

LEGISLATIVE ASSEMBLY OF SASKATCHEWAN  
Second Session — Fifteenth Legislature  
15th Day

Monday, February 28, 1966.

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

**WELCOME TO STUDENTS**

**Mr. E. Whelan** (Regina North): — Mr. Speaker, it is my pleasant task to introduce to the legislature a group of young visitors who are in the east gallery. They are from Sherwood School in Northwest Regina, a group consisting of 58 students from the grade 8 classes. With them are their principal, Mr. John Newton, and Mrs. Myrtle Ellis. I am sure all members join me in extending a welcome to them and expressing the wish that their stay this afternoon will be both pleasant and educational.

**Hon. Members:** — Hear, hear!

**Mr. W. G. Davies** (Moose Jaw City): — Before the Orders of the Day, I would like to draw the attention of the members to grade 8 classes from Moose Jaw, from the Queen Elizabeth public school in that city. This is a sparkling and attractive looking group behind me in the west gallery. They are accompanied by Mrs. Ruby Scott and Miss Verna McLeod. I have assured them that they have arrived this afternoon at a most interesting and effective part of our proceedings, Mr. Speaker, and I know that the house will want to assure them of a warm welcome and our good wishes while they visit other points in the city, and a safe journey home.

**CONGRATULATIONS TO SKI TEAM**

**Mr. W. G. Davies** (Moose Jaw City): — May I, Mr. Speaker, while I am on my feet ask the house to join me in congratulating the Moose Jaw contestants who captured the Alpine Team honours at White Track resort, just north of Moose Jaw, with five firsts and a total of 65 points, beating out such places such as Regina, Saskatoon, and Prince Albert. The White Track resort is, of course, part of the Buffalo Pound Lake Park complex, and is, incidentally, in the constituency of my friend the hon. Attorney General (Mr. Heald).

**Mrs. Sally Merchant** (Saskatoon City): — While introductions are being made, I would like members to join me in welcoming a group from the city of Saskatoon, we have, with two teachers, Miss Kerzak and Mr. Windemere, a grade 7 class from the Loren Hazelton school in Saskatoon, with other children here this afternoon. I know that members will wish them a very happy and instructive day.

**Hon. G. J. Trapp** (Minister of Education): — Mr. Speaker, I also would like to welcome a group from Saskatoon, from the Lorne Hazelton school. I think in this group is a young lady, Cathie Mallard, the granddaughter of J. R. Davidson, who served education in Saskatchewan for more than 40 years. I am very pleased to see this group here.

## STATEMENT REGARDING SAFETY OF REGINA TEACHERS IN GHANA

**Hon. G. J. Trapp** (Minister of Education): — I would like to say, Mr. Speaker, I had word from the External Aid Office, just a few moments ago, from Mr. Reynaud of Ottawa, saying that all Saskatchewan teachers who were in Ghana are safe. He would like this message conveyed to all their relatives and friends that all our teachers who are in Ghana are well and safe. Thank you.

**Some Hon. Members:** — Hear, hear!

**Hon. G. Grant** (Minister of Industry): — Not to be outdone, I would like to welcome 32 students from the Assiniboine School in Saskatchewan's best area, Regina South. They are accompanied by the vice—principal of this school, Mrs. Burns. We are very happy indeed to have them with us today and we trust their stay will be most enjoyable.

**Mr. A. E. Blakeney** (Regina West): — Mr. Speaker, I want to join with the member from Regina South (Mr. Grant) in welcoming this group from Assiniboine School. It is, of course, true to say that they come from Regina South constituency. I felt, however, that I might add a word because I see in their midst a very familiar face, and one which I saw this morning at breakfast, and no doubt, will see again. I am sure all will join in wishing them an interesting and educational visit to the legislature.

**Hon. Members:** — Hear, hear!

## STATEMENT RE BOWLING CONTEST — PRESS GALLERY AND MEMBERS

**Mr. I. C. Nollet** (Cut Knife): — Mr. Speaker, now that all the welcomes have been extended to the school children — unfortunately I don't have any here from Lloydminster — but I would like to draw the attention of yourself and the house, Mr. Speaker, that it has almost become traditional now for members of this legislature to have a bowling contest with the press gallery every year, the members of the government and the members of the opposition. Last Saturday, Mr. Speaker, we had such a contest and unhappily we came out on the short end of the stick. We put up a heroic battle, but the trophy remains in the possession of the press gallery. I hope, almost reluctantly, that the government members may take it away from them.

I understand, Mr. Speaker, that the Minister of Public Works (Mr. Gardiner) made the selection of this particular trophy. I want to congratulate him and also show the members of this house the kind of trophy we have in this traditional contest. I don't know if the hon. Minister of Public Works consulted with those people who believe in Darwin's theory of evolution or not, Mr. Speaker, but this is the trophy. I don't know if I should table it either, Mr. Speaker. There may be some technicalities there, so I shall keep it in this bag, and return it to the press boys. I hope that the members of the government have better luck than we did. This particular specimen sometimes reminds me a bit of some of the behaviour that goes on in this legislature. I notice this character is looking skyward and at the same time trying to knock down five pins and get a strike.

Mr. Speaker, thank you for your indulgence in letting me

introduce a bit of monkey business in the legislature.

**Mr. Grant:** — Mr. Speaker, I don't like the inference that the hon. Minister of Public Works (Mr. Gardiner) contributed that trophy. Actually that trophy came from my wife . . .

**Some Hon. Members:** — Hear, hear!

**Mr. Grant:** — . . . and she had the lowest score, so I think she was the only monkey. But we will see that we win it back next Saturday.

**Mr. Nollet:** — I would like to tender my apologies.

**Hon. J. W. Gardiner** (Minister of Public Works: — I just want to say I get blamed for a lot of things, it might as well be one more.

#### ANNOUNCEMENT OF APPOINTMENT OF MR. J. T. KYLE, DEPUTY MINISTER OF PUBLIC WORKS

**Hon. J. W. Gardiner** (Minister of Public Works): — I would like to make an announcement of interest to the members of the legislature. I am very pleased to announce the appointment of Mr. J. T. Kyle, as Deputy Minister of the Department of Public Works to succeed Mr. Don Larmour, who is leaving his position as Deputy Minister to join the staff of the Regina Campus of the University of Saskatchewan. The change is due to go into effect on April 1st.

Mr. Kyle, a Master of Science graduate of the University of Saskatchewan, also holds a certificate of business Administration from the University of Saskatchewan. He spent 11 years with the Department of Agriculture, and was the head of operations and construction. He was four years with the Agricultural Machinery Branch, and three years with the Saskatchewan Power Corporation, where he established a Vehicles and Equipment Division. Following a very brief sojourn with PFRA, Mr. Kyle returned to government service, as Director of the Central Vehicle Agency, and during the past year has been instrumental in establishing this new agency which comes under the supervision of the Department of Public Works.

Mr. Kyle is 42 years of age, is married and has four children, and, of course, is a resident of the city of Regina. I believe that under the guidance of Mr. Kyle, and with the continued co—operation of the staff of the department, the Department of Public Works will be able to continue its efficient and capable operation.

**Hon. Members:** — Hear, hear!

#### QUESTION RE RETURNS

**Mr. W. S. Lloyd** (Leader of the Opposition): — Before Orders of the Day, can the government tell us when we may expect one motion for return, which was passed last year, and one address which was passed last year, which has not

yet been tabled.

**Hon. D. V. Heald:** — Mr. Speaker, each of those returns is in the process of being prepared. I was checking on it Friday, and I think within the next two days, probably next week, or Friday.

### BUDGET DEBATE

**Mr. A. E. Blakeney** (Regina West): — Mr. Speaker, when I adjourned the debate on Friday, I had not availed myself of the opportunity of congratulating the new members of the house, the member for Moosomin (Mr. Gardner), and the member for Bengough (Mr. Mitchell). I had earlier taken the opportunity privately of congratulating the member for Moosomin (Mr. Gardner) on his very creditable maiden contribution to the debates of this house. I am sure that the member for Bengough will also prove to be a valuable addition to our midst, as did his immediate predecessor whose legislative career was so tragically cut short.

Each of the members comes from a distinguished general area of the province, for each area has had the distinction of converting an opposition politician into a Liberal Senator. The conversions have been dramatic if not entirely convincing.

**Some Hon. Members:** — Hear, hear!

**Mr. Blakeney:** — I've no doubt that many of the Liberal faithful are pondering just what has happened. They welcomed these converts into the orchard to help them with the political labours, the converts have now left, taking with them the choicest plums. To the distinguished ex—mayor of Saskatoon and to the others I think we can only say, better luck next time. And to their Premier I think we would offer the advice from the Talmud that a teacher should not be envious of his pupil.

**Some Hon. Members:** — Hear, hear!

**Mr. Blakeney:** — I noted, Mr. Speaker, with some amusement, but no great surprise that the Premier, in outlining the principles of his budgeting, quoted a Liberal sage of another era, W. E. Gladstone. I say no great surprise for two reasons: one, because the ideas are 75 years old, and most of the Premier's ideas appear to have about that degree of freshness and originality; two, because it came from Gladstone. Some might find some affinity between the Premier and Gladstone. It was Gladstone of whom Disraeli said, rather unkindly:

A sophisticated rhetorician, inebriated with the exuberance of his own verbosity, and gifted with an egotistical imagination that can at all times command an interminable and inconsistent series of arguments to malign an opponent and to glorify himself.

**Some Hon. Members:** — Hear, hear!

**Mr. Blakeney:** — And it was Gladstone of whom Queen Victoria said:

He speaks to me as if I were a public meeting.

Well, these rather unkind words were spoken of Gladstone, and whether they have any more current application I leave it to the hon. members to decide. I want now to consider some of the comments of Gladstone's latter day disciple, for in his very first works the Provincial Treasurer struck the note upon which the budget must be judged. As he rightly said, the duty of the Treasurer is to consider available revenues and establish priorities for spending these revenues or reducing taxes. Upon its scale of priorities any government must be judged.

Last year, Mr. Speaker, I said as clearly as I could that the budget was a mistake, a mistake because it would shift taxes and shift them in the wrong direction, shift them from provincially collected taxes to locally collected taxes, and from those best able to pay to those least able to pay. Every word that I said has proved to be correct. The past year has been characterized by the largest increases in local taxes in many, many years. Let me cite just one or two examples of the hundreds that could be cited. Public school mill rates went up 3 mills or more in at least 17 towns and four cities in 1965. Examples, Moosomin town up 6 mills, Wynyard, up 8 mills, Weyburn School unit, 4 mills, Shaunavon School Unit, 4 mills. I am pleased to see that the government has acknowledged the folly of the policies it pursued last year and is trying to make some amends. I will have something more to say later about the methods that they are using to make amends.

Last year's budget might have been called the shifter's budget. Well, if last year's budget was the shifter's budget then this year's budget is the juggler's budget. I said in my brief remarks on Friday that the budget was noteworthy primarily for what it did not say. The Provincial Treasurer has adopted some rather remarkable expedients to obscure the true picture revealed by the estimates.

Let's look at these figures for education, and I know in speaking with members of the press gallery, — that the figures baffle them as they baffle me. We are told that regular school grants are \$55,100,000 compared with \$46,200,000 last year. But when we are later told that of this \$55,000,000 over \$6,000,000 is for capital grants for technical high schools, and not for operating grants at all, the figure looks a little less impressive. It is now down to \$49,000,000. Consider also that the CCF government paid 100 per cent of the cost of the regional technical high schools and did not include the amount in school grants at all. Consider too that this \$55,000,000 includes extra sums for private schools, and I hope, substantial extra sums for northern education, and it will be seen that the actual increase in regular operating grants to school boards is less than \$4,000,000.

This is not much more than the wholly inadequate figure which was provided last year, and which caused mill rates to advance and advance sharply. If the Provincial Treasurer thinks these so-called regular grants will be enough to stabilize mill rates, I tell him he is dreaming. It might be possible for one year to stabilize mill rates by dipping into reserves but grants at this level cannot and will not stabilize mill rates.

But the Provincial Treasurer says, "I've got more. I've got \$1,000,000 for teachers' pensions." To comment on that I would have to borrow a phrase from my young daughter, "Big Deal".

**February 28, 1966**

For 15 years the provincial government has been paying the teachers' pensions. The Provincial Treasurer is going to continue to pay them and by paying the Canada Pension Plan contributions — and he adds it to school grants — for the first time in history. As I say, "Big Deal".

But the Provincial Treasurer says, "I have more, I have incentive grants." Everybody shares the Premier's desire to keep mill rates down, even if he is a year late, but when I read the proposal on incentive grants I had two thoughts.

First, the speech speaks of school units. This was probably a slip of the tongue because I can't conceive of the grants not being available to all school boards alike, whether they be organized as units or not. If the Provincial Treasurer actually means that these are available only to school units then the proposal is totally unacceptable. How can anyone defend grants which will keep mill rates down in Rosetown, but not in Humboldt; in Tisdale but not in Melfort; in Assiniboia but not in Gravelbourg.

In case the Provincial Treasurer is not aware of it municipal taxes create hardship for people in town and country alike. In fact I doubt if anyone is harder pressed than the young married couples in our larger centres, who because of down payment problems are forced to buy a house for more money than they want to pay and then have to pay taxes of \$400 or \$500 a year, which they can ill afford.

If this grant is not available for all school boards, I would urge the Provincial Treasurer to reconsider. I urge him in the strongest possible terms.

My second thought is about the whole idea of incentive grants. We hear a lot of talk by members opposite about local autonomy, but grants that are only available if a school board freezes its mill rate make a mockery of local autonomy. One duly elected board may want to run a minimum system and keep taxes down and that is their right. Another duly elected board might want to run a better system with more teachers, with some new ideas and innovations; that is their right. If their people are willing to pay the shot, they surely do not deserve to be penalized for their initiative.

I, for one, believe that the education in this province will prosper best if boards are given every opportunity to experiment and innovate. All the wisdom doesn't reside in the Department of Education; it didn't even reside there when I was there, not all of it. We are fools if we say it does, we are fools too if we do anything to snuff out the initiative and the enterprise of local boards. I am very much afraid that these so-called incentive grants will kill more initiative and more incentive than they ever generate. Now, I am as concerned as the Provincial Treasurer is about mill rates. But we don't run a school system for mill rates, we run it for children. And there are other values besides money values — more important values than money values. These so-called incentive strings on school grants are a reflection on our school trustees and a threat to the school children and to the future of these children for whom these trustees are, in fact, trustees. These strings should be dropped and our trustees given the freedom they need and the freedom they deserve.

I now turn to the melancholy story of technical education

under a Liberal government. Let me first recall the background of the problem. Immediately after the war the rural school system of this province was completely overhauled. Larger school units were introduced by the then Minister of Education, the present Leader of the Opposition, a bold forward step for which the people of Saskatchewan will one day accord him even greater honor than they have already done.

**Some Hon. Members:** — Hear, hear!

**Mr. Blakeney:** — I noted with some amusement an editorial in the Leader Post on the occasion of the formation of the Rosthern Larger School Unit, the last unit to be formed. The editorial was congratulatory, it recounted how the unit system had been introduced against stubborn opposition. Well, certainly on this point the editor spoke with authority. For there was no more stubborn opponent of this reform in Saskatchewan than the Leader Post. The editor of the Leader Post had perhaps only two rivals in the bitterness and unreasonableness of his opposition. And who were these two stubborn foes of progress? The member for Rosthern (Mr. Boldt), and the member for Melville (Mr. Gardiner).

On the solid base of Larger School Units a system of elementary schools and high schools was built. Attention was directed not only to students who wanted a university entrance course but also to those seeking a general education, and those who wanted courses in domestic, secretarial and manual skills. Technical education was offered in the three largest cities. But it was realized that these schools did not do the whole job.

Two groups seem to have been left out: firstly, young people who could not, or did not want to, meet the academic requirements of the composite high school but who wanted straight technical training, secondly, people older than high school age who for many reasons have left the regular school system and wanted technical training. So two main steps were taken: one, Technical Institutes were established at Moose Jaw and Saskatoon. These are schools offering first class technical training. Two, a system of technical high schools and local technical institutes was planned to give technical training to young people of high school age and to older people as well. The first one of these was built at Prince Albert. It has given technical training, high school, and training for adults who were beyond high school age.

The government has apparently abandoned both of these policies. True, they still operate the Technical Institutes and a very fine job these institutes are doing too. True, the government has plans for expanding these institutes. But they had plans last year. They even provided \$400,000 in the budget last year. But, Mr. Speaker, how much did they spend on all of the projects, all of their projects on these two technical institutes in the two years they have been in power? Ten dollars, Mr. Speaker.

**Mr. J. H. Brockelbank (Kelsey):** — The Minister of Education (Mr. Trapp) should know that if he wants to take notes of this speech he should be at his desk, not in the Speaker's gallery.

**Some Hon. Members:** — Hear, hear!

**Mr. Blakeney:** — I was indicating that they

**February 28, 1966**

have spent \$10 on expanding the technical institute at Saskatoon and Moose Jaw. That is considerably less than they had spent trying to bring into this province trained men who had the good fortune to live in some place where they had proper technical training institutions. The government has apparently abandoned the idea of technical institutes. And if they haven't abandoned the idea they have lost two valuable years.

But as for the program for technical high schools, they have abandoned that altogether. Instead they keep talking about a program of comprehensive schools. I say that these schools will not and cannot do the job that needs to be done. When the smoke has cleared it will be found that these comprehensive schools have not attracted anyone which a good composite school wouldn't attract. They will leave largely untouched the 20 or 25 per cent of our young people who need regular technical training.

Now, Mr. Speaker, it wouldn't be quite so bad if they were even getting on with the job of a comprehensive school program, but in two years they have provided not one new space, not one single space in a comprehensive high school, or in a technical institute for any young person in Saskatchewan.

There are, or would be, real job opportunities for technically trained people. Instead they are unemployed or working at unskilled jobs or they have left Saskatchewan. Such is the bankruptcy of the policies of this government opposite.

**Some Hon. Members:** — Hear, hear!

**Mr. Blakeney:** — You may say, well, give them a chance. But they were elected in 1964. They did nothing. 1965 has come and gone. They have nothing. 1966 is upon us and we are budgeting for 1967. And still no effective answer. Tens of thousands of young people will have lost the opportunity that they need and they deserve. It is said, Mr. Speaker, that Nero fiddled while Rome burned. I don't think the present government could get up the strength to fiddle.

Mr. Speaker, I now turn to Crown corporations. The Premier enlightened us on the qualifications which a Crown corporation must have in order to commend itself to him. He listed three qualifications. He should perhaps have cited a fourth, the fourth would be, that the operation is not coveted or feared by any friends of the government.

**Some Hon. Members:** — Hear, hear!

**Mr. Blakeney:** — I listened, Mr. Speaker, with amazement to the Provincial Treasurer's suggestion that Saskatchewan Government Printing Company might be disposed of. This corporation does printing for the government and for nobody else, 100 per cent of its business is government business. Its record of success has been truly outstanding.

When it was established in 1945 the government paid to it the prices for printing which were actually paid by the Liberal government of 1944. By 1952 when the printer's wages had more than doubled, when machinery and other costs had doubled, this company was still being paid the 1944 rates and was still making money; \$34,000 in 1952. Can you imagine what profits were made



in 1944 by the friends of the then Liberal government. Is it any wonder that the Premier wants to get rid of this useful corporation? For while it exists it is a constant check—rein on the natural pork—barrelling instincts of Liberal government, instincts which are still very prominent, whether or not they are handing out printing business or senate appointments.

Or take Saskatchewan Sodium Sulphate. How often I remember the Liberal members, and particularly the former member for Saltcoats, (Mr. Snedker) deriding this venture. Every time the plant closed down temporarily for overhaul he would stand up in his place and announce that the plant had closed. He particularly disliked this corporation because it was, as he said, set up by the Socialist planners, because it was an obvious success, because it was competing with private enterprise companies right here, and because it was selling 100 per cent of its products abroad in the competitive private enterprise market. It was a success where other plants failed, because it was better designed and better managed. With considerable foresight this company foresaw the expansion in sodium sulphate business and it bought up a defunct private company. It bought salt deposits at Bishopric and Alsask. The Bishopric deposit has developed and will net the taxpayers of Saskatchewan, I venture to think, a million dollars as well as providing very well paid employment.

The Alsask deposit was held in reserve. But now the Alsask deposit has been sold to a private company, a private company who will cash in on the foresight of the government of Saskatchewan. No price has been disclosed but I would be amazed if the price was one—tenth of the profit which would have been realized had that deposit been developed.

**Mr. Thatcher:** — You had 20 years.

**Mr. Blakeney:** — Chaplin was developed. Bishopric was developed over those 20 years as he says. This operation is a proven moneymaker. In spite of comments of the members when they sat on this side of the house, these operations consistently made money. The corporation has given life to two new communities, Chaplin and Bishopric, and since it disproves so many myths of members opposite about public enterprise and private enterprise it must be undermined. And the Provincial Treasurer is doing just that. He claims that there has been no sell out of resources. If so why does he not tell us why he is setting up this private company in competition with Saskatchewan Minerals, and selling to the private company their salt beds that they will operate with? He should tell us why this private company will have the use of the research that Saskatchewan Sodium Sulphate bought and paid for, from the Saskatchewan Research Council.

**Some Hon. Members:** — Hear, hear!

**Mr. Blakeney:** — Why doesn't the Premier disclose to use the terms of this sale?

**Mr. Thatcher:** — I will be pleased to if you want me to.

**Mr. Blakeney:** — You will have every opportunity. The Department of Mineral Resources will have its full opportunity to tell us all about this. He has held his peace since last July, he has made

announcements about how this big plant was here, but at no time did he tell us the terms of the deal between the government and the Saskatchewan Sodium Sulphate.

**Hon. A. C. Cameron** (Minister of Mineral Resources): — On a point of privilege, I don't wish to interrupt the speaker, but he should know that is not under the Department of Mineral Resources. He shows utter ignorance of the sodium sulphate operation if he says it is operated by Mineral Resources.

**Mr. Blakeney**: — Perhaps then it should have been the Premier. And the criticism is all the more valid for the first minister of the government to fail to disclose information over eight or ten months about selling of resources of this province.

Or take Saskair. The Provincial Treasurer tells us that Saskair has been sold at a price which realized a net gain for the taxpayer. This statement represents another good example of the juggler's art. The company's assets were worth perhaps \$750,000 to \$1,000,000 and it cost the taxpayers something over \$600,000. They are being sold to a new company, NorCanAir, for \$378,000 cash plus air services to be rendered to the government by the new company at prices set by the new company. Stripped of its verbiage that is what this agreement means.

I would have no strong quarrel with the sale of Saskair if the terms were right. Saskair has played an outstanding role in the opening up of the north when private carriers would not do so. For 15 years Saskair maintained scheduled runs, five scheduled runs, which it operated at a loss consistently. It operated these scheduled runs in order to open up the north and in order to remove some of the isolation experienced by people in the north. Profits were made on the private charter work, and, of course, private companies came in to cream off some of the profit from private charter business. There was nothing we could do about that, the Air Transport Board at Ottawa allowed it to happen. And under the Liberals at Ottawa, the Air Transport Board was consistently biased against provincially owned carriers. In addition Liberal governments at Ottawa consistently gave preference to private carriers over Saskair for government business. But over the years the *raison d'être* of Saskair was disappearing. Roads were pushed into the north, to La Ronge, to Buffalo Narrows, to La Loche, and now into Cumberland House. The scheduled runs were must less important than previously. The job of opening up the north was well on the way, and the CCF would have been prepared to sell Saskair. I said sell but not sell—out. The Premier is proud of his deal. Now I want to compare his deal with some considered by the previous government. The previous government would have considered a price of \$700,000, half cash, for the assets of Saskair. But compared with the Premier's deal, the proposal considered by the CCF had significant differences.

1. The assets to be sold were not to include \$100,000 in accounts receivable.
2. The assets to be sold were not to include \$200,000 receivable from the Government Finance Office.
3. The assets to be sold which were the subject of this \$700,000 negotiation did not include assets purchased in 1964, aircraft worth close to \$200,000, that the government opposite bought when it knew it was going to sell out this company.

**Some Hon. Members:** — Hear, hear!

**Mr. Blakeney:** — And most important:

4. The deal involved no commitment forcing the government to use the services of the purchaser, no guarantee of \$2,750,000.

On paper the Liberal government got perhaps \$150,000 more, and all it gave was extra assets worth \$300,000 or \$400,000, and a guarantee of \$2,750,000. Now let's look a little closer at this guarantee. I say that the agreement between the government and the purchaser, NorCanAir, contains no guarantee against the government being forced to pay exorbitant prices for flying . . .

**Mr. Steuart:** — Get a good lawyer to read it and you'll find out the truth.

**Mr. Blakeney:** — Just listen. I heard the Attorney General (Mr. Heald) the other day and it is perfectly obvious that I need a better lawyer than that. I want to say this; the agreement says that the government can use NorCanAir, must use NorCanAir, for 75 per cent of air operations, and this 75 per cent must be at least \$275,000 a year. True, if NorCanAir's prices for any single job are too high, the job can be excluded from air operations, but all it does is exclude this job from air operation. The remaining flying which is left within the definition of air operations must total \$275,000 a year. You may say that the government can do its own flying, but if it did it would still have to pay that company \$275,000 a year. What is more, the government is prohibited from doing any commercial work and I think it would be well known to anyone familiar with northern flying that there is not enough government business to support an airline. You would have to have some commercial work or the operation would be uneconomic. Now that is the deal. The government will get a down payment of \$378,000; the balance will in reality be paid out by flying done by the purchaser, NorCanAir, at rates set by it.

Now, Mr. Speaker, this is supposed to be a good business deal. It is good business all right but not for the people of Saskatchewan. I'm sure it will be profitable all right, but the profit will not come to the people of Saskatchewan, the people who took the risk when this airline was set up and who saw it make a great contribution to the opening of the north, who saw it double and triple the income of our northern people, and who saw it sold, and I would really like to say, sold out, by the member from Maple Creek, the Minister for Mineral Resources.

**Some Hon. Members:** — Hear, hear!

**Mr. Blakeney:** — Saskair, Sodium Sulphate and perhaps Printing. How many more friends will the Liberal government find?

The Premier talks about the philosophy of the Liberal government. It is becoming increasingly clear that the philosophy of the Liberal government is to look after its friends and to look after them at the expense of the taxpayer.

**February 28, 1966**

I want now, Mr. Speaker, to turn to a discussion of economic progress in Saskatchewan. This year the Provincial Treasurer omitted the usual review of international and national economic affairs. If he had included such a review he would have had to tell the house that economic prosperity is being enjoyed by all the countries of the western world. In particular the United States, under the stimulation of military operations, is enjoying unprecedented levels of production and employment. And the same is generally true of Canada. Saskatchewan is sharing in this prosperity. Our growth is continuing and continuing at a good rate. But the figures indicate two things very clearly. First, our rate of growth is slowing down compared with 1963—64. Second, we are losing ground compared with the rest of Canada.

Now let's take a few of these indicators, let's take oil production; 1963, 7,000,000 barrels increase; 1964, 10,000,000 barrels; 1965, 6,000,000 barrels, good, but not spectacular.

Take manufacturing. Our investment in manufacturing in 1965 was well below the figure for 1963. In fact in two successive Budget Speeches the Provincial Treasurer has admitted what he could not deny, that manufacturing growth is poor.

Or take investment per capita. 1963, 25 per cent above the Canadian average; 1965, 11 per cent above the Canadian average.

Or take cattle numbers; this should appeal to the Premier. End of December, 1964, 2,038,000 head; end of December, 1965, 1,975,000 head, down three per cent, contrary to the Canadian trend.

Or take non—agricultural investment. Saskatchewan in 1965 up seven per cent over 1964, Canada up 15 per cent over 1964.

Or take retail trade . . .

**Mr. Steuart:** — Take pulp wood.

**Mr. Blakeney:** — Well, we haven't got it yet, but when we get it we will take it. To return to retail trade, 1962, retail trade up 6.8 per cent; 1963, 10.9 per cent; 1964, 9.3 per cent; 1965, 5.7 per cent. You may argue about the figures. One set of figures may vary a tenth or a fifth of one per cent from another set; but it is perfectly clear that the increases in retail trade are much lower than previous years and much lower than the Canadian increase.

Or take personal income that the Premier took so much pride about in this Budget Speech. He said it is now up to the Canadian average. Well, well! In 1962 it was \$32 above the Canadian average; in 1963 it was \$137 above the Canadian average. I will tell you that if it is more than \$10 above the Canadian average this year, I'll eat it.

Housing starts, another indicator that he was proud of. 1964, Canada up 7.3 per cent; Saskatchewan up 4.8 per cent.

I am not denying that there is progress but I am saying that this myth that Saskatchewan has somehow taken off, has surpassed all the other provinces, is just that, sheer myth.

It is true that we are continuing the boom that started in 1962, and it is true, too, that we are enjoying the prosperity that comes from four successive bumper crops. But what is not true is that either the boom or the bumper crops are the product of the Liberal government.

We all rejoice at the extensive development of our natural resources which has taken place since the war. Our greatest natural resource has continued to respond to the skills of our farmers and agrologists. The result is that in terms of production per man—hour or per man employed, productivity has probably increased more in agriculture than in any other field of endeavour. Many of the representatives of business and industry who talk about productivity could well take a lesson from our Saskatchewan farmers.

The oil industry has flourished. Now it is true that members opposite were fond of saying that not a barrel of oil would be produced under a CCF government. Well, Mr. Speaker, they were wrong, very wrong, they were wrong 400,000,000 times, and that is quite a lot even for Liberals.

**Some Hon. Members:** — Hear, hear!

**Mr. Blakeney:** — The potash industry has flourished. In the early days of this industry some predicted that the industry would open up a great new frontier of development. But others, who could not or would not see the possibility scoffed. I remember those days nine years ago when Premier T. C. Douglas said:

When Saskatchewan's infant potash industry gets rolling, it is expected to provide direct and indirect employment for 12,000 persons.

There were those who scoffed. And who was scoffer no. 1? Even then he was big no. 1, the member for Morse (Mr. Thatcher). Here is what he said, as quoted in the Leader Post for February 2, 1957, when commenting on Premier Douglas's statement:

Is it any wonder, we say that Aesop has a new challenger in the telling of fables. As far as potash is concerned, we have two plants in the province, neither one of them is in production and several of the potash companies that were exploring a few years ago, have pulled out of the province.

Such was his faith in Saskatchewan.

**An Hon. Member:** — A real help.

**Mr. Blakeney:** — A real help as my seatmate says. But in spite of the jeers of the scoffers, development proceeded and is continuing. There have been notable developments in cement, steel and pipe, fertilizer and chemicals and also a host of secondary industries over the last six to eight years.

**Mr. Thatcher:** — All due to private enterprise.

**Mr. Blakeney:** — Yes, due to private enterprise and public enterprise, and co—operative enterprise. There are some reservations in

**February 28, 1966**

our enthusiasm. One is that in all too few of these developments, has it been possible for Saskatchewan people to retain a major share of the ownership. It was possible in the case of cement and steel, to have some shares offered to the public. But the time has come, I believe, to offer new opportunities to our citizens to participate in these developments. I urge the government to consider setting up a Saskatchewan Mutual Development Fund in which citizens could participate. The idea is not new, it was suggested by others, including my Leader, (Mr. Lloyd), and the member for Arm River (Mr. Pederson). It deserves close attention. The idea would be to establish a mutual fund which would take the savings and investments of individuals and invest them in Saskatchewan undertakings. New industrial ventures would be particularly favoured but I would think there should be some investment in municipal securities in order to balance the portfolio.

It would be necessary for the government to guarantee a dividend of say 3 ½ and 4 per cent, and any earnings above this figure would be used partly to pay a larger dividend, and partly to establish a reserve, a reserve which would guarantee future dividends and incidentally, protect the government on its dividend guarantee. Directors would be selected partly by the government, and partly by the shareholders. As a basis for consideration I would suggest that the government look at the Alberta Investment Fund set up last year and consider some of the new policies which have been suggested for this fund in the last few weeks.

As has been said elsewhere, there will be a real opportunity to own more of our resources when the money from the Canadian Pension Plan starts coming into Saskatchewan. This will amount to about \$25,000,000 a year. Used wisely and combined with other savings of our people, we could have a fund which would do a real job in developing Saskatchewan by our people and for our people.

**Some Hon. Members:** — Hear, hear!

**Mr. Blakeney:** — Mr. Speaker, surely this must be our goal. We want our resources developed for Saskatchewan people. We want jobs. But we want something more than jobs — hewers of wood and drawers of water have jobs. We want the full fruits of ownership for our people. Perhaps, we can't do this all at once, but we on this side of the house believe that it should be our aim. That is why we support Crown corporations, as members opposite do not; that is why we support co—operative enterprise, as members opposite do not; that is why we support local private ownership as opposed to external private ownership, as members opposite do not. But surely even they can join with us in agreeing that a judicious blend of public and private initiative would give to our people an opportunity to hold on to some of our birthright, so that our children may live as free men, full heirs to the great heritage which is Saskatchewan.

**Some Hon. Members:** — Hear, hear!

**Mr. Blakeney:** — Mr. Speaker, I am constantly surprised at the lengths to which the Liberal government will go to perpetuate the myth that all was stagnation and despair before the election of 1964. They do this by ignoring facts as long as possible, and when they can't any longer ignore the facts they distort them just a

bit.

Take the matter of population. Year after year, Liberal spokesmen decried the loss of population by Saskatchewan. Year after year they suggested that if only Saskatchewan had a Liberal government all people born in Saskatchewan would stay here and not only that, people would flock into Saskatchewan from other provinces and other lands. In his last Budget Speech, last year, the Provincial Treasurer told us this:

In the near future, the government will endeavour to take action which will retain the natural increase of this province, and attract other citizens from Canada and other parts of the world.

But in last Friday's address the Provincial Treasurer was strangely silent on this topic about which he used to wax so eloquent. Let's see if the population has burgeoned and bloomed. Let's see if everyone has stayed in the new Saskatchewan now miraculously warmed by the beaming countenance of the Provincial Treasurer. Have all the people stayed? Have others flocked in? What do the figures show?

In the year ended May 31st, 1964, population rose by 10,000. In the year ended May 31st, 1965, population rose by 8,000, and since our natural increase is around 14,000 it means that our people are continuing to leave Saskatchewan. Four thousand in the last CCF year, 6,000 in the first Liberal year.

The Premier is fond of contrasting Saskatchewan with other provinces. Well, neither Manitoba nor Saskatchewan is hanging on to its natural increase, and Alberta barely so. Since June, 1964, Saskatchewan has grown by some 10,000 people and British Columbia has grown by some 100,000 people. I could go back in history and show that no province in the history of Canada has ever lost population at a faster rate than Saskatchewan under a Liberal government. But all I really want to say is that in spite of the boasts of members opposite, Saskatchewan is still losing part of its natural increase and at the same rate or at a faster rate than at any time for fifteen years.

I suppose that some felt that the gusts of warm air issuing from the Premier's office would be enough to offset our weather disadvantage. But not so. The legislative Chinook has been impressive as a wind but it hasn't been quite enough. In fact we are losing Saskatchewan people at just as fast a rate as at any time within the last fifteen years. Whether or not the members opposite have any special skills in adding to the population — and we think of the member for Milestone (Mr. MacDonald), and some of the others — they have no special gifts in keeping them here. The population issue, Mr. Speaker, has been ducked by the Provincial Treasurer.

But the matter of new industries, really that one can't be ducked. So much has been said about new industries that when put on the spot they just have to come up with some sort of a list of new industries. In response to a question by the member for Saskatoon, the Minister of Industry (Mr. Grant) tabled a list of new industries, at least so-called new industries. He tabled a list of so-called expanded industries as well. I looked at the list of "expanded" industries and saw lots and lots of familiar names. But it was to the list of new industries which I directed my attention. I looked at the list, and I looked again, and I saw some strange names.

**February 28, 1966**

Kalium Chemicals. Isn't that the company that was established in Saskatchewan in February of 1963? Isn't that the plant that I saw being built in 1963 and 1964? Isn't that the plant that some of my colleagues toured while they were still cabinet ministers? Well, did it somehow disappear and reappear in the last twenty months? I want to call attention to members of the house that these were in the words of the minister "established during the last twenty months".

Then I saw Agra Vegetable Oils Limited. Isn't that the company that was established in 1960? Isn't that the company that was lent money from the Industrial Development Fund while I was chairman of the Fund back in 1961 and 1962? Did it too disappear and get re—established in the last twenty months?

Then there was Alwinal Potash at Lanigan. Now, I did a lot of legal work for that company back in 1958 and 1959. Our firm acted as its solicitors. Now what has happened to this company? What happened to it to cause it to disappear and reappear in the last twenty months?

**Mr. Thatcher:** — You charge too much.

**Mr. Blakeney:** — No, I am happy to say that they are still with that firm of solicitors; they were so satisfied with the work.

**An Hon. Member:** — Are you still with that firm?

**Mr. Blakeney:** — No, as a matter of fact, I established a firm of my own, but they still were served by my old firm of solicitors back in 1963, when the leader of my firm announced a plant of \$50,000,000 for Alwinal potash would be built at Lanigan. Now, I don't know what happened to that industry because it disappeared and reappeared in the last twenty months.

There were certainly other names that had the same sort of on—again, off—again, gone—again, back—again attribute. I thought this was really a strange phenomenon; this is a case for the Perry Mason from the north over there. This is the case of the disappearing companies.

It reminds me of George Orwell's 1984. Remember that book? In 1984, when the Fuehrer there found some bit of history inconvenient, he simply rewrote it and expunged from the record all the things that had gone before; he erased all the evidence of any inconvenient historical fact. I think they called it "news—peak, 1984"; and it is a sort of "Ross—speak, 1964". Well, Mr. Speaker, it won't wash, it won't hold water, light or heavy.

**Some Hon. Members:** — Hear, hear!

**Mr. Blakeney:** — No amount of bogus trumpeting by the members opposite will rewrite the past; the record of achievement is there. And it will not escape notice but if the Liberals' own record consisted of more substance and less bluster they wouldn't have been forced to descend to such shoddy prevarications. Neither Saskatchewan industry nor Saskatchewan public life is well served by such transparently false claims of new industries. I'm sorry that the member for Regina South (Mr. Grant) felt it necessary to put them forward.



Mr. Speaker, the Provincial Treasurer spoke of his priorities. The budget estimates he presented spoke even more eloquently of his priorities. Of the substantial increase in gross spending what agency of the provincial, the executive agency of the provincial government got the least benefit? Need we ask? The Department of Co—operative Development. Notwithstanding the substantial growth of the co—op movement this department is at the bottom of the list of priorities. Its staff is actually being cut by two people. What is the second from the bottom of the list? Well, need we ask again? The Department of Labour. Again, notwithstanding the continuing growth in the number of people who work for wages and the continued and in some cases pressing need to improve their safety and protection, the Department of Labour is second on the bottom of the list. Of the 120 new people added to the government payroll, two are in the Department of Labour. Not only in spending . . .

**Some Hon. Member:** — The minister is very efficient.

**Mr. Blakeney:** — Not in finding cars.

**Some Hon. Members:** — Hear, hear!

**Mr. Blakeney:** — It is not only in spending that the Provincial Treasurer shows his priorities; he shows them again with his tax changes. Last year he said this:

Liberals believe that regressive taxes are harmful at low rates; they become positively disastrous when the rates are extreme.

If this is what the Liberals believe, the Treasurer has proved beyond question that he is not a Liberal.

When the medicare program was introduced, it was financed by taxes of three types, the premium, the sales tax, and the income tax. The premium is the same amount for everyone, \$72 a year whether the family makes a thousand a year or a million dollars a year. The sales tax particularly when food and rent and that sort of thing are exempted, is about proportional. The man with a small income pays about the same per cent of his income as does the man with a big income. Income tax on the other hand is progressive, a rich man pays a greater per cent of his income in tax than does a poor man. Now, what changes have the Liberals made? Have they increased the progressive tax and cut the regressive tax, as you might expect from their statement? No, indeed, they have done just the reverse. They have increased the premium, the most regressive tax of all, to its highest level in history, and they propose to cut the income tax, the fairest tax of all. I think it is not a question of at what level a tax was, but when the chance came to cut a tax what tax did they cut? They cut the progressive tax and not the regressive tax.

Do you know what this cut in income tax will mean? For most people in Saskatchewan it is so small that you will hardly be able to find it. For three—quarters of the people who pay tax, it will mean less than one cent a day. For three—quarters of the people who pay tax, and all of the 30 or 40 per cent who don't pay tax, it will mean less than one cent a day. But if you happen to be wealthy it means quite a bit. If you are married, have three children, and make \$4,000 a year, it will mean about \$1.25 a year. If you are married, have three children, and make \$20,000 a year, it is worth about \$65 a year. The man

**February 28, 1966**

with the big income gets 50 times the benefit of the man with the small income. If the money had been used to lower the medicare premium each man would get the same benefit, but that is not the way the Liberals do things. They opposed the principle of medicare financed on the basis of ability to pay. They still oppose it. Every move they make either to raise the premium or to lower the income tax, to finance more by poll tax and less by progressive income tax, shows their true colours, the colours they paraded in 1962, and dipped to get through the electoral gate in 1964.

The CCF believes that wherever possible social programs like health and education should be financed by taxes closely related to the ability to pay. This is what we stand for. We don't believe that cabinet ministers or senators or lawyers are in need of immediate tax relief. We believe that there are many people who deserve attention first.

**Some Hon. Members:** — Hear, hear!

**Mr. Blakeney:** — Mr. Speaker, we are sorry, but we are not surprised that once again the government has decided that the well to do have the first call on the treasury of Saskatchewan.

Mr. Speaker, before I leave the matter of priorities, I want to touch on one of the many groups who are called upon to suffer so that those with the higher incomes may enjoy their holidays in Hawaii. I could name instance after instance of little people being made to suffer, of older people having their health services card cut off with inadequate explanation or notice, deserted wives being denied social aid, emotionally disturbed children being denied the care they need.

The instance I want to comment on more fully this afternoon is the disgraceful story of mental health. However much the minister may want to deny it, people are being discharged from the mental hospitals in a way which I believe is callous and unforgivable. Let me first say that I and my colleagues agree that it is desirable for people to be discharged from mental hospitals, but we certainly do not agree that they should be discharged without regard to where and under what conditions they will live.

**Some Hon. Members:** — Hear, hear!

**Mr. Blakeney:** — Life in a mental hospital may have its shortcomings, but it is infinitely better than life in some of the places to which these poor people have been forced to move.

Let me give you a few examples, take the case of Mrs. A. At the age of 91, Mrs. A. was placed in the provincial hospital at Weyburn, and I may say that each one of these cases occurred in the last several months. She was only in the hospital a few weeks when she was placed in a halfway house at Weyburn, again for a few weeks. Soon after she was moved to another nursing home at Regina Beach, where there is no resident doctor. Before long Mrs. A. was quite ill and was moved to another home in Regina. By this time she was really ill and had to spend a few weeks in the Munroe Wing. From there she was moved to still another nursing home in Regina where she now is. As might be anticipated these frequent moves have upset Mrs. A. and have upset her family. Her family by the way were not consulted while

their mother was shunted from place to place. It may well be that Mrs. A. should not be in Weyburn, but if she was to be moved surely it was not too much to ask that her family be consulted and that a place be found where she could enjoy the security and the permanence so necessary for the welfare of a pioneer lady in her nineties.

Or take the case of Mrs. B. Mrs. B. was confined to Weyburn last fall. She has two adult children in Saskatchewan. Without their knowledge, let alone the consent of either of these children, and after being in Weyburn only a few weeks, she was moved from Weyburn to Estevan. She is there now, along with seven other persons in a house designed as a bungalow and wholly inadequate for the care of eight patients, together with regular occupants. Four bed patients are in a room approximately 10 or 11 feet by 22 feet. The persons who operate the home, and I am not critical of them personally, have no training in the care of mental patients. The Administrator of Estates took over Mrs. B's estate during the few weeks that she was in Weyburn, and he is paying for the care in the nursing home, although the arrangement was made by the Department of Public Health, without the consent of Mrs. B., or any of her family. Now, if my facts are right, I say that this is a breach of trust. The Administrator of Estates has the job of protecting the estate of the patient; his job is not to save money for the government. I believe that it is quite wrong for him to pay out of the funds of the patient, or an ex—patient money due under an arrangement made by the Department of Public Health. It is grossly improper to finance our mental health services by dipping into the estates of people who can't protect themselves.

**Some Hon. Members:** — Hear, hear!

**Hon. D. Steuart** (Minister of Health): — Mr. Speaker, I wonder if the member, the former Minister of Health (Mr. Blakeney) would be kind enough to give me the names of A, B and C. He might be taking them out of his head, I don't know. If these cases are true, we will certainly look into it and have it corrected. But if you will please table them . . .

**Mr. Blakeney:** — The name is Bennett, you can get more information from her son who lives at 1450 Cameron Street, Regina, in my riding.

**Some Hon. Members:** — Hear, hear!

**Mr. Blakeney:** — Now, I move to the case of Mr. C. Mr. C. is a patient at Weyburn, he is about 77, his wife is about 75, and lives a hundred miles from Regina. He has an estate of \$10,000 to \$15,000. Mrs. C. has been informed that Mr. C. is to be moved to a private nursing home in Regina, that the costs will be \$350 per month, that this will be paid out of his estate until it is all gone, that the department doesn't know what will happen then, and that if Mrs. C. wants to be near him she can move to Regina and live at the YWCA.

Now, a written protest was sent to the department and the Administrator of Estates by a lawyer on her behalf. If either of these ministers wishes to know they can check their files and they will find the lawyer's letter there.

**February 28, 1966**

**Mr. Steuart:** — What is the name? “C”?

**Mr. Blakeney:** — No it is not “C”, but I will tell you the name, I don’t have . . .

**Mr. Heald:** — What is the name? Will the hon. member provide me with the information after?

**Mr. Blakeney:** — I will, but you can find it in your own files, I will tell you the name so you can find it there. I am not authorized to . . . If the minister was familiar with the correspondence which is going to his department, then he would know the name . . .

**Some Hon. Members:** — Hear, hear!

**Mr. Blakeney:** — . . . and when I am through giving the facts, if the minister isn’t familiar with them, then this will display a clear neglect of duty on his part.

**Mr. Steuart:** — What a performance.

**Mr. Blakeney:** — I have said that this has been said in a letter to your department. A written protest was sent to the department. The department dealt with this by not answering the letter, but by having a doctor from Weyburn call Mrs. C. and attempt to persuade her to have her husband go to Regina. Now this lady is 75 years old, and she is very, very upset. Now at this stage, Mr. C. is still in Weyburn. I say this sort of conduct on the part of a government department is shocking. It is going on, and it is going on right now, and this instance is in the month of February, 1966.

Now, take the case of Mrs. D. Mr. and Mrs. D. homesteaded 50 miles southeast of Battleford in 1906. Mrs. D. was committed to the North Battleford hospital in 1924. Her entire estate including that which she inherited from her father was exhausted, and Mr. D. was called upon to pay further sums for her care. In the 1930’s she could no longer pay. He went to the Debt Adjustment Board and got his debts cancelled up until 1935, but by 1944 he owed \$2,600 again.

This debt was, of course, wiped out when the government was elected in 1944. He is now living on an old age pension, and he is visiting now in British Columbia. While he is visiting in British Columbia, his wife who is now over 70, is being discharged (a polite word for it), from the hospital at North Battleford. Just this month he received a letter from the Administrator of Estates as follows. The letter is dated February 8th, 1966. Now, I have to advise the house that I am not authorized to release the name. The minister can find these in his files, February 8th, is a pretty fair lead . . .

**Mr. Steuart:** — Will you table the letter?

**Mr. Blakeney:** — . . . the letter reads:

We are advised by the authorities at the Saskatchewan Hospital at North Battleford that your wife is being placed in the Del Haven Lodge in Saskatoon, as of February 8th, 1966.

Same date as the letter, nice notice.

We understand her maintenance in the home will be . . .

**Mr. Steuart:** — On a point of order, will you table the letter?

**Mr. Speaker:** — The question has been raised, is the gentleman from Regina reading the letter. I think the rules are pretty well known in regard to reading letters in this house, that anybody who reads from a letter in the house should table the same when requested to do so.

**An Hon. Member:** — How can . . .

**Mr. Speaker:** — Please have the courtesy to be quiet until I get through will you? If he isn't prepared to do that, then he must take full and complete responsibility for everything that he quotes from the letter . . .

**Some Hon. Members:** — Hear, hear!

**Mr. Speaker:** — Order! Including the name on the bottom thereof and the date on the top. Now have I made myself perfectly clear?

**Mr. Blakeney:** — Mr. Speaker, I am prepared to take full and complete responsibility, including the name on the bottom and the date on the top.

Now, this is Mr. and Mrs. D., February 8th, 1966.

**Some Hon. Members:** — Hear, hear!

**Mr. Blakeney:** — I don't wonder that members opposite try to laugh this off, because they certainly haven't any answer of substance . . .

**Mr. Steuart:** — Either table those, or give us the names, we might be able . . .

**Mr. Blakeney:** —

We are advised by the authorities at the Saskatchewan Hospital at North Battleford that your wife is being placed in the Del Haven Lodge at Saskatoon as of February 8th, 1966.

We understand that the charges for her maintenance in the home will be \$185 per month, and that she will also require an allowance for comfort purposes. We are in receipt of the old age security benefits of \$75 per month for your wife. As these funds will not be sufficient to cover the charges, we have made an application for old age security supplemental allowance. In the meantime we note from previous correspondence when we contemplated making application for old age assistance that she would not have qualified, and we wonder if the assets which you now hold would still disqualify her from supplemental

**February 28, 1966**

allowance. If so, would you please advise what arrangements can be made to supplement the funds which we have to cover the charges for her care and maintenance in the home.

If you are in receipt of old age security pension,

which he is

it may also be that you will be required to make the application for old age security supplemental allowance rather than your wife. We will be pleased to hear from you at your earliest convenience.

Sincerely yours

D. M. Spicer, Administrator for  
Mrs. K. Banda, Estates Officer

Now, Mr. Speaker, once again, a patient placed in a private home, selected by the department on terms agreed to by the department, without the consent of the husband, and then what amounts to a demand that he pay the bill. Such is the Liberal approach to mental health.

In spite of this surplus of \$26,000,000, the Provincial Treasurer finds it necessary to finance his mental health program by pillaging the savings of mental patients and their families. Now this demonstrates a fine sense of priority, Liberal style.

**Mr. R. A. Walker** (Hanley): — How do you like that?

**Mr. Blakeney**: — Now the Department of Public Health can discharge a patient, and say he doesn't need care anymore, put him in a home, make a deal without the consent of his family, still hang on to his estate through the Administrator of Estates, and then pay off on the contract which they make without any consent of this patient, (who presumably is perfectly able to handle his affairs), or his family, I don't know. From where I sit it is the next thing to theft by the Crown. It is inexcusable, it should stop, and it should stop right now.

**Some Hon. Members**: — Hear, hear!

**Mr. Blakeney**: — Mr. Speaker, during the course of my remarks, I have on a couple of occasions been interrupted with comments about 20 years, and I think it is time I had a word to say about 20 years. We have heard this constant refrain from members opposite about why didn't you do it, you had 20 years. Well, let's take not 20 years, but two years. Let's see how your record of two years stacks up. Let's stack it up against 1944 to 1946. Let's take education.

Let's take education. The CCF launched a program for larger school units. What have you done to match that? They gave free textbooks for eight grades, you are preening yourself on giving one.

**Mr. Steuart**: — We made it work.

**Mr. Blakeney**: — We started a program for northern education which had suffered from 40 years of Liberal neglect. What have you done for

northern education in two years?

Let's take health. The CCF introduced free cancer care, you haven't even managed free drugs for the patients with cancer in your two years.

**Hon. W. Ross Thatcher** (Premier): — Free cancer, what are you talking about?

**Mr. Blakeney**: — I have been through this routine before. Not one penny was ever paid out by a Liberal government on free cancer care.

**An Hon. Member**: — Check your records.

**Mr. Blakeney**: — What about air ambulance? That was introduced in the first two years. What have you done but curtail services?

**An Hon. Member**: — What about the Crown corporations?

**Mr. Blakeney**: — What about free health services for old age pensioners? What have you done for them by way of health for these people in your first two years? What about establishing health regions? That was done in the first two years? There was establishment of the Swift Current health scheme. What have you done to match that in health? In the first two years the CCF laid the plans for the hospital scheme which came in January of 1947. What plans are you laying which will be a leap forward for public welfare like the hospital scheme? Or take industrial development then. The CCF started building up a power utility after years of Liberal neglect. What have you done which has equal long—range importance? The CCF cut power rates. What have you done except announce that you were going to use it as a taxing device?

Or you may say '44 is a long way away. Why don't you take the last two years of CCF government? Well, alright let's take the last two years of CCF government.

Let's take education. We completed the Moose Jaw Technical Institute. We built the Saskatoon Technical Institute. We built the Technical High School at Prince Albert. What have you done that matches that? What have you done except stop that program dead in its tracks? The CCF launched a new Regina Campus in the last two years of its term of office. What have you done for university education that matches that?

Let's take health. The CCF introduced universal medical care over your bitter opposition.

**Some Hon. Members**: — Hear, hear!

**Mr. Blakeney**: — What have you done but curtail benefits in your first two years? The CCF built the first psychiatric centre at Yorkton. What did you do but claim credit for it and drag your feet on the one at Prince Albert?

Let's take industrial development. I.M.C. at Esterhazy in full production, Kalium established, notwithstanding the answer of the Minister of Industry, (Mr. Grant), Alwinal on the way,

notwithstanding the answer of the Minister of Industry. What have you done but more of the same?

New chemical and fertilizer plants at Saskatoon and Regina, what have you done but announce them once again? Mr. Speaker, it is time the members opposite began looking at their own dismal record of performance in two years, and start to at least try to match the record of accomplishment of the CCF. This they failed to do. They contented themselves instead with self-congratulatory releases hoping that the stridency of the tone could hide the paucity of the contents.

Mr. Speaker, I represent the riding of Regina West . . .

**Mr. Stuart:** — Not for long.

**Mr. Blakeney:** — No, it will be Regina Centre next time, but I will represent it, Davey. Speaking of our representatives, I am sure that Regina had no representative when this budget was prepared. School grants are to be increased. The Premier now assures me that some of these incentive grants might well be available to Regina, but it is my guess that the Board of Education in Regina will be unwilling to pare their educational program to the bone in order to get incentive grants. I think that they believe that their responsibility will be primarily to the children, to see that the level of education which is offered to them is adequate for this changing world in which we live. So I think we in Regina won't get any of these incentive grants.

I looked for library grants, but they weren't there. Same old library grants. I looked at health grants. The previous government had started these in 1963, upped them 50 per cent in 1964, no increase last year, nothing this year. They haven't increased one penny even though — and I commend this to the lady member for Saskatoon (Mrs. Merchant) — even though the costs of the city health departments are sharply rising. Dr. Chiao and Dr. Dantow and their staff do a good job. They deserve a substantial increase in grants, and so do the taxpayers of Regina.

The taxpayers of Prince Albert, where the Minister of Health sits for, they get support of about \$2 per capita, perhaps more, Regina and Saskatoon get 75 cents and no increase. We will be interested to hear the comments of the member for Regina South (Mr. Grant) on this matter.

The gas tax is to go up, but according to the budget every penny is to be spent on rural municipal roads and streets, and not one cent on urban municipal roads and streets. Now fully 20 or 25 per cent of the gasoline bought is burned on city streets. And now that our main highway system is approaching completion it is time that both the rural and the urban municipalities get some of the gas tax proceeds. Certainly some of the most expensive and most necessary road projects are in our cities. Bridges, railway underpasses, ring roads, all these are necessary if our cities are going to continue their rate of growth.

As a matter of fact I would commend to the government their looking at the idea of grants for municipal public transit systems of the kind which have recently been announced in Winnipeg. Saskatoon, Regina, Swift Current, Yorkton, these cities are growing and growing very rapidly. They have enjoyed a phenomenal rate of growth in the last few years and Regina has been hard pressed to keep pace with this development. The time has come for these



cities to get some of the tax revenues that come from gasoline. This is particularly so when the tax is to be raised as in this year to the highest point in history. But the budget offers nothing.

I looked for a base hospital. Last year there was an item in the budget for planning the base hospital, \$100,000. Of that amount not one cent was spent, in spite of the urgent need to get on with this project nothing was spent. The hospital will take three or four or five years to plan and build, and if the minister continues to dilly—dally the situation will become acutely serious. The bed shortage now is more critical than at any time under the CCF government. Even when the new 80 beds are opened at the Regina General Hospital, the ratio of beds per thousand will be no better than in the worst year of CCF government, and after that it gets progressively worse. But nothing effective is being done. The minister is playing it so cool that he is stone cold dead on this issue.

**Some Hon. Members:** — Hear, hear!

**Mr. Blakeney:** — Two years ago, the legislature by a unanimous vote agreed to set up a board to operate this hospital, and in two years the minister hasn't even got around to appointing a board. He set up a council to do a little talking, not too much of that, regrettably. Now, it is going to take something more than planning. It is going to take some leadership. And that, Mr. Speaker, is what the minister is not prepared to provide. That is what the minister has no intention of providing. The Rip Van Winkle from the north — and I am sorry that he ducked out to have another nap — is still slumbering on. He wakes up long enough to say “CCF talk, and Liberals act”, and then he goes back to sleep again. I think it is time we had something more than phrases from him on this base hospital.

I asked myself what would an ordinary Regina family think of this budget. Certainly they won't be overjoyed with life under the Liberals. The housewife will have seen her family budget being assaulted from all corners, will have seen milk go up in price, bread, now soap and gasoline. Every trip to the shopping centre will tell the story again. If she and her husband rent, they know that before long they will be faced with higher rent, as the landlord is forced to pay higher municipal taxes. If she and her husband own their own home they will have to face higher tax bills because of the fact that adequate school grants are not coming to Regina, because none of the gas tax hike is going to be spent in Regina, because there is nothing for library grants, nothing for health grants. They will be anxiously calculating to see whether their home—owner grant will cover the increase in taxes, earnestly hoping that they are not like many people in Regina who last year faced an increase of \$60 or \$65 on a simple three bedroom project bungalow . . .

**An Hon. Member:** — Blame Henry.

**Mr. Blakeney:** — Not blame Henry, blame the member from Touchwood (Mr. Trapp) who sits by and sees grossly inadequate school grants being foisted on our school boards. The housewife knows that when extra is paid for soap, and gas to take her husband to work, and an extra \$20 on medicare, she is going to be short, short quite a bit. I don't think she will join in the glad tidings that sales tax is no longer

**February 28, 1966**

going to be collected on turkey harnesses, turkey saddles, and the like. As one of my colleagues was saying, this was gross discrimination against buggy whips and nose baskets.

**Some Hon. Members:** — Hear, hear!

**Mr. Blakeney:** — Did someone say snorting poles? She sees no evidence that Regina will get a technical institute or get a base hospital. All in all she will wonder and she will wonder a good deal just who is getting the benefit from all this prosperity we hear so much about.

I now turn, Mr. Speaker, to the estimates for the Department of Public Health. I looked with anticipation and I turned away in disappointment. What is budgeted for is very much a stand—pat program. It does nothing or next to nothing to fill the gaps on our public health program. Saskatchewan had and still has the best public health program in Canada, but there are gaps and gaps which should be filled. It is going to be a long time before we have the public health service that our people are entitled to, but I think enormous progress has been made and I would like to see this progress continue.

One of the gaps I see is in dental care. Now, I compliment the university and the government on the decision to open a dental school at Saskatoon. I trust that there will be no delays in getting on with this project. This will undoubtedly assist in meeting the need for dentists, but the shortage of dental services has not been solely due to the shortage of dentists. It has been due in part to a failure of effective demand. Even though there is theoretically a shortage of dentists, there are dentists in Saskatchewan who are not fully employed. An organization job needs to be done. The government should be embarking on a program of assisting health regions to engage dentists to do both preventative and curative dental work, particularly on children. I see no evidence that this problem is being met.

Another gap is in home care programs. Home care offers a real opportunity to give better levels of service for less money. Most people would sooner be home than in the hospital especially for long periods of convalescence. Most of their families would sooner have them home, if they had some help with the more difficult jobs of nursing. Now this help can be provided by a good home care program. A good start was made with active programs at Saskatoon. Two of them, one in Moose Jaw and another in Regina were well on the way. I am sorry to see that in two years little solid achievement can be seen. I would urge the government to get on with the business of establishing home care programs. Get out of the business of talking and on with the business of doing.

**Mr. C. G. Willis** (Melfort—Tisdale): — Practise rather than preach.

**Mr. Blakeney:** — If I may borrow a phrase this is just one more example where the CCF acted and the Liberals are talking . . .

**An Hon. Member:** — Dreamer.

**Mr. Blakeney:** — Well, the Liberals have produced precious little but talk in this field so far. There has been not one extension of the medicare program in two years. When I spoke in this house last year, I said that there was likely to be a curtailment of services

under medicare, and there was. One hundred per cent right I was. Within a few months the government had cut out physiotherapy as an insured service under medicare.

**Mr. Steuart:** — Where did we put it.

**Mr. Blakeney:** — Instead they insured the service under the hospital plan, and by the way they forced the physiotherapists to sign a contract which is both arbitrary and oppressive.

**Mr. Thatcher:** — They didn't have to sign it.

**Mr. Blakeney:** — Oh no, an interesting point of view. They didn't have to sign it at all. All they do is get no insured patients if they don't. And what is more, here is an interesting little point. The patients who received physiotherapy between the time when it was excluded from medicare and the time when the physiotherapists were starved into accepting your contract Mr. Minister, the patients who received physiotherapy during that period got no insurance whatsoever. The previous government, when it got into a problem over X-rays and lab. services, paid back the public who had to pay their own bills, but not so this government.

The public who were innocent bystanders in the dispute between the government and the physiotherapists had been left holding the bag and the bill. After all, paying bills costs money and money is what this government doesn't want to spend on health care. They campaigned in 1964 on a program — “extend medicare to cover major drug costs’ — ‘extend medicare to cover major drug costs’”.

**Mr. Steuart:** — We will.

**Mr. Blakeney:** — We will, yes, I'll come to the Liberals “never never” promises on health care. But it is now '66, budgeting for '67 and still no drug program. Minuscule steps forward, like drugs for sufferers from cystic fibrosis are good, but far, far too small. If this rate of progress had prevailed since 1944, Saskatchewan health services would be in the same dreary and backward condition that has been true in Liberal provinces from coast to coast. Almost without exception, in any matter of public health, in any province of Canada, if it was Liberal it was backward.

Mr. Speaker, there has been no absence of talk from Liberals on the matter. Listen to this:

The drug bills in this province and in Canada as a whole take far more of the average person's income than doctor's bills. I do not think there is a member in this house who would not agree with me, when I say on many occasions when one is required to visit a doctor or a physician, the doctor or physicians' bill might run to \$5 or \$6, but when he goes to the drugstore it costs him \$15 or \$16 to get medicine. There is no provision in this budget to do anything about this.

Well, that was the Liberal financial critic, A. H. McDonald, speaking in the house in 1964. And if he were speaking here again today he could say the same thing. The Liberals promised drug coverage in 1964. They were elected — they did nothing. They did nothing in 1965. They are budgeting for 1966, and into 1967, and still nothing. They are waiting for the federal Liberals to introduce medicare. They hope to get it in 1967. Well that will be

**February 28, 1966**

Canada's 100th anniversary, and very nearly the 50th anniversary of the promise of medicare from Liberals.

**Some Hon. Members:** — Hear, hear!

**Mr. Blakeney:** — Mr. Speaker, the time has come for the government opposite to stop stalling and to get on with its promise of drug coverage under medicare. The time, Mr. Speaker, is now.

**Some Hon. Members:** — Hear, hear!

**Mr. Blakeney:** — Mr. Speaker, there were two or three other topics I wanted to touch on briefly. I noted with a good deal of regret that another year has gone by without bringing the treaty Indians under medicare.

**Mr. Thatcher:** — You had 20 years.

**Mr. Blakeney:** — Mr. Speaker, 20 years, how do you like that? In case he doesn't know it, the medicare program was introduced in 1962 . . .

**Mr. Thatcher:** — You could still have done it.

**Mr. Blakeney:** — He will recall that door, I am sure. I believe that segregated services for Indians are bad from every point of view. I had hoped that the Minister of Health (Mr. Steuart) would have had the necessary attributes to convince the previous Minister of national Health (Miss LaMarsh) . . .

**Mr. Steuart:** — I tried.

**Mr. Blakeney:** — Well, you evidently failed. Perhaps you will have the attributes to convince Mr. MacEachen, I don't know.

**Mr. Steuart:** — She missed you, Allan.

**Mr. Blakeney:** — Now, I regard it as of prime importance that we integrate health services and I would urge the minister to press the federal government on this matter. If the Ottawa Liberals continue to talk and not act, I would suggest that the minister act and not talk.

I saw no special reference in the budget to the completion of the Centennial Auditoriums. I saw the matter of grants mentioned, but nothing about the completion of these auditoriums. I trust the government will be fully appreciative of the contribution that these projects can make to the business and cultural life of the province, and that they will be prepared to give any assistance which may be necessary to see that they are completed by July of 1967. I commend this to the government for their consideration.

I want to say a few words about the pulp mill. Let me say first that my colleagues and I welcomed the announcement that a pulp mill would be built in Saskatchewan. Naturally we are disappointed that the project will require such massive public support, including a direct grant from Canada of \$5,000,000, direct investment from Saskatchewan of several million and a guarantee by Saskatchewan of \$50,000,000. We regret too that after this

massive public investment ownership will rest as to 70 per cent with the sponsors and 30 per cent with the public . . .

**Mr. Thatcher:** — Will you vote against it?

**Mr. Blakeney:** — . . .well, I will tell you we will wish first to be satisfied on five or six points, and we will make up our mind after that.

**Mr. Thatcher:** — I challenge you to vote against it.

**Mr. Blakeney:** — Well, we will see, we will see.

**Mr. W. J. Berezowsky** (Cumberland): — We will . . .

**Mr. Thatcher:** — Berezowsky, too.

**Mr. Blakeney:** — First we want to know this, that studies by independent consultants have shown it feasible. As to the general feasibility of a pulp mill under given conditions we have no doubt. But before the steel mill guarantee was given we had two separate feasibility studies, and we hope that the government has been similarly prudent.

Secondly, we will want to know that the freight rate hurdle has been overcome. That was the major hurdle and unless it has been surmounted the project is in jeopardy.

Thirdly, we will want to know that the sponsors have committed themselves to go ahead with the project in a fixed time. We would think it unwise for the government to offer a guarantee of this kind, open—ended as to time.

Fourthly we will want to know the approximate dollar amount of the government's commitments respecting road construction, wood supply, and the rest.

Fifthly, we will particularly want to know that there are firm safeguards that the sponsors cannot make a substantial profit out of the construction of the mill as opposed to its operation. If the sponsors, who appear to be pulpwood machinery manufacturers, can make their \$7,000,000 investment as a profit on the construction of the mill, then, of course, they take no risk, and the people of Saskatchewan take all the risk. It was a cardinal principle of the old government that if the government guaranteed, the sponsors had to have invested a substantial sum which would be lost if the venture was not an economic success. If the sponsors could get out without a loss, regardless of the economic success of the venture, we didn't guarantee. We want to see that this same principle has been adhered to in this case.

**An Hon. Member:** — What are you talking about?

**Mr. Blakeney:** — Well, I'm talking about the steel mill which was so vigorously opposed by the member from Morse (Mr. Thatcher) and I am talking about the cement mill which was so vigorously opposed by the previous member from Moosomin (Mr. McDonald) and the member for Saltcoats (Mr. Snedker) the previous member for Saltcoats. Those are the ventures that I am talking about.

**An Hon. Member:** — Not those pulp mills you promised.

**Mr. Blakeney:** — No, I haven't talked about heavy water. I think that is just too sordid a story to raise in this legislature.

We will want to know that this same principle has been adhered to. Sixthly, we will want to know whether local governments have been asked to grant concessions to the mill, and if so, why?

Now these are some of the main questions we will want to ask. They are questions which the government will have asked itself. We hope that they will be answered to the full satisfaction of the public so that all of us can give this project our full support.

Now, Mr. Speaker, I draw my remarks to a close. The budget talks of priorities, but ignores all rational sense of priorities. It downgrades the co—operative movement and the needs of working people. It once again fails to open educational opportunities; it displays an unwarranted lack of confidence in the competence and integrity of our school trustees. It raises taxes for people with low incomes, it lowers taxes for people with high incomes. It is a budget of priorities but they are perverse priorities. Since the budget fails, and fails totally to distribute the fruits of prosperity fairly, so as to meet pressing public needs, Mr. Speaker, I beg leave of the Assembly to move, seconded by the senior member for Moose Jaw (Mr. Davies):

That all the words after “that” be deleted and the following be substituted therefor:

This Assembly expresses its regret at the government's decision to finance the medical care program by retaining and increasing taxes which bear most heavily on lower income groups while reducing taxes based on ability to pay.

Mr. Speaker, with leave, I so move.

**Mr. W. J. Berezowsky** (Cumberland): — Mr. Speaker, first of all I consider it my duty and my pleasure to welcome the two new members to this house, the hon. member from Moosomin (Mr. Gardner) and the hon. member from Bengough (Mr. Mitchell). I am sure that whether their stay is long or short they will enjoy the proceedings in this house as I have enjoyed them over the years, and I am sure that they will also gain considerably in philosophy. I would also like at this time to congratulate my friend the hon. doctor member from Wilkie (Mr. McIsaac) on his elevation to Minister of Municipal Affairs. I would say that he controls a good department, with a good staff, and good policies which the CCF have inaugurated in this department, such as under the Grid Road Authority, and others. I hope that he can expand on these. If he does so I can assure him that congratulations will not be wanting from this side of the house. But I must warn him about what I call the Liberal machine. Recently in Saskatoon, I heard that the Saskatchewan Government Transportation Company is going to cut out the bus service to Unity as it is being carried on now, that the bus is going to be turned over to a well—known Liberal who has been bankrupt. I can only say to the hon. minister that he should feel sorry for “Willy” who has been a very popular driver on this route. If he can do anything to see to it that injustice is not done I hope he will persuade the minister concerned to keep the line operating under Saskatchewan Government Transportation.

I wish to congratulate the Minister of Public Works (Mr. Gardiner), last year he mentioned in this house, Mr. Speaker, that he is going to make Creighton the north—eastern capital of Saskatchewan. I had hoped that he would have acceded to the request of the people at Creighton and built the kind of government building that they have been requesting for some years and which I am sure the CCF government would have built. However, I wish to thank him on behalf of the people of Creighton for the fact that he has rented premises from Parkland Builders who have recently constructed a building, and we now have government offices in that building. It is going to cost a lot more money of course but after all this is private enterprise and I guess they figure this is the best way of doing it. Had we been the government, as I said, we would have put up publicly owned buildings and saved money thereby. I am also pleased that the mineral resources office has been moved from Flin Flon to Creighton and that is as it should be.

I would like to congratulate the Minister of Co—operatives (Mr. Coderre), Mr. Speaker, but I cannot because when I go through my constituency and through the north I find that the co—operative movement is disintegrating in the north. For example, Cumberland house used to have an excellent Fishermans Co—operative. It is now defunct, and the fishermen will naturally receive less money for their produce than they did before. They are now selling to Keystone, I do not think this is good. I think the minister should take some action to increase his staff and give the kind of assistance that northern people must have to guide them along the co—operative way to economic security there.

I am very proud to congratulate the hon. member from Regina West for the excellent critique of the budget that he made.

**Some Hon. Members:** — Hear, hear!

**Mr. Berezowsky:** — I would say that there is very little that anyone can add to what he has said. He has shown to you, Mr. Speaker, and to the house how actually dry the budget is. Our budget critic has been good and it has made us proud to listen to our member on this side of the house who made this excellent presentation.

I would like Mr. Speaker, to congratulate the Premier on his well prepared, and well—delivered speech. But like everything else one does not judge by bombast, hash or dash. It is known to farmers like myself that when there is a threatening cloud you usually might expect hail, or dust or wind, and that is exactly what we have received from his speech. The Premier, who is the Provincial Treasurer, said that the first concern of government is good budgeting. With that I agree. He said that the wisest use and best application of money, of public monies should be made. With that I am not sure whether I agree. We in the CCF agree with this concept. We say that the government should make the best and wisest use of public monies for the public benefit, as the previous speaker has pointed out. This is exactly I think, Sir, where we differ in philosophy, as members of this side of the house with members on the other side of the house. So it must be recorded and noted, Mr. Speaker, that when the Provincial Treasurer set up priorities it is always last for the taxpayer like you and me, for the little people, of whom there are so many and who need help from this government. But always the Provincial Treasurer set up priorities for free enterprise. How he can be of help to his pet industries? Always ahead of the problems of living standards of

ordinary people he thinks of profits and revenues, profits for industries, revenues for the province. Yet the Premier, as Provincial Treasurer, has conceded that the taxes in this province are exceedingly high and something should be done to the tax structure. So in order to help the working people, the great number of them I have mentioned, what does the Provincial Treasurer do with the budget?

Well, first of all, he increases the gasoline tax by one cent a gallon, so every time I fill my tank it will be 14 or 15 cents, and I do fill my tank quite often; in a year's time that will amount to a few dollars. One person told me yesterday, "The present government wants us to be dirty because they put the tax on soaps and detergents". I cannot understand why for a small insignificant sum of \$100,000, indicated in the budget, the Provincial Treasurer or the Premier should have brought in such an insidious tax. I have been talking to merchants about this tax. They are quite angry, and certainly housewives who buy considerable soap and detergents will not be happy with this kind of tax.

As has been pointed out, when it came to relieving people in high incomes of income tax of which the provincial share is now seven per cent which will be brought down to six per cent, it will be of considerable benefit to some people but certainly is not going to be of benefit to farmers who have either low incomes or no incomes. It is not a benefit to the working people, or small business people. I think I can say, Mr. Speaker, this is a budget which will go down in history as being slanted in favour of the rich and as a further tax—load on the poor.

**Some Hon. Members:** — Hear, hear!

**Mr. Berezowsky:** — Mr. Speaker, this is, of course, what the Liberal party has preached all along. Those who supported them — I am sorry for them — are getting the kind of punishment they deserve. Mr. Speaker, there are many unhappy members opposite who really deep down do not express this kind of Liberalism, because this budget cannot possibly conform to the new Liberal philosophy or ideology. It is simply and purely an outworn status statement. It is still the 19th Century capitalistic argument of soaking the poor, the selling to the electorate of the outworn shabby, shop—worn and false ideology of goodies. I submit, Mr. Speaker, the Saskatchewan people deserve a better deal than this and no one but the Provincial Treasurer (Mr. Thatcher) could have made such a dull and uninspiring budget look so good. After careful analysis without a microscope one finds that it is just plan ersatz. There is not a single imaginative, outstanding bargain representing sound and durable programs. The budget contains no challenge or even a dream of improving living standards for those who pay the shot, for those who one way or another must pay the shot. History will record, Mr. Speaker, that never before, anywhere in any democratic country where possibilities were so great, so opportune, were the people so let down as they were let down in the province of Saskatchewan under the Thatcher administration.

I would like to say this, too, that it is my impression that even private enterprise has been avoiding the province of Saskatchewan since the government got elected. The Provincial Treasurer knows and we all know, that some 30 companies were invited into this province, yes, 30 pulp companies and they were offered very, very attractive terms. I submit that because the kind of government that they saw in this province they turned their thumbs down on the offers. This government only got the pulp mill in Prince



Albert and the cement plant at Cory by leading these industrial people by the nose to very, very attractive concessions. This was not the case, Mr. Speaker, with the former CCF government. As you know there was no industrial development in this province whatsoever when the first government was formed in 1944. Liberals had all kinds of opportunities to develop oil resources but there was no development whatsoever. And companies did come in because they found out after two or three years of the first rule of CCF government that it could be depended upon, that the CCF government was seriously interested in real development. So these companies were not hesitant about coming to the province and developing this province and in paying their fair share of royalties. Because they knew, they knew that there would be no such situation as happened at Wizewood where a Liberal government actually confiscated a plant that was actually owned by the people of this province.

The only pat I can give the Premier is that he made the best political speech I have heard from him. For once in his Budget Speech he did not abuse anyone, he did not lend himself to name—calling as has been the case on other occasions. Previously I was prepared on one or two occasions to rise and object to his insults but seeing where it came from I thought it would be best left alone. The Premier has said in this budget that at all times his government would nourish the investment climate in Saskatchewan to find better methods of attracting capital to this province. I would ask the Provincial Treasurer to admit that using public funds and guarantees apparently does not induce too many industries to come into this province because the record is very sad and clear.

I suggest to the Premier and to his ministers that they have a false concept of the economic situation insofar as agriculture is concerned. As a farmer, I know and all farmers know, that they have never been so hard up as at this time. I have heard Ministers of the Crown tell us how well off we are. One of them told me, “Bill, boy you’re lucky to be a farmer”, and I said “Why?” This happened in Prince Albert. “Look at all the money you are going to make, the good crop you had.” I told him in reply that if business depended upon farmers for profits it would be completely bankrupt. This is a fact, this is the truth. The only reason that our communities are surviving, the cities are surviving is because of the programs that we have such as Mothers’ Allowances, Old Age Pensions and Old Age Assistance and other programs of that kind. This is money that is being channelled into business as I pointed out to the minister and I want to point out to this house that as a farmer I know where my money goes. By the time I pay my oil bills, my repair bills and my taxes and other expenses in order to operate my farm there is nothing left. Out of ten years we find that an average farmer has probably ten deficits. Yet the Minister of Agriculture, the Minister of Public Health and the Premier will get up and talk about the tremendous prosperity in the farm community. The same day that they so speak in this house here is what we see and hear. In the Star Phoenix, February 25th, mention is made about eggs, and it is true. This is what is happening all across the province where they are producing eggs today. Grade A, small eggs brought 12 to 22 cents per dozen to the producer. Grade B eggs brought 13 to 14 cents, Grade C eggs eight cents and cracks eight to ten cents. Yet hon. gentlemen in this house talk about the prosperity in the farm community. While they are talking a leader of the farm movement, Mr. Gibbings, says this on February 25th in the Leader Post with reference to the final payments for wheat, — what did he say?

**February 28, 1966**

Mr. Gibbings noted that the final payment for the various grades were from 9 to 17 cents below those announced in 1965.

A cut of about 28 per cent on the payment from the previous year. Last year the farmers didn't make any money; this year they are getting 28 per cent less payment. Mr. Gibbings points out again:

Once again it becomes plain price—cutting is failing because the Canadian farmer is the person who is hurt since he is not protected by government subsidy as are producers in other countries.

I could add, Mr. Speaker, he is not protected like gold mining companies are protected, or ship building companies are protected, or some other industries are protected. I think Mr. Gibbings is concerned, as all leaders of the farm industry are concerned, at what is happening to farmers. In the final paragraph of his statement it says this:

When it is realized that \$72,000,000 less than last year will be distributed it would be apparent that such a decline is detrimental, not only to agriculture but to the economy as a whole.

So there is the farm prosperity that our hon. friends opposite are boasting about as being the highest ever. Plain nonsense!

Now this government could have done something to help the farmers re—establish. The former CCF government passed ADA legislation as I recall it two years ago to work through ARDA. It could have assisted small holders of land to get re—reestablished but of course the Liberal policy has been to remove small people off the land, to get them into the cities; they end up on social aid, so what! Let the big farmers get bigger and the smaller ones get smaller. That has been their philosophy and so they refused to implement this excellent legislation that was passed at that time. I say that this government must take full responsibility for their deeds, good and bad. I for one will not hesitate to speak up and strike hard on behalf of the people who elected me and who want me to make representations on their behalf here today.

When I see what is happening in my community and I think it is happening right across the province of Saskatchewan to farmers, it irks me. It makes me feel that governments are failing in their responsibilities to the people. Here is what I mean, concerning leases, for example. I wish the Minister of Agriculture were here.

**Hon. D. McFarlane** (Qu'Appelle—Wolseley): — He's right here.

**Mr. Berezowsky**: — You are there. Thank you, I want you to listen to what is happening. I will say this, never before have I seen so many people being refused leases, or people being dispossessed of leases.

**Mr. McFarlane**: — Was your son refused?

**Mr. Berezowsky**: — I don't know if my son has been refused or not, but I do know that in my community I have a neighbour who has been very active in the Liberal party, who got a lease from the government,

from the Department of Agriculture. Later on because he was so greedy he organized a group of farmers and applied for another lease. I understand he got it, where the people from Weirdale couldn't get this other lease. This is wrong, I don't care who the government is.

**Mr. McFarlane:** — Can you give me his land description?

**Mr. Berezowsky:** — I can give you this information privately if you like, Mr. Minister. I think it is bad for all of us who sit in this legislature to see this kind of thing happen, I have had representations made to me, delegations came to me and asked me to do something about it. I said “write to the minister and put in your complaints”, and I think they put in an appeal. Now, I think in all fairness from what we have heard the minister is probably trying to an honest job, but you cannot consider yourself friends of farmers if you are going to take away grazing leases or cultivation leases or increase the price of these leases by 60 per cent, because our people in the marginal areas of the north, north—east, north—west cannot pay that kind of price. They will probably find the money somewhere in trying to hold on to a little bit of property, but you must make greater concessions to farmers and you must not increase the price of land to them, prices they cannot pay.

I think that the construction of shelters or the assistance in the construction of shelters is commendable but at the same time I think that there has been a mistake made when the government decided on the policy of reducing assistance on moving forage. It is quite possible that we may have a dry year, even this year in spite of the fact that there is a lot of snow, and we do produce considerable forage in the north. It is one item where we got some income. I think they should continue the system such as we had under the CCF government for freight assistance to move forage into areas where it's needed.

Now, I would like to talk to the Minister of Public Health (Mr. Steuart) and I notice he is not here. He is in charge of the Saskatchewan Power Corporation. A year or so ago I made representations on behalf of the people of Candle Lake, just as other members have made representations for power on behalf of their constituency and their areas. Candle Lake has about 300 cottages. Thousands of people every year come to this resort and I feel it justified in view of the tremendous popularity of this resort that we should ask for power services. I was assured by the former minister in charge that power would be brought to Candle Lake. I was assured also that the Department of Natural Resources would take under advisement the granting of some assistance in this project. Now the Minister of Public Health (Mr. Steuart) — or was it the Premier? — came out last year and said that it was impossible if we were not to endanger the credit of this province to borrow further monies. So the government refused to borrow a measly \$5,000,000 to extend power services to places like Candle Lake and to rural areas. The Minister of Natural Resources (Mr. Cuelenaere) was out there shortly after these people were turned down and he said, “Well, I am going to look into this”. And he is still looking into it. But the fact is that this government refused to borrow \$5,000,000 to develop resource areas for the people of Saskatchewan and for the tourists who came into this province and from whom we benefit. But this same government can find it possible to borrow \$50,000,000 to help with a pulp mill. Maybe it's necessary but surely if they can now find \$50,000,000

they should find another \$5,000,000 guarantee for the Power Corporation to provide the services that are so essential for our people.

Now I want to take the Minister of Social Welfare (Mr. Boldt) to task. I think that is my job, there will be nothing personal about it, Mr. Speaker, but a year and a half ago in my community we had a Pool Elevator Agent, Mr. Speaker, who died from heart disease. The man was very popular, was active in the community, his wife was active in raising money for the cancer clinic and Red Cross. Mr. Alex Wolf was not active politically, he was a friend of the CCF but he wasn't on the executive or anything like that. He had built up a business of considerable value. After his death Mrs. Wolf tried to dispose of this business. We have another agent who is licensed in the village of Meath Park, he was prepared to pay her \$2,000, as a matter of fact he did pay her \$2,000. And I understand from this agent that he had "phoned to the Saskatchewan Government Insurance Office and they said it was okay. But, Mr. Speaker, apparently they found out that this agent who was taking over the insurance agency from the Wolfs was a CCF supporter because they advised him that under no circumstances could he have the agency and that he would never receive any approval. We still have no agent in Meath Park. Now this is a good agency, this is a good community, we are trying to make it a good town. We have water and sewer now. We would like an agency in Meath Park. But what has been happening, Mr. Speaker, is that one of the Liberals on the Liberal executive — I don't want to use the word "stooges" — has been around contacting a number of people. The condition was he had to be a Liberal before he could get that agency in Meath Park. This is a fact that can be proven if the minister wants to investigate it. As a matter of fact, Mrs. Wolf, in spite of what the Return says, did have, she assures me, verbal assurance that she would get the agency. This woman is sending youngsters to university. She is still a young woman, she is a very capable woman, she minds her own business, she has a home, she wants to make a living in Meath Park. I suggested to the representatives of the minister who were there at the time that if she did have any difficulty and if there is any way that I could help her in her business that I would do so to try and see that she made a good agent. Now, Mr. Minister, people have been approached in that community and they refused to take the agency because they don't want to have a row in the community. I wish you would reconsider what is pointed out here, that she did not get the agency because it is in the public interest to approve another applicant. I think it would be a disgrace to dispossess people who put time and effort into building up an agency. Surely you can't rob a family of something that's worth at the minimum of \$2,000, without some kind of compensation. Or if you are not prepared to pay, surely the least you can do is to give this citizen of Saskatchewan the right to carry on an insurance business in a place which she calls her home.

I would like to say this to the Minister of Natural Resources (Mr. Cuelenaere). I was going through a report the other day and I found out, Mr. Speaker, that they are now permitting the cutting of immature timber. It's in one of your reports, Mr. Minister. I can show you where it is, the report is right here on the desk. I would like to point out, Mr. Speaker, to the credit of the CCF government, in spite of what has been said, I want this to go on record, that when we took over the timber resources of the province of Saskatchewan there was no timber left. Forest wealth had been burned over, it had been cut over and there were really no large forests left. We had some pulpwood left that was cut subsequently, but the job that had to be done was to try and

rebuild this forest resource. So our people put out extra effort and the government put out extra effort by sending teachers into schools advising our people to conserve this resource, not because of the timber alone but because of the beauty that you would have in the north and because of the other things that conservation brings to the community, more water, wildlife and resources like these things.

When I read that this government is allowing the cutting of immature timber in this province then I think this is a tragedy. I feel that the government should take another look at their policies and that they should be very, very strict about the kind of timber that should be allowed to be cut by the exploiters of our resources.

Mr. Speaker, there are a number of items I want to talk about. I don't intend to talk directly on the budget, I suggest it was very well criticized by the previous speaker. But there are some things that puzzle me and I think that when the Minister of Natural Resources gets up to speak he should give us some explanation. I asked a question the other day about the cost of fire fighting. I asked this, what is the total cost of the forest fire season, 1964—65? What is the total cost of fire suppression? What were the number of fires and how many acres were burnt? I have the answer for 1964 when the cost was \$1,211,503; in 1965 the cost was \$344,357.22. I will forego the other question asked.

Then I have an item from the Leader Post, September 13, 1965, concerning forest fires, it goes on to say:

T. Harper, Chief of the Resource Program of the Natural Resources Department told the Leader Post the government has spent a total of \$65,000 in forest fire suppression this year compared with \$1,100,000 the same time a year ago.

This is rather puzzling and the only conclusion I can arrive at is that somewhere along the line this company which we call NorCanAir enters into the picture. Now if I am wrong the minister will be able to correct me at a later time, because there is a discrepancy as you can see for yourself, \$344,000 compared to \$65,000. It would appear that you are carrying out commitments that the government has made to NorCanAir of paying them every year guarantees of \$250,000 to a maximum of \$400,000. I think this is very regrettable. I think the company should have been able to have stood on its own feet, but this apparently is the explanation of the discrepancy.

Now, I would like to talk to the Minister of Social Welfare (Mr. Boldt). I would like to advise him what President Kennedy said, I think I can quote a line:

The reasons for poverty and distress are more often social than economic.

I think this is partly true, Mr. Speaker. Indians and other ethnic groups who are denied social equality, are resultantly poor and they do not have access to employment. I might point out that some of my Liberal friends from Cumberland constituency reported to me that they visited, as a delegation, members of the government on August 16th. When I asked them what it was all about they said, "Well, we made representations about the Indians", and they submitted a brief about other things. This person, as a matter of fact, was quite friendly. Whether it is true or not

this government knows the facts. But I gather from the brief that Liberals in my constituency consider that the Indian people are not a resource. I think this is a shameful attitude toward these aboriginal people. I think that they are a resource; we on this side of the house think that they are a resource. I think that we should be doing the kind of things that are going to raise their standards of living and encourage the preservation of Indian culture. So I am going to suggest a few things to the Minister of Social Welfare (Mr. Boldt) since the Department of Natural Resources is failing in this field. I suggest to him that one of the reasons for poverty is that these people still don't get a good enough chance for education. The former government did whatever it could as you know, but there still are too many dropouts. There is a program for about 30 students that we send to Saskatoon, I don't know how this program is coming along. It should be expanded, perhaps the minister in charge will be able to tell us. But I think that it is very essential that these people get the best possible educational opportunities and money should not be a criteria. After all this country took plenty away from the Indians. We can never give them back what we took away, so let's not begrudge them the cost of an education.

The government should also be looking forward to arriving at some kind of an agreement with the federal government to establish minimum incomes for people, not only for Indians and Metis but also for other people who are living in poverty. I listened the other day to a radio broadcast that said:

Big Industry in the United States is now approaching the federal USA government, the Johnson Administration, recommending that there should be minimum incomes for all people whether they work or not.

The reason given was the fact that 50,000 people are thrown out of employment every week. This suggestion makes sense for if the machines are going to do the work, certainly there should be enough money for people to make a living. I think that this government should be looking as we are looking to the future and thinking of providing free opportunities for education. Such a program is not only good for us but good for Indian and Metis people, and I am thinking in terms of technical, vocational education and right through to university. It is known that in the next few decades, the people of the next generation will have to change their jobs three or four times in order to be able to carry on. So the least that this generation can do is to provide equal opportunities in education. First of all we will remove barriers between people who are rich and those who are poor; there would be opportunity for those that have ability. I regret exceedingly much when I hear the Premier get up and say that he is not prepared to take on the responsibility of assisting our young people to get a full education, whether it be university or lower.

I think that this government should be thinking about planning modern communities and undertaking decent housing. I don't think that as far as the Indians and Metis are concerned, that the government has taken the right approach. Building 100 houses in Esterhazy without asking the Indians first of all whether they wanted them or not is not the answer as this government has found out. I think what we have to do is to first of all work with them as we have tried to do in the past and in that way we will probably have some success.

**Hon. J. M. Cuelenaere** (Minister of Natural Resources): — . . . twenty houses.

**Mr. Berezowsky:** — Well, that's nonsense.

**An Hon. Member:** — Twenty houses in twenty years.

**Mr. Berezowsky:** — Twenty houses. Well, you've helped out with only twelve. So we started out with twenty houses. Two years ago you started out with a program. You have a good man in your department that is anxious to see that 100 or 200 be built. I don't know if he is still there with you. Most of your civil servants have gone somewhere, most of them to Ottawa. But if he is still there you have the staff to undertake such a program. What did you do? Your own report shows on a question asked in the house, 12 or 13 houses were built in northern Saskatchewan last year after you voted \$500,000 for the Indian and Metis program. That is the record. That is the question and it's here — the answer!

**Hon. D. Boldt** (Minister of Social Welfare): — Twenty houses in twenty years.

**Mr. Berezowsky:** — Nonsense! May I suggest further that there should be some special training for these ethnic groups so that they will have equal education and will not be discriminated against because of their lack of knowledge.

I could also suggest that there should be very deep concern about psychiatric counselling for those who are in need of rehabilitation. I don't think money should be the criteria at all. I think we have the responsibility to make this the best province in Canada, the best place in the world. I think that we must have genuine concern, some warm sympathy if we are to carry out such programs.

Now I have made a few suggestions to the government and I would now like to talk to the Minister of Mineral Resources (Mr. Cameron). I admit that incentives are necessary. I admit that we must promote industrial development but I don't think that anybody in any government needs to overpromote like this.

There was a Trappers Conference at Prince Albert recently. At that conference they had quite a number of poor people from the north. If you want to know the amount some of them make all you have to do is to go into the records and you will find out many have incomes of around \$200 a year. None of us would want to live on such an income. These people, of course, had to be cheered up and so what happens. The Minister of Mineral Resources (Mr. Cameron) becomes as exuberant as the Premier sometimes becomes and I think he exceeded himself in exaggeration, I quote his remarks:

The future of Saskatchewan lies not in the southern part of the province but in the north. Development, mineral resources, the coming of the \$65,000,000 pulp mill to Prince Albert, the expansion of the fur industry plus the growing agricultural industry will mean more to Saskatchewan than anything ever accomplished in the southern part of the province.

Now, a few items there need some explanation. We all know, that the agricultural industry is unlikely in the north unless the minister was thinking of the area north of Saskatoon, a good area; but north of Prince Albert there is only about 20 or 30

miles, a wide strip that stretches up to Meadow Lake and down south—east towards Preeceville, and this is the north margin of one agricultural area. But if he was talking about the Precambrian or the northern administration district, then what was the minister talking about? Who was he talking to? Who was he trying to cheer up by saying such things about northern opportunities for agriculture? And when he got down to fur and talked about the tremendous possibilities and developments in the fur industry, the Minister of Natural Resources (Mr. Cuelenaere) knows as I know and as everybody in this house should know, that there is more fur produced in the southern part of the province than there is in the north. The Minister of Mineral Resources should know that when it comes down to mineral development that to date he cannot tell us of one mine that has been discovered since he took office. There has been production up at Rotten Stone, — by the way for the benefit of the member for Athabasca (Mr. Guy), Mr. Peter Bodnoff is a big shareholder in Bison Petroleums — by the company mining up there at Rotten Stone. This is a great big huge mine they say. Yet it has only 40,000 tons of high—grade ore. I noticed in the Star Phoenix today they are shipping out the first load of 11,000 tons down to Ontario somewhere. Then when I say peanuts, Mr. Speaker, they try to make a joke out of it. The joke's on yourself because you don't know what a good mine is. It takes millions of tons for a good mine.

This government, just to prove once again that they are willing to help those that don't need help and would take it away from those that do, have built a road into Rotten Stone which cost \$25,000 according to the return I have here. Because this government's policy is not to collect one cent of royalty no matter how much profit is made, this company will walk out with maybe hundreds of thousands of dollars in their two—year operation. They will leave a hole in the ground, they will walk out of this province without having paid the people one cent rent for the wealth that belongs to the people of this province of Saskatchewan. This is a policy that is wrong. An incentive policy is good. I'm glad that the government initiated an incentive policy to help in the search and development of ore. That's good. But once you have a mine producing I don't care whether it's Rotten Stone or the other peanut Anglo Rouyn mine, — (I say it's a peanut mine because it doesn't own the mine. It's got nothing but debts. It has \$3,000,000 or \$4,000,000 debt that is owing to the Imperial Bank of Commerce and I have the record right here if you want me to quote it. Those who are really going to make money are the shareholders of Rio Algom and you didn't tell the people that.) But even that mine shouldn't get away scot free, Mr. Speaker. If this mine is so good and going to make so much money, then why did this government have to spend \$175,000 to help build a road. The government failed to protect the people of Saskatchewan in recovering at least part of this outlay.

Of course, the former CCF government assisted mining companies, but we made them pay one—third of the cost of the road, we paid one—third and the Dominion government in the north was asked to pay one—third. In some cases they did and in some cases they didn't; there were arrangements. But after companies arrived at a certain point where the profit exceeded the capital investment, Mr. Speaker, we ascertained that they pay royalties so that we could recover some costs that the public had invested.

I must remind the Minister of Highways (Mr. Grant) that he spent about \$2,000,000 in building the connection between no. 102 and no. 106 for the benefit of this company. This is a good road. I'm glad to have the road. I'm glad it's in my constituency but



the fact remains that your government, Sir, is not going to recover one cent if they remove the ore out of Lac La Ronge or Anglo Rouyn in two or three years. They can remove all the ore in three years as you know if they speed up the process. They only have 2,000,000 tons according to the report I have here, the latest, 1966 report.

The hon. Minister of Mineral Resources (Mr. Cameron) boasted “the north is to be a hot spot of good development”. He says there are three mines operating. I don’t know of a third one unless he refers to the Hudson Bay Mining and Smelting mine at Birch Lake which they just moved from one side of the lake to the other. It has previously been in operation. There is only one other that he could say is starting out. It is probably the Share Oil Mine down on Hanson Lake. This is one company that wouldn’t accept any grants from you people. They built their own road according to the report I have here, and all good luck to them. At least if they take the ore out we will not have subsidized them because they didn’t ask for that kind of subsidy.

It is interesting to note here, and this has to do with civil servants, that Ernie Paynter, Provincial Wild Life Branch Director forecasts better trapping conditions because the trapping conditions have been poor since the Liberals took over as I forecast a couple of years ago. “The conservation of fur animals was essential and will be enforced” he said, “by the government”. But here is what he said that is even more interesting. He said he was the only one left in the administrative field in the Wild Life Department. I feel sorry for you people. You had some good men. In the Wild Life Department you had good men in the department, Mr. Minister, that you let out from the deputy minister down. You’ve not got a good deputy, he’s a good forester but he doesn’t know problems as your former staff knew them whether it was Churchman, or whether it was Roy Young or any of the others. Poor Ernie! All alone!

There is one other thing that I want to point out to the Minister of Natural Resources. If I’m wrong I will apologize, but when the former government made agreements with option agreements with pulp companies that were interested at one time or another, we always protected the people. We reserved for them an area between the forest and the settlements. I hope he can tell me that he has made reservations for farmers. We still have a lot of farmers who are trying to establish themselves and there will be young people trying to establish on farms. It used to be convenient under the Forest Act to get a permit to cut timber. But the government turned over all the area in Saskatchewan to Simpsons and to MacMillan Bloedel and to the Prince Albert Pulp Company and to the Primrose Company, leaving nothing for farmers, then I say, Mr. Minister, you and your government should be condemned if you have forgotten the little people who have helped to conserve those same forests, who made it their business to see that those forests grow. The least you could have done was to reserve them a little strip that they could have benefited from. But you made no mention, nobody in the government has made any mention of this point. I think this is to be regretted and the people will never forget your failure.

A year ago, Mr. Speaker, I brought to the attention of this house a situation that existed at Creighton. I don’t want the Minister of Natural Resources to think that I am picking on him. But I must bring to the attention of this house this complaint once again. The situation in Creighton was this. The community had about 130 young people who were attending high school at Flin Flon

**February 28, 1966**

and wanted to attend high school in the province of Saskatchewan. They were forced by circumstances to study in a Flin Flon school. So the people of Creighton and the school board wanted to build a high school. Originally they estimated the cost would be \$500,000. They had an agreement with the mining company, the Hudson Bay Mining and Smelting Company under which the company paid about half the costs of administration and half the capital costs. The company originally agreed to pay their fair share of this high school. Later when the estimates came up indicating the school was going to cost about \$650,000, the company started to balk. Then before negotiations could be completed between the local people and the company, the Minister of Natural Resources confiscated the agreement, cancelled the agreement between this community and the company. I brought this up last year. My impression was that something was being done about this agreement. However, I'm sad to report that up to this time nothing has been done.

I have a copy of a letter that was sent to the minister just a day or two ago, in which some of these facts are pointed out. This is dated February 21st, 1966, from the town of Creighton, signed by the town clerk. In the first paragraph about the middle it says:

Promises have been made verbally to Mayor Clark that have not been forthcoming. Firstly that the previous agreement . . .

which the minister cancelled.

. . . would be reinstated for the year 1966 and that grants would be made on that basis . . .

I understand on the same basis as they had previously.

This has not been done. Secondly, that a satisfactory agreement will be finalized by January 15th. It is now more than a month past that date.

The agreement has not been signed unless the minister has done since that letter was sent to him. I will file this letter, Sir. This is a bit of history, Mr. Speaker.

I would like to point out that the actions of the minister mean that the board cannot budget for this coming year. They are stalled. The town feels the same way about it. I would suggest that it is high time that a minister, a responsible minister of the government who took upon himself the responsibility of cancelling the agreement, had better sign a new agreement which will be satisfactory and not continue to forestall local governments in carrying out their business.

**Mr. Cuelenaere:** — The school board asked for cancellation.

**Mr. Berezowsky:** — You know all about it. It is you who had the final authority and you did it.

I'll tell you, Mr. Speaker, why this agreement was cancelled. I happened to talk to the Minister of Education (Mr. Trapp), bringing up this cancelled agreement a year ago right in this building. He told me it was time the people of Creighton started to pay some

of their school taxes. This is the attitude of the government there. This same Minister of Education (Mr. Trapp) met with delegations. I can tell him when and where, and he made similar statements that it is time that they paid more taxes than they paid. I wonder whether this government is concerned about the Hudson Bay Mining and Smelting Company or other mining companies or are they concerned with the people who live at Creighton. As for me — I am concerned with the people at Creighton and I say the government should have an agreement signed forthwith and that a minister should not make statements of such a nature whether it is to a member personally or to the public generally.

I must talk about political patronage. I walked into an office, it was in August or September, and I saw a former candidate who ran against me, sitting in the Department of Natural Resource there. (They have to find somebody to replace staff so they find these fellows.) When I asked him what he was doing, he said, “Well, I couldn’t hold a job with Buckland municipality because of the regulations that the CCF put down so I had to take this job here.” But he didn’t stay there very long and the minister won’t tell us why he didn’t stay very long. I’m referring to one, George Newell. I asked a question the other day. Do you know where he is now? They have put him in an office in Paddockwood in my constituency so that he can sit there and stooze and report to the Minister of Social Welfare. If the Minister of Social Welfare (Mr. Boldt) were here he would admit that what I am saying is true.

They have another stooze in the Department of Natural Resources. I asked a question the other day. Maybe I didn’t get the name right. This mans name is George McIlwrath. I would like to know how he got his job. He’s in the same office that your supervisor or superintendent Earl Dodds is sitting in. But the answer I got was “Not employed by the Department of Natural Resources”. Well, I would like to know who he is employed by, Mr. Speaker. The Liberal delegation from Cumberland that came down to meet with the Premier and the Minister of Natural Resources in August, and others — the deputy minister was there too — recommended to the government at that time that the government should set up one man to decide who would be hired for the four northern constituencies. You wonder how I got that information but I have it. Apparently you appointed Mr. George McIlwrath to be the Himmler in that office there. If this isn’t the worst kind of political patronage I don’t know what is.

**Mr. D. MacLennan** (Last Mountain): — The CCF kind.

**Mr. Berezowsky**: — We didn’t do things like that.

**Some Hon. Members**: — Hear, hear!

**Mr. Berezowsky**: — It was below our dignity. We have had people who had a philosophy. The government has the right to choose, I’ll never criticize the government if you democratically hire somebody who has the same philosophy as you have and carries out your projects, but for you to put somebody in there to “stooze” and spy upon people and report back to you as to who supports you and who doesn’t, that stinks!

Mr. Speaker, there are many other things that I want to talk about and I hope I have time before five. I have ten minutes to go yet. I would like to point out something that has not been said by the Minister of Public Health (Mr. Steuart) and

others when they were talking about NorCanAir. You see, when Saskair operated they had some hangars in Prince Albert and somehow or other these hangars landed in the hands of the city of Prince Albert. On one hangar, I understand, thousands of dollars were spent for renovations just a year or so ago. Do you know what NorCanAir bought this hangar for, Mr. Speaker? \$3,500, for a hangar worth tens of thousands of dollars that we kept in good repair. This government and the city of Prince Albert somehow connived to sell it to NorCanAir for \$3,500. If you read the press, Mr. Speaker, you will find another situation in Prince Albert . . .

**Mr. Steuart:** — Bill, that's paid for.

**Mr. Berezowsky:** — There's another hangar that Athabasca had negotiated for. When Athabasca offered \$10,000 to the city, NorCanAir came in with the protestation, "We are entitled to buy this \$10,000 building" which, Mr. Speaker, is worth from \$50,000 to \$100,000. Right now, Mr. Speaker, all I can say is that the wolves are at it trying to get the remnants of what used to belong to Saskair.

There are other things that the public knows that haven't been brought up in this house and I think that the government should be ashamed of becoming involved in these kinds of situations.

Mr. Speaker, I am disappointed that the Budget Speech does not contain any reference to correcting the injustice that exists insofar as non-taxable gasoline is concerned. I brought this up last year. The reason I voted against the bill at that time was not because the government offered to give the farmers a concession in taxes. That was fine. But when you refuse to allow those who dispense gasoline to put up pumps so they could continue to make a living, that is what I objected to then and I am objecting to now. I have talked with these operators who own service stations in my constituency. I have been told they have lost fifty per cent of their business since this policy has come into effect. And I plead with this government to allow these service station operators to install pumps to dispense purple gasoline to those who have the right to use non-taxable gasoline in their trucks.

It seems strange that this government on one hand says that farmers can use such fuel and on the other hand they do everything possible to stop them from using it. It's much more convenient for farmers to stop at service stations and fill up with non-taxable gasoline than to have to haul a pump and drum all over the country. You can't stop farmers doing this but for goodness sakes let's use some logic and satisfy the people who are complaining. They, too, want to make a living, Mr. Speaker.

Then we have the Minister of Public Health (Mr. Steuart)! I am not going to ask you to keep the overall promise of bringing free drugs to everybody but I'll tell you an area that you could do something better than giving Home-owner Grants. You could pay all hospitals for all the drugs that are required by patients. It's not the fault of the patient. When my wife was in the hospital and she received approved antibiotics the medical plan paid for that. But supposing she had to have other medication and the doctor prescribes some other kind of medicine or other kind of antibiotic, the patient must pay, because you experts haven't approved of particular medication, the hospital board must charge the patient. This happens in every hospital in the province, in

every community where there is a hospital. You will find many situations where people are expected to pay for medicines that doctors prescribe. The least that you can do is to remove this deterrent, or whatever else you want to call it, and see that all drugs or medications that are given to patients be provided at no extra cost to the patient. After all many of the hospitals can't collect all these accounts. In the final analysis, the government just makes up the difference and pays it anyway. You might as well get credit. You might get more votes if you do it that way.

**Mr. Steuart:** — We never think of votes, Bill.

**Mr. Berezowsky:** — That's a new one. If the minister is right that he doesn't need the votes then why are you building the pulp mill in Prince Albert? That \$50,000,000, Mr. Speaker, that you are guaranteeing and the millions of dollars that you are putting into this plant is for one purpose only, to see that Davie Steuart is re—elected. And he is not going to be re—elected.

**Mr. Steuart:** — And worth every cent of it too!

**Hon. A. C. Cameron** (Minister of Mineral Resources): — That's a good enough reason, Bill.

**Mr. Berezowsky:** — I have a bit that I want to say about the Indian and Metis people. Could I call 5:30, Mr. Speaker?

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

**Mr. Berezowsky:** — When I called 5:30, I pointed out to the government some of their sins of omission and commission. I pointed out that I hoped that what I said would be of some benefit to them so they might be able to give good government to the province of Saskatchewan and carry out the kind of responsibilities that we should be carrying out so that our province would grow and develop in the best interests of the whole Dominion and all the people concerned. I said at the time that I would like to talk of the problems of Indian people. You recall, Sir, that a year ago the government set up a Metis and Indian Branch. At that time I had some reservations on the establishment of this branch because I was afraid it would not do the kind of job that it should be doing. Apparently I have been right because one of the returns that I mentioned in the house this afternoon concerning housing indicated there were only some 13 houses built in the north for these people.

I would like to dwell on that for a moment. There has been a study made, as pointed out in this periodical of Central Housing Corporation called the "Habitat". It points out some of the conditions that exist in housing that you may find — these are the better ones, usually about 14 x 15 feet, some smaller than that and sometimes housing as many as 12 people. For example, in the report here this pertains to the province of Saskatchewan, it says in this periodical on page five:

Pelican Narrows . . .

And I think the hon. member for Athabasca (Mr. Guy) should be very

much concerned about Pelican Narrows. He does not visit there except during election time, that's once in four years. But he should be concerned. It is in his constituency. It's his responsibility. I try to do the best for my people and I'm sure he tries to do the best for his, but there is a better way of doing it than he is doing it now. Get out there and take a look at how they are living. Take cognizance of what is said here.

Pelican Narrows, 170 miles northeast of Prince Albert, Saskatchewan is one of the Indian communities still housed in a most inadequate fashion but with promise of a better future. This old settlement established in 1770 has about 80 homes for its 860 people. The homes have been thrown up in a haphazard fashion on predominantly rocky ground which does not lend itself to proper drainage, sanitation or elementary servicing.

Take note of that, Mr. Member of Athabasca. Here is an area where you can do something.

**Mr. A. Guy** (Athabasca): — Read that again, please.

**Mr. Berezowsky**: — And you have such communities across the north, all across northern Saskatchewan.

**Mr. Guy**: — Where were you for 20 years, Bill?

**Mr. Berezowsky**: — The hon. member for Athabasca (Mr. Guy) has got 20 years on his brain, Mr. Speaker. He doesn't reply or suggest what he has done. He has been paid this past year a good salary to do something in helping those people out in the north. And what has he done? Politicking!

**Mr. Guy**: — I'm helping them in Cumberland, don't you worry.

**Mr. Berezowsky**: — Now, Mr. Speaker, this is a deplorable situation. The other day I asked a question in the house as to what action has been taken by the government to conclude an agreement with the government of Canada providing for shared costs community development programs for Indians. Here is the answer that I got. It's dated February 21st, 1966:

A basic shared—cost agreement with the government of Canada pertaining to a community development program for people of Indian ancestry has been reviewed. It is generally acceptable to both governments except for minor revisions. We hope to include in this agreement, cost—sharing of placement services . . .

That's the member for Athabasca. They want to include his salary in the cost of this program on behalf of the Treaty Indians as a placement officer.

It is expected that this agreement will be signed on behalf of the province within the next few weeks.

**Mr. Guy**: — My number is 107, what's yours?

**Mr. Berezowsky**: — You should be ashamed of yourself!

Mr. Speaker, we hear all this talk about community development. The previous government had surveys made. We had studies made in Cumberland House, the Economic and Social Survey of Northern Saskatchewan Report No. 2 by the Research Division Centre of Community Studies. Any minister of the Crown, any member of this legislature can get a copy and he can find out that there had been research made, there had been suggestions made as to how the problems could be resolved in the north.

**Mr. Guy:** — What did you do?

**Mr. Berezowsky:** — In 1960 we undertook programs.

**Mr. Guy:** — What did you do?

**Mr. Berezowsky:** — We had a program started off in 1962 and within the area of our jurisdiction. The native Indians as you know, Mr. Speaker, are under the jurisdiction of the federal government but in our jurisdiction we did start good programs. As a matter of fact when we first became the government in 1944 we put up schools where there had been no schools before under the former Liberal administration. Had the hon. members when they sat opposite not tried to frustrate the government we could have made much more progress.

**Mr. Guy:** — You are easily frustrated.

**Mr. Berezowsky:** — The fact is that in 1962 a report, a brief report on community development in the north was presented to the government. We were quite prepared to act on it but the fortunes of politics were such that the Liberals got into office and there they sit, they have the report as to what should be done. They are just now going to consider it with the federal government. And this is all ready in 1965.

It mentions here about the municipal roads. It mentions the population and the fur resources and so forth and suggests in this report all kinds of programs that could be carried out which this government has failed to carry out. Last year you voted \$500,000, Mr. Speaker, and you've done nothing, absolutely nothing except place a few native people in schools. As I said, you should be ashamed of yourselves.

**Mr. Guy:** — You had 20 years and you did nothing. Aren't you 20 times as ashamed?

**Mr. Berezowsky:** — If you had a smaller mouth and longer arms to do things you wouldn't be saying what you are saying right now. You would be more sincere and considerate of the problems of these people, instead of thinking of them as not even being a resource.

The hon. member knows, I've said it before and I'll say it once more, that if he respected the native people he would not have used liquor for votes in elections.

**Mr. Guy:** — I'll say again that the CCF provided more liquor . . .

**Mr. Berezowsky:** — He admits it but . . .

**Mr. Speaker:** — Order! Order! Now I think that statement will have to

be withdrawn.

**Mr. Berezowsky:** — Mr. Speaker, I have to withdraw and so I withdraw.

**Mr. Guy:** — Withdraw it, Bill. You know you're a liar.

**Mr. Berezowsky:** — Do you remember, Mr. Speaker, the other day the Premier said that there were 13,000 people — and I presume native people — that were looking for jobs at La Ronge. These people no doubt need homes just like other people when they move into a new community. What has been the program of this government? They built one, they helped to build, they didn't build it, they helped to build one house in La Ronge, Sir, one house. I say they should be ashamed of the progress that they have made.

In spite of the fact that the government has set up an Indian and Metis Branch headed by the supervisor of Vocational Training and who is also a Legislative Secretary and MLA for Athabasca, yet all they have done, as I have said, is to place a few Indians on jobs. I contend that the government has greatly failed in establishing any kind of policy. Now what does Chief Laliberte say from Meadow Lake. I heard him on the radio and here is what he said:

That the depressed conditions and poverty among Indian and Metis people cannot be regarded as acceptable to Canadian society.

He said that welfare payments only perpetuate the problem, they offer no solution. He said that Indian reserves have not served the purpose for which they were created because they cannot generate the incomes necessary to make the Indian minority self-supporting. Yet this was to the Indian people the only place (that is the reserve) which they could still call home.

The Liberal government must agree with these facts pointed out by Chief Laliberte, yet as I have said they have not come forward with any solution whatsoever. But I suggest that we in the CCF have a solution because we began policies which would rapidly expand; economic programs, educational programs, which would guarantee these people educational opportunities, educational opportunities which would guarantee them social equality and economic independence.

These people, Mr. Speaker, are human beings. They are a resource of this country just as you and I are resources, I hope. They deserve to be free. They deserve to be independent and they deserve to carry on their native dignity because these are natural attributes of Metis and Indian people. I agree that the reserves are too small for this kind of development that we envisage so there must be some other answers. I think the answers can be found in what the Indians themselves have said. I have here a few clippings. There are some talk not so long ago and we in the CCF, just as the Liberals, thought that integration of the Indian was the answer to their problem. But what do the native Indians say themselves? They say they are unhappy with integration. They don't want integration yet, they want to improve their lot. It says in another statement I have here, the Prince Albert Herald of recent date, that Indian leaders are sceptical about integration plans. It makes one ask what are Indians really thinking about? Because they are people like ourselves then, of course, they are thinking as we think, "I want to have freedom. I want



to be able to go to the church that I belong to. I want to be able to speak my native language although I live in the Dominion of Canada. I know my responsibility is to be able to speak the language of the country but I would not want anybody to deny me my own language if I am to be free and to retain my dignity.” It seems to me, Mr. Speaker, that the Indian people want just that! I think they want good housing but they want to build their own houses. They don’t want the kind of houses that the government has offered them, costing \$12,000 and \$14,000. I think they want to live in their own community so they can grow up together and expand and develop just like other people have done.

I think they want a great number of other things. I would suggest to this government, and I would suggest to governments they look at this idea as it has come from the Indians themselves, Mr. Speaker. Not long ago I was reading an article in —I’m sure you read it — it was about an area in Ontario where the natives were given a certain tract of land, it’s on an island — a tract of land where these people have self-government. They have self-government there, they operate their own hospitals; they operate their own schools; they build their own roads. In other words they are taking upon themselves full responsibility. Further to that article, I made it my business to look into what is happening in some of the other countries. I found that there are certain countries today where similar problems existed in the past. Today they have national areas set aside for people, people such as our Eskimos here. The Yakut people, for example, they have a national area! They have their own government, their own local governments; they operate their own schools; they operate their own hospitals and instead of being a primitive people such as they were and such as our Indians are forced to be today, these people have doctors, engineers, professors, and they have members of parliament just as other people have. I think maybe in that, Mr. Speaker, lies a solution. It’s happening in Ontario in a small way where we have given people self-government and they say they are happy. They say that they are making progress. They say this is the answer. Maybe it doesn’t mean integration in the sense that we think of integration. After all you can’t just say to people, “Well, you are going to integrate”. By what they are doing in Ontario, natives will integrate eventually but only as equal citizens with other Canadians of this country.

There is not much more that I wish to add to this debate. I am very sincere in what I have said. I do hope the government will take under advisement some of the things that I have mentioned tonight. As I said before there is nothing personal. I’m concerned with people, people in my constituency, the people in the province of Saskatchewan. I think it is my business to bring problems of these people to the attention of this house at this time as I have done.

From what I have said, Mr. Speaker, you can be certain that I will not be voting for the motion but for the amendment, Sir.

**Some Hon. Members:** — Hear, hear!

**Mr. F. A. Dewhurst** (Wadena): — Mr. Speaker, in speaking in this budget debate I would first like to add my voice to those who have spoken in previous debates and in this debate in extending a word of welcome to the two new members who have taken their seat in this legislature for the first time. I like many other members was in those constituencies, and took part in the election campaigns. It was amusing to me, Mr. Speaker, when I was in the Moosomin campaign — Moosomin

**February 28, 1966**

as all members are aware of straddles the no. 1 highway — to notice that as it was in June and in the tourist season, consequently a lot of cars from the east and from the west were travelling through this province on holidays and on trips. But every time the Minister of Public Health (Mr. Steuart) saw a car coming through with an out—of—the—province license, he declared “Whoa, it’s one of those paid out of the province union organizers coming in”.

**Mr. C. P. MacDonald** (Milestone): — What were the signs . . .

**Mr. Dewhurst:** — It was amazing to see how they got so scared of tourists coming in when they holler for tourist trade. Also in the by—election of Bengough, as in Moosomin, there were a number of the Liberal members of the legislature taking part in the election campaign. I note that all of those who were a year ago appointed Legislative Secretaries and received, according to the legislation brought down a year ago, \$2,500 with expenses attached, were taking part in those campaigns which meant that this past year the public treasury of this province has paid \$15,000 to subsidize people on behalf of the Liberal party going into those by—election campaigns.

**Mr. MacDonald:** — Mr. Speaker, on a point of privilege. At the time of the Bengough by—election the appointments for one year ago were concluded on December 31st.

**Mr. Dewhurst:** — Mr. Speaker, I don’t think that is a point of privilege at all. It’s not even a confession . . .

**An Hon. Member:** — Isn’t it.

**Mr. Dewhurst:** — . . . because the appointments were not made until the end of March or April last year. The legislation wasn’t passed until the session, so in December one year couldn’t have expired.

**An Opposition Member:** — It did. Check your facts.

**Mr. Dewhurst:** — So once again, the mathematics of the member from milestone (Mr. MacDonald) is very bad.

**Mr. MacDonald:** — Check your figures.

**Mr. Dewhurst:** — So the year has not expired and they were appointed for a year so the legislation gave them the right to have \$2,500. If it wasn’t for them it could be transferred to someone else.

**Mr. MacDonald:** — Prove it.

**Mr. Dewhurst:** — Last year, too, we celebrated our Jubilee in this province — sixty years of being a province. Sixty years ago this province was not as we know it today. A lot of things have changed. Sixty years ago homesteads were quite freely to be had in a major portion of the province. Also in those days we had what was called squatters rights on homesteads where people would get on a piece of land by the virtue of being there and they claimed first right. It appears now to me, Mr. Speaker, that sixty years later we are

having squatters rights in the legislature.

Now, Mr. Speaker, on the 16th of November I happened to receive a letter from the Premier's office. You will recall that a year ago I raised in this house the fact that I had on two occasions written to the Premier of this province, one in his capacity as Premier, another letter in his capacity as Provincial Treasurer and I had not received an answer to either letter. Well, on the 16th of November I did receive a letter from the Premier's office but when I opened it, Mr. Speaker, and looked on the inside I saw Cliff McIsaac's stencilled signature on the inside. So to me it's very amazing as to why the Minister of Municipal Affairs in sending out the announcement of the government municipal conference had to have all these letters go through the Premier's office. There must be something wrong, either one of two things. Either the Premier doesn't trust the minister to send out the letters for himself or else he is not supplied with enough money to supply stationery for his department. So I can say that I did receive a letter from the Premier's office.

There are a lot of other things that we haven't had an explanation for this year — it was mentioned earlier this afternoon. We are still waiting to see what happened to those lost cars that were reported last year.

**Mr. MacLennan:** —That's pretty original.

**Mr. Dewhurst:** — It was quite original last year when we had the announcement but we are still waiting for the answer. It was really original last year. About those cars that are lost I think maybe we should find out. Have they been sold for salvage or something? We have a right to know where they are.

You will note, Mr. Speaker, too, on the question paper a number of questions on road building. I asked some questions on the oiling from Archerwill south on no. 35 highway which would go some 20 miles south of Archerwill. Another stretch from Wadena 14 miles south. This oiling contract was let to a private construction firm in round figures at a bid of about \$83,000. The cost according to the answer I got was in round figures \$109,000, yet the work has not passed inspection.

In a question by the member for Melfort—Tisdale (Mr. Willis) which is question no. 82 on the Order Paper, he asked the question — What was the cost of oiling for government oiling crews? What was the cost of contractors? And in round figures again, the cost for oiling by government crews was \$2,500 per mile; for contractors \$3,100 a mile. Six hundred dollars more for private contractors than it was for department crews. I can truly say that I have never seen at any time a department crew leave a piece of oiling in such deplorable condition as is the oiling at the present time on highway no. 35. The minister assures me in a later question that that is going to be rectified this coming summer and brought up to standard. Well, I sure hope so because at the present time it is in very bad shape.

Now, Mr. Speaker, it isn't true to say that the present government hasn't done anything in the past two years. That isn't true. I would just like to list a few of the things that they have done in the past two years: One is A.M.A. They did away with A.M.A. Last year I asked for an order for return of all correspondence exchanged between the government of Saskatchewan and the University of Saskatchewan since June 20, 1964 concerning

**February 28, 1966**

the Agricultural Machinery Administration. Here it is, Mr. Speaker, I invite anyone to read it. And if this is the only amount of discussion that was carried on between the Departments of Agriculture and the university before turning A.M.A. over to the university, to me it is a disgrace because in here it tells you nothing. The main part of it is a press release put out by the Deputy Minister of Agriculture in which he starts off by saying that he is putting words in the mouth of the president of the university and he doesn't give the information. I am not going to take the time of the house here this evening to go into it in detail, but I invite any member of the legislature to peruse this return and see if they can make any sense out of this type of a return.

Also no. 2, we saw them abandon Embury House, an establishment that was doing a good job for a given number of people, people that were in need of special care.

The Centre of Community Studies was abolished, and also the Municipal Advisory Commission. On the Municipal Advisory Commission were men who were well known and noted for being authorities in their field of work.

The government garage was done away with. Saskair — we all know the story of Saskair, the statements that were made in the house a year ago and what the returns show.

The Wizewood Plant. I will have a little more to say a little later on about the Wizewood Plant.

The Student Aid, the provincial fund was done away with. It was in this province for a number of years that students could get aid from the Student Aid Fund interest free until they had completed their learning. Then they would have a period after they had completed their learning in which to pay back the loan. If it was paid back within that agreement there was no interest charged. I have a letter here where a certain fellow wrote asking for a loan. It says the new plan has replaced the previous province of Saskatchewan Student Aid Fund Plan and that they must get their loan under the federal plan which they have to pay interest on. I don't think this was doing a service to our young folks of this province when we had a fund set up there, a fund that was doing a good job. I think that the Minister of Education (Mr. Trapp) owes to this house, when he does speak, a good explanation of why this Student Aid Loan Plan was done away with, the best of its kind on this country of ours, the best of its kind in Canada.

Also, this government in the past two years has done away with the road allowance oil as it was set up before, being the right of the province. This has been attached to the oil companies, the oil on the road allowances.

The Guarantee and Fidelity Company, another casualty.

The Hospital Privileges Appeal Board was another casualty. The problems which that Hospital Privileges Appeal Board legislation was set up to take care of has not solved the problems as yet, Mr. Speaker. We still have those problems in our midst.

Technical schools. We saw a lot in the budget last year for technical schools, yet when the answers come down to questions we see that there was little and in most cases, absolutely nothing spent last year for technical schools.

The Premier less than two years ago promised political and personal freedom to the civil servants as long as they didn't do political work on their jobs but that is not the case, Mr. Speaker.

**Hon. L. P. Coderre** (Minister of Labour): — . . . no differently.

**Mr. Dewhurst:** — There is a man that we saw just a few years ago, kicking on the door of the legislature here and a year or so later going down and offering to be the 51st state of the U.S., while speaking in Quebec. These are the types of things we have seen happen in this past 20 months or two years.

We've seen the Long Term Illness Grants done away with in the Department of Public Health which would have done a good job for our old and aging people. I have mentioned, Mr. Speaker, the legislative secretaries which were set up here a year ago. I fail to see in any way shape, or form, that they have done anything to justify the money expended for them. I hope that one of these days some of those present or ex—legislative secretaries will tell us what their job was or what they did, because I am sure the public at large don't know.

We have seen an increase in medical and hospital registration fees. Grazing fees go up. Vital statistics — the charge for vital statistics up; the assistance to our senior citizens is being curtailed but we have seen a lot of liquor piled in private liquor outlets. We've also seen two Senators appointed, Senator McDonald and Senator Argue. Now we don't know who they got their recommendation from. We know Senator McDonald came to the Liberal party by way of the Conservatives and we know Senator Argue came to the Liberal party by way of the CCF.

**An Hon. Member:** — Ashamed of that?

**Hon. J. W. Gardiner** (Minister of Public Works): — Where did you come from?

**An Hon. Member:** — . . . got to raid the other parties . . .

**Mr. Dewhurst:** — I'm more proud of where I came from than you are. I'm more proud of where I'm going than you ought to be proud of where you are going.

We also saw last fall, Mr. Speaker, a lady who had had a part to play in this legislative session for the past 20 years dismissed without any notice given to her in advance, without any warning and with a notice handed to her not by any of the ministers but by another civil servant, a lady that was dismissed, Mr. Speaker, in your absence, when you weren't here. I refer to Nellie Johnston. I think these things are despicable and the type of things which should not be done in the name of fair play and justice.

On previous occasions in this legislature we have heard a lot of my friends opposite say how they were in favour of the farmers and of fighting for farm problems in this province. We have seen them stand in their places and vote against giving \$2.10 a bushel to the farmers for their wheat. Everyone that was in the

house stood up in their place in a recorded vote and voted against giving the farmers a fair share of the national income and \$2.10 for the first part of production of their wheat. Yet now they will stand up and tell us that they are for the farmer but they are on record as being opposed to it.

We have seen, Mr. Speaker, in the last couple of years the cost of education continuing to go up and up. When the statistics are available for the 1965 year, that was mentioned this afternoon by the member for Regina West, we will see a considerable increase in municipal mill rates for educational purposes. A year ago in this house I asked what the total taxes for education were in the rural areas. I asked again this year what the total taxes for education in the rural areas were. I see from the official answers that during 1964 — this is the last year figures are available for — the rural areas paid over \$1,250,000 more in school taxes than they did in 1963. The urban municipalities paid almost \$2,000,000 more in 1964 than they did in 1963. Once the statistics are available for 1965 we will see considerable higher amounts of money collected.

Now, I would like to turn, Mr. Speaker, to the Budget Speech itself. I would like to analyze some of the statements in this Budget Speech. First I wish to turn to page five and six of the mimeographed copy, that is the copy which was placed on our desk the other day, Mr. Speaker. On page five, the Provincial Treasurer reports that last year he forecast a surplus of \$250,000. On page six he reports the surplus will exceed this figure by over \$26,000,000. Now, Mr. Speaker, he is only out by 10,500 per cent. This is typical Thatcher arithmetic. Only a Liberal government could be out that much.

**Mr. Thatcher:** — Only somebody as stupid as you could be out that much.

**Mr. Dewhurst:** — It is plain to be seen that these revenues were obtained in spite of the policies pursued. Only a Thatcher Liberal government could be wrong by over 10,500 per cent.

On page eight he claims that Wizewood is one of the Crown corporations. On page nine he says “theoretically it wasn’t” but he points out that in effect it was because the province owned roughly 70 per cent of the plant. So this plant, Mr. Speaker, received the Thatcher broad axe. According to the financial statement which I saw last year, this plant was paying its way and making a success of the enterprise.

It is true that they were in arrears on account of the fire damage they had received which for a time forced them to cease production. But, Mr. Speaker, I repeat this plant was proving to be a success. When the mailed fist of Mr. Thatcher fell no one was given a chance to make any arrangements. It was pole—axed, just like a steer at the slaughterhouse. Federated Co—ops were interested in this business at Hudson Bay but they were not given a chance. The result was that the millionaire from outside of the province was given a nice ripe plum. The investors in the province lost 43 cents on each dollar invested.

Now let’s look at it, Mr. Speaker, from another direction. If 70 per cent of the investment in Wizewood made it in reality a Crown corporation, let’s look at the proposed pulp mill. According to the information we have been given, over 89 per cent of the \$65,000,000 to be invested will be by the government, less

than 11 per cent by Whittemore and Parsons. But under this set—up the company will own 70 per cent and the province 30 per cent. Which we have been told they can buy as soon as it proves a success. What a phoney businessman is our Provincial Treasurer! This is not free enterprise, it is monopoly enterprise. The Provincial Treasurer does not believe in free enterprise but rather monopoly enterprise. The Wizewood plant was free enterprise but it got the axe.

I would now like to turn to page 22, where the Provincial Treasurer speaks of education and tells us that there is an equivalent of 800 new classrooms for this year of 1966. On page 23 he tells us that school costs will rise in 1966 by \$10,800,000. On page 37 he tells us that the increased grant will be \$5,000,000 plus another \$3,000,000 conditional, plus \$1,000,000 for school boards for their share of the Canada Pension Plan, a total of \$9,000,000. I wish now to analyze these generous and glorious gifts.

To start with there are 800 new rooms. The \$5,000,000 of increased grant will not operate these new schools or schoolrooms because 25 per cent of these new rooms are of a specialized nature. The \$5,000,000 will only provide \$6,250 per school for these 800 rooms. This does little more than pay the teacher's salaries so there goes the increased grant. The next \$1,000,000 goes for the Canada Pension Plan and none of this is left for school operations. The remaining \$3,000,000 is conditional on schools reducing the mill rate or as stated on page 24, the major portion of this \$3,000,000 must be used to reduce taxes. We will assume that over half is to go to reduce taxes. This will leave \$1,400,000 for school purposes. So at the present, as stated on page 23, increased cost \$10,800,000, then we'll subtract the grant, so we get less increased grant of \$5,000,000. This leaves a deficit yet of \$5,800,000. From the \$5,800,000 we take the \$1,000,000 for the Canada Pension Plan, which means that the schools are down \$4,800,000. From this we will take the conditional grant of \$1,400,000, so we get a balance left of \$3,400,000 of cost for the schools with no provision made to meet it. So, Mr. Speaker, you can readily see that the school taxes must go up this year. This will mean that the \$3,000,000 conditional grant will not be paid; it will be pure window dressing. If this \$3,000,000 is going to be paid only on the condition that grants are reduced, when the school boards collectively, after allowing for all these things, have a deficit of \$3,400,000, this \$3,000,000 will not be paid unless the schools reduce the services which they are now providing. It's just a case of fooling the public. By the Provincial Treasurer's own figures, this will leave the schools short by \$4,800,000.

The Wadena School Unit no. 46 expects they will have to increase the school mill rate by 4 or 5 mills this coming year. This will be with a minimum increase in teacher's salaries. As yet they haven't finalized negotiations with the teachers. But allowing a minimum increase they find that they will have to increase their mill rate from 4 to 5 mills to carry on the present type of program they are carrying on in that unit, when they take into consideration their increased school loads.

The year 1965 showed an increase in school taxes over most of the provinces. The year 1966 will show another year of increased school taxes. Tax reductions are once again a case of helping those who have, and the tax increases once again are placed on those least able to pay.

On page 41, he lists a number of items to be exempt from sales tax. All more or less obsolete items. He could well have included along with this list such items as buggy whips, binder whips, chop sticks, high top button shoes, old fashioned bustles, left hand monkey wrenches, hoof clippers and twitches, coal oil lanterns, eveners, neck yokes, single trees, wagon wheels, livery barns and equipment. Yes, and with the turkey saddles he could have included sheep aprons. The four—cent tax on all detergents and soaps, etc., along with one cent a gallon on gasoline affects all of the people, especially the working people. On the other hand, the reduction of the one per cent on the Saskatchewan surcharge on income tax will not benefit the majority of our people. Only a small portion of our people along with large companies will benefit. This was ably pointed out this afternoon by the member for Regina West (Mr. Blakeney). Mr. Speaker, this is a budget for “To those who have shall be given, from those who have not shall be taken away”. So, Mr. Speaker, when one analyzes the budget it is easy to see where the plums are going to fall. So for those reasons, Mr. Speaker, I shall support the amendment but I cannot support the motion.

**Some Hon. Members:** — Hear, hear!

**Hon. J. W. Gardiner** (Minister of Public Works): — Mr. Speaker, in rising to take part in the Budget Debate, I would first of all like to extend congratulations and welcome to various individuals who have come to this legislature since the last session. Since this is the first opportunity that I have had of addressing the house since we began the session, I would like to welcome to our legislature the temporary Clerk, Mr. Bradshaw, who has come to us from the Mother country and to express to him our appreciation for the knowledge of parliamentary procedure that he brings to us.

**Hon. Members:** — Hear, hear!

**Mr. Gardiner:** — We have presented him with a rather cold, wintry welcome this year but we hope that when he returns home he will take with him many happy memories of the time he has spent with us.

I would also like to extend to the new Sergeant—at—Arms a hearty welcome to the legislature as well. He is a man who has spent most of his life in public service, as well as military service, on behalf of the people in this province. His knowledge of government and also of military procedure is serving him well in his new position.

I want to also express a personal welcome to the two new members who joined us since the last session. Mr. Gardner, the member from Moosomin, and Mr. Alex Mitchell, the newly elected member for Bengough. I hope that Mr. Gardner will get over the fact that he has to share much the same name as I have although they are not spelled quite the same. They quite often sound alike and I am sure that in spite of that he will manage to make a very excellent member for his constituency.

As for Mr. Alex Mitchell who has just been elected recently, I think the case of his election has been even more important because it has been in a constituency which has been traditionally on the CCF side of the house for many, many years. I think one can say that it is traditional that in by—elections the government



will usually drop some support, because there are many people that become displeased perhaps through small things and take the opportunity of using a by—election in order to show their displeasure but at the same time not to damage the position of the government. I think for this reason the fact that the voters of Bengough supported the Liberal party under the leadership of our Premier to the extent that they did without the loss of one percentage vote in the vote since the last general election, indicates better than anything else could the support of the general public in this province for the Liberal government, and for its actions since the election of 1964.

**Some Hon. Members:** — Hear, hear!

**Mr. Gardiner:** — The two newly elected members since their election to this house have indicated that they are both going to be worthy additions and worthy replacements to the members whose place they are taking in this house.

I want to take this opportunity before getting into my general remarks to express my congratulations to the Premier and Provincial Treasurer for his presentation of the budget that he made here last Friday. I regret that I cannot say the same for the presentation that we heard this afternoon and for the presentation of the other two supporters on the opposition side of the house. And the reason I say this, Mr. Speaker, is that I have never heard more personal defamation from any members of the house than I heard this afternoon. Harping, carping criticism even by the official critic of the opposition trying to emulate his former leader, Mr. Douglas. Most of his jokes fell flat, very flat. Most of his personal references instead of bringing enjoyment to members of the house, I believe lowered him in the estimation of many of us. And I want to say this that this afternoon he lowered his house in my estimation because of the personal harping criticisms that he made of the Premier of this province and other members of the government sitting on this side of the house.

The other two addresses that we heard hardly bear mention because their total period was made up of personal criticisms of one minister after another and one member on this side of the house. Now I think when it comes to the presentation of the budget and the discussion of the budget, that it is our position as members of this house to get on to the vital questions that affect the people of this province and not be continually taking the time of this house for the type of criticism we have had here this afternoon from members sitting opposite. It is quite odd that after twenty years of attempting to solve some of the problems of this province and failing that they should come here today with the type of criticisms that they do of the actions of the present government, a government which has done more in two years, to carry out its commitments to the people of this province than the previous government did in 20 to carry out the commitments they made to the people in 1944.

It is quite odd to listen to speakers on the other side of the house and then look at the budget and actually try to believe that what my friends across the way are saying could be true. When one can increase the budgetary expenditures in 12 months by \$38,000,000 and at the same time show a net reduction in taxation this year of \$7,000,000, I believe this alone must stand as a record in the financial history of our province, no matter what anyone says about the progress of the last two years. I think the fact that today we are showing a budget which indicates expenditures of \$53,000,000 above that shown in the budget of two years

ago with a reduction of taxes of some \$20,000,000, well then I think anyone in this province will have to say that in the last two years we have been growing by leaps and bounds, that the revenues of this province have been growing by leaps and bounds. I think this also indicates that industry and business have been increasing since the present government came into office. It is very well for my friends across the way to read figures about sales in the province last year, or production in the province. I know, and so do hon. members opposite that a factory doesn't set up over night, or start to produce over night. A mine doesn't start to produce over night. But we do know that once companies settle in our province, once companies come here to develop, we know we are going to have revenues in the future. When just in the last two years we have had the increases in revenue that we have had, I think that in the few years ahead we are going to see an increasing amount of revenue come to the coffers of our province in order to provide the benefits we would all like to see the people of our province enjoy. So I am going to say here tonight that so far we just have a small indication of the increased revenues in the future and of the money that we are going to have to provide the good things in life to the people of our province. To our Premier, Ross Thatcher, the member for Morse, must go the lion's share of the credit for being salesman not only of the year, but of the two years since this government took office.

**Some Hon. Members:** — Hear, hear!

**Mr. C. G. Willis** (Melfort—Tisdale): — Any apples in your pocket?

**Mr. Gardiner:** — In reading the resolution of the amendment to the budget, I find it very odd that members sitting opposite would even consider supporting such a motion, and I want to read it. I hope that I have it down fairly well as it was given this afternoon:

This Assembly expresses its regret

This is to replace the words following that

at the government's decision to finance medical care programs by retaining and increasing taxes which bear most heavily on the lower income groups while reducing taxes on those with ability to pay.

Well, you know in the last two years, I think for the first time in the history of our province, we have seen a reduction in taxes to almost every citizen in our province. Last year it was the mineral tax and the law permitting farmers to use purple gas in their trucks. Surely this wasn't just for the high-income group in our province. Each one of these measures gave relief to every farmer in the province of Saskatchewan whether it was the mineral tax or whether it was the permission to use purple gas in farm trucks. Last year there was a reduction in the education tax from five to four per cent. Every person in Saskatchewan had tax relief through that reduction in the education tax. This year again, the Home-owners grant of \$50. I want to point this out, that I know that particularly in the smaller urban communities throughout our province there are going to be many of our citizens receive a tax reduction of 50 per cent. Many of our citizens in our small rural communities, and many of the citizens in our larger cities are going to receive tax relief of from 25 to 50 per cent, those people that are in the lower income groups of our province. Surely the members opposite wouldn't claim that the Home-owners grant is a grant only for the well—to—do

and those with ability to pay. Surely the man that has a house which is assessed at a point where he pays \$100 in taxes is certainly not one of the well—to—do in our province of Saskatchewan. But yet that individual will receive a 50 per cent reduction in his taxes this year through the policy of the government through Home—owner grants. That is the man who is going to recognize the assistance that is being given to him more than any other person in our province through the providing of Home—owner grants in this budget. So again I say to my friends opposite, I don't see how they can claim that the taxes that have been reduced since the Liberal government came into office in 1964 have been helping those with ability to pay and not helping the lower income groups in our province.

Now, Mr. Speaker, they speak about priorities, and this is the favourite topic of many of my friends across the way. No matter when they are speaking they talk about priorities of expenditure. You know since this session began I have been wondering why they haven't been supporting on every hand the work of the present government in this province, because what do we find in the budget that has been placed before us? We find that out of the increase of \$48,000,000 in the budget this year in expenditures \$11,000,000 of the increase goes to the Department of Education, \$13,000,000 goes to the Department of Highways, \$6,000,000 goes to the Department of Health and then the Department of Agriculture, which has needed extra amounts of money over the years and didn't receive them from the previous government, receives an increase in expenditures this year of \$3,000,000, one of the largest increases I believe in the history of the department. The Department of Municipal Affairs which again involves the saving of tax dollars for all the people of our province receives an increase of \$12,000,000 in its budget this year. Two other departments receive a total of \$1,000,000 in increase in their budgets. Otherwise the other departments which my friends opposite seem to think are secondary are much the same as the primary priorities of health, education and I believe highways. It is my feeling that unless we have good roads in a province such as Saskatchewan, unless we have good highways to drive on in this day and age, the good schools that we have in our communities would be almost useless, the good hospitals that we should have in our communities would be useless. We wouldn't be able to bring the industry that we need to this province without roads, so I say that the government in the last two years in putting the chief priority on the construction of roads in this province has placed it where the emphasis is most badly needed at the present time. I think that when the program has been carried to completion and the promises and commitments that were made by the Leader of the Liberal party in the last election campaign and in our party generally are carried out, we will then be in a position to transfer these funds to the buildings, to the other services that are needed by the people of this province.

They will also be in a position where they will be able to use them, whether they live in the far north areas of our province, whether they live in rural areas at great distances from hospitals in many cases in our province, and whether they live in areas where perhaps they even have to send their children 30, 40 or perhaps 50 miles in order to receive the education that they require. So I say that as far as priorities are concerned, I don't see how any member in this house can stand up and state that the present government is not carrying out the priorities that are most badly needed in our province today and giving support to those priorities. I want to say here tonight that I believe everyone of us on this side of the house and I would hope on the other side

**February 28, 1966**

of the house would like to see many more millions spent and I think these are going to come. As I mentioned a few moments ago, they are going to come because of the policies of the Liberal government of this province which is going to make possible the revenues that we need in order to provide better services to the people of our province. I am not going to say any more at this time because of the radio time tomorrow. Mr. Speaker, I, therefore, beg leave of the Assembly to adjourn the debate.

Debate adjourned.

**Some Hon. Members:** — Hear, hear!

### **ADJOURNED DEBATES**

The Assembly resumed the adjourned debate on the motion of the Hon. D. Boldt for second reading of Bill No. 11 — An Act to amend the Child Welfare Act.

**Mr. A. M. Nicholson** (Saskatoon City): — I have had an opportunity to see the comments made by the minister when introducing the legislation last week. This legislation seems to be in the public interest so I will leave my questions until the house goes into committee to examine the Bill clause by clause.

Motion agreed to and Bill read the second time.

On the motion of the Hon. Mr. Steuart, the Assembly adjourned at 9:29 o'clock p.m.