

**LEGISLATIVE ASSEMBLY OF SASKATCHEWAN**  
**Second Session — Fifteenth Legislature**  
**21st Day**

**Tuesday, March 8, 1966**

The Assembly met at 2.30 o'clock p.m.  
on the Orders of the Day

**WELCOME TO STUDENTS**

**Mrs. Sally Merchant (Saskatoon City):** — Mr. Speaker, may I draw your attention and the attention of the house to a group of students in the gallery. They are two grade seven classes from the Princess Alexandra School in Saskatoon. The group consists of a class under Mr. Strauss, who is their teacher and a second grade seven class from the Princess Alexandra with their teacher, Mrs. Hoglund. I would like to take this opportunity of welcoming them to the assembly and wishing they have a very happy and a very productive day.

**Hon. Members:** — Hear, hear!

**Mr. A. Thibault (Kinistino):** — Mr. Speaker, I would like to welcome to this house a fine group of students from Birch Hills High School. Birch Hills High takes in the area around Crystal Springs, Hagen, Weldon, and surrounding district. There are over 80 students, I believe, and most of the ones in the gallery I could say come from my constituency. This being Education Week I am sure that their trip to Regina will contribute a great deal to their education. I would also like to point out that they are accompanied by their bus drivers, Mr. Peter Wild, Frank Tilford, Ernie Lowe, Ivor Opseth, Ray Salm, and Mr. Clarence Winder. The teachers are, some of you may know them, Mr. Len Allan, Mrs. Tait, Mrs. Rude, Mrs. McFie, and Miss Olson. I hope that their trip to Regina will be a pleasant one and I wish them a safe journey home.

**STATEMENT BY MR. SPEAKER**

**Mr. Speaker:** — During the debate yesterday, the hon. Minister of Social Welfare and Rehabilitation made a statement to which objection was taken. I have now had an opportunity of checking the official report and I find that the hon. member (Mr. Boldt) said as follows:

Well, let me assure this house that the government of the day, from 1944 to 1964, they took more mineral rights away from the farmers than any other government previous, because they couldn't pay the tax, the only reason was so that Fines and his company could get their fingers in the pie and make money on the farmers' mineral rights.

I have already had occasion in this session to draw attention to Beauchesne's statement (Parliamentary Rules and Forms 4th Edition Citation 154 (3)) "that it is disorderly to impute bad motives, or motives different from those acknowledged" to members; and also to Erskine May's Parliamentary Practice which states "that reflections must not be cast on members unless the discussion is

**March 8, 1966**

based on a substantive motion drawn in the proper terms and admitting of a distinct vote by the House. (17th Edition, pp. 396 and 454-5). As a general comment on what occurred yesterday afternoon, I would add one further quotation from Erskine May (17th Edition p. 455-6).

Good temper and moderation are the characteristics of parliamentary language. Parliamentary language is never more desirable than when a Member is canvassing the opinions and conduct of his opponents in debate.

In the light of these citations, I find the use by the hon. member of the words "the only reason was so that Fines and his company could get their fingers in the pie and make money on farmers' mineral rights" was out of order, and I ask him to withdraw them.

**Hon. Dave Boldt (Minister of Social Welfare):** — Mr. Speaker, I withdraw that statement.

### **QUESTION RE SAVINGS BONDS**

**Mr. W. Robbins (Saskatoon City):** — Mr. Speaker, before Orders of the Day, with respect to Series Six, Saskatchewan Savings Bonds, I wonder since we received a goodly number of reports a year ago with respect to these, if the Premier would care to give us a report on the progress of the current Series Six, Saskatchewan Savings Bonds.

**Hon. W. Ross Thatcher (Premier):** — I will be glad to do so tomorrow, Mr. Speaker.

### **MOTION: CONDOLENCES, MR. GEORGE COCKBURN**

Hon. W. Ross Thatcher (Premier) moved, seconded by the hon. Leader of the Opposition, (Mr. Lloyd):

That this assembly records with sorrow and regret the passing of Mr. George Cockburn, former member of this assembly, and expresses its grateful appreciation of the contribution he made to his community, to his constituency and to this province.

Mr. George Cockburn died on Saturday last, March 8th, at the age of 89. He was born in 1876 at London, Ontario, of Scottish parents who had emigrated to Canada in 1871. After being educated at London, Ontario, he left for Manitoba in 1895 and spent the rest of his life as a farmer in the west. He served in this assembly as a member for the Redberry constituency, being first elected in 1921, re-elected in 1925 and 1929 and finally defeated in 1934. After his defeat he became Sheriff of the Battlefords, a position he held until his retirement 20 years ago.

In recording its own deep sense of loss and bereavement, this assembly expresses its most sincere sympathy with members of the bereaved family.

**Mr. D.W. Michayluk (Redberry):** — Mr. Speaker, I would like to associate myself with the mover and the seconder of the motion concerning the late George Cockburn, the former member of the constituency which I now

represent. Although I did not have the privilege of ever meeting or knowing the late Mr. Cockburn, during the time that I have been in public life his name has been brought up by a good number of people in the area which I now represent. The late George Cockburn was elected to the legislature, as mentioned by the mover, in 1921 for the constituency of Redberry as an Independent Liberal. He was re-elected to represent the same constituency in the elections of 1925 and 1929. In the redistribution of 1934, Mr. Speaker, the Redberry constituency was wiped out, and although the late Mr. Cockburn had attempted to win the nomination in the new Shellbrook constituency which covered this area, he did not meet with success. The late Mr. Cockburn was also active in his community and the area in which he lived. He was Reeve of the R.M. of Great Bend, No. 405 from 1911, and was elected by acclamation for the last several years as Reeve. He was also Chairman of the local school board for a good many years, so that, Mr. Speaker, the late Mr. Cockburn devoted his time not only to political public life but he was an active member of local governments in the area where he lived. Although the area in which the late Mr. Cockburn farmed is now out of the present Redberry constituency, I am certain that those people in the Borden and the Radisson areas who had lived with him and knew him well, will feel a deep sense of loss in the passing of this public figure.

His appointment as Sheriff to the district of the Battlefords, after his active political life, and the service rendered to the people of this area will long be remembered. His appointment came in the time of economic imbalance, and it was in his capacity as Sheriff that he made the just and fair decisions for which I have heard his name mentioned by people of the area on numerous occasions, Mr. Speaker. Therefore, Mr. Speaker, as a member of the constituency which the late Mr. Cockburn had represented on numerous occasions, I deem it a privilege and an honor to associate myself with the mover and the seconder in their expression of tribute and condolence to the members of the family of the late Mr. George Cockburn.

**Mr. E. Kramer (The Battlefords):** — Mr. Speaker, I want to say a very few words after the message that the member for Redberry (Mr. Michayluk) has read; there is very little left to be said.

I knew Mr. Cockburn personally, he was a friend, a neighbor at River Heights Lodge where he spent the remaining years of his life, the River Heights lodge in the Battlefords is not too far from my home, and it was quite often that I met the old gentleman there. It was always a pleasure to meet, talk with him and reminisce with him. To his family and friends I want to add my condolences to those that have already been expressed.

Motion agreed to.

Mr. Thatcher: moved, seconded by the hon. Leader of the Opposition:

That the resolution just passed, together with transcripts of oral tributes to the memory of the deceased former member be communicated to the bereaved family, on behalf of this assembly, by Mr. Speaker.

Motion agreed to.

March 8, 1966

## ADJOURNED DEBATE

### BUDGET DEBATE

The assembly resumed the adjourned debate on the proposed motion of Mr. Thatcher, That Mr. Speaker do now leave the Chair, and the amendment thereto by Mr. Blakeney.

**Mr. W.E. Smishek (Regina East):** — Mr. Speaker, last night before I adjourned the debate, I made eight specific recommendations for the consideration of the government. I asked, one, that university operating grants be increased to take care of the increased enrolment and to provide for substantial staff salary increases. I suggested an increase of at least \$3,000,000 equal to the additional university grant Saskatchewan will receive from the federal government. I suggested that the university plant construction in Regina be expedited. I now suggest that new programs be introduced including the consideration of establishing first year colleges at our smaller cities.

Second, I recommended that a provincial technical school be built in Regina. Third, that public health grants for Regina be increased, particularly for effective mosquito control. Fourth, that the King's Park, known as Boggy Creek, be developed as a provincial regional park. Fifth, that an effective air pollution control program be instituted. Six, that funds be appropriated for public housing. Seven, that Home-owner grants apply to all Indian citizens and home renters. Eight, that the government proceed forthwith with the construction of a specialty hospital in Regina at provincial expense.

I now want to make a further recommendation, Mr. Speaker, and that is that the government does not close the door for more provincial grants for Regina auditorium if more money is needed. I know that the Regina auditorium committee will try to keep costs down to the minimum, but we all know that construction costs are going up. I ask the government to agree now that, as a minimum, to go up to at least the \$2,000,000 mark offered by the previous administration for the construction of the auditorium.

An authoritative source defines the word budget this way "a statement of probable revenue and expenditure, and a financial proposal for the ensuing year, as presented to, or passed on by the legislative body". Over the years I have had the opportunity to listen to budget presentations by four immediate past Provincial Treasurers. They have followed this criterion well. The present Provincial Treasurer who is also the Premier, in his presentation strayed far afield from this norm. Instead he chose to make a biased political speech as if he were on the hustings addressing a partisan political meeting.

**Some Hon. Members:** — Hear, hear!

**Mr. Smishek:** — I am certain that citizens wanted to hear the facts about their budget, not the twisting and the turning of the truth. Not another high-strung political address. The people were unimpressed, they were disappointed. In the words of the Premier, the duty of the Treasurer is to take the available revenue and within their limits establish the priorities. The priorities, the Premier set are:

1. The Liberal election promises, which I suggest were

poorly conceived and are not being fulfilled. I shall discuss these in more detail a little later.

2. The Premier charges that taxes in Saskatchewan are higher as compared to those in other parts of Canada. This may be true now, and for this the Premier must assume responsibility. Since the Liberals took office the provincial tax bill has increased by 24 per cent and because of the failure of this government to assume its responsibilities municipal taxes have risen sharply. Two years ago 72 per cent of Canadians paid more taxes and received less services than Saskatchewan citizens did under a CCF administration.

When the Premier made his irrational comparison, he forgot to tell the people that consumption taxes, that is the sales tax, gasoline tax, liquor and tobacco taxes, will be up by almost \$9,000,000 from two years ago. This means, Mr. Speaker, that Saskatchewan people on a per person basis will now pay \$8.33 more in these taxes alone for approximately \$27.50 per family. Some of this increase in the per capita consumption tax is due to the Liberals both in Ottawa and here, failing to do anything about preventing the spiralling cost of consumer goods.

Another very important fact to note is that two years ago, the last CCF budget, the provincial per capita tax stood at \$115.57; this year it will go up to \$141.50. On the average each Saskatchewan resident will pay \$25.93 more in provincial taxes under the Liberal administration than they did under the CCF.

The one per cent reduction in the surtax will be of small consolation to wage earners and the vast majority of farmers. It has already been pointed out that for a married man with a family of three children, earning \$4,000 a year, his income tax will be reduced by a miserable \$1.25 only, whereas the rich man will get a substantial reduction. The Royal Commission on taxation stated emphatically and I quote:

Taxes are levelled against people and not against things.

This, the Provincial Treasurer fails to recognize in his budget. The indisputable fact is on the average you and I will have to pay some 20 per cent more in provincial taxes than we did two years ago. The third priority the Premier set is "that additional assistance must be found to help our local governments". I agree, but the Provincial Treasurer closed his eyes completely to this need, he turned a deaf ear to the pleas of urban municipalities. He ignored the needs of urban people. Sixty per cent of Saskatchewan citizens now live in urban centres. The urban dweller will get less of his tax dollar back than he did a year ago, and much less than he did two years ago, to meet the rising educational and operating costs of our growing cities and larger towns. Local governments will have little choice but to increase property tax. The Home-owner grants will help, but not enough to offset the foreseeable increases in education and other municipal costs. Furthermore one-third of the urban people who are renters will get no tax relief.

The next on the list of priorities is "help and assistance to private enterprise". Mr. Speaker, can you imagine this fanatical critic of Socialism, admitting publicly, in his own Budget Address, that this sacred cow, free enterprise, can't stand on its own feet, that it needs help and assistance from the public purse. Perhaps, Mr. Speaker, the Premier has finally recognized a truth that economic development by private enterprise will only

**March 8, 1966**

take place where public services abound. Transportation and highways, socialism; power, socialism; telephones, socialism; education, socialism; hospitals, socialism. The federal Liberals in Ottawa seem to be well aware of the dependence of the private sector on the public development. One only has to look at the new Nelson River project in Manitoba, over a billion dollars of development, all of it from the public purse at Ottawa and Winnipeg. Private enterprise could not profit, it could not even exist today without socialism. I would commend to the Premier some humble thoughts on this subject before he again bites the hand which feeds his friends.

**Some Hon. Members:** — Hear, hear!

**Mr. Smishek:** — Socialists' programs are essential, I suggest, to the growth and development of our province and our nation.

Well, Mr. Speaker, the fifth priority and significantly in the last place, "that much remains to be done to improve living standards for our people". Again, this year, the same words as last year, the same order, the Premier places people last. Improving living standards for people is a priority of the CCF party the MLAs on this side of the house are dedicated to place first and foremost. One does not have to look far and long to prove that a Liberal party and a Liberal government in Saskatchewan place people last in their consideration.

Let me illustrate, Mr. Speaker. Last December, the government of Canada convened a federal-provincial conference on poverty. The purpose of the meeting was to plan for the eradication of poverty in the borders of our nation and in the borders of our province. I have been informed that Saskatchewan was the only province not represented by any government member, nor any civil servant at this conference. Senator McDonald is reported in the Leader Post of January 26th, stating:

That out of 85,000 farmers in Saskatchewan, 35,000 have a gross annual income of less than \$2,000.

These are poverty incomes; in Saskatchewan we have approximately 40,000 citizens of Indian ancestry, the majority of them live in privation.

The Premier refused to attend the conference on poverty, but he will spare no effort when it comes to attending a Chamber of Commerce, a business club, or other like meetings. He will even use the Saskatchewan Air Ambulance aeroplanes to fly half way across Canada to attend such meetings.

Another example of the government's refusal to place the needs of people first, is its failure to take part in the manpower and training conference held in Ottawa on February 21-24th. The conference was convened by the Canadian Labor Congress, almost every provincial government asked to be invited and did attend. The provincial Ministers of Labour and their deputies were represented, some provincial Departments of Education were in attendance. Participating at the conference were the Prime Minister of Canada, the federal Minister of Labour, the Minister of Citizenship and Immigration, the future Manpower Minister. They presented papers, they presented facts, they presented their views and their future programs. The analysis and comparisons of manpower education, training and re-training schemes in the provinces of Canada showed that Saskatchewan is slipping and slipping badly. Maybe this is

the reason the Minister of Labour and other government officials failed to participate in this conference.

Let us look further at the government's refusal to recognize the needs of people first. We all remember the Liberal promise to create 80,000 new jobs in a four year period, a promise they dropped during the Bengough by-election. The Minister of Labour (Mr. Coderre) taking a cue from the Premier last October and speaking at the Saskatchewan Federation of Labor, became exuberant. He exaggerated. He stated that Saskatchewan's non-agricultural labor force in the last year increased by 20,000, a ten per cent increase in one year. I suggest to you, Sir, and facts will bear me out, that the increase was normal, about 1/4 of this amount, about 5,000, of which 2,000 are the dislocated Saskatchewan farmers.

I further suggest to the Minister of Labour (Mr. Coderre) that approximately 20,000 wage earners are presently unemployed. Another group who live near poverty.

My question is: Why did not the Minister of Labour work up the same kind of scheme of getting the Department of Labour budget increased by at least 10 per cent to take care of this so-called enlarged labor force? The Department of Labour budget will be \$80,000 less than it was two years ago under the CCF administration.

Mr. Speaker, I am beginning to get convinced that our Minister of Labour (Mr. Coderre) has very poor eyesight, where there is one job he sees four, where there are 20,000 unemployed, he sees none, where there is a crow in a bush he sees a car. The Minister of Labour has what can be described as 20-20 vision, he sees 20 inches with one eye and 20 inches in the other, both focused in the opposite direction.

The Premier in his Budget Address appeared to have been conscious of the importance of making substantial investments for the training and re-training of the labor force, but he obviously was totally unconscious when it came to appropriating funds for that purpose. Adequate funds are not provided in either the departments of Labour or Education, for the upgrading of the labor force.

Research into manpower needs continues to be curtailed. The estimates tabled do not square with the statements made in either the Throne or Budget address on a work force policy. The action, or should I say the inaction of the government, is downright irresponsible.

Let me ask a few questions about the promises of the Liberal party candidate in Regina during the last election campaigns. Where is the sales tax removal from children's clothing and shoes you promised? Instead we will get a sales tax imposition on products which makes the children's clothing clean. Where is the 50 per cent of all education costs you promised for Regina? Last week the Public Board of Education said that expenditures of \$10,200,000 will be required to finance the public, elementary and high school system alone. Then there is the separate school system; another \$7,000,000 to \$8,000,000 will be needed. The total cost in Regina will total approximately \$18,000,000. Last year the provincial grants amounted to less than one-third of Regina school costs. They promised 50 per cent. To make this promise good, this government owes the citizens of Regina over \$3,000,000 for last year.

**March 8, 1966**

Mr. Speaker, the Premier told us in a clear and loud voice of the \$26,000,000 surplus, but he omitted to tell us about the debts the government owes. I say to the Premier again, you owe the citizens of Regina over \$3,000,000 in school grants for last year. On behalf of the citizens of Regina, I say "Pay up".

It has already been pointed out that the actual increase in provincial grants to school boards in the proposed budget is less than \$4,000,000 despite how the Premier might try to camouflage the facts. No government spokesman has tried to refute this fact. From this, it is obvious that Regina will again not get one-half the school costs paid by the province, so the school boards will have no alternative but to ask for an increase in the mill rate. Last year a 4 1/2 increase, this year perhaps a similar amount because the Premier has failed to keep his promise.

What happened to the promise to exempt city purchases from provincial taxes. This was to help reduce mill rates. The budget makes no reference to this one. Or of the pledge to provide increased grants for nursing homes, nothing is mentioned in this budget.

Mr. Speaker, I want to remind the Premier and the hon. Minister of Highways, the member for Regina South (Mr. Grant) of another unkept Liberal promise. It reads this way and I quote:

Provide an equitable share of gasoline tax for Regina road construction and maintenance.

The budget proposes a one cent increase in gasoline tax; this will mean a tax of 15¢ a gallon. The gasoline tax will net the province \$32,700,000, on the average \$35.40 per person. The citizens of Regina will pay approximately \$4,600,000 — what will they get in return? Well, according to the budget, all the urban municipalities in the province will share a half million dollars in road construction assistance if a suitable formula is worked out, Regina's portion on a per capita basis will be approximately \$114,000. The urban dwellers will each pay \$35.40 in gasoline tax and in return will get 88¢ for road construction assistance. A ratio of 40 to one. Is this the Liberal equitable tax-sharing formula? Mr. Minister of Highways, this can more appropriately be described as "Liberal highway robbery".

**Some Hon. Members:** — Hear, hear!

**Mr. Smishek:** — Before closing, Mr. Speaker, I want to make my last recommendation to the Premier. This assembly has now given approval to the Public Assistance Act. If that act is going to be administered fairly, in the interests of needy people and in view of the shameful record of the present Minister of Social Welfare (Mr. Boldt) and his despicable performance in this house yesterday, which even embarrassed his colleagues, I suggest . . .

**Mr. Speaker:** — Now this is another personal accusation against a member of this house and I think this is just going a little too far. We had an episode with regard to this. Now I ask the member to withdraw that statement. That's a personal accusation against a personal individual member. General things, very well — personal ones, no.

**Mr. Smishek:** — I would suggest, Mr. Speaker, that in view of this, the

minister be removed from office and that a new minister be appointed . . .

**Mr. Speaker:** — Just a minute.

**Mr. Smishek:** — . . . in charge of Social Welfare and SGIO.

**Mr. Speaker:** — Now, just a minute. I'm asking you to withdraw the personal accusation that you made against the minister. Now, the minister . . .

**Mr. Smishek:** — I will withdraw, Mr. Speaker, I will withdraw.

**Mr. Speaker:** — Let me also add while I'm on the subject. When the Speaker rises it is customary for the person speaking to sit down.

**Mr. Smishek:** — I'm sorry.

**Mr. Speaker:** — Thank you.

**Mr. Smishek:** — Mr. Speaker, I will not support the motion. I will support the amendment.

**Some Hon. Members:** — Hear, hear!

**Mr. W.S. Lloyd (Leader of the Opposition):** — Mr. Speaker, one day last week, when we on this side of the house were trying to put the government on the right road or to stop them from going along the wrong road, one of my friends across the way sent me over a question which reads:

Are you frustrated at every turn?

This is the first chance I have had to answer it, Mr. Speaker, and I may say the answer is "No, only when I'm trying to get some information out of the government which is factual or which is meaningful or which doesn't contradict something they have already said."

Now, Mr. Speaker, there are many people in this debate who are deserving of congratulation because of the contribution which they have made to it, including I may say, some of the ministers across the way who have described their programs. I think all of us enjoyed particularly the address of the member from Kindersley (Mr. Howes) yesterday when he spoke of the municipal problems throughout the province.

The major statement for the opposition has been made by our financial critic, the member from Regina West (Mr. Blakeney). Mr. Speaker, in the opinion of many, both inside this house and outside of it, that statement was one of the best documented, most ably illustrated, pointedly directed addressees that has ever been made in this legislature.

**Some Hon. Members:** — Hear, hear!

**Mr. Lloyd:** — Of course, it was precisely

**March 8, 1966**

because it was so effective that the government called out its main hatchet man, the minister of Public Health (Mr. Steuart) in an attempt to distract attention from the devastating analysis to which the member from Regina West had subjected the budget. And, of course, as was predictable with the Minister of Health, he didn't confine himself to the matters under consideration when he sought to reply. He sought to detract by a considerable amount of personal attack. He wasn't, I admit, inhibited by the facts, either the facts raised by the member from Regina West or the facts provided him in some cases by his own department.

Let me talk for awhile about the matters raised by the member for Regina West (Mr. Blakeney) with respect to mental health programs in the province. First of all the mental health program under discussion is certainly not a new program. I have here a clipping from the Leader Post of July 20, 1965, speaking about the program. I quote in part:

In 1963 a new program was implemented resulting in an extensive decrease of the inpatient population. At December 31, 1962, there were 1,478 patients in the hospital. This dropped to 1,202 at December 31, 1963 and 836 at December 31, 1964.

So the program is not a new program. The program itself, may I say, was not attacked as the member, the Minister of Health, (Mr. Steuart) sought to say, by the member from Regina West (Mr. Blakeney). Let me make the position of this group as clear as I can. The idea behind this program is a good idea. We wish it well. The purpose of the program, its objectives, are most desirable purposes and objectives. But what is equally important is that the method of administration can very often ruin the best of programs. That is what we are afraid is happening in this case. And that is why we have spoken out so strongly about it. It was the method, which the member for Regina criticized. It was the cracks in the methods, which he exposed in his address. He made his own position very clear and all of us will concur in it. May I quote from what he said:

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. Life in the mental hospital has its real shortcomings, but it is infinitely better than life in some of the places to which these poor patients have been forced to move.

May I say also, that contrary to what the minister led the house to believe, this is not the first time that he has been warned that all is not well with this good program. One of our other colleagues, the lady member from Regina West (Mrs. Cooper) had been in contact with the Department of Health about some difficulties in this program some time ago. There has been evidence of public concern. There was a delegation to see the minister and the Premier, reported in the Leader Post on December 21, 1965. It was somewhat surprising to hear the minister and the Premier say at that time that they were not aware of conditions which have been described to them! One would have thought they could have been and should have been. There were representations, I understand, by Saskatchewan Representatives of the Canadian Mental Health Association. So the minister has been aware of the difficulties for some time. He finally agreed to set up a committee.

He announced this committee on February 19, some six weeks after he had been contacted by interested persons, including the town council from the city of Weyburn.

February 19, this was set up. Yesterday in reply to a question on this from the member from Arm River (Mr. Pederson) he said that the committee was going to meet soon — three weeks after it has been set up. One wonders why all the delay — first in setting up the committee, then in seeing that the committee gets together to do its work.

In the meantime there has been a ground swell of complaint and concern in many communities for many people in parts of the province. Yet the minister has sat during January and February and part of March and said in effect, "Well, it's alright, Jack". Part of the time that he was sitting he was busily engaged in the work of being the chief political organizer in the Bengough constituency by-election. Instead of looking at the real problem in his department he was inventing imaginary ones in Bengough. If the minister were to pay more attention to people and less to politics and inventing propaganda we would have a better health program in the province of Saskatchewan.

**Some Hon. Members:** — Hear, hear!

**Mr. Lloyd:** — Mr. Speaker, the member from Regina West (Mr. Blakeney) used four cases as examples, as symptoms of what happens while the minister fiddles with his organization. The Minister of Health (Mr. Steuart) in reply said that there was only one case out of four that could be checked off. This the case of Mrs. B, that leaves three others. Let's see how often the minister in the same statement proceeded to contradict himself or be contradicted by his own evidence, see how often he proceeded to deny his own statements or to have his statement denied by the facts.

First, the minister discussed the full details of another case, that of Mrs. D, including where her husband spends his holidays and how much land he owns. He identified that one which he couldn't identify.

Secondly, his department was fully informed in the third case, that of Mr. C by letter dated February 9th, 1966. The department hasn't replied to the letter as yet. This one could have been identified.

Thirdly, there was a lady of 91 years of age who has been moved several times — from a Saskatchewan hospital in Weyburn to a halfway house in Weyburn — to a nursing home at Regina Beach — to the Munroe Wing in Regina — to a nursing home in Regina, with all of this the minister says he couldn't identify her. How many 91 year old people receive this kind of treatment? I submit the case could have been identified.

Let's take these cases one by one. Mrs. A the lady of 91 who has had six different homes since being in the hospital in Weyburn for a few weeks. There was real thoughtful careful care of a seriously disturbed person! The minister has already been advised by the member for Regina West (Mr. Blakeney) where he can get additional information about her.

Let's turn to Mrs. B, the one about which the minister really attempted to make a production. The member for Regina West said that Mrs. B was moved without the knowledge or the consent of her

**March 8, 1966**

children. The minister then quoted . . .

**Hon. D.G. Stuart (Minister of Public Health):** — False . . .

**Mr. Lloyd:** — Let's see how false it is. Just sit with your mouth closed and your feet dangling for a minute and see how false it is.

**Some Hon. Members:** — Hear, hear!

**Mr. Lloyd:** — The minister then quoted from a report from Dr. Lafave. Mr. Speaker, I now quote a letter which I am going to table from Mr. Jack Bennett, the son of Mrs. Elizabeth Bennett, and we'll see who has had false things to say. The letter is directed to my colleague, the member from Regina West:

Dear Mr. Blakeney:

This letter concerns the information which I gave you about my mother who was in the mental hospital at Weyburn. You tell me you used the information in the house, referring to my mother as Mrs. B. I have seen some of the reports about what Mr. Stuart said about my mother's case and I want to write to you to set out some of the facts as clearly as I can.

I am the Jack Bennett who lives at 1450 Cameron Street and the son of Mrs. Elizabeth Bennett who was a patient in the Saskatchewan Hospital at Weyburn. I understand that Mr. Stuart quoted from some sort of a report from Dr. Lafave saying that the entire family was consulted prior to my mother's discharge from the hospital and that we all agreed to whatever plans the social service department of the hospital would make.

I want to say this. First, so far as I know I have never met Dr. Lafave and Dr. Lafave has never met me.

Second, I did not consent to my mother being moved from Weyburn to Estevan and I did not know she was moved to Estevan until after she was moved.

Third, I did not consent to having the social service department of the hospital find a place for my mother. In fact, I specifically asked that my mother remain at Weyburn.

I understand that the minister said that the house where my mother is kept in Estevan is a two-storey house. He said that you were wrong when you said that it was designed as a bungalow. I have been in the house and I say the same thing as I told you the first time. It looks to me as though it was designed as a bungalow and that the now stair case to the upstairs or attic was something that was added later.

As to the room where my mother is kept, I noted you said it was 10 feet by 11 feet by 22 feet, while Mr. Stuart says it is 14 feet by 26 feet. I can't say exactly, but my recollection is that your measurements are closer

than Mr. Steuart's. I feel sure that the room where my mother is and where there are three other beds, is not 14 by 26. I am positive it is not 14 feet wide.

As I said when I spoke to you before, the family and I have no quarrel with Mr. and Mrs. Kotez who seem to do the best they can under the circumstances. However, as far as we can find out they have no special training in dealing with mental patients.

I understand there are four patients upstairs. I know there are four beds for patients downstairs. When I visited my mother all beds were full on some occasions and sometimes only three were occupied. I have no objection to you giving a copy of this letter to Mr. Steuart or giving these facts to the legislature. I am certainly unhappy about the way mother was moved, about the facilities at the house where she now is in Estevan, and I think this matter should be looked into by the government.

Yours sincerely

John Bennett

**Some Hon. Members:** — Hear, hear!

**Mr. Lloyd:** — Mr. Speaker, I table this copy of this particular letter. Now let's summarize what Mr. Bennett, the son of the lady in question said. (a) That he has never met Dr. Lafave as far as he knows. That Dr. Lafave has never met him. That he did not consent to his mother being moved. That he did not know she was moved until after the event. That, in fact, he specifically requested that his mother remain at Weyburn. I think we are entitled to believe the first hand information from the son rather than the third hand information of the minister.

**Some Hon. Members:** — Hear, hear!

**Mr. Lloyd:** — Thus the first two statements by the minister in this case are false. That the whole family was consulted — not true. That the family consented to the idea — not true.

The minister then goes on to misquote the member for Regina West (Mr. Blakeney) saying that the house in Estevan was a bungalow. What the member said was that it had been designed as a bungalow. In fact, it was so designed and has been converted, perhaps. I now, Mr. Speaker, want to table pictures of the house in question and I invite all of the members to look for themselves and see if this is as the minister says, "a two-storey house" and see if it is a "two-storey house". This, too, has a letter from the son saying, "I am attaching to this letter some pictures of the house where my mother is kept. I think the pictures show clearly that the house is a bungalow style house and not the two-storey styled house that Mr. Steuart talked about." The picture shows more eloquently than anything anybody could say just how wrong the minister was in that particular case.

**Some Hon. Members:** — Hear, hear!

**Mr. Lloyd:** — As for the size of the room, the son who has been there

**March 8, 1966**

expresses the opinion that it is not 14 by 26 feet. The minister who has not been there thinks otherwise. Whether the son and the member from Regina West, or the minister, already wrong in three statements is wrong again, is something that has not been firmly established.

The minister then continued to misquote. He alleged that it has been said that the people who run the house are incapable of looking after people like Mrs. Bennett. What the member from Regina West said about the people who operate the house, and I quote, "I don't criticize their good will, they have no training in the care of mental patients." The statement is precise and clear. It reflects no discredit on the persons concerned. The minister should refrain from twisting it to appear otherwise. Let's look in summary then at the minister's statement. He said:

All the Bennett family gave consent to the move to Estevan.

This is false on the word on one member of the family. He said:

The nursing home was not designed as a bungalow. It is a two-storey house.

The weight of evidence, including the pictures, states that this is also false. He says that it's 14 feet by 26 feet. The son says "No". This must remain in dispute.

**Mr. Steuart:** — It's a two-storey house.

**Mr. Lloyd:** — It's hardly basic and the odds are against the minister anyway. He tries to make a point falsely by misquoting the member from Regina West (Mr. Blakeney) who said only that the persons giving the care have no training in the care of mental patients.

Mr. Speaker, I say that the member for Regina's statement was true and that the minister's statement in this case could hardly have been more false.

**Some Hon. Members:** — Hear, hear!

**Mr. Lloyd:** — After all of his production histrionics the Minister of Health (Mr. Steuart) was wrong in two major statements. We are in doubt about a third and in the fourth one he takes refuge in misquoting and twisting.

**Mr. Thatcher:** — Pretty good score.

**Mr. Lloyd:** — The minister then moved on to ask why names were not given to the house. He claimed inability to identify. He even suggested that these persons didn't exist. Let's consider the case of Mrs. C and consider more ministerial errors, if I may be so charitable as to use that particular word. With regard to Mrs. C a letter giving full details was written to Dr. LaFave, the superintendent of the Saskatchewan Hospital at Weyburn on February 9th, 1966. A further letter on February 22nd, 1966 . . .

**Mr. Steuart:** — By whom?

**Mr. Lloyd:** — . . . and I now table copies of both of those letters for the information of the minister if he wants it and for the other members.

No letter of reply or no letter of acknowledgment has been received with regard to either letter. The minister says he didn't know about the case. This is strange, strange coming from the campaign manager for the Liberals in the Bengough by-election.

**Mr. Thatcher:** — Did pretty well.

**Mr. Lloyd:** — Strange because the member for Bengough, the newly elected member knew about it. He won't deny, I suggest, that he called on Mrs. C soon after he was elected. If the Minister of Health (Mr. Steuart) had been more occupied with his responsibility as Minister of Health, less occupied in dreaming up fairy tales about union organizers, he might have known something about what is going on in his department.

**Some Hon. Members:** — Hear, hear!

**Mr. Lloyd:** — Or, Mr. Speaker, take the treatment given by the minister to the case of Mr. D. Mr. D asked that his name be not published. Details were given which allowed the minister to locate the case without difficulty. His protest that he wasn't given names and as a result couldn't identify the cases, is the shabbiest and sheerest of window dressing. He easily located this one after having stated a few minutes before that such people didn't exist, but he found it. He didn't hesitate to reveal the name of the people to the public. Nor did he hesitate to strike out blindly, belligerently, and bad temperedly, Mr. Speaker, this revealing of the name was completely unnecessary. It was also totally reprehensible. It served no purpose to publicize these names. But this didn't deter the Minister of Public Health (Mr. Steuart) snapping and snarling like some wounded animal in the corner. He lunged out at anything and everybody in sight.

Mr. Speaker, if there were only four cases that would be bad enough. But there is an accumulating mass of evidence to suggest many more. The city of Weyburn is alarmed. The Canadian Mental Health Association is alarmed. Many people in many communities are alarmed. The members of this legislature are alarmed. The minister says "It's all right, Jack, don't worry."

The minister also tabled a report dated March 2nd, 1966, concerning 10 persons on "trial leave or a discharge basis between May 1st, 1962, and May 31st, 1964". He claimed and I quote his words, "that this arrangement was without the consent of the relatives". Mr. Speaker, there is nothing in the memorandum from his staff to support that statement whatsoever, nothing whatsoever. The memo makes clear . . .

**Mr. Steuart:** — On a point of privilege, Mr. Speaker. If he read the document I tabled it said "Put an 'X' after the names where no consent or no knowledge was made of the closest relative". Quit trying to misrepresent the facts.

**Mr. Lloyd:** — I've read the documents, Mr. Speaker, I've read them very

**March 8, 1966**

carefully and I repeat, having read them that there is nothing in the document to substantiate this statement that this move was taken without the consent of the relatives. The memo makes clear that in many cases the relatives were advised and no complaints were received. As to the others, the ones with the "X" which he might have read, it infers that there was no relative known, no relative on the file. But it does not say, "without the consent of the relatives".

Mr. Speaker, here is another important difference. What the memorandum from the department does state specifically for this period of May 1, 1962 to May 31, 1964, is this:

We have not found one case where the relatives have definitely expressed disagreement or hostility regarding our handling of these patients.

Compare that with what has been going on in the province in recent weeks and in recent months. I say again, Mr. Speaker, that the minister's claim, without consent, is proven false by the information from his own department which he held in his hand at the time pretending to read from it, stating today again that he did read it. You know, Mark Twain once said "First get your facts and distort them at your leisure". The minister gets the facts . . .

**Mr. Steuart:** — Is that what you are doing?

**Mr. Lloyd:** — . . . disregards the facts, and distorts them all at the same time.

Mr. Speaker, this budget which we are being asked to vote for is one which fails the people of Saskatchewan in many ways. In no way does it fail more than with regard to education. My hon. colleague who has just sat down gave us some of the facts with regard to this. I want to add just a very few more.

The budget for example, states that last year some 800 new school rooms were opened in the province. These figures came from the annual report of the Department of Education but the annual report also says that included in these school rooms were such projects as the Composite High School in Yorkton, the Miller and O'Neill High Schools in Regina, the Junior High School in Weyburn. The school in Weyburn is open. The Composite High School at Yorkton is scarcