago on small pensions will be increased. You know, Mr. Speaker, our friends opposite refused to do this, although they were asked to do so year in and year out. I wonder which way they will vote on this issue? It is in the Throne Speech and they have indicated one after the other that they intend to vote against the Throne Speech. The field of arts and culture will receive added encouragement and help in the form of larger financial grants.

An Indian and Metis branch of government will be established. Its responsibility will be to raise the standard of living of the Indian and Metis people to a level closer to that enjoyed by their fellow citizens.

Mr. Berezowsky: — Did they ask for it?

Mr. Steuart: — And again, the member from Cumberland rose in his place and I think made a shocking statement. For twenty years these people have failed the Indian and Metis people, and have failed them badly. Before we even started on our new program, a program that we say and we claim will do everything possible to raise the living standards of our native people, he stood up and he condemned it. Mr. Speaker, I don't think the native people in this province will forget or forgive what he said.

Mr. Berezowsky: — Mr. Speaker, on a point of order, I . . .

Mr. Steuart: — I didn't say you condemned the Indians but you might just as well have condemned them. For twenty years you condemned them to live as second-rate citizens, and when we are trying to do something about it you have the nerve to stand up in your place and condemn us before we even got going. You showed your true colors . . .

Some Hon. Members: — Hear, hear!

Mr. Steuart: — You showed your true colors, you have been going around this province, you and others like you, spreading fear about what we are trying to do. The first concrete step that any government of Saskatchewan has taken for over twenty years to do something for the Indian and Metis people and that was the answer for the hon. member for Cumberland (Mr. Berezowsky).

Some Hon. Members: — Hear, hear!

Mr. Berezowsky: — . . . buy liquor votes.

Some Hon. Members: — Hear, hear!

Mr. Steuart: — Mr. Speaker, we intend to increase the Saskatchewan minimum wage. And it will be interesting to watch the members opposite, the so-called friends of the little people. They stand up in their places and they say they will vote against the Throne Speech that will increase the minimum wage for the people of Saskatchewan.

Some Hon. Members: — Hear, hear!

Mr. Steuart: — The tourist industry has lagged too far behind for too long. It will be expanded and expenditures on tourist promotions will be increased. We intend to expand our provincial parks system. Our aim will be the development of eleven new regional parks in 1965. Mr. Speaker, the Premier stated earlier, and I think it's worth repeating, that we intend to co-operate with the government of Canada in the development of the Canada Pension Plan. Now, Mr. Speaker, this has not been a complete summary of everything contained in the Throne Speech, nor is the Throne Speech an indication of our entire legislative program for 1965. The Premier will bring down the budget on Friday, February 19th. This document, along with other legislation, will complete our plans for the first step of our four year program. It is interesting to note that at the end of this session of the legislature, we will have completed over half the program we took to the people of this province and upon which we were elected.

Some Hon. Members: — Hear, hear!

Mr. Steuart: — Mr. Speaker, we feel, and others share this feeling, that we have made a good beginning, and we are confident that when this session is completed, we will have placed Saskatchewan firmly on the road to greater prosperity and to new growth. We are equally confident that our policies will result in all of Saskatchewan's people sharing in this prosperity. Mr. Speaker, when I raised the question about the Indian and Metis department, the objections were taken by the hon. member from Cumberland (Mr. Berezowsky). I think this is one step that most people in this province look forward to and I think the eyes of this whole nation should be on this province. We will try to raise their standard of living.

I know we will succeed in bringing industrial and business development to the province of Saskatchewan, but it will not help us if we succeed, if we don't spread its benefits among all the people. This has been the aim throughout the years of the liberal party. This will continue to be the aim and the goal of the Liberal government.

Mr. Speaker, I will, of course, oppose the amendment and I will support the motion, and the finest Throne Speech this government has had in this province for twenty years.

Some Hon. Members: — Hear, hear!

Mr. A.M. Nicholson (Saskatoon City): — Mr. Speaker, I too would

like to congratulate you, as you assume your new duties. Your performance to date gives us all confidence that you will discharge your duties and uphold the very best traditions of this and other assemblies throughout the Commonwealth.

I must congratulate the representative from Athabaska (Mr. Guy) and the representative from Saskatoon (Mr. Merchant), who have moved and seconded the Address. I would like to endorse what has been said by the member for Arm River (Mr. Pederson) regarding the lady member for Saskatoon (Mrs. Merchant). She deserves credit for being the first Liberal to be elected to represent Saskatoon to either the federal or the provincial parliament for twenty-seven years, and naturally, the people of Saskatoon are not happy that, for the first time since the province was formed, our city has not had a member in the cabinet with exception of one legislature, when there didn't happen to be a government member elected in Saskatoon.

Mr. I.C. Nollet (Cut Knife): — Hang on.

Mr. Nicholson: — Since a number of new members are speaking with the knowledge that there is a vacancy in the cabinet, it would appear to most impartial observers that the lady member for Saskatoon has made one of the best speeches made by new members across the way.

Some Hon. Members: — Hear, hear!

Mr. Nicholson: — I do want to congratulate all the new members. I think that we have some excellent new material on both sides of the house. Naturally I am disappointed that Mrs. Strum, who represented Saskatoon in the last assembly, was short of votes on election day, but I am happy to have been re-elected, and that I am representing Saskatchewan's fastest growing city, the third fastest growing city in Canada and have along with me three very able young men who, I am convinced, will make a name for themselves and for Saskatoon in the years to come.

Before discussing the Throne Speech, I would like to make a few comments about the war on the poor of Saskatchewan, as was described so well by the lady member for Regina West (Mrs. Cooper) when she spoke the other day. I would like to say something about the social aid controversy in my own city of Saskatoon, the closing of Embury House, the withdrawal of funds from the institute of the aging, and the withdrawing of financial support from the centre for community studies on the Saskatoon campus of the university. Mr. Speaker, it appears to me that the Premier and the Minister of Social Welfare (Mr. Boldt) have failed to recognize that we are living in the last half of the twentieth century.

Some Hon. Members: — Hear, hear!

Mr. Nicholson: — When after ten years with the highest percentage of the working force unemployed of any country in the western world as a result of the advent of automation and cybernation, no problems are to be solved by the slashing of food expenses for the unfortunate people in this province who happen to be on social aid. Mr. Speaker, I appeal to members on both sides of the house, to do some educational work regarding this problem. I know it is very easy to criticize able-bodied people in this day and age who are on social aid, but the Minister just tabled an answer to a question showing that at the end of November, 1964, 19,243 people in the whole of Saskatchewan were on social aid, or less than two per cent of our entire population of my recollection of the population of Saskatchewan is correct. I must give them credit for reducing this number in the last twelve months, the number is down by 123 and that is worth mentioning. However, the costs are going up. He spent, in November, more money on social aid than in November a year ago and the average monthly payments were \$27.84 in November 1964, and \$27.29 in November 1963. Mr. Speaker, is there any reasonable person in Saskatchewan who will complain about making available \$27.84 per person, per month in this very affluent society of Saskatchewan, at a time when we are spending more than \$50,000,000 per year on liquor.

I don't know why the Minister of Social Welfare (Mr. Boldt) picked on the beautiful city of Saskatoon to launch his attack on the mayor and the city council regarding the administration of social aid. I think it is significant that while this attack began during our municipal elections, not one candidate for Mayor, or for city council considered that the minister's charges were valid, and certainly no one said that he

believed that there were chiselers, drunks or dead-beats in the city, abusing their privileges. I must thank the Saskatoon Star Phoenix for running four excellent articles on the controversial question. I wish I had time to review these articles. The Star Phoenix also carried a challenge in which I suggested that the minister and I should discuss some of these problems publicly in Saskatoon. I also suggested in good faith that the minister with his family should try living on these schedules for one month in the city of Regina. I have had no report that the minister will accept these suggestions. At that time I read in the University Sheaf the program as advocated by the Young Liberals on the Campus, "Let's Look at Social Welfare". It was a brief prepared on the campus for presentation to the Western University Liberal Federation Convention in Calgary. I am sure the young people wouldn't embarrass the government of Saskatchewan by recommending something that hadn't been cleared with the Premier, and the minister of Social Welfare (Mr. Boldt). What did the young Liberals on the campus say?

We say flatly that today there is increasing evidence that thousands of people are drawing social aid who are simply not entitled to it. Social aid in Canada, especially in this province, is becoming a scandal.

There is evidence that social aid on an ever-increasing scale is being given to chisellers, drunks and dead-beats, to people who are too lazy to work. Even the people in the social aid departments are rebelling in disgust at the waste of the taxpayer's money.

What has the Minister of Social Welfare to say about these charges levelled by the Young Liberals on the Campus?

An Hon. Member: — . . . at Sing Sing.

Mr. Nicholson: — Mr. Speaker, the young people took the remarks made by the Premier of the province in the legislature almost two years ago, when he was leader of the opposition, when he attacked social aid and I submit, Mr. Speaker, that with less than two per cent of the citizens in the province in this category, it ill behooves those of us who are fortunate enough to sit in this assembly to use this kind of language about some people I will have something to say about a little later on.

I am sure that hon. members will want to read the first annual review of the Economic Council of Canada published by the federal Liberal government. The chairman is John Deutsch, a distinguished graduate of Campion College. Here is a chart showing that the country in the western world with the highest percentage of the working force unemployed in 1962 was Canada with almost six per cent, United States about five and one-half per cent, Italy about three per cent, the United Kingdom a little less than three per cent, France under two per cent, Sweden about one and one-half per cent. Along with this description of the very serious unemployment problem in Canada, they tell us about the explosion in the work force that we are going to experience in the next five years. There is a table showing the percentage increase in the labour force between sixty and seventy. Again, in this chart, Canada will have the highest increase, higher than United States, Netherlands, Japan, France, Italy, United Kingdom and Germany. One of the sentences is significant:

The number of people in the 20 - 24 age group in the labour force, is expected to increase by 33 per cent from 1965 to 1970, and by 57 per cent over the ten year period, whereas the male labour force in this age group only increased 25,000 between 50 and 60, it is going to increase 270,000 between 60 and 70.

Now, Mr. Speaker, with these facts staring us in the face, how can one seriously suggest that slashing food allowances for the two per cent on social aid, is going to make any useful contribution in this day and age? The member for Pelly (Mr. Larson), made an excellent speech the other night. He referred to an article by Joan Callwood in MacLean's, January 23rd, entitled "Crisis in the Classroom", in which the prediction is made

that there are going to be a thousand twenty year olds coming on the labour market every day, from now on, with 4,000 losing their jobs each week because of automation. Let me repeat, 7,000 young people every week in Canada are going to be looking for jobs while 4,000 are losing them because of automation. I am really not surprised that the Premier, who unfortunately is not here at the moment, holds these views regarding welfare problems. When he was a member of the House of Commons, he caused us a great deal of embarrassment by recommending the introduction of the means test for family allowances and old age security, regardless of income. However, I am surprised that the Minister of Welfare (Mr. Boldt) shares these views. A member of his church was kind enough to send me out literature telling of the remarkable work done all over the world by the Mennonites. For this one year in Algeria, Argentina, Austria, Bolivia and many other countries, over \$2,000,000 was made available to help poor people.

Some Hon. Members: — Hear, hear!

Mr. Nicholson: — In the Christian Declaration on Peace and War, the first sentence reads:

We believe that war is altogether contrary to the teaching and spirit of Christ, and the Gospel, and that therefore war is sin.

I submit, Mr. Speaker, that while this refers to war on the battle fields, I am sure that members of his church will have something to say about the war on the poor in Saskatchewan, which was described by the member for Regina West, the other day.

I would like to come to a situation in Saskatoon, As this report would indicate, a very small percentage of our citizens in Saskatoon are drawing social aid, and I have the figures for the end of the month. At the National Employment Office, I was able to get a sample of the jobs that are available all over Canada. If you are a mechanical engineer you would not have any trouble finding work. On this particular day, on the last day of January, there were 5,086 men and women seeking work in the Saskatoon National Employment Office. A year ago, there were 5,011. There were 75 more people looking for work the last day of January of 1965, than in January last year, and, on that day, there were 1236 employable persons drawing social aid at Saskatoon. And when you check over these lists, you find, if you are a cost accountant, that you could go to Trail, B.C., Quebec, or Prince Rupert, at salaries from \$6,000 to \$8,500 but these people drawing social aid in Saskatoon couldn't go. If you were a civil engineer, you could go to Port Arthur, to Regina, to St. Catherines, and a number of other places. There were openings for dieticians in Lethbridge, Port Arthur, and Moncton, and openings for nurses in every province in Canada but only one X-Ray technician was wanted. But, Mr. Speaker, in all of Canada, there were only 878 jobs listed. I am not suggesting that these are all the jobs that were available, but these lists indicate that there simply were not enough jobs for those seeking employment.

Mr. Speaker, the major factor in electing the government across the way, was the firm commitment made by the Premier and the members of the cabinet that 80,000 new jobs would be provided in the next four years if there was a Liberal government. Now I am willing to give the Premier and his colleagues every chance, four years if necessary, but, Mr. Speaker, the government has been in office nine months next Monday. We had a most interesting ceremony yesterday when we raised the new flag. We would have an even more interesting ceremony next Monday, if the Premier could issue a press release, "Here are the 15,000 New Jobs which have been Provided in Saskatchewan".

Some Hon. Members: — Hear, hear!

Mr. Nicholson: — I understand . . .

Mr. Thatcher: — Give us time, you will get them.

Mr. Nicholson: — . . . that the Liberal party in Canada will be looking for a new leader some of these days, Mr. Speaker, and if the Premier of Saskatchewan can report some progress next Monday, he will stand a very good chance of becoming . . .

An Hon. Member: — . . . maybe he will be able to do it.

Mr. Nicholson: — . . . Prime Minister of Canada some day but, I would like to remind him, Mr. Speaker, that before some of the hon. members were born, we did have a Prime Minister who promised that he would banish unemployment from Canada or perish in the attempt. Mr. Bennett disappeared from the Canadian scene shortly after he tried earnestly for five years. Since no mention was made in the Throne Speech of this very firm commitment, I would not expect that the Premier will be calling a conference on Monday but I could be wrong. My guess is that there is a smaller number of people drawing wages or salaries in February of this year than in February a year ago.

This last weekend, the Saskatchewan Council of Public Affairs has had a winter conference on the theme "Tomorrow's Technology, Tomorrow's Society". One of the most stimulating speakers was Robert Theobald, an internationally known economist, author, and journalist from New York City. I am sorry I did not see anyone from the government side of the house at the Theobald meeting.

It is not easy to appreciate the changes that the combination of the computer, and the automatic machine will have on modern society during the next ten years. A good deal has been written about the revolutionary changes that are going to take place. I have been especially interested in the Ford Engine Plant near Cleveland where six cylinder engine blocks are turned out by the union of an electronic brain fed by twenty-seven miles of wire and forty-two mechanical hands in the form of automatic machine units. Through the joint complex, covering two city blocks, lead castings are pushed and pulled, turned in every direction, conveyed by and subjected to cuttings, drilling, milling, and boring and broaching in more than five hundred manless operations, each one checked and inspected only by the brain itself with performance and accuracy. Fully instructed in advance, it decides when the block is ready for the grinder, how far and fine it is to be ground, and where it is to move when it is done. A block that once took nine hours and 117 men to complete is now sped through in fifteen minutes with forty-one men. When Walter Ruether of United Auto Workers was taken through this plant, the general manager told him it is going to be difficult to collect union dues from these five hundred manless machines. "That's not the problem", said Ruether, "how are you going to sell automobiles to these machines?"

Mr. Theobald had some comments about his theories of high level guaranteed incomes that I will have something to say about later.

Now, let me come to the proposal made by the Minister of Welfare and the Premier, that food allowances for large families in receipt of social aid should be slashed. It should be explained that if you have more than one child you have a large family, according to this plan. The Premier and the minister should explain whether or not this is Saskatchewan's first move to check the increase in the world's population. The other day, in an answer to a question of mine, the minister said, that according to existing schedules, a family of father, mother and ten children under twelve years of age, would be entitled to \$172 for food in Regina and Saskatoon and to \$168 in Moose Jaw. He had suggested to the city councils in the three cities that these allowances should be slashed by \$18 per family or more than ten per cent. He also stated that the consumer index had increased by more than five points since the schedule had been established. The minister is reported to have said that \$18 a month for twelve people is only \$1.50 per month per person. A \$1.50 per month cut per person, isn't very much for a cabinet minister in the province of Saskatchewan, but I submit, Mr. Speaker, if you and your family were living on 16 cents a meal, for three meals a day, without any allowance for morning coffee, afternoon teas, or a snack in the evening, a slash of two cents a meal to cut this from 16 cents to 14 cents is very, very cruel.

Another answer gave me information regarding what it costs to feed people in jail nowadays, 32 cents a meal in Prince Albert. This is just twice what the family, father, mother and ten children would have per meal. Let me make it clear. I am not complaining about the food allowances being too high in jail, but it should be drawn to the attention of the minister that never in the middle ages, when authorities were much tougher than they are now, did they consider that twice as much per day should be spent on food for people in prison than would be allowed to them if the breadwinner had lost his job, or if a family had no breadwinner and they were eligible for social aid.

The Minister of Health (Mr. Steuart) is not in his place and I have forgotten to thank him for giving me a little extra time out of this deal. He distributed a very interesting booklet, entitled "How to plan meals for your Family", which is published by the federal Department of National Health and Welfare and distributed by the provinces. It gives some very interesting information on ways to keep food costs down and how to save on milk, (you should buy milk in the form of skim milk or milk powder), how to save on fruit, how to save on vegetables, how to save on bread, how to save on meat, fish, eggs, and how to save on extra food.

And then they supply a market order for a family of four for a week. Here it is commencing on page 16. They suggest that this family should have fourteen quarts of milk for the week. They suggest the amount they should have for vegetables and everything, and the minister even goes to the trouble to work out the menu that we might have. You see, today is Tuesday, isn't it? Well, now if we were following the minister's advice, for breakfast this morning we might have had vitaminized apple juice, bran flakes, toast, jam, milk or coffee. For lunch at noon, macaroni and cheese, carrot sticks, stewed prunes, cookies, milk, tea or coffee. For dinner, cold pork, scalloped potatoes, peas, butterscotch pie, milk or coffee.

Hon. D.G. Steuart (Prince Albert): — I would rather have cold beef.

Mr. Nicholson: — Well, we would do fairly well on this. I asked my favorite store, the Saskatoon Co-op, to price these groceries that the Minister of Health suggested and they gave me an estimate of \$112.50 for one month. Now, some people might think, with a Scottish name such as the Minister of Health has, that he would want people to have good food and plenty of it with sufficient variety so that they might have good health and thereby keep down hospital and medical bills. This suggestion would do an injustice to the much maligned Scottish people. I am sure that the minister suggests this shopping list so that everyone in Saskatchewan might be able to look as healthy and happy as he appears to be. I wish that he would speak to the Minister of Welfare.

Hon. A.H. McDonald (Moosomin): — No commercials.

Mr. Nicholson: — I would like to suggest, that the Minister of Social Welfare has unfortunately slashed this grocery order from \$112.50 to \$82 or a slash of 27 per cent and he has suggested that the allowance be cut further from \$82 to \$80 for this family, father, mother, girl and boy — the boy 9, the girl 13. Oh, I am sorry, the Minister of Health is there. I couldn't see him since he was out of his seat.

Hon. A.H. McDonald (Moosomin): — Can't see . . .

Mr. Nicholson: — No, I was looking at his own place. I am sure he will get together with the Minister of Welfare . . .

Hon. A.H. McDonald (Moosomin): — None of that.

Mr. Nicholson: — . . . and do something about it. Before I go on to my next topic, Mr. Theobald and a group of very distinguished American economists have come up with a theory which does not get support from every economist but they are drawing support in Canada as well as in the U.S.A. The American economists give Canada credit for introducing family allowances and old age security for everyone over seventy, as ways to raise living standards. I was interested to note that Professor Charles of the economics Department of the University of Manitoba, had adjusted the figures that the Americans have suggested. He proposes a guaranteed family income for everyone. This is how Professor Charles sets it out — that if you are unemployed and had no income you would fill out your income tax returns and would show your income to be zero and you would set out a basic income of \$1,500 for yourself, a basic income of \$1,500 for your wife and a basic exemption of \$500 for each of your children or \$1,000 — a total of \$4,000. You would send this in to Ottawa and in a very few days the government, through the computer, would have a cheque come out to you for \$4,000. If you were a cabinet minister, you of course, would have your regular income as a cabinet minister taken into consideration, but no one in Canada would have less than \$4,000 per year for a family of father, mother and two children. And I submit, Mr. Speaker, that

in this day of automation and cybernation, that is not more revolutionary than the suggestion made at the end of World War I that the people of Canada would provide family allowance to everyone as a matter of right.

Well, Mr. Speaker, the next subject that I want to say something about is the closing of Embury House. The minister, I understand is following me. I am sure he will want to have something to say about this. The subject has been dealt with very well by the member for Regina North. It is shocking that this backward step should be taken without the minister, the Premier, or some member of the cabinet going to Embury House, sitting down with the staff and asking: "Now, what sort of problems do you have here? What harm will result if Embury House is closed?" the Minister of Health is reported to have said, according to the Leader Post, that Embury House was just a show without coming to grips with the problem. This statement could only have been made out of profound ignorance. I think that the statement that the Minister of Welfare is alleged to have said, that only sixty per cent of the boys received benefits, if true, is a shocking statement for anyone to make who is in public life.

I am glad to see the minister back, I wrote a letter to him to which he hasn't replied yet. In my letter I made three suggestions which I thought would be helpful. I suggested that he visit the provincial jails, with the Premier, and ask the superintendents: "What sort of problems do you have here, as a result of the emotionally disturbed children who did not receive help?" If he accepted this advice, I am sure he secured some information. I suggested that he invite one of the boys to his home for a month and that he ask the Premier to read the case histories after he had read them himself. Since I did not get a reply, and since nothing was done about continuing Embury House, I presume that he did not consider these of sufficient importance.

The Toronto Star Weekly sent someone to Saskatchewan to find out something more about Embury House. The premier is reported to have said that "some people have said that we are turning out potential murderers". He admitted that he probably made a mistake, but nothing has been done yet. Here is what the Star Weekly says about David, (a fictitious name) a twelve year old who had been in trouble almost continuously since the break-up of the family six years ago:

David established a savage record for stealing, fighting and skipping school when he was only nine years old. When he was admitted to Embury House three years ago, he confessed to setting twenty-seven fires. After a year of treatment, during which he showed marked improvement, he was withdrawn from the House by relatives over the protests of the staff. The old pattern swiftly reasserted itself. He skipped school as often as seventeen days a month, failed, fought, stole and went back to setting fires. He was committed to Embury House once more by a court and the long climb to normality resumed.

Last year, David missed three days of school. The Premier is quite right in saying that these boys go to school. They are not retarded. They are boys who have been very seriously damaged when they were three or four, or five or six, through no fault of their own. David passed with honors. Fighting and stealing stopped and so did the fires. Last summer, during a visit to one of the parks, he saw a sign, "The animals in this park are under government control". David said:

I used to think that the government cared more about bears than kids, but I guess we are under government protection too.

And then when David was advised that Embury House was going to close, what did he say, according to the Toronto Star?

I guess the government doesn't give a damn about us anymore, does it?

I presume David is one of the boys who has been sent to Winnipeg. I am familiar with his case history. I ask the minister, when he is speaking after me, to tell this house what David has done to deserve

this treatment. When I wrote my letter, I had before me in Harold Winch's office in Ottawa, a weapon which was manufactured by a former Saskatchewan boy, who should have gone to Embury House but didn't. This boy has been in the Saskatchewan jail and in the Saskatchewan penitentiary. He featured, with two others, in the incident in the penitentiary in British Columbia, where for fourteen hours a guard was held with this very weapon. Here is one boy who is still hitting out against society. While he was in the penitentiary his first teacher wrote me. She said:

Surely the Department of Rehabilitation is able to do something about a boy who should have a life other than a life in crime.

Here is a young lad who will have cost society over one hundred thousand dollars before he is very old, unless something is done and, in his present state of mind; he is not getting very much help. The closing of Embury House is really a great shock to people who have the welfare of children in mind. These boys cannot be cared for in a general hospital. The majority of them do improve to the point where they might be able to resume a normal life, and the annual cost of running Embury House may well be less than the future cost of crime for any one of the boys concerned.

Mr. Speaker, when the CCF government began to plan for the Golden Jubilee, my predecessors in the welfare department, Mr. Valleau, Mr. Sturdy and Mr. Bentley, were able to develop a very keen interest all over Saskatchewan, in providing better care for our senior citizens. Our province was the first to provide supplementary allowances at age seventy for people who had nothing else but the Old Age Pension, We were the first province in Canada to build hostels, taking advantage of funds made available by the federal government, and the only province, until 1962, when Manitoba applied for and received one loan. Those who were at Swift Current on the 9th of October, 1963, when the new Geriatric Centre was opened, would hear the parliamentary assistant Minister of Health, Dr. Stanley Haidasz, who represented Judy LaMarsh. He said that the men in charge of the Department of National Health and Welfare are generally interested in Geriatric Centres, and the people of this province should be proud, and their government should be proud of taking the initiative and being the first in Canada to provide a centre such as this for its people.

My namesake in the Federal Cabinet, who was in charge of Central Mortgage and Housing until very recently, sent me, in October of this last year, a copy of a brief which was presented to the Senate Committee on Aging. This is a very interesting booklet, telling what is being done and what should be done in the field of housing for elderly people. All the members will be interested in knowing that of the eleven pages of pictures which are shown in this book, three pages are from Saskatchewan. These pictures show facilities at Swift Current, Meadow Lake, Whitewood, Indian Head and Regina. They were kind enough to say that:

from the outset of the scheme which began to operate in 1956, the provincial minister and his staff have gone out to explain the needs of old people and to interpret the way in which local governments can organize to meet requirements.

It is hard to understand why this work should stop so abruptly. In June of 1959, a province-wide conference on aging was held. It was attended by 124 persons, including representatives from interested agencies and organizations and from provincial and federal government personnel. The conference recommended to the cabinet that a public committee should be appointed to develop a frame work of services and facilities for Saskatchewan over the next several years. The cabinet accepted this recommendation. On January 8, 1960, an order-in-council was passed and the committee was established. The federal government was sufficiently interested in this project to contribute two-thirds of the cost. I would like to commend the people from Saskatchewan — the Saskatchewan Chamber of Commerce, the Provincial Council of Women, the College of Physicians and Surgeons, the Roman Catholic Church, the Co-operative Union of Canada, the Pensioners, the Saskatchewan Association of Rural Municipalities, the Saskatchewan Urban Municipalities Association and the Regina Ministerial Association. The report that was prepared again was the first and finest which was produced on the Canadian scene. I am sure that the Minister will have some regrets, as we plan for our Diamond Centenary, that we are not going to be able to have the personnel available to carry on these activities to

involve the people in the working out of programs, such as meals on wheels, and finding out whether better care might be provided in peoples' homes.

Well, Mr. Speaker, I mentioned that I would like to say something about the withdrawal of funds for the Centre for Community Studies. I realize that I have been speaking for some time but I do want to draw the attention of the house to the fact that this is a centre whose activities have been recognized all over the country as being important. The member for Turtleford (Mr. Wooff) made some reference to an article in Maclean's on our "invisible poor". The federal government, through ARDA is facing up to the fact that roughly twenty per cent of our people are very poor and that we should have a war on poverty rather than on the poor. I think that the minister of Welfare, the Minister of Agriculture, the Minister of Municipal Affairs and the Minister of Education, all have some interest in having this type of work continue.

The item in the Throne Speech, referring to a new jail is a matter in which the Member for Saskatoon welcomed, but I am disturbed that in this day and age the government of Saskatchewan visualizes having so many women in jail. For the benefit of House, I should say that the women of Saskatchewan are much better behaved than the men. The last figures gave the population of the men in the provincial prisons and federal prisons being a ratio of forty men for every one woman.

In 1956, the Fauteux Commission Report was brought down. It recommended that the federal government take over responsibility for all who were serving sentences of more than six months, For the benefit of those who have never been in trouble, I might advise that if you get a sentence for more than two years, you become the responsibility of the federal government. If the sentence is for less than two years, the province looks after you. This proposal that no one would be the responsibility of the province who is serving more than six months will drastically reduce this number, and furthermore, the average number of women in the Saskatchewan penitentiary at any given time has been only about twenty. The proposal to spend \$800,000 even if you could put seventy people in there, would work out at an average of over \$11,000 per person. A very high percentage of these are Indian or Metis, who are in for very short periods. I would think that, if the government is determined to spend \$800,000, it would be well to consider the recommendation made by the Fauteux Commission that there should be smaller minimum security quarters. I am not going to suggest definite places where women's prisons might be built but for \$800,000, you could build \$200,000 institutions in four places. I am not going to suggest that constituencies represented here be considered but the minister might consider Meadow Lake, Nipawin, Melville, Yorkton, Estevan, Maple Creek as well as Prince Albert, where for \$200,000 it would build a very sizeable place. But I am sure that . . .

Mr. Thatcher: — May I ask the hon. member a question?

Mr. Nicholson: — Yes.

Hon. Mr. Thatcher: — Do I understand him to say that he is opposed to the building of this \$800,000 jail in Prince Albert?

Mr. Nicholson: — Oh yes, very definitely. I think it is shocking to propose an expenditure of \$800,000 for a women's jail in Saskatchewan in the year 1965, when the federal government is committed to move into this field and to take responsibility for caring for all people who are serving more than six months.

Some Hon. Members: — Hear, hear!

Hon. D.G. Steuart: — May I ask a question? When is the federal committed?

Mr. Nicholson: — The federal government was committed while Mr. Garson was Minister of Justice . . .

Mr. Thatcher: — Oh when . . .

Mr. Nicholson: — Oh no, no, and Mr. Favreau after the riots in St.

Vincent de Paul said "At last we are going to take action and we are going to move in every province in Canada . . .

Mr. Thatcher: — You have five years to do something about that.

Mr. Nicholson: — Still waiting, still waiting. Still waiting for the federal government . . . I think it should be said . . .

Mr. Thatcher: — Humanity first.

Mr. Nicholson: — No, it should be said in defence of Mr. Garson, his career as Minister of Justice was rudely ended in 1957, and while Mr. Fulton agreed with the provinces to continue to implement the agreement, Mr. Fulton too was changed. It so happens that there have been several elections and several Federal Ministers of Justice but the federal government, both Liberal and Conservative departments of Justice, are committed to honor this commitment to the provinces. If the department can justify having . . .

Mr. Thatcher: — If you are going to pass the buck to the federal government . . .

Mr. Nicholson: — Mr. Speaker, if you reduce the number of people who are going to be taken out of the responsibility of the province, at no time in the history of the province did you ever have a large group such as has been contemplated. These women are serving very short sentences in violation of liquor laws, and a very high percentage of them are Indian and Metis, and certainly the government of Saskatchewan will have to explain to the women of this province how they figure out that in the next four years they are going to require accommodation for seventy women in a place where it will cost \$11,000 for the accommodation of each one. Nowhere in Canada that I know of is it contemplated to build so large or so costly a facility for this type of person.

Mr. Speaker, you will gather that I will be voting for the amendment and against the motion.

Some Hon. Members: — Hear, hear!

Hon. L.P. Coderre (Gravelbourg): — In rising to take part in this debate, Mr. Speaker, I wish to congratulate you on your elevation to this office, knowing that you come from the same area as one of our former Speakers in Saskatchewan, a part of the country which has brought dignity in the capacity of the Speaker. I know that you, too, Sir, will continue to conduct the affairs of this house in the British tradition with which you are so very conversant.

I would like to congratulate all those who have participated in the debate thus far. The contribution made by the members has been enlightening and encouraging to all. Although I must say that I am not in agreement at all with what has been said from the other side of the house.

I was rather amused by the statements mentioned by the hon. member for Regina East last night (Mr. Smishek) that I had made violent attacks on labour. For the attitude that I have taken toward the gangster type, and the politically ambitious type of labour bosses, Mr. Speaker, I make no apologies to anyone.

Since being appointed as Minister of Labour, the doors of my office have been open. The doors of the Department of Labour have been open to everyone — to every rank and file employee or employer in this province — to every labour business agent or manager. Since taking over the Department of Labour I have had the pleasure of meeting many business agents and shop stewards and I find that all that I have met have proven to be upright, upstanding citizens that can take their place in society, side by side, along with the best people of this province. This we can not say about the politically ambitious type who use the sweat of the working people as a stepping stone to power. To these, I make no apologies.

Some mention was made about the Federation of Labour meeting

in Moose Jaw, there were at least three or four newspaper reporters present as well as radio commentators. The reports of this meeting in my opinion were correct. I confirm them. The reporters are honest and doing a job and stating the facts as they see them. The facts, we say are that a cold, cold, stony silence was suggested for me. This was discussed a matter of minutes before I entered, and this is precisely what happened. I was received with a cold, cool welcome.

I also find I have been accused of violating labour standards and labour organization. I have no intentions of violating any of the codes of labour. The Department of Labour is here today, was there yesterday and will continue to be here tomorrow.

Some Hon. Members: — Hear, hear!

Mr. Coderre: — The intent of the Department of Labour has been to look after the affairs of employees in this province, and it will continue to be so.

Since my entry into the cabinet, I have had the opportunity of speaking at several meetings, labour and otherwise. In all cases, I have been given the usual applause and I have been well received. At the Moose Jaw meeting, when I went to the platform, the ovation and the applause were conspicuous by their absence. The introduction was cold and informal. I was introduced in this manner, Mr. Speaker: "Resolution no. 44, everybody in favor, raise their hands." "Resolution no. 54, — Oh, we have the Minister of Labour, he will speak to you." That was the introduction, Mr. Speaker. A very cordial introduction! The reception, or the applause after my speech, Mr. Speaker, was very, very scattered. I must say, though, that after the meeting, I had many calls that evening and the next day from people apologizing for the attitude of some of those in charge.

An Hon. Member: — . . . particularly the member for Regina.

Mr. Coderre: — I expect, Mr. Speaker, that because of the nature of the greetings I received on that particular day, many people have come into my office and we have had good, close, consultations with labour business agents. For this reception, Mr. Speaker, I thank those who were responsible for agitating against me. I was rather amused by the attempts of the members from Regina to somewhat disassociate themselves and discredit those who reported the news of that time.

Some mention was also made regarding the dismissal of the former Deputy Minister of Labour. The member from Regina East stated that great pressure had been brought to bear upon me for the dismissal of the former deputy. This is a fabrication. I had been aware of his activities for quite awhile and I had criticized his actions. Upon my arrival in the department, I went to see the deputy. He, in turn, introduced me to the branch heads. We then retired to my office to discuss various matters. I then indicated to him that I was not too sure of his future. That depended a lot upon himself. We had a discussion and I indicated that I expected complete allegiance to the administration from every one of the staff. He was not prepared to give me this assurance and said "I cannot serve two masters". I wonder who the other master was?

Some Hon. Members: — Hear, hear!

Mr. Coderre: — I then felt that such a statement warranted my asking him for his resignation, which I did and which he refused to give. He told me that the next step was up to me. His appointment being by Order-in-Council required the withdrawal of Order-in-Council. This was done and the press was advised. Need I say more?

In regard to appointments to the various boards and committees I feel that I am in no way obligated to the Federation of Labour because of its dedication to our defeat in the next election. I have indicated, time and again, that I am more than prepared to meet with the various Labour Councils, Trade Association, and Unions in the province. This I have done, from time to time.

I am responsible to the people of Saskatchewan and I will make the appointments to boards and commissions to the best of my ability, to serve the needs of the people of Saskatchewan generally, and not a few

persons within some special organization.

Some Hon. Members: — Hear, hear!

Mr. Coderre: — It is common knowledge among staff members within my department that some attempts had been made to dispense with the services of the former deputy, but some way or the other these attempts never materialized. Sometimes I wonder who was putting on the pressure to keep him there. The vociferous remarks made by the hon. member from Regina East were very numerous and somewhat irrelevant. I regret that I have bored some members on this side of the house with this type of rebuttal. I feel that I, as Minister of Labour, should concern myself more in the presenting of reports to this house.

Before we go, let us make a statement that is applicable to the people of this province, "Labour disgraces no man, but there are men who disgrace labour."

Some Hon. Members: — Hear, hear!

Mr. Coderre: — I repeat I will always oppose those who exploit the employee, whether it be unscrupulous political employers or unscrupulous political bosses. I pledge myself above all to look after the welfare of the employees of this province as long as I am the Minister of Labour.

Some Hon. Members: — Hear, hear!

Mr. Coderre: — Some comments were also made in regard to the Labour Relations Board. The comments received from all sectors of our provincial economy have been most favorable in regards to the present Labour Relations Board. Whether we have ex-K.O.D's, or ex-merchants or ex-labour people on the Board, this in no way indicates that it is an ineffective and a good Board. I am sure all sectors of the economy, including the people of Saskatchewan, are happy to see a truly quasi-judicial Board in operation and which is doing justice to all the people concerned.

Some Hon. Members: — Hear, hear!

Mr. Coderre: — There are persons that we all like to avoid, Mr. Speaker. These are the perpetual fault finders. So busy are the chronic complainers that their lives are filled with one series of wails and grievances after another. This seems to be a chronic ailment of my good friends across the way, Mr. Speaker.

Here is what they normally do. They are always able to find something wrong with everything. They never give credit to anything, or to anyone. They constantly agitate and promote trouble. Who of us who have tried to do good work have not heard the constant wailings from across the way? As Minister of Labour and Co-operation, I consider it my duty and my privilege to inform the house of the progress made by the departments of which I have been in charge since taking office belatedly on May 22nd. I shall report to this house first on the activities of the Department of Labour, then on the Department of Co-operation. Before doing that, Mr. Speaker, I want to express my most profound gratitude to the people of the Gravelbourg constituency for electing me for the third time to be their representative in the Saskatchewan legislature.

Some Hon. Members: — Hear, hear!

Mr. Coderre: — I shall do my very best to deserve their confidence in the future. I hope that the services which they have been denied in the past will be supplied by the government which is now in office.

I should like, at this time, to pay a sincere tribute to a group of people who have made my task very much easier, namely the staff of the Department of Labour and the staff of the Department of Co-operation for their efficient work and for their devotion to duty. This, Mr. Speaker, has greatly facilitated my task and that of my immediate assistants.

The whole program, Mr. Speaker, as depicted in the Speech from the Throne is one of a practical, sensible approach to the problems facing

the people of Saskatchewan. We must meet this challenge squarely if we are to become one of the provinces that will be on top industrially and otherwise. Diversification, Mr. Speaker, will continue to be our aim in the industrialization of this province. What pleases me greatly, Mr. Speaker, as Minister of Labour, is that this will provide employment for the people of our province. It will raise the standard of living for the people of the province, and will lower seasonal unemployment. Already this has been felt in our economy. We have already one thousand fewer unemployed people after the most severe winter that Saskatchewan probably has ever has. This augurs well for the future of the province, Mr. Speaker.

Some Hon. Members: — Hear, hear!

Mr. Coderre: — This is one of the reasons

Mr. Smishek: — . . . why don't . . .

Mr. Coderre: — You had your chance to speak yesterday, I didn't interfere so you keep quiet and give me a chance to speak or do you continuously agitate this way? It is at times like this that the opposition should be constructive instead of being destructive, and continually finding fault. I am tired of hearing false words. I have been tired for quite a few years from watching the ineptness in the administration, and the people of Saskatchewan have been tired after twenty years and now I am sure that the people of the province will appreciate progressive thoughts that were put into the Speech from the Throne.

The Department of Labour was established to administer statutes adopted by the legislature, to evaluate and publish information relating to labour conditions. It administers statutes relating to the safe construction and operation of pressure vessels, elevators, electrical, gas and other installations, theatres, public halls, prevention and suppression of fires, apprenticeship training, the qualifications of tradesmen, wages, hours of work, holidays and conditions of employment, labour management relations and the various safety programs.

Safety programs apply particularly to the suppression of fires, and the safe construction and operation of pressure vessels, electrical and gas appliances. Over one-half of the total staff of the Department of Labour are employed in some aspect of safety work. This proportion indicates, Mr. Speaker, the importance of which we attach to safety in industry and in the home. The staff of our safety services division is doing a very good job. I believe that when all the data for the year 1964 are in we will find that in matters of safety that our province will occupy an enviable rank amongst other Canadian provinces. We do our best, Mr. Speaker, to prevent industrial and other accidents. As more and more industry is brought into the province, we may expect an extension and expansion of safety services.

You know, of course, Mr. Speaker, that the Workmen's Compensation Board is empowered to deal with the prevention of accidents in places of employment, and to process claims for compensation in case of injury or death of wage earners and salaried employee.

Apparently the meeting that took place in Moose Jaw, at which I was so well received, is opposed to co-ordinated planning by the government, employers and society. I wonder what these political heelers did to convince the former administration what they should do insofar as apprenticeship training is concerned? How would they promote it? We concern ourselves, Mr. Speaker, today, with automation and cybernation, and nothing seems to have been done about it. From the moment I assumed office, Mr. Speaker, I have heard wailings from across the way and at meetings and gatherings about what we are doing. We propose to do something about it. We are a government that will do something, not a government that will just talk.

Some Hon. Members: — Hear, hear!

Mr. Coderre: — The Apprenticeship and Tradesmen Qualification Branch is another important unit of the Department of Labour. This branch is responsible for the administration of the Apprenticeship and Tradesmen Qualification Act and regulations made thereunder. The act and regulations govern tradesmen in seventeen designated trades. The purpose of these regulations is to facilitate the training of skilled tradesmen and

to establish the standard of qualification in the trade. Since May 22nd, Mr. Speaker, we have held consultations with representatives of labour unions, private agencies and other government departments with a view to finding ways and means of improving our apprenticeship training program for the benefit of all the working people of Saskatchewan and especially for boys and girls in their late teens who are entering the labour force.

We are fully aware that the age of automation creates problems in training and education, problems which require the co-operation of industry, labour, government and even the opposition. Accordingly we intend to study manpower requirements, existing facilities for training and upgrading of workers, whether employed or unemployed, and methods of preparing our younger workers for the part which they are destined to play tomorrow.

I may say that we will take a new approach. We will be deeply concerned with the overall problem of training and education. We will do our best to make more on-the-job training available to our young workers. The ultimate objective, Mr. Speaker, will be a comprehensive training program and, needless to say, the raising of the general level of technical training as well as academic learning.

To accomplish these objectives, Mr. Speaker, our department will continue to consult with the appropriate federal agencies in matters pertaining to technical and vocational training and up-grading. As indicated under the terms of the federal labour code, employees under federal jurisdiction across Canada will probably become entitled to a new minimum wage, to certain holidays and other privileges which they have not had in the past. It is our intention, Mr. Speaker, that some of these benefits should go to our Saskatchewan employees under provincial jurisdiction, having regard, Mr. Speaker, to the economic potential of our province. We also believe that the young members of the labour force, that is today boys and girls of seventeen and over, should be entitled to the same minimum wage as their older fellows. We are now waiting for a final report from the Minimum Wage Board which will make recommendations.

I am very happy to see that the government of Canada is entering upon a pension plan. It is only right that we should provide for the welfare of our older people who have been in the labour field. It is much better to do it on that basis rather than do it piece-meal and a regional basis.

Mr. Speaker, as my time is running out, I think I should say a few words about the Department of Co-operation. I would be remiss in my duty, Mr. Speaker, if I did not report on some of the general activities that have taken place in this department. It needs to be repeated again and again as to what has happened. Ever since Saskatchewan became a province, the policy of the Liberal party, Mr. Speaker, has been to encourage people to help themselves both by means of private enterprise and by co-operative methods. This is what has made Saskatchewan what it is today. Many of our settlers of the early days worked together co-operatively to make their community a better community. In the past the Liberal party introduced legislation to improve marketing procedures of farm produce and the purchasing of farm supplies and to raise living standards in general. In the field of co-operative legislation we have the Co-operative Elevator Act in 1911, long before the CCF party was born. Even before this, there was legislation to federate local co-operatives creameries. These acts were followed, Mr. Speaker, by special acts of the legislature to organize co-operatives and stock yards, both in the north and the south. Approval was given for the organizing of the Wheat Pool, the Livestock Pool, the Poultry Pool, the Saskatchewan Co-operatives Wholesales and many others. Later still there was legislation leading to the successful re-organization of the Co-operative Creameries after the drought and the depression of the thirties. A special committee of the legislature, appointed during the session in 1939 to investigate the cost of the manufacturing and distribution of farm machinery, made recommendations that resulted in the organization of the Canadian Co-operative Implements Ltd. In 1944 the legislature of the day approved a special act to organize a Saskatchewan Co-operative Credit Society to act as a central deposit and lending agency for the credit union movement.

Now, turning to general co-operative acts, making possible the organization of local farm supply co-operatives, legislation was passed late in 1913. It is the basis for the general Co-operative Associations Act, under which retail farm production surplus co-operatives were organized. This was followed, Mr. Speaker, in 1914 by the organization which

became the Co-operation and Markets Branch, which in turn became the foundation of the present Department of Co-operation.

In 1926 we had the Co-operative Marketing Association Act. In 1937, the Credit Union Act was passed at a time, Mr. Speaker, when very few people in the province believed that it was possible to organize and operate credit unions, especially in rural areas, a period in the midst of drought and depression. The need to encourage people to build up their savings and to make them more independent financially was clearly recognized in this legislation at that particular time. It has paid dividends in the rapid growth of the credit unions ever since that time.

The three public co-operative and credit union acts which I mentioned, along with special charters and special co-operative acts, have enabled people, particularly our farmers, to lay the foundation of what has made Saskatchewan the co-operative province of Canada.

Some Hon. Members: — Hear, hear!

Mr. Coderre: — Our party believes, Mr. Speaker, that the purpose of co-operatives and credit unions is to serve the economic and social needs of people without regard to race, creed, or politics. We believe, Sir, that co-operatives and credit unions, along with the private and public sectors in our free enterprise economy, are entitled to certain government services as they need them. Since becoming Minister of the Department of Co-operation and Co-operative Development, I have reviewed its services and its operating policies. I have tried to learn as much as possible about the services that co-operatives and credit unions provide for people, especially in the low income brackets. I can assure the members of the house that this government intends to continue the historic policy of our party, of making it possible for citizens, regardless of race, creed or politics, to use co-operative and credit union methods whenever and wherever they believe there is a need for this service. We will continue to amend co-operative and credit union legislation as is needed from time to time. Moreover, we intend to give special assistance wherever we can to people in the lower income brackets. This will, of course, include our Indian and Metis population.

Some Hon. Members: — Hear, hear!

Mr. Coderre: — I am sure, Mr. Speaker, that the co-operative movement seeks no special favors but wants to stand on its own two feet, and it does. At the same time, in view of the service that it has performed for the province, it is entitled to its share of government services, along with other types of business. We intend to see that these services are continued as they are needed.

I would like to review briefly the present situation in the cooperative field. However, in view of the time, I will have to postpone this to some future occasion.

During 1964, Mr. Speaker, the Saskatchewan Co-operatives had the largest volume of business in their history. It is a well known fact, Mr. Speaker, that there is hardly a farmer in this province who does not make use of some kind of co-operative. It is for this reason, Mr. Speaker, that co-operatives handled sixty-three per cent of the grain marketed in Saskatchewan, seventy-five per cent of the dairy products, fifty-nine per cent of the cattle and calves, and over fifty per cent of all the fish produced. Co-operatives in the farm supply field are large handlers of petroleum products for farm use, although their share of the overall provincial retail sales has remained almost stationary in the past few years.

During the six month period ending March 30th, the credit union movement experienced its greatest growth for any comparable period in the history of the province. The member for Assiniboia mentioned the other day that the world's largest credit union is right here in Saskatchewan. The co-operative movement in Saskatchewan, in the processing, manufacturing, retailing, and credit services fields, has become part of the way of life for many people, and much more needs to be done. The importance of co-operative methods is assisting people of developing countries and is gaining increasing recognition. These methods are one phase of winning the race against time, against subversive elements on the one hand and near starvation on the other hand. Many of these countries need assistance and technical know-how. They need to know how to encourage people to work together towards their own economic salvation. They need training in

co-operative methods.

I was happy to note, Mr. Speaker, that last fall a group of thirty-nine people of various under-privileged countries of the world came to Saskatchewan to take courses at the Co-operative College in Saskatoon. I had the privilege of meeting them and I could see in the eyes and in the hearts of these people their grave concern over subversive elements in the world. They feel that they can rally the people of their own countries, underprivileged as they are, to a common cause to help each other and to lift them out of the morass of poverty. They feel that they will be doing their jobs as their brother's keepers. It is the duty of all of us here to do what we can to help these people in their problems, whether through co-operative or other methods. We are doing that in Northern Saskatchewan among many of our Indians and Metis. I think we should do more in helping them and I am happy to see the government of Saskatchewan has taken a stand in providing this type of service to assist these people. I am sure that we will work hand in glove with that department. All in all the work of the Department of Labour, Mr. Speaker, and the work of the Department of Co-operation and Co-operative Development is for the people of Saskatchewan. they will continue to serve them as best they can.

In view of the remarks I have made about both departments, Mr. Speaker, It is quite obvious that I will not support the amendment, but that I will support the motion.

Thank you very much.

Some Hon. Members: — Hear, hear!

Mr. H.H.P. Baker (Regina East): — Mr. Speaker, I want to say how pleased I am to be able to rise in this house for the first time to speak on this occasion. I am somewhat annoyed to find that new members have to wait until 5:15 to speak. I came here expecting to speak at 4:15 or 4:30. We were informed that the ministers of the crown gave reports on their departments after the Speech from the Throne. I suggest there should be some re-arrangement for the new members to speak during the second week on the Speech from the Throne. It was my understanding, when I came here, that former members speak during the first week. However, I am quite pleased and honoured to stand here and say a few words on the Throne Speech.

First of all I would like to welcome everyone in this house to their Capital City, the greatest city in Canada.

Some Hon. Members: — Hear, hear!

Mr. Baker: — Yes, the greatest city in Saskatchewan. I don't like to mention the word Saskatoon. I see the hon. lady member from Saskatoon, (Mrs. Merchant), isn't here. I wanted to extend to her a special welcome. If I don't the Saskatoon City administration will be down my neck. But you know, the Saskatoon people and their MLA's say a lot of things about the fine city of Regina. In fact, they refer to us as a sort of Victorian city where the streets are so narrow that the dogs cannot wag their tails sideways — they wag them up and down. However, I must say that the good city of Saskatoon is the best laid out city in all of Canada . . .

An Hon. Member: — Did you hear that Sandy?

Mr. Baker: — . . . and the reason for that, of course, is that it has been dead for twenty years. But, in a way, we always like to recognize the Hub City here, and welcome those members on this side of the house as well as those on the other side. We are pleased to have you in our midst.

I want to congratulate you, Mr. Speaker, on your appointment. I believe it was a good one. I don't think we could have picked anyone on this side of the house or the other side who could do greater justice to that office.

Some Hon. Members: — Hear, hear!

Mr. Baker: — I know what it is like, in fact I feel sorry for you at times, because I have sat on city councils and have had to control Liberals in the main over the past six or seven years . . .

Mr. J.E. Brockelbank (Saskatoon City): — Pretty unruly bunch.

Mr. Baker: — I want to congratulate the Premier and all the members to this legislature on their election. I wish them the best. I recall meeting one of the former Liberal members on the street during the election campaign. When we met, he said: "I won't wish you good luck, but I'll wish you good health." Anyway, I will wish the Premier good luck and good health in the future. I want to congratulate the dean of the legislature, Mr. J.H. Brockelbank (Kelsey) on his excellent performance.

Today I want to do something a little different, if I may, Mr. Speaker. I don't want it to be construed as sort of a bribe or expect any kick-backs. I am going to present to you, Sir, to the Premier of this province, the leader of the opposition and the two lady members a little gift. It is something for the ladies and it depicts the primary industry of this province, a wheat head and part of the wheat stem. I will not pass them out now because it is nice on the first occasion to retain a captive audience. I will see that they are distributed after we adjourn at 5:30. I would also like to present the Minister of Public Health with one of these gifts, if he promises me and the people of Regina a new University Hospital which we all know is badly needed.

Some Hon. Members: — Hear, hear!

Mr. Baker: — I understand he is trying to get a new university in Prince Albert in some six or seven years. I can think of other good centres, such as Swift Current and Melfort . . .

Some Hon. Members: — Hear, hear!

Mr. Baker: — . . . and North Battleford.

An Hon. Member: — Oh, yes.

Mr. Baker: — In presenting these gifts I hope you don't expect me to kiss your boots, I would much prefer to kiss the ladies with their husband's permission, of course. They tell me that there is a great future for people who start kissing the babies. I haven't started that yet — I will be looking forward to that in time to come. I plan on saying many things about the fine city of Regina, but first I wish to say how pleased I am that the people of this city have elected me as their Mayor for the fourth term, and have given me the added honor of representing them in the legislature for the Regina East constituency.

Some Hon. Members: — Hear, hear!

Mr. Baker: — The hon. Minister of Education, Mr. Trapp, made some very complimentary remarks on my behalf. He was born in the community where I come from. He mentioned that I had gone astray politically. Well, when he was first nominated I asked my wife in what constituency he was running for the CCF. However, his brother used to be my seat mate in school, and he had some difficulty with mathematics. I believe I did a good job on him during the time he sat with me because today he is a bank manager in Phoenix, Arizona, so I should be able to take a little credit for that. His father and mine had the privilege of sitting on the same municipal council for several years. I know that they made a real contribution. I am very pleased that we were born and raised in the Lipton area and not too close to Lemberg, the home of the Minister of Public Works.

Hon. J.W. Gardiner (Melville): — . . . good town.

Mr. Baker: — Regina is a city of many people from all parts of the world, a city of all faiths, a really and truly little United Nations. It is a city with great traditions and culture, and a great heritage. I think it can be said that the strength of a nation lies in the heritage of its people and we have a great people. Many people in the world would like to become Canadian citizens but are unable to do so. I think we can call Regina sort of melting pot of all nations. It is a city that usually goes over the top first in its United Appeal. It is a city that always thinks of others too, particularly the less fortunate. We really believe in practising humanity first.

Some Hon. Members: — Hear, hear!

Mr. Baker: — It is a city of many outstanding service clubs dedicated to community service. Regina is the heart of the great wheat-lands, the centre of Inland Canada and a distribution centre for something over 500,000 people. It is the home of the Mounties, the home of Wascana Centre, the home of the unique new Regina University. It is a city of beautiful parks and buildings, including the new Library, the Y.M.C.A., and the new power building known to others as the Pride of the West. It was the city in which Riel met his untimely death.

Some Hon. Members: — Hear, hear!

Mr. Baker: — A city that has completed most of its local improvements in regard to cement walks, roads, sewage and water installations. Our world-famous Museum of Natural History is here and the new telephone building. It is the home of the famous Saskatchewan Roughriders, the home of the provincial exhibition and the home, of course, of two outstanding members of this legislature, namely Smishek and Baker . . .

Some Hon. Members: — Hear, hear!

Mr. Baker: — . . . and where the best food in Canada is served, particularly the Regina East area with its wonderful Canadian and European dishes. You are always welcome in Regina, your capital city, the city with good buildings, the city of parks, recreation, culture and good food.

Mr. Speaker, I was somewhat appalled the other day, when the honorable members opposite produced some letters or documents which were filed in this legislature. As a member here, I want to make it abundantly clear that I hope I will never be called upon to vote for an enquiry against any person in the government or opposition which might tend to incriminate or defame. I have been brought up to be able to disagree with an individual and it has always been my policy in life too, to look for the good in my fellow man. I believe there is much good in all people. I think the names mentioned included Mr. J.H. Brockelbank, the member for Kelsey, and Mr. I.C. Nollet. I would say we received this information with some shock. I am sure we all agree that these are honest men, men of integrity, good men and men with a strong faith. Sometimes when we try to rob a man of his good name, we rob ourselves. I am not going to get into . . .

Some Hon. Members: — Hear, hear!

Mr. Baker: — . . . debate on such issues. I hope that, from here on in, we debate and pass legislation that we think is best for a growing and progressive Saskatchewan. I have a great deal of respect for the Attorney General and I believe he is a man of good character — I have had many dealings with him over the years in civic life. I hope he will take all these documents that have been tabled and others he perhaps intends to bring here and dump them back in the wastepaper basket where they came from. We have a province of great wealth, not only in natural resources, but in the people who live here.

In my remarks in this house, I will be critical but I will also try to respect the code of ethics you have laid down for us. I hope that I will have the courage to be able to withdraw remarks at times that may not be called for, but I assure you that I will argue and fight hard. I pray God that he gave me the wisdom and strength to serve our Saskatchewan people well and to always help me think and be honorable toward my fellow men.

Now, there has been much said. I don't know, Mr. Speaker, whether you want me to proceed. I am prepared to ask you to declare the hour and continue at 7.30. I do so now give way.

Mr. Speaker: — It is not yet 5.30.

An Hon. Member: — You can call it 5.30.

Mr. Speaker: — Do you wish me to call it 5.30? I now leave the chair until 7.30 this evening.

House adjourned 5.30 p.m. until 7.30 p.m.

Mr. Baker: — Now, Mr. Speaker, I am sorry that I didn't get my talk over before supper. Of course, in one way it might have been a bit difficult for some members to digest. In looking through the Throne Speech, your honor, I searched and searched to try and find something real in it. I tried to find something with regard to certain policies. It has been said by many speakers from the other side that it was a wonderful document. I have always thought, that a speech from the throne would tell the legislature and the people of the province something. I looked for a positive program, a program upon which we could build better communities and a better province. We have heard a lot of talk about industrial development. I want industry and we in the city of Regina worked hard and have had great results in the past years. We want to build . . .

Some Hon. Members: — Hear, hear!

Mr. Baker: — . . . we want to build on that, we do not say that you shouldn't get industry. I want you to get it, and I am expecting results. So far, we have not seen anything, and I want to find out whether industry will be forthcoming. The remarks I am going to make and the program I wish to outline will be a program for progress, more so than the information that has been brought forward in the speech from the throne. I also looked forward to extensive support for the primary industry of the province, namely, agriculture.

Some Hon. Members: — Hear, hear!

Mr. Baker: — As a city representative, my first remarks should perhaps deal with local and municipal problems, but I know full well that if the farmers have not got the money, neither will the cities have it, and so . . .

Some Hon. Members: — Hear, hear!

Mr. Baker: — . . . we have to develop concrete proposals, whether we can do it here or not. At least let us refer these matters to Ottawa and have them act in some capacity. You and I know that agriculture is the future, the wealth, and the strength of this country and will always be. We must keep it strong at all times. My desk mate, the hon. member from Turtleford, Mr. Wooff, touched on one or two things with regard to agricultural income. Now I want to take it one step further. If you were to check the national income of countries like Denmark, you would find that twenty per cent of the population engaged in agriculture gets eighteen per cent of the national income. If you were to take England, the thirteen per cent engaged in agriculture get thirteen per cent of the national income, but the figures that I have for Canada are that the thirteen per cent engaged in agriculture get only six or seven per cent of the national income. Mr. Wooff pointed out that it was down to nine per cent. I haven't those recent figures. However, the ratio still works out the same.

Now if we don't bolster and strengthen our agricultural economy, our cities will suffer. The machines that are brought from Eastern Canada and manufactured there won't be bought by the western farmer. That is why I say agriculture is not only the backbone of the West, but the backbone of all of Canada, and will always be our primary industry. These other . . .

Some Hon. Members: — Hear, hear!

Mr. Baker: — . . . industries, manufacturing plants, and potash, the oil and gas wells are gravy to us, but the backbone is still agriculture. I had hoped that the speech from the throne would have something concrete. Let me quote some figures with regard to farm costs including farm income, machine prices and so forth. I based them on the costs of operating a three-quarter section farm. For example, in 1950, a tractor cost approximately \$2500, in 1963 that same tractor cost \$6000. In 1953, 15-foot discer was \$1200, in 1963 a discer was listed at \$2200. A combine with power take-off in 1962 was \$5100, in 1963 it was \$5400, and in 1964 \$5700. I suppose the self-propelled type would run to \$11,000 at present. This farmer told me that his expenses in 1960 came to \$4200. In 1963 his expenses amounted to \$4900. Since we got the Liberal government in Saskatchewan, it could well be over \$5,000 at present. This is what the

farmer is faced with. I would have hoped that farm members across the way, who claim that they are pulling for the farmer, would have come up with something definite. Those of us from the urban centres stand by the farmers. I am one who believes that the farmer and labor can work together.

Some Hon. Members: — Hear, hear!

Mr. Baker: — Here is something that Mr. Bentley, the chairman of the Canadian Federation of Agriculture said in Regina — I quote:

Farm cash income for 1964 is expected to reach a record high of \$3,500,000 and a realized farm net income of \$1,630,000,000.

While these figures do give ground for some encouragement, nevertheless, the income position of many of our farmers is far from satisfactory. The fact is that the prices the farmers receive for their produce has not kept pace with the rise and costs of things that modern farmers use in their production program. In recent years, agriculture has met these costs primarily by increasing its efficiency. But all farmers are concerned as to how long they can continue to meet the rise and cost of goods and services by stepping up the efficiency of their own operations.

Now the answer is, of course, that we have not kept pace to bring the farm income into line with the cost of living that has been going up very rapidly. Mr. Bentley said that during the last five years, compared with the five years following the Second World War, the index of costs of commodities and services used by farmers increased by sixty per cent while the increase of farm products went up by fifteen per cent. So you see the plight of the farmer. And this to me, Mr. Speaker, should have been the key in this Throne Speech. I realize that they did say something about giving tax-free purple gas to the farmers. I am not against it, if they want to do this. I will support that part of the Throne Speech. Some farmers will get \$15 a year, others between \$30 and \$40 a year. This isn't going to solve the farm problems facing us. Why don't we do something concrete? I am going to suggest this, seeing we have all talked about a two-price system. We have one, and the amended motion which was passed setting the base price at Fort William at \$2 a bushel . . .

I am going to make a suggestion which I think is a bold one regarding the two-price system and which will give the farmer a basic cash income for the first wheat that he sells. It is related to the cost of the things that he has to purchase and protects the family farm which is the backbone of this country. We have got to keep the family farm regardless of its size . . .

An Hon. Member: — . . . wasn't this discussed by this house . . .

Mr. Baker: — . . . I will finish this part in a minute, Mr. Speaker. I will just make the following point: I suggest that on the first 2,000 bushels of grain sold by the farmer that he get, for no. 1 northern, \$2.75 a bushel clear, in order to give him his basic income. Any wheat over and above that be sold at the prevailing rates in accordance with the resolution. I will be glad to leave the discussion on wheat seeing as it was debated earlier. I thought the new members had some privilege in their maiden speeches. I had a few other points, one in particular which doesn't deal with wheat and which I hope this legislature would support and that is that all farm laborers come under the Unemployment Insurance Act. This is the reason why farmers are unable to get farm workers. When they are laid off for the winter, the only income they can draw is social aid or some other form of assistance. Therefore it is my recommendation that they be given unemployment insurance coverage. This would resolve the farm labor shortage. This would bolster the primary industry of this country.

I want to lead into the next phase of my remarks with regard to labor. I noticed that the Minister of Labour has stated labor legislation would remain intact. I am not here to attack the Minister of Labour. I don't know what his final proposals will be, we must give him a chance. He has spoken on numerous occasions at different functions. I see that he complained about the treatment he received at a union meeting in Moose Jaw. We were together at the Regina Labour Council and I think that he received a cordial welcome. I am sure he will agree that we both received a cordial welcome. He spoke first, which I always like to see happen.

Following him, I made certain recommendations which I thought his report would contain today. In fact, I am pleased when people pick up the good things I suggest. A few moments ago I mentioned protective measures for the farmer. Now, what about the worker in urban centres? We have a good labor code, we have good legislation, the best in Canada. Some of the labor legislation I hear spoken of in the Mayors' Conferences across this country we have forgotten about, — many things that others haven't got in their Statute books as yet. Let us not disturb that labor act, it is a good one. Let me tell you this: if it had not been for organized labor in this country our standard of living wouldn't be half what it is today. They have derived a greater share from the exorbitant profits, I want to see business . . .

Hon. Mr. Gardiner: — . . . not as high as in other provinces . . .

Mr. Baker: — . . . make a good profit, they are entitled to a good profit, no one denies that, but let us give a little bit to the people who make it for them. Our labor laws should be extended. I see the Minister of Labour shaking his head — yes, I am pleased to see him do that and I hope he will continue to make them better.

I heard some remarks the other day about the Public Service Commission and the Public Service Act. I worked on that commission for some years, and we established a program in which people were recognized for what they were worth. They were given collective bargaining by this government, the best thing that ever happened. We in the city of Regina have something like eight or nine union agreements, and I can tell you that we are proud to have our workers organized in this city, and I was proud to be working with a plan in the province that also has collective bargaining. What about the federal civil servants? The federal employees in this country have been clamouring for bargaining rights for a number of years, and they still haven't got them. They were promised this and promised that. Why don't we as a legislature endorse a recommendation that the federal employees be given bargaining rights as well?

Some Hon. Members: — Hear, hear!

Mr. Baker: — And, of course, we must think about the security of our employees. I mentioned earlier that we must extend the labor code. I am pleased to hear that they are going to increase the minimum wage. I think that something must be done now and over the next two years. I would hope that the Minister of Labour would accept my recommendation that a minimum wage be struck at \$1.40 over the next two year period.

Hon. W. Ross Thatcher: — Come on Henry, you are beating Smishek . . .

Mr. Baker: — This to me is needed.

An Hon. Member: — Why don't you get together?

Mr. Baker: — This to me is needed. The minimum labor rates in the province are going to begin at \$1.25, and would like to have seen a higher hourly rate struck a year ago.

An Hon. Member: — . . . a year or two . . .

Mr. Baker: — I said over a two year period and I am giving you lots of leeway time to do it in.

An Hon. Member: — . . . \$1.25 . . .

Mr. Baker: — Yes, our city employees have a minimum rate of \$1.25 an hour. We have young girls supervising playgrounds at a slightly smaller rate who work in the summertime.

Hon. D.G. Steuart (Minister of Public Health): — . . . \$1.25 an hour . . .

Mr. Baker: — . . . our regular labor rate was around \$1.38 an hour last year. We have old people working for the city who get the \$1.25 rate.

Our skilled labor rate is about \$1.65 per hour. I am glad you asked these questions so that we can point out what we are doing. I hope Prince Albert is doing as well. I understand that when the hon. Minister of Health was mayor, they were paying 75 cents an hour.

I wish to present something very concrete to this legislature as part of the labor program known as the "income continuance pay plan". We in the city of Regina are making a study of an income continuance plan for our employees. By this we mean to provide income to an employee who becomes ill. People who drive our transit buses may work eighteen or twenty years. It is a difficult job. Many have developed a heart condition. It is difficult to find light work for them and so in some cases we have to carry them on salary when sick leave runs out. Some employers dismiss them. The income continuance plan is a relatively cheap plan and I am going to ask the government of this province not only to inaugurate it for employees in the public service, but all people of the province. According to figures I have here, if you were to give a man seventy per cent of his income, it would cost less than one-half of one per cent to do this.

I would suggest too, that schedules be set up and a program worked out by this legislature whereby these people could take insurance policies from their local life insurance agent. In this way it would spread the insurance to all people. In Regina, we are studying it under one insurance company. We want to find out how these costs will compare but I think it would be better if we brought it in and gave the individual the opportunity to take his policy from whom he wished. Some people carry this themselves, giving security against health hazards as well as for the protection of their family. This to me is a real measure of security and should be brought in for our people. I think that the Canada Pension Plan is long overdue and I want to give the credit to those who are bringing it in. We in the CCF . . .

Mr. Stuart: — . . . you read the papers . . .

Mr. Baker: — . . . If Mr. Pearson brings it in, all the more credit to him. We in the CCF have advocated this for years and I see that in Ottawa our opposition is supporting it. The only problem is that they have cut it up so badly that it doesn't look like a plan anymore, but the thing is to get it in on the Statute Books. Let's get it made law and we can build on it from there.

This is a real protection for people 65 and over. I looked in the Budget Speech for another plan, a plan for the portability of pensions. Perhaps the minister of Labour or some other minister will be bringing it in later on. The training and re-training programs referred to by the Minister of Labour and others in this house, I hope will be accelerated. I would suggest to the minister of Labour that those who are taking the training be given more than \$25 per week. I have had numerous ones come to my office who went to these schools including married couples with one child getting only \$25 per week. Let us give them a living wage if we want them to go to school and get proper training. One chap I met dropped out and had to go and find a job because of the low income. The rules under the Social Aid Act do not permit one to get added benefits if he is drawing a wage. That is why I advocate greater assistance be given men and women working in factories and offices who have no protection from the standpoint of illness. For example, some agreements have one and one-half days a month, or eighteen days a year for sick leave. Some contracts have twelve days a year. The unorganized employees do not have one day a month. I am going to ask that this be added to the labor code. Working people should be credited with one day sick leave a month, not necessarily pay, but that it is there when sickness strikes, without pay deductions.

Now, I want to turn to the matter of industry. While I have had the privilege of serving civically for some ten years, this has been one of the things for which I pressed and I know other mayors have done the same in their respective communities. However, we have met with great success in the city of Regina these past six or seven years. When I got on the Council in 1955, we had our own electrical energy. We did not have enough water and we did not have gas. We all know that we must have these three ingredients if we are going to attract industry. What did we do? We set out after some difficulty with certain members of the Council who kept gas out of Regina for some five years. Because of this, we were five years behind in industrial growth. Once we got gas into Regina, it was much easier to attract industries. On top of that, we started a successful well-drilling program, something they laughed about and said it could

not be done. We did it and today we have plenty of water to sell. We have electrical energy from our wonderful Regina power utility. I am sorry that we are trying to sell it to the government. I hope the Minister of Health will forget about it and let Regina keep its light and power system.

Mr. Steuart: — Better check with the other honorables from Regina.

Mr. Baker: — Yes, I know the majority are for it, but I am not . . . Over the years pressed industry . . .

An Hon. Member: — . . . on that one . . .

Mr. Baker: — . . . and we have had great results, let me give you . . .

Mr. Thatcher: — They don't tempt . . .

Mr. Baker: — Let me provide you with some figures. Here is an example of the investment in industry in the city of Regina. From 1960 to 1963, new industrial expenditures amounted to \$66,407,000 in the City of Regina, and yet we hear that no industry had come to this province. No money has been spent. I am waiting to see what will come here in the future. Everything we have got in the line of industry and commercial development has been on the drawing boards for some time. I am waiting to see other industries come here under the new government. I am going to press for it. We will co-operate with the new Minister of Industry and I can say that I think he will co-operate with us. I wouldn't say that for the man who preceded him.

Investment in expanded industries in the same period from 1960 to 1963 in Regina amounted to \$14,987,000. In other words, a total of some \$90,000,000 for industry over a three-year period was invested in this city for industry alone. On top of that, the actual money that was spent from 1959 to the end of 1964 for our building permits in the city amounted to \$196,504,000. Is that stagnation? This is what made our city, and we can give thanks to the government of this province over these years. However, as city representatives, we deserve some credit, too.

Mr. Allan Guy (Athabasca): — . . . private enterprise . . .

Mr. Baker: — It is well and good to talk and to scream to the high heavens, but what is your program? I will tell you what we did in the city of Regina. Two years ago an industrial tour was made to the city of Toronto. We took with us fifty-four city people, including labor, business, professional, government and city officials. We have had marked success so far and we are going to have much more in the future. This is what I had hoped to see in the speech from the throne. I hoped the hon. Premier would bring down in his budget something for industrial tours and not just in Canada. In fact, we are hoping to plan another one to the city of Chicago. It is our hope to plan one for overseas in time. We are prepared work with the government on this. As municipalities, we are the creatures of provincial governments. We hope that you will work with us as the former government did.

Some Hon. Members: — Hear, hear!

Mr. Baker: — Now, then, I am sure that all my honorable friends across the way have read this wonderful document, The Financial Post, that came out eleven days before the election last spring. It tells about the industries of Regina and about the marked success of our city. I hope you have read it, I hope you have seen it. Let me read you some of the headlines: "IPSCO Now Going at Full Blast." Not too many years ago, I had heard some of the members say: "close it up, it is a white elephant". Do you know what this industry means to this city and to this province? It was the start for other basic and related industries to come here.

Some Hon. Members: — Hear, hear!

Mr. Baker: — And this in essence, is a crown company working with private capital. I understand the provincial government backed it with

millions of dollars. I haven't these figures, you people have. There was a time when everybody cried to kill it, but now it is really going ahead. Here is another headline: "Industry Bounding Ahead in Regina". At the end of 1963, well over two hundred industries established, new and expanded. I could go on and on in this paper. It deals with medicare. It talks about fertilizer sales to keep the good earth good.

Mr. Guy: — To much fertilizer . . .

Mr. Baker: — It goes on to tell about the trip to Toronto, the marked success we have had with commercial enterprises, with industry, and in other words building a tax base for this community. That is what has given us the prosperity that we have. I am proud of this city. We had the least unemployment until the end of 1963 of any city in this country, and this is something of which we can be proud.

Some Hon. Members: — Hear, hear!

Mr. Baker: — I might say to you gentlemen across the way that it took a lot of courage to make it a modern community. The streets and walks are practically completed in this city. When I first came to Regina those in control were more or less related politically to the men across the way, half Regina had board sidewalks, not a road or a lane was gravelled. Today we have a modern community, and we get money from the provincial government.

An Hon. Member: — . . . Liberal council . . .

Mr. Baker: — This is what you can do when you work together. It is wonderful to read about the development of the Wascana Centre and to see here a picture of the new university. I am sure the present government will give us full support. I am not doing this to criticize. I haven't any doubt that they will work the city and the university to make this development grow and make it one of the best in this country of ours.

We read a lot about disaster, and rather poor wages all through the years. I am sure that most of you people will have noted, in this issue of the Financial Post, the following summary of per capita income of the prairie provinces in 1963: Manitoba, \$1,767, Alberta, \$1,701, Saskatchewan, \$1,929.

Some Hon. Members: — Hear, hear!

Mr. Baker: — The average for Canada was only \$1,725, so that the per capita income in this province in 1963, was \$200 higher than the rest of Canada, and it shows under the system . . .

Mr. Nollet (Cut Knife): — Stagnation . . .

Mr. MacDougall (Souris-Estevan): — What are . . .

Mr. Baker: — I will give you . . .

Mr. Guy: — Table it . . .

Mr. Baker: — . . . that they talk about, you Socialists this, you Socialists that. Well let me read you something. I am sure you will love this one . . . I hear this word from every other speaker on the other side about you Socialists this and you Socialists that. Well let me read this, this is good . . .

Mr. Guy: — Table it . . .

Mr. Baker: — Well, I have to put my glasses on, I am sure the Premier will say I look better in them . . . Yes, I will table it. It is a quote from the Leader Post of January 19, 1965. It was spoken by a Liberal cabinet minister in the province of Quebec. This is what he said:

Quebec's government faces an overwhelming challenge in the province's social revolution, and will not find the solution in

dogmas of the right or left, Revenue Minister Eric W. Kearns said Friday. Our policy must be grounded in realities of an economy that suffers from severe unemployment. A slow rate of growth in all but the metropolitan sectors, and an unlucky adherence to the ineffective forms of business organization.

He said in an address to the Canadian Club in Winnipeg:

The point is that we can no longer move forward on an economy by relying only on those who enter business and consider business to be a purely private affair. If we are to secure the maximum social advantage for our people, we have to accept the principle that private enterprise and crown corporations are complementary, not mutually exclusive.

An Hon. Member: — Liberal policy . . .

Mr. Baker: — Here is what he said. This is not Socialism. I have heard nothing but "you Socialists" when you talk about crown corporations. This is not Socialism, it is simply the frank admission that public expenditures can be and are productive and should be undertaken when unemployment exists and education facilities are inadequate. This is what has been said by a Liberal in a provincial cabinet of this country. I give the man credit. He is absolutely right. You don't have to put a name tag on everything. If it is good to do things through crown corporations let us do them. We have heard a lot about pulp mills, and now we hear about another agreement being signed by the people across the way. I hope it comes to fruition. Get a pulp mill, that is good. We want it.

Mr. E. Kramer (The Battlefords): — . . . get \$400 . . .

Mr. Baker: — But I hope you didn't sign an agreement that is going to give these people the right to cut down our timber for the next six, seven or eight years without any royalties. This is the sort of rumor we are getting. I don't know if it is true or not.

Mr. MacDonald (Milestone): — Wait, and see . . .

Mr. Baker: — Or if you have signed an agreement tying up and not developing our natural heritage, then lo and behold if another government comes in what problems they will have to get it back!

Now, I would say that I would have hoped that the opposition when they were the government, would have built a pulp mill themselves, I would not . . .

Hon. J.W. Gardiner (Minister of Public Works): — . . . don't worry . . .

Mr. Baker: — I would not be afraid to support you people today if you wanted to put a pulp mill in the north as a crown company. I would support it, and I think perhaps that is what is going to happen, that if you have a good agreement and these people are coming in, well and good, but let us make sure that we get some royalties out of it. With regard to the iron ore that Mr. Winters has now under agreement, the Premier announced, I don't know if it is true, that he going to have a number of years free from royalties or a concession of that type. If you are going to give away the resources and not get royalties you might as well leave them there. You might as well leave the timber there for the wild animals to propagate and hibernate and keep it a happy hunting paradise.

Mr. Guy: — You are against it too . . .

Mr. Gardiner: — Leave them in the ground . . .

Mr. Baker: — I am very pleased, Mr. Speaker, that the hon. member from Athabasca (Mr. Guy) is getting a little bit worked up because I will have a few things to tell about the north in a little while. But anyway, if he voices the same opinions, he is looking for a

cabinet post. It is quite true.

Mr. Guy: — I won't cross the floor to get it . . .

Mr. Baker: — But anyway I must say . . . I would say to the hon. Premier that I would take him in place of one or two that he has got and drop one or two. But anyway this is his affair and I can tell the Premier right here and now that he is sitting on a pretty hot seat over there, in fact I would call it the electric chair, and I think you will find that there are one or two that would like to pull the switch any minute.

Some Hon. Members: — Hear, hear!

Mr. Baker: — Now, we talk about . . .

Hon. D.T. McFarlane (Minister of Municipal Affairs): — . . . overhead reasons . . .

Mr. Baker: — I didn't hear the Minister of Municipal Affairs (Mr. McFarlane) . . .

Mr. McFarlane: — I said the leader of the Conservative party said you were coming over for a cabinet post.

Mr. Baker: — Did he say that? I thought he said we should welcome back our prodigal sons. Well, anyway, we talked about crown corporations.

Now, then what about the air ambulance service, Mr. Speaker? To me, this is a crown company. I looked in the speech from the throne to see if it is going to be protected. I hope that it will remain. I don't know . . . well, this is what I am coming to. The air ambulance is a crown company. It is a public service. I believe in services being owned and operated by the government. Anything that is a service, electricity, gas, railways, trans Canada airlines. Saskair in the north was a service to the northern people. I don't know why you want to sell it. I think you should expand it instead of doing away with it. I do not know what the profits or the losses are. Just like, our ambulance service, I am sure there are many of the people across the way who have friends or relatives whose lives were saved by our air ambulance service. My father's life was saved the second year it was in operation, because they couldn't travel by road. Before the CCF got in, you know what roads we had. We never had a winter road.

Mr. W.J. Berezowsky (Cumberland): — Cowpaths.

Mr. Baker: — So you had to have the planes and these flights of mercy were the greatest, things for the country people that ever hit this province. I think in 1963 they had some 15,000 or 18,000 flights and I was proud to see that the Australian government sent over people to study our air ambulance program.

I could go on and on and talk about corporations, crown companies and even our medical and hospitalization plan which, in essence, is really a crown company. I hope that our government insurance plan will be left alone and continue as it has in the past.

Now, I said I would mention something about my good friend, the hon. member from Athabasca (Mr. Guy), He said a few things about the north and all of Saskatchewan. I want to tell him something about the north. I am not saying that I live there but I had the privilege of flying through there in 1949 or 1950 for a two week period. The dean of the legislature, the hon. Mr. Brockelbank, was on the same flight, there were five or six of us in one of the northern Saskair planes, a brand new one. We felt quite safe flying through the north and I want to say that I had two fine weeks.

Now the things that this gentleman has said about what the government has done in northern Saskatchewan, I think were absolute falsehoods. I made comparisons of the conditions that the Indians and Metis lived under with what they had four years after the CCF government had taken over. They didn't have any schools or hospitals. When we went to

places like Stony Rapids, we saw a brand new hospital built by the provincial government — I think a fourteen bed or twelve bed hospital. There was a nurse in charge who was able to do work as a midwife. That hospital in the forgotten northland had running water and electric lights. Having been a school teacher, I was interested in the schools and I was some of the old sod shacks with ground floors, it was pathetic. I saw some of the new schools. I will name them for you, Buffalo Narrows, Ile La Cross, Cumberland House, and places like that. These schools in the far north had proper lighting and sewage facilities, and the teachers were qualified.

And do you know that I got quite a surprise? I am sure the hon. member from Athabasca (Mr. Guy) doesn't like to hear this. I met two young chaps at Island Falls where the government was building a school and some frame houses. They had just come out of Prince Albert jail. They were nineteen or twenty years of age, and they had committed some crime and had been sent to jail for a few months. We got talking and I asked one of them, "Why do you do these things?" "Well," he said, "Mr. Baker, to tell you the truth we did it on purpose so we could get to jail and learn to read and write". This is what the north was like before the CCF went up there and this a true story

So there you have what the CCF people did for the Indian and Metis in the north. We attended a meeting at Cumberland House where the Department, of Natural Resources called all the members of that community together. The hall was packed. At the meeting it was decided how many moose they would shoot and how many muskrats they would catch in the Cumberland district. I think the government has an area, Mr. Speaker, where they take out 30,000 muskrats a year. A private firm has an area that takes out 50,000 a year in perpetuity, lots of bacon, yes. So that . . .

Mr. W.J. Berezowsky (Cumberland): — . . . government.

Mr. Baker: — Is it now government?

An Hon. Member: — It is all government.

Mr. Baker: — All right. Well, at that time it wasn't. But they had it arranged where the local people got shares in trapping these muskrats. And I want to tell you this, no one can tell me that those people there, under the CCF, were ill-clothed or ill-fed. They had the best of clothing and their families looked well — I can take an oath on this that what I saw was true. I am sure that from 1959 to the present day, it must be ten times better than what it was. And I hope that the government across the way will do as well as the CCF have done for our first Canadian citizens.

Now, they say they are going to set up an agency. That is fine. I agree with that, but what are they going to do through that agency? What are you going to set up? And may I make the suggestion that the Indian reservation people be given the same type of autonomy that any municipality has. I think this is the answer. That will create much quicker integration. I am going to go one step further. In order to give them representation in this house, I propose that the province of Saskatchewan be divided into two seats for them — one in the north and one in the south — so that they may elect their own people representatives to this legislature until the integration program is carried out. I think that it will be thirty or forty years before it is completed during which time we should have them right here to give us first hand information.

It looks like I am going over my time, Mr. Speaker.

An Hon. Member: — Go right ahead.

Mr. Baker: — I am enjoying it. I hope you are too.

An Hon. Member: — . . . anything better so that is O.K. Henry.

Mr. Baker: — But anyway, turning to Social Welfare. I am not going to say anything against the Minister of Social Welfare (Mr. Boldt), as a person. I can stand here and disagree with his policies but I consider him a fine gentleman. I have had the privilege of being with him on occasion. We had some heart to heart discussions. I think perhaps if I work on him a little longer, he will think like I do or we do.

Mr. Michayluk (Redberry): — Come on, Dave.

Mr. Baker: — I am sorry to see that he had suggested the schedules to the various municipalities. I am hoping that this will be changed when the budget is brought down. I think there is evidence to show that not only should these be held at the present rates but should actually be increased. I think, because of the increased cost of living that social aid, mother's allowances, and pensions need an upgrading very badly.

I do not want to go into your department too much, Sir, but there are some things that have to be done from the standpoint of tax concessions. We talk about giving tax concessions to certain people. I think the group that need it the most are our pensioners, and people who have reached the age of 65 when they retire and their incomes drop. I've found in my experience in public life, that the property tax is a burden to them. I am going to suggest, a firm recommendation to this house which I hope will be included in the budget. My recommendation is give a tax concession on their homes to all people over sixty-five years of age, and if they are on the farm, fine. I was going to suggest the extent of the school tax but I think they should get a flat amount. I would recommend that \$150 be paid on June 1st of each year to these people as tax relief and a tax concession. I think it is needed. The government may do this, I don't know. They may even go further. I hope they do. But in line with those who rent, you can't overlook them either because, in essence, they are indirectly contributing taxes too. I was going to suggest to those people, sixty-five years and over, that they be allowed \$10 dollars a month or paid \$120 a year as of June 1st each year.

I think that this is a real concession and need. I would make another suggestion that I hope this legislature will pick up, and the ministers in charge of this will follow through. You know, we talk about our railroads running empty across this country. Why don't we put people on these railroads? All you hear about is abandonment. Many of our senior citizens haven't travelled any further than the city or perhaps a few miles outside. Why don't we, as a government, recommend to the federal government at Ottawa, that these people receiving pensions be given a free pass on the railroad to travel anywhere in Canada once every two years? I think this is the answer to help bolster the railroads. We give them subsidies anyway. I would also suggest to the Minister of Highways in charge of transportation that he issue a free pass to all pensioners once every two years to travel anywhere on our Saskatchewan buses.

It is a similar plan to the one used in Regina for providing bus transportation for our senior citizens. I think these people deserve it. Our pioneers should get some recognition for what they have done for us, because they are not going to reap the benefits that we will through pensions and superannuation plans.

I want to mention store night opening. I think it has been known that I have opposed this for some time, Mr. Speaker. I would like to see that this government take that piece of legislation back. I would hope that the legislation remain as is. We in Regina have Monday closing. We have a straight five day week and I want to tell you that ninety-eight per cent of the retail outlets want this, both management and employees. It is a two-way street. You do not get many complaints, just two or three. My good friend, the manager of Simpsons, has been after me for the past four years to change it. Unfortunately, he has the same name I have. But anyway, he has opposed and wanted night openings. He wanted Monday opening too. The moment you open the door to Friday night, you've got Thursday, Wednesday, you've got every night, and the Monday closing is gone too.

We have good hours in this city. I don't think many people complain. I think we should protect them, Mr. Speaker, and the owners. I want to see business go to the smaller outlets and to the chain stores. In this way they are all getting something. In fact, I have had retail people tell me, after we brought in Monday closing, that their income went up at least ten per cent. You don't need longer hours. In fact, they ruin our shopping system. You get staggered hours. You do not keep permanent staff. And the result is they will not stay on those jobs. And who is the loser? The owner and the employee as well. Furthermore, you are going to kill the hamlets and villages that you represent and the towns that are retail outlets, because they are going to go to the larger centres. Maybe I am speaking against myself, but I want to protect them too. They have a right to a living and a fair share of the economy and the income.

Some Hon. Members: — Hear, hear!

Mr. Baker: — I am not going to say too much on education. My good friend, the hon. Mr. Trapp, isn't in his chair, but I looked forward for more in the speech from the throne on education. I understand that there are going to be grants. I hope they are substantial. I hope there will be some library grants. That wasn't mentioned. But you know, you talk about municipalities suffering. It is this area which hits us the hardest. But what can be done to relieve the municipalities? These outright grants are all right but they are not the answer. I think we should adopt the system which you find in other parts of the Commonwealth, particularly Australia and New Zealand. This would be the answer for municipalities, urban and rural, that all teachers be paid out of the provincial treasury. This is the custom in England and I think that an arrangement could be made with the units. I want the autonomy to be left to the units, yes, but they should all be paid out of the provincial treasury.

This is where the costs are hitting our property tax, because it is an always increasing thing. I am sure that every teacher in this province would accept that recommendation. And I think it is a good one. And it has been used and it is going to come about sooner than we think anyway. I think now is the time to start to relieve your municipalities through this sort of pay system.

Now, I wanted to talk about the hospital, the auditorium. I think I will save those for when the budget is brought down, but I did want to touch on one or two more things that you find in other parts of the commonwealth with regard to municipal grants. I am pleased to see that the government is going to take over the grid system as part of the highway system. Is that right, Mr. Minister?

Mr. Grant: — . . . budget . . .

Mr. Baker: — Or the maintenance of it. An odd one. Well this is all right, as long as you make the start. But anyway, what I am going to suggest is cost sharing arrangements. This is something you find, not just arterial streets and roads in cities and different parts of the commonwealth. You will find that the governments in the States build the roads completely and maintain them. The cities look after them but they are paid for by the government. I think we have reached the day when costs are so exorbitant that there must be some cost sharing arrangements on sewer and water installations, I think a fifty-fifty cost would be just. I think that the cost of arterial roads, like Albert Street, Victoria Avenue and Winnipeg Street, should be borne entirely by the provincial government. We will maintain them and I think you should pay the cost of construction.

Now, these are the recommendations I am going to make, and before I read my blueprint for progress to you, which I hope you will accept in place of the speech from the throne, — I want to talk about hospitals. We, in the Mayors' Federation of Canada, have adopted the policy and we presented it to the Prime Ministers of Canada over the past five or six years, that all hospital costs be absorbed by senior governments. We are paying taxes in one place for that. I would suggest to the government that you earmark some portion of taxation for the construction of hospitals. The municipalities cannot carry that load. It is unfair to put it on them. Your property taxes can only carry so much. And I think this is the right one — it is not my idea. It has been thrashed out in the Mayors' conferences and was indirectly, I think, acceptable to the Prime Ministers.

Mr. Speaker, I was going to touch on the auditorium. I will wait and see when the hon. Premier will bring down his budget. We have been working on the basis of \$3,250,000 with the previous government that we are going to get. I hope he ups that a little bit and gives me \$4,000,000.

But anyway, this is the document I am going to present and I will even table it, your honor. Here is the program, the blueprint for progress. I hope that you will adopt it. It is a fourteen point program in regard to what I have said and I think if it was put to a plebiscite to the people of Saskatchewan it would get a ninety-nine per cent endorsement. Point number 1. Press the federal government to establish a two-price system on the following basis. Can you forgive me? It is just the first point. I will read it. It is the same as what I said with the 2000 bushels:

For the first 2000 bushels a fixed price of \$2.75 to be paid for no. 1 northern wheat over and above the freight charges. The wheat over and above the 2000 bushels be sold at the prevailing prices.

2. Request the federal government to put all farm laborers under the unemployment insurance plan.
3. Legislature provide the following benefits:
 - (a) Raise the minimum wage to \$1.40 an hour for the next two years.
 - (b) Credit at least one day a month sick pay for all unorganized and organized workers.
 - (c) Provide three weeks holiday, after one year of service, and four weeks after ten years.
4. Increase pensions, social aid and mother's allowance.
5. Place electrical and gas distribution for all localities under public ownership.
6. Earmark part of the tax structure for construction of hospitals and related institutions, with provincial and federal governments assuming full costs of construction.
7. Institute an income continuance pay plan for all Saskatchewan people, operated and controlled by the provincial government and permitting each person to take out his or her policy with their own life insurance agent.
8. Enact legislation to permit portability of pensions.
9. Pay all teacher's salaries out of the provincial treasury.
10. Provincial government assume:
 - (a) Full cost of construction and maintenance of arterial streets and grid roads in all urban and rural municipalities.

I know it is hard to swallow, Mr. Minister of Municipal Affairs, because it is the truth.

- (b) Assume fifty per cent construction and installation costs of all sewer, water and sidewalks in all urban and rural municipalities.

11. Plan for Indian and Metis people.

I know the hon. member for Melville (Mr. Gardiner) doesn't like this because he knows where he gets his votes from.

- (a) Promote full autonomy for Indian reservations similar to rural municipal system.
 - (b) Set up two legislative seats for the Indian and Metis people, one in the north and one in the south.

12. Keep present legislation governing store night openings.

13. Reduce property taxes to all people sixty-five years of age and over, by paying \$150 on June 1st of each year to all home owners. Pay \$120 a year to all renters over sixty-five years of age on June 1st of each year.

The hon. member for Melville (Mr. Gardiner) doesn't like this because he has never made a good suggestion in this house as long as he has been here.

Mr. Gardiner (Melville): — Just missed . . .

Mr. Baker: —

14. Remove medical care premiums. Removed medical care premiums charged to each person by April 1st, 1966.

I want to say to you, Mr. Speaker, that this is a real document that is acceptable. This is one that I will continue to prod for because it is right. Anything that I have put down here I can be held accountable for in time to come, because I am going to pres for it. It is what we need today. It is a modern document and I would hope that it would be accepted unanimously by this house to replace the speech from the throne.

Therefore, I want to support the amendment on this side because I think it has more of an answer to the speech from the throne. Thank you so very much.

Some Hon. Members: — Hear, hear!

Mr. A.R. Guy (Athabasca): — Will the hon. member permit a question before he sits I down?

Mr. Baker: — Oh sure, I don't mind questions. Sherman asks me lots too.

Mr. Guy: — I was very interested in your references to the north in 1949 and I regret that I was unable to catch what you said about Island Falls and the schools there. How many classrooms did you say the province had provided in Island Falls?

Mr. Baker: — Buffalo Narrows. I said Buffalo Narrows.

Mr. Guy: — You mentioned Island Falls.

Mr. Baker: — Well, they were building some houses there. Is that where you go from the power system?

Mr. Guy: — Sandy Bay.

Mr. Baker: — Oh, Sandy Bay! Is that it? Sandy Bay, where you go on the Churchill River? Well, anyway we were there. The Minister . . . Sandy Bay, I believe . . . or was it the hospital . . .

Hon. D.G. Steuart (Prince Albert): — Are you sure . . .

Mr. Baker: — Or was it the hospital . . .

An Hon. Member: — You made a reference to the hospital.

Mr. Baker: — Just a moment. Just a moment. If I used the wrong place. I have said there are schools in the north and you know that. It was either Sandy Bay or Island Falls. Island Falls is where the town site is . . . company town. It is Sandy Bay where you go down the Churchill River and we went on a very small canoe and it was dangerous, I will tell you. I hope that answers your question.

Mr. Guy: — Well, it does. It told me that you didn't know very much . . .

Mr. Baker: — I know the truth hurts. I don't think you have been there.

Some Hon. Members: — Hear, hear!

Hon. Dave Boldt (Minister of Social Welfare): — Mr. Speaker, we have just found the mayor of Regina. He was lost and he has come back into the house.

Some Hon. Members: — Hear, hear!

Mr. Baker: — First of all, I would like to congratulate you, Mr. Speaker, for the wonderful job that you have done conducting the business

of this house. I am sure that the free state of Saltcoats is missing your part in the debate which we have enjoyed in the past four years.

I am also delighted, Mr. Speaker, to see so many of my colleagues on this side of the house. I am also delighted to see the Socialists on the other side of the house.

I take great pride, Mr. Speaker, to point out to the house that we have the two youngest members in this legislature sitting immediately behind the Minister of Education (Mr. Trapp). Certainly the Liberal party has indicated to the voters that we believe in youth and we will do something for the young people of Saskatchewan.

Upon taking office after the Socialists finally decided that they had to resign, I moved into my office with some reservations but I want to report to this house the findings as I found them since taking office. First of all, I want to say that I believe that the department of Social Welfare has one of the finest staffs in the whole operation of the government.

Some Hon. Members: — Hear, hear!

Mr. Boldt: — I also want to say, despite the fact that the former minister (Mr. Nicholson) scared a good number of the employees in my department into thinking that they would be fired, we have fired nobody in the Social Welfare Department, and nobody has resigned because of the change of government. As long as we leave politics out of Welfare, my staff will continue to do a marvellous job as they have in the past nine months for which I must account.

A few months after we took office, Mr. Speaker, the Minister of Labour (Mr. Coderre) was requested by the Barbers Association to increase the cost of shaves and haircuts. I did not realize that this was the responsibility of the government. We asked the reason and all we could get out of the barbers was that a certain percentage of the electors' faces were twice as long after the election of May 22nd.

Some Hon. Members: — Hear, hear!

Mr. Boldt: — The people of Saskatchewan would like to know something about the Department of Social Welfare. In the past, the former minister was busy talking politics in the house. While on radio, it took him twenty minutes to tell the people of Saskatchewan what a wonderful uncle I had. There was no need of this, the voters proved that. He dealt with individual social aid cases which I have every reason to believe he had interfered with. I want to thank the former Minister of Welfare and the ministers of the former government for having spent such a tremendous amount of time during the campaign in the Rosthern constituency. They helped increase my majority by almost four hundred per cent.

Some Hon. Members: — Hear, hear!

During the past years, as I said, we, on the opposite side of the house made repeated and futile attempts to find out what social welfare was all about. I would like to deal with this for a few moments, and I would like to deal later on with some of the statements that were made by the member from Arm River (Mr. Pederson) during the Hanley by-election, and some of the statements made by members opposite regarding social welfare.

Looking back on these years, Mr. Speaker, it seems to me that social aid was the featured highlight every time the minister addressed the house. This, I would say, was rightly so when the 1959 social aid legislation was enacted. But was it necessary that it be featured, almost to the exclusion of other welfare programs, throughout the four years I was opposition welfare critic? While I will have something to say regarding social aid, I know you would feel let down if I didn't, I intend also to give emphasis to various other welfare department programs, because I am convinced they are little known, and less understood.

Welfare is here to stay, there is no doubt about that. Even if it is your personal good fortune never to need any social welfare services for yourself or your family, it is your tax dollar that foots the bill for those who do need it. Since this is the case, you should have the

opportunity to look at what you are paying for. Furthermore, the right welfare programs can only be developed and developed at the appropriate time, if the climate is receptive and the purpose of the program is understood. These things can only happen in a well informed public.

Government welfare services are personal services. They relate to the personal aspect of living, such as parenthood, married and otherwise, the hunger for a child, or the decisions to give up a child, the inability of some people to earn a living, the problems that come with old age, and many other matters that are usually one's own business.

Government welfare services are an individual service for individual people, a baby born today, a delinquent juvenile, a man or woman of any age. In due course these people may be referred to as cases, and will become part of statistical records, but while we are working with them they are individuals, or individual families, and we work with them as such. Government welfare service is a helping hand, not just a hand out, services that function within the framework of one word — need. The need may be an economic need for the wherewithal to buy the necessities of life, or it may be social. This is much more difficult to pin-point and to find, but it includes such things as physical care, and treatment for the aged, infirm, and the long-term ill, services to certain children and their parents, vocational rehabilitation for the disabled, and the custody and treatment of men and women who have broken the law.

Mr. Speaker, I would like to turn for a few moments to child welfare. I have a great respect for the services that these people render in my department. Child welfare services were set up in 1907 to protect the children of this province. As times have changed, emphasis has been placed on prevention of family breakdowns. Services of a preventative nature to families and to unmarried mothers have been instrumental in helping many parents to carry their responsibilities. But despite our efforts almost 3,000 children are the responsibility of the department for placement in adoption or foster homes and institutions.

Child welfare services operate within communities all over this province. Therefore, Child welfare services need the understanding and the support of an informed, knowledgeable public. It is necessary for our citizens not only to understand services but to participate actively in certain aspects of these services. The placement of children, both in adoption and foster homes, is an important part of this. This placement program, and the challenge of finding homes, particularly for children of mixed racial background, is one which requires co-operation of our citizens.

In order to help understanding, the department will embark on a public information program during the coming year. It is hoped that this will ensure that the general public knows what services are available. Recently there was a wonderful article in the Star-Phoenix, and I hope the hon. members have read this article on child adoption. It will also enlist the help of the individual citizens who are interested in children, by informing them of the needs of our children and how they can help, if they wish to become adopted parents or foster parents. Facilities at the Saskatchewan Boys' School were expanded last year to provide accommodation for boys in emergencies and pending court hearings. This function is separate from the Schools' rehabilitation program, and efforts will continue to be made during the coming year to improve both these aspects of the School's program.

Dales House, the new Dales House, will function as a receiving unit for thirty-four boys and girls from four to sixteen years of age, and as a holding unit for up to six teenage girls. It will continue to be operated by the Regina Region of the Department of Social Welfare. The function of the receiving unit is to provide a temporary home for children who must be removed from their own or foster homes. Among the emergency situations that make it necessary to take children into care, are cases where children are deserted, or are neglected by parents. In other cases, illness or mental breakdown on the part of the mother may make it necessary for the department to care for the children.

Dales House is a step in the direction of providing children, whose young lives have been seriously disrupted, with the care and the security they had been denied. The interval in Dales House permits experienced staff to get to know each child, and to assess his future needs, thereby assisting regional field staff in making more permanent plans.

The holding unit, a facility not currently provided in the

present Dales House, will provide temporary accommodations for teenage girls who have rebelled against social authority. This segregated portion of the new Dales House will provide a daily program of activities suitable to their needs. During their stay in the holding unit, the regional staff will make more permanent plans for their care. In some instances, this may involve the use of treatment in an institution in one of the neighboring provinces.

I would like to turn for a few moments to the provision of services to families by the field staff. One of the goals of welfare services is family well-being. Many of the families that receive help from public funds can function adequately with only financial help. Other families need assistance to use money properly, or require help with many problems that a one-parent family faces in raising children. Our department is concerned with these families and is giving help to them when they first apply for financial assistance. This is the right time to look at the well being of the family and to offer appropriate assistance. By providing services sooner it is hoped to prevent irreparable damage to families. The Department of Welfare is closely examining its procedure to reduce the amount of time and effort necessary to give services and keep staff cost to the minimum. Very little attention in the welfare field has been placed on work-load standards, and it is the intention of the department to study this area to ensure the best service possible in the most effective manner.

What about our provincial correctional institutions? I wonder what people, in general, think when they read in the press that somebody has been sentenced to jail? Last year there were some 5,900 admitted to Saskatchewan Correctional Institutions. On any given day there are, in all, about six hundred inmates. What do people think happens to these prisoners between the time they go to jail and the time they come out again? Do people think prisoners just mark time doing whatever chores they are assigned to until their time is served and they leave the institution, and possibly commit another infraction and come back in again? Regardless of what specific crime has resulted in a man or a woman being sentenced to jail, the fundamental reason people are sentenced is because their behaviour, their habits and their attitudes are socially unacceptable. If nothing is done to counteract these attitudes, the person returns to circulation with the same attitude intensified.

The focus of the Saskatchewan Correctional program is, therefore, to use all the activities within the institution as a means of helping offenders to develop more mature attitudes and habits of behaviour patterns and to improve their social relationship with a view to developing a socially acceptable value system. The correctional program, therefore, provides much more than custodial care. It offers a treatment program under the direction of professionally-trained staff who work as a treatment team.

A real problem in staffing is encountered in both mens' institutions. Vacancies in the professionally-trained staff are almost impossible to fill. This problem could be related to competition in similar positions or professions.

The activities in both the mens' institutions that serve as part of the treatment program include farm work, work crews that are organized for various constructive purposes, housekeeping, maintenance and various trades training shops.

In former years, the Department of Social Welfare has faced a good many problems in its endeavour to implement the advanced concept that Saskatchewan subscribes to. The most pressing problem relates to the rising inmate population, which far exceeds the accommodation.

To help alleviate this situation some additional accommodation has recently been added, and more is being added at Regina Jail. We recently announced construction of a new jail for women which will be located in Prince Albert. This will free the present women's' section of the men's' jail building for the use of the men's' jail.

One of the advanced methods that is helping prisoners in

Saskatchewan to become better adjusted and to develop a socially acceptable value system is the Forestry and Lumbering Camps. The Prince Albert Institution now has three full-scale year-round camps that are operated in co-operation with the Department of Natural Resources. One at Fort a-la Corne Forest Reserve houses thirty men. Another at Holbein is entirely for men who have a drinking problem. It houses twenty-five. The third and newest, at White Gull Lake, houses thirty.

The Regina Institution's main year-round camp project is located at Kenosee and Moose Mountain provincial park. The men at this camp work mainly at clearing underbrush in the park area. They also man the fire control lookout tower, and make directional and other signs for use in the parks. Incidentally, I have visited all these camps and would recommend that each individual member of this house visit these camps if possible. The Regina Institution's newest camp project operated last summer at Buffalo Pound Lake. About eight inmates cleared the underbrush from Monday to Friday and were taken back to Regina Institution for the weekend. In all, some four hundred prisoners worked at various camps for longer or shorter periods during the past year. Camps are a worthwhile means of helping prisoners. A good many of the camp inmates make more rapid and more favourable progress toward becoming better adjusted than they would in a strictly institutional setting. They seem more ready to consult with staff, and to discuss their pent-up feelings, and thus become better fitted to make their way as free citizens. The majority of the inmates paroled on conditions imposed by the National Parole Board are supervised by the John Howard Society. This society is subsidized by an annual grant from the provincial government. Probation services for persons released under supervision by the courts is carried out by the staff of the department. The demand for probation services is steadily increasing.

Another area that I would like to make a few comments on, is Emergency Welfare Services. Another program now administered by my department concerns the organization and provision of emergency welfare services to people made homeless or in need as a result of natural disaster or national emergency. I am sure that none of us like to dwell too long on the subject of a disaster whether it be a so-called "Act of God" or an international conflict; nevertheless, these are harsh facts of life which, as responsible legislators, we cannot brush aside. Ignoring a problem does not make it disappear. One has only to look around at recent disasters in Canada and the United States to realize that Saskatchewan has been very fortunate to date. We hope this situation will continue but we cannot be sure. Nor can the possibility of armed aggression yet be completely ruled out. As long as the threat of disaster exists, we must be ready to adapt our normal services to meet abnormal conditions. The welfare of persons in need is a constitutional responsibility assigned to my department. There is no dividing line between those who command our services because of disability or social circumstances, and those who become temporarily dependent as a consequence of disaster. Any legitimate demand on our services and skills must be planned for and met.

The Emergency Welfare Services Program has a two-fold aim. First, to ensure that the department is capable of adapting its services and staff, quickly, to disaster situations when needed, and, secondly, to encourage and assist municipal councils in the planning and operation of mass-care services, including feeding, clothing, and providing shelter and emergency aid.

All of our senior staff appreciate the need for preparedness and have accepted planning and operational responsibility in addition to their normal duties. This is particularly true of our Regional Administrators, whose staff members are currently being trained in disaster techniques, and who, I hope, will soon be in a position to assist municipalities within their regions in the organization of local emergency welfare services. In addition to looking after our own residents, Saskatchewan has a recognized role as a Reception and Mobile Support Area for national emergency purposes.

This means that other provinces and states are looking to find refuge and temporary care in Saskatchewan for many of their endangered citizens. Since disasters always involve people, it is fair to say that welfare has the biggest single role to play. It is on this basis and in close co-operation with other federal, provincial, municipal and voluntary agencies that our department is going ahead with plans that will reduce the toll in human misery which always accompanies a flood, tornado, earthquake, epidemic, or a passage of arms.

One final point I would make. The federal government reimburses

the province seventy-five per cent of all approved expenditures in connection with this program, and it is currently considering the best means of assisting provinces in dealing with peace-time disasters, which are traditionally the exclusive responsibility of the provinces. Preplanning is a cheap form of insurance when the lives and the well-being of our citizens are at stake. We must not be found wanting when the chips are down.

I would also like to turn for a few moments to the Housing and Nursing Homes Branch. Greater desire in larger towns and cities for subsidized public housing for families in the low income bracket has been noted during the past year. There is a tremendous support in this area throughout the whole province.

This year, 110 units have been completed and occupied in Saskatoon. An additional 141 are under construction in Regina. There are twenty in Estevan, twenty in North Battleford, and twenty are planned for Swift Current. We will continue to negotiate with larger urban municipalities showing an interest in public housing or land assembly where need is fully justified.

Amendments to the National Housing Act have widened the scope of Central Mortgage and Housing Corporation in making loans available for housing accommodation and care facilities for the aged and low-income families. One of the features under the new regulation is that the provincial government is no longer required to guarantee loans on hostel accommodation. Provision is also made for municipalities to establish public agencies which would be eligible for federal loans to enable them to provide housing for low-income families without provincial participation.

Heavy demands are being made on the Department of Social Welfare for technical assistance and capital grants by municipal groups, church and charitable organizations to assist in providing self-contained housing units, lodges, and nursing homes, for the accommodation and care of the aged and infirm segment of our population. Over sixty proposed projects are currently being negotiated. If all are negotiated this coming year, the provincial government will be asked to spend in the neighborhood of a million dollars which represents twenty per cent of the total costs. Some are fittingly being designated as Centennial projects.

Technical and administrative services entail detailed interpretation of government policy, assistance with organization and planning, negotiations related to location, size and type of project, survey of need, liaison with Central Mortgage and Housing Corporation, and so on. There continues to be a serious shortage of nursing care beds throughout the province resulting in long lists of persons waiting admission to geriatric centres and a growing number of long-stay hospital cases.

This briefly then is a report which I have read into the records of this house. I am sure that the majority of the members appreciate knowing what we have done in the department and what we intend to do.

Now I would like to come back to a few of the comments that have been made in the past few days in regards to the Welfare Department. I was really delighted with some of the remarks made by the lady member for Regina (Mrs. Cooper), regarding the Welfare Department. In her remarks it was evident that Socialists have only one answer for the disabled, infirm, and the unemployed. Their answer is more social aid to meet the needs. She mentioned the work and wages program which she is against, the closing of Embury House, and the reduction of food allowances as a backward step while . . .

Some Hon. Members: — Hear, hear!

Mr. Boldt: — . . . President Johnson was waging a war on poverty. Well I am also interested in Johnson's program on poverty. I read with a good deal of interest how he was going to do it. At no time in his message did he mention more social aid. His solution to the problem was based on education, training, and jobs in the free democratic society . . .

Some Hon. Members: — Hear, hear!

Mr. Boldt: — . . . almost word for word, the program of the Saskatchewan Liberal party which I aim to implement in welfare. She stated in her speech that she had heard that I was going to reduce the maximum allowance

to \$200 a month in the cities and to \$150 a month in rural areas regardless of the size of the family. Well, I come from a rural area. How could you attribute such a statement to me? If this was reversed, \$150 to the city and \$200 to the farm, there might have been some reason to believe this. I want to say to the lady member that she has been in politics long enough to know that what people say about politicians cannot always be relied upon. If it could, I might not say 'hello' to her. The lady member is critical of the suggested cut in food allowance in larger families. Well, let me state first, that I do not agree that Regina, Saskatoon and Moose Jaw should have a higher food allowance than the rest of the people in the province.

Some Hon. Members: — Hear, hear!

Mr. Boldt: — I want to state to you and to read into the records a report of what the food allowances are in the province and what they are in the city of Saskatoon, Regina, and Moose Jaw. Can the former minister justify the fact that in the province a family of six should receive \$105 for a food budget, and \$115 in Regina, or a family of eight \$137 in the province and \$148 in Regina?

Mr. A.M. Nicholson (Saskatoon City): — Mr. Speaker, I gather the hon. minister is asking a question, may I answer it?

Mr. Boldt: — No. No, I didn't interfere with the hon. minister. He can get up and ask questions after I have spoken.

Mr. Speaker: — Order! While a member is making a speech, if he doesn't choose to give way, then there will be no interruption.

Mr. Nicholson: — Mr. Speaker, I am only suggesting that he was asking a question.

Mr. Boldt: — I am going to tell you what you are thinking. Can he justify a family of ten in the province receiving \$166 for food allowance and in the city of Regina \$179?

Mr. Nicholson: — Mr. Speaker, again the hon. gentleman is asking a question . . .

Mr. Boldt: — Will the former minister please sit down? I have told him he can ask me any questions after I have finished my message.

Mr. Nicholson: — . . . you . . . change your script.

Mr. Boldt: — Now, this is the problem in Saskatchewan we have to face. When people in municipal affairs say that this is a backward step to cut down on the food allowance they do so for political reasons only. I have talked to dozens and dozens of municipal people and they say it makes good politics when they talk about the poor, but you are on the right track, and I aim to be on the right track. Can you justify a family of ten in Regina, who would qualify if they are not employable, receiving \$556.25? A family of ten would receive \$179 for food, \$85 for rent, \$74 for clothing, \$24.75 for fuel, \$13.50 for utilities, and \$18 for personal and household allowances per month. This is a total of \$394.25 for social aid. On top of that the family allowances would be \$42. If they have two children over the age of 16 they would receive another \$20. If the two children are under the age of 16 they would receive \$16 instead of the \$20. But taking for granted that the two children are in the \$20 bracket, a family in Regina on social aid would receive \$456.25 in the youth allowance. Now, it is also reasonable to believe that if in a family of ten, there would be at least two, three or maybe four children that could go out baby sitting. I know my neighbor's child is baby sitting and she has reported to us that she has earned as much as \$40 a month from this source. Certainly the mother maybe could do a few odd jobs and we would like them to do this. It is, therefore, reasonable to believe that this family on social aid could perhaps be in the income area of \$500 to \$600

Now, I don't begrudge them. This is fine. These are statistics, taken from my department. They are not my figures, these are facts.

Now we have looked at a family that is receiving between \$500 and \$600, including social aid. I have here an advertisement for employment from the Public Service Commission. It just happens that our department is advertising for an Assistant Classification Officer. For this position, a Bachelor of Social Work degree is required, and the starting salary is \$416. With a Master's Degree the salary would be \$468. This individual could and might have eight children, and you go right down the line as low as \$289. Now, how in the world could you ask a Social Welfare family that is receiving social aid up to \$400, family allowance, youth allowance, and other casual earnings, which could amount to between \$500 and \$600, how could you ask such a family to take a job at \$300 a month?

A lot of people are telling me, "you know we are foolish to be working."

Mr. Speaker, I would like to lay this report on the table for hon. members to see what the Social Aid schedule is in the province and the city of Regina.

Now, the lady member also had something to say about Embury House. Well, Embury House has been discussed on numerous occasions and I do not care to delve too deeply into it. But I want to read some of the facts into the records.

This is the way I saw it. After long and careful consideration, I recommended to the government the closing of Embury House. Embury House had guest population of eight boys when I took office. A few months previously, they had only six and at the time of closing there were ten boys. Two had been admitted shortly before it was closed. I was advised by my department officials in Child Welfare, and by the deputy, that about fifty to sixty per cent of the boys could be helped over an eighteen month period. This would average out in the last year to from five to six in any eighteen month period. The Council for Exceptional Children, Saskatchewan Federation, in the 1964 brief to the government, estimated that there were 20,808 exceptional children in the province of which 4,504 are classified as emotionally disturbed. In the past two years, Embury House was looking after six to eight of these children in this institution. This was just scratching the surface. The cost this year was budgeted at \$110,000. Divide this by eight and the cost would work out to around \$13,780 per child. On staff at Embury House we had eighteen full-time and two part-time employees, plus many, many hours of overtime. Mr. Gray, the Superintendent, was receiving in the neighborhood of \$8,000 and several of the staff between \$3,500 and \$6,500 per year. The children were attending public school.

I just couldn't believe that the professional and domestic staff could be kept busy with this small number of boys. However, Mr. Gray felt that he was seriously understaffed. Some of the regions complained to me that they had boys to look after who could be admitted to Embury House but Mr. Gray said, "no, we can't admit them". They were not taken in by Mr. Gray, the Superintendent, for various reasons, mainly because they did not fit into his program. During the summer months, I visited a good number of the welfare regions, met with the supervisors and got acquainted with the child welfare program.

One supervisor told me that in his region he had a couple who had taken into their home more than one hundred children, a good number of whom were emotionally disturbed and who had made remarkable recovery. There are many such foster homes and foster parents, who have worked and will continue to work with these children, and I am confident that such homes are by far the best place for them.

Some Hon. Members: — Hear, hear!

Mr. Boldt: — The Council for Exceptional Children recommended strongly against institutional care. Wherever possible it should not be permitted. The Committee on Mental Health and Retardation recommends a 150-bed hospital for Saskatchewan for emotionally disturbed children — a hospital I cannot help but recommend and urge benevolent societies to operate a boys' farm, similar to the project of the Mennonite Central Committee in Ontario, the Ailsa Craig, for emotionally disturbed children. The former-minister mentioned some of the projects of the Mennonite people that they have gone into, and I am proud to be a Mennonite, and proud to be part of

some of the programs. But the reason I am here is that the Mennonites are fed up with the socialist attitude of the former minister, and that is why I am here. The Mennonite people are industrious and they want to see a dollar wisely spent.

Now, what have they done? They have bought a farm in Ontario consisting of three hundred acres, with three separate family-style living homes, each home has its own house parents, on duty twenty-four hours a day, and each house accommodates ten boys. The farm provides the boys with ponies, pet dogs, and other livestock plus lots of space for release of tension and for pure enjoyment of the outdoors. I am also convinced that a pet will do more good for an emotionally disturbed child than perhaps many, many hours of sincere work by a professional worker. The Ailsa Craig Farm had a budget of \$110,000 in 1964 and is looking after thirty boys. I am convinced that this Home is a better success story than Embury House, at only one-fifth the cost per child in comparison with our government operated Embury House. This farm is supported financially by the Ontario government and other agencies. It is a non-profit organization and let me say this: Any non-profit organization, dedicated to this type of work, would receive the greatest encouragement normally and financially from this government.

Some Hon. Members: — Hear, hear!

Mr. Boldt: — Embury House has been used as a political football by the opposition. Some of the CCF-NDP committees have stopped to the bottom of the pit by having debates or discussions introduced into church panels, and I shall read you some of the letters that we received. It is a disgrace to what limit the NDP will go. I am going to protect this lady who wrote, but if the ex-minister wants this letter, I will table it. This is the way this letter goes:

I am Mrs . . . of . . . CCF executive of the constituency . . . If you care to check on this, phone central office, 1630 Quebec St., Regina.

This is the way she goes on:

In our United Church Womens' Organization, we are planning as a program a panel on Embury House, or at least the disgraceful action this present government has taken in closing this home.

I won't read all of it, but I will read the main parts:

We thought by a church group doing it, we could keep politics out of it.

A very noble suggestion.

Now what I would like from you, or your office, would be a rough sketch of the case history of such children that are looked after by this home, and a little idea of the care and treatment and age of the boys, etc.

Now what does she say further? This is the damaging part of it. She speaks for a CCF organization and says:

We would appreciate any help you can see fit to give us. I might add we are a CCF group that are doing the planning but are trying to keep politics out of it.

Some Hon. Members: — Hear, hear!

Mr. Boldt: — The CCF will even go into the church panels. Well, I would like to tell the hon. minister that my Church is concerned about saving souls for Christ and not about saving souls for Socialism.

Some Hon. Members: — Hear, hear!

Mr. Boldt: — These are other letters,

some of them addressed to Mr. Gray:

I am trying to arouse public opinion re closing of Embury House. Many people are not aware of its existence and now think \$110,000 is a lot of money for that capacity, so, thanks for closing it. It was similar ignorance that lost the election for us.

This lady says —

I believe if we had the cost broken down into comprehensive items it would be accepted much better . . .

Mrs . . .
CCF Councillor,
. . . Constituency.

Most of the letters were from CCF organizations. I may have received a dozen or so. But this is what the CCF are trying to infiltrate into the churches — Embury House.

Mr. D.W. Michayluk (Redberry): — . . . none from the Liberals.

Mr. Boldt: — I would like to say a few words about Boys' School. I said before that I have a wonderful staff but I do not agree with all they say and they don't agree with all I do, and I appreciate this. I like them to come into my office and argue with me and I like to go into their offices and argue with them, and we have had perfect co-operation. Whenever we have made decisions, our staff has gone to work and implemented them with great speed and in detail.

The Boys' School — now let me turn to it for a few moments. The boys are between the ages of ten and sixteen years of age. Can you imagine, Mr. Speaker, that cigarettes were issued to these boys on a daily routine? These are the socialists that claim no evil. Selling cigarette to minors is contrary to the Canadian Saskatchewan statutes. It is legally wrong, morally wrong and physically wrong and I want to make it abundantly clear that if the government should ever insist that I reinstate smoking in the Boys' School, I will resign as minister. The senior member from Saskatoon, Mr. Nicholson, as minister of the department at the time, is an ordained Minister. I fail to see any rhyme or reason why he would implement smoking in view of the stand his church takes in this regard.

Hon. Mr. Thatcher (Premier): — Shame . . . shame.

Mr. Boldt: — This is what appeared in Hanley, the "CCF were parents doling out cigarettes to minors". I want to read to you what appeared on the bulletin board in the Saskatchewan Boys' School on July 7th, 1960, shortly after the former minister took office. He is an ordained minister of the United Church, this church is strongly opposed to smoking. This is what was permitted to appear on the bulletin board:

Notice — July 7th, 1960, Cigarettes

Effective today Saskatchewan Boys' School has taken over the control of all cigarettes in the building. A V-master and a can of Vogue has been purchased and a can of cigarettes has been made up for the weekend.

Each boy in the school will receive six smokes and we will watch to ensure that no finagling takes place.

Some Hon. Members: — Hear, hear!

Mr. Boldt: —

These six cigarettes will be handed out each evening by the respective group leaders. The boys have been asked to tell

their folks to refrain from sending further cigarettes. Should a carton or package arrive they will also be doled out to the owners at the same rate. The cost of this tobacco will be split equally amongst the smokers each month and will be deducted from their allowance. A full tin of made-up cigarettes will be found in the bottom left hand drawer of the desk in the staff office.

Then on November 2nd a new order was issued:

Convert the use of tobacco to Vogue cigarettes. Six per day.

These are the Socialists that have done no wrong, and I certainly would appreciate it, if the former member from Saskatoon (Mrs. Strum) were in the house. How she would take to this? I am certain that she would not approve of it. I have a great admiration for the lady and what she stands for.

Now, Mr. Speaker, this afternoon when the former Minister of Welfare was speaking, the Premier asked, "Are you against the building of the womens' jail at Prince Albert" and he said "Yes, I most certainly am".

Mr. Nicholson: — Yes, for \$800,000 . . .

Mr. Boldt: — You said you were against building the jail.

Mr. Nicholson: — Yes, for twenty inmates, yes, \$40,000 per inmate.

Mr. Thatcher: — Okay, give it to him . . .

Mr. Boldt: — All right, we will read about the Socialists who keep all their promises. I have here the journals of the session of 1956. This was just before the election in 1956. On page 9, we read the Throne Speech. It states:

Plans are being prepared for the construction of a new womens' jail to replace the present inadequate facilities.

Some Hon. Members: — Hear, hear!

An Hon. Member: — . . . eight years ago . . .

An Hon. Member: — . . . the new commission report came out after that . . . the federal government is taking over . . .

Mr. Boldt: — Mr. Speaker, I want to inform the house that in the budgets while the ex-minister was the Minister, they repeatedly brought this to the Treasury and it was refused and I imagine that the minister recommended that a womens' jail be built.

Mr. Thatcher: — What about that one, Sandy?

Mr. Nicholson: — Not for \$800,000.

Mr. Boldt: — The reason why we want to build a womens' jail is that the staff, including the deputy minister, have recommended it to me. There has been no commitment to my office from the federal government that they are going to take over the institution for those committed for more than six months. This has been recommended in the budget for a good number of years, and you know the Socialists believe that the women and the men should be in the same compound. They want everything social. The Socialists don't realize that this is improper.

Mr. McFarlane: — They want togetherness.

An Hon. Member: — . . . the womens' goal . . .

An Hon. Member: — Now this isn't funny . . .

Mr. Boldt: — For this reason, Mr. Speaker, our department feels that the women should be taken away from the compound and we certainly need more room in the mens' jail at Prince Albert. These are some of the fundamental reasons . . .

Mr. Thatcher: — People before dollars . . .

Mr. Boldt: — . . . and one of the reasons why I do not believe in the suggestion that was made by the former minister. We have the staff in the one compound. We have the hospital. We have the training staff. There is a technical school at Prince Albert. These are the reasons why I believe that it is most economical and wise to build in Prince Albert. Now, Mr. Speaker, I would like to turn for one moment to the member for Arm River (Mr. Pederson). I am sorry that this man who is the Lone Ranger in the house, had to stoop down to gutter politics. I heard him on a television broadcast in the Hanley by-election say this:

One of the ways the Liberals have been achieving economy is by reducing social welfare payments, by cutting off widows and others who are on supplemental allowance. These are the facts, (he says)

Mr. Speaker: — Order! Pursuant to standing order 37, sub-section 3, it becomes my duty at this time to put the question on the amendment before the house.

Amendment negatived on the following recorded division:

Yeas — 24

Brockelbank (Kelsey)	Nicholson	Snyder
Cooper (Mrs.)	Kramer	Broten
Wood	Dewhurst	Larson
Nollet	Berezowsky	Robbins
Blakeney	Michayluk	Brockelbank (Sktn. City)
Davies	Smishek	Pepper
Thibault	Link	
Willis	Baker	
Whelan	Wooff	

Nays — 32

Thatcher	MacDougall	Bjarnason
Howes	Gardiner	Romuld
McFarlane	Coderre	Weatherald
Boldt	Mclsaac	MacLennan
Cameron	Trapp	Larochelle
McDonald (Moosomin)	Grant	Asbell
Steuart	Cuelenaere	Hooker
Heald	MacDonald (Milestone)	Radloff
Guy	Gallagher	Coupland
Merchant (Mrs.)	Breker	Pederson
Loken	Leith	

Mr. Boldt: — Just before I sat down, I mentioned that I was going to comment on one of the remarks made by the hon. member for Arm River (Mr. Pederson). I have just been advised that he voted with us and I shouldn't be too hard on him . . .

Mr. Pederson (Arm River): — Go ahead . . .

Mr. Boldt: — But I don't care how often a man votes for me, if he

is not honest, I am going to tell him so. He said this in a TV address:

One of the ways Liberals have been achieving the economy is by reducing social welfare payments . . .

Mr. Pederson: — Mr. Speaker, on a point of privilege, the hon. minister has imputed to me that I am not honest, and I believe that it is proper for him to withdraw that.

Mr. Boldt: — I will read to him and I will prove to the house that he is not honest.

Mr. Speaker: — I think this is a little bit in the grey area but I think the member's point of order is well taken.

Mr. Boldt: — I will withdraw but I will prove to the members of this house that I don't like to call a man a liar but he is certainly very reckless with the truth.

Mr. Pederson: — Mr. Speaker, I must really protest that type of a statement. In his remarks previously he imputed that I had lied and I believe that if he sincerely believes this then he should table evidence to that effect, otherwise he should withdraw and not use those remarks again.

Mr. Boldt: —: I will withdraw it but I will prove my statement. One of the ways . . .

Mr. Pederson: — Mr. Speaker, I don't believe, Mr. Speaker . . .

Mr. Boldt: — I will prove . . .

Mr. Pederson: — On a point of privilege, Mr. Speaker, I don't believe that the minister had the right to withdraw and then qualify the withdrawal.

Mr. Boldt: — I will withdraw, Mr. Speaker. Now if the hon. member will let me continue I will be pleased to read the statement that he made and what I have to say in this regard:

One of the ways Liberals have been achieving economy is by reducing social welfare payments by cutting off widows and others who are on supplemental allowance.

These are the facts (he said) many people have come to me and told me that since the election of the Liberal party they have been cut off without explanation, or without any opportunity to defend themselves or establish their own case.

This is what he said on television. If this is true I would challenge the hon. member to produce one case. He cannot do it, I challenge you, one case. Now, I want prove my point. This is a blatant, misrepresentation that cause all older citizens, who receive supplemental allowances, needless doubt and worry. To alleviate this anxiety, I want to assure all supplemental allowance recipients that we have no intention whatever of curtailing, much less cutting off any allowance currently paid to eligible persons. Now . . .

Some Hon. Members: — Hear, hear!

Mr. Boldt: — Now, what did the hon. member do? He sneaked into one of my offices without my knowledge, and inquired about a certain case. The director told him that this case was not cut off. As a matter of fact

the allowance was being paid and we had no intentions of cutting it off. For many years, it has been the policy of the department if there is any change regarding allowances to notify recipients, giving reasons. I am sure that the ex-minister will bear me out on this.

They are also advised if they wish to appeal the decision, they will have the opportunity to do so. The basis for the remark of the member for Arm River (Mr. Pederson) might have been the case which I have just mentioned, and which he questioned in my department recently. It pertained to an allowance which he contended had been cancelled. He was advised that the particular person's allowance had not been cancelled and that the department had no intention of cancelling it.

I am prepared to prove to the member from Arm River (Mr. Pederson) that no one who was eligible for an allowance has had his allowance cancelled since I became the Minister. And I challenge you, bring me one name. He cannot do it. He cannot do it. Now I leave it up to the house to judge whether my former statement was right or wrong.

I would like to say a few words about social aid administration in municipalities. Here again, the former ex-minister tried to make political gain. Although I have not the press clipping with me just now, it was reported in the press that:

There are no abuses in Saskatoon. He left the impression that we sent a political team out in Saskatoon to undermine some of the work that Mr. Jones was doing.

Well, this wasn't true. When I became minister, I inquired about welfare costs in the city of Saskatoon and in other cities, and in all municipalities. And we have taken a good look at a large number of municipalities, and I am using the word 'municipality' advisedly.

My people told me that they were concerned about the costs of social aid in Saskatoon and that they were going to make a study of social aid in Saskatoon. I didn't tell them to do so. They went into Saskatoon and examined some of the files. I want to say today that my staff went into Saskatoon and did a real good job in examining files. They didn't have the opportunity to examine all of them but the report was sent to me. The former ex-minister has suggested I should put it under the table and forget about it.

Well, I want to say this. We have found, in a number of municipalities, social aid irregularities. Some don't like the word abuses, but many of them have been abuses. I want to say that my staff and I cannot live with it under these conditions. If the municipalities concerned are not going to help in rectifying this, if this is the way it must be, I don't want to be any part of it.

What did our staff find in their review when they visited the respective municipalities? Well, Mr. Speaker, some of the reports of the reviews made in various areas are most shocking and appalling. Regardless of what the opposition members, the press or certain municipal officials say, it will be my responsibility to see that welfare monies are carefully scrutinized, to see that the public will be protected, and that aid will be given where proven needed. Failing in this, I would not be able to live with it as minister and I would tender my resignation. What are some of the findings? What are some of the findings we believe are irregularities in many of the cases? Time and time again we find that the decision sheets are not up to date. Some are a year and a half old. Decision sheets prove a deficit in some cases and in many cases overpayments of from five to seventy dollars have been made. The deficit shows \$50, they give \$120. The deficit shows \$110, and they give \$160. This is what the ex-minister doesn't want me to look at. In many cases, aid is granted prior to the application. Aid is granted or continued where the client has refused employment. And the ex-minister has said in this house repeatedly, that if somebody refuses a job you can cut him off social aid. I would like to ask the hon. member for Regina, the lady member (Mrs. Cooper), does this not mean work for relief?

What else have we found? Aid is being granted in many instances without an application or decision sheet being filed. Some municipalities issue aid, and I have . . .

Mr. Thatcher: — Just for the Socialists.

Mr. Boldt: — . . . some of the reports right here in my briefcase. Some of the municipalities have issued aid to people as much as \$500 and there isn't a decision sheet, not a decision sheet.

The ex-minister doesn't want me to look into these irregularities. One of the most serious of all the abuses and this is an abuse . . .

Mr. Nicholson: — On a point of privilege. On a point of privilege. The hon. member (Mr. Boldt) is making charges against me which are not true. At no time, did I approve of persons getting social aid with false applications and all the minister has to do is to identify the people but he must not involve me. It hasn't been proven anytime . . .

Mr. Boldt: — This is a repeated story that whenever I speak of welfare the ex-minister jumps up and denies everything he has said and press reports and what I have to say.

One of the most serious of all is where aid is being granted to students over sixteen years of age in their own right. In some cases, Mr. Speaker, the public would be interested to know this, in some cases, the head of the family is fully employed. The parents take their children to the welfare official and they apply for aid in his own right and it has been granted. In other words, I have a daughter in the Rosthern Junior College. I could say to her, "You apply to the welfare official, Mr. Epp," and he would put her on aid.

Mrs. Cooper (Regina West): — Nonsense.

Mr. Boldt: — This is exactly what is being done. These are the facts.

Hon. D.G. Steuart (Prince Albert): — These are the facts.

Mr. Boldt: — In some families on welfare, the moment a child reaches the age of sixteen and is a dependent, he applies for aid in his own right. Board and room has been issued. In one municipality all the girls who applied received \$60 to \$65 for board and room and all the boys received \$30 to \$35. This is not fair. It is discrimination against the boys. Neither of them, boy or girl, has any right to apply for social aid in their own right when they live under the family roof.

These are the things that my staff has found. Some of the municipal officials say there is nothing wrong and that it is all above board. Now this issuing aid to students is a very unethical practice. It is outside the social aid regulations. My staff and I aim to correct it.

Some Hon. Members: — Hear, hear!

Mr. Boldt: — I am positive we have a large number of well administered social aid municipalities. I would just like to mention the Meadow Lake Social Aid Board. I have criticized the town of Meadow Lake on numerous occasions. Since they set up this Board, they have done a marvellous job of keeping costs down. I met with this Board last fall and we had a wonderful meeting. Their problems were fully discussed. And they want to go a lot further than many of my colleagues might care to go. During the course of our discussions, one of the key figures on the board asked at the meeting whether the government would consider interdicting social aid recipients. These are the words he used: "It is pathetic. If it were done, one of our beer parlors would have to close". I want to say to the Socialists that these are not my words. These are the words of one of the most respected citizens in the town of Meadow Lake who is concerned about our welfare program.

I want to repeat what I have said before that those in need have nothing to fear. We will continue to improve the whole welfare program. To the welfare recipient, I want to say this, whether he is employable or unemployable, "stay out of the beer parlors and the liquor outlets, whether you are being treated or not, lest you spoil the image of all recipients, the majority of whom are good citizens whom we are proud to help.

Some Hon. Members: — Hear, hear!

Mr. Boldt: — In order to improve on the administration of welfare, we will asking the legislature to vote money to assist in the administration of social aid. If we are to have a good welfare program that will meet the need of the unfortunate, we must have the co-operation of local governments, willing to administer public funds in the best interest of all concerned.

Mr. Speaker, I shall support the motion.

Some Hon. Members: — Hear, hear!

Mrs. Marjorie Cooper (Regina West): — Mr. Speaker, before the hon. gentleman sits down could I ask him a question? He made one statement that surprised me, about the member for Arm River (Mr. Pederson), sneaking into his department to get some information without asking him. May I ask the hon. minister if he objects to MLA's getting information from your department without coming to you first? Or isn't this the prerogative of any MLA?

Mr. Boldt: — I'll answer the hon. lady. All questions and information should go through the Minister. What I very much despise is that only very recently the ex-minister of Social Welfare phoned one of the staff in the Health Department and ordered her to give him certain information. My staff regard this as highly unethical. We are willing to give you all the information that you desire but I don't think that you should put the staff on the spot.

Mr. A.M. Nicholson (Saskatoon City): — I rise on a question of privilege, Mr. Speaker, affecting the rights of members of this legislature. By what authority does any member sitting opposite deny an elected member from asking any civil servant any question he might wish to ask?

Mr. Boldt: — Mr. Speaker, could I answer this?

Mr. Speaker: — Yes.

Mr. Boldt: — I can keep my staff employed without the ex-minister ordering them what to do.

Mr. Nicholson: — At no time have I asked my former staff . . . The only time I visited the office in Saskatoon was with one of the constituents from the minister's constituency who had a problem and came to me about it. I have been most careful not to embarrass anyone in any of the branches anywhere in the province since I gave up my duties as minister.

Mr. Pederson: — May I ask the hon. minister a question?

Mr. Speaker: — Member for Saskatoon City.

Mr. Nicholson: — Could the minister please tell me how many people in the city of Saskatoon are receiving between \$500 and \$600 a month social aid?

Mr. Speaker: — Excuse me. I thought the member was about to speak in the debate. I didn't know you were going to ask a question.

Mr. Eiling Kramer (The Battlefords): — Mr. Speaker, this is rather late in the evening. I am sorry that the debate has gone on for such a lengthy period. My colleague, the hon. member for Kinistino (Mr. Thibault) was scheduled to speak but it looks as if the opportunity has been missed and that he has been crowded off the speaking agenda.

However, Mr. Speaker, I want to say just a few words before I ask leave to adjourn the debate.

I want to tender congratulations to you, Sir, and to other speakers who have spoken in the debate thus far. And now that we have

disposed of the sub-amendment and the amendment, the debate apparently reverts back to this scanty, barren sheet of paper that I have in my hand here and I find it very difficult — in fact, I could almost, I believe, say everything necessary on this before ten o'clock.

I would like to have some time on the radio tomorrow, Sir, so seeing that we have had a fair amount of acrimony and somewhat needless lecturing from the last speaker, I beg leave at this time to adjourn the debate.

Mr. Speaker: — Has the hon. member leave to adjourn the debate?

Debate adjourned.

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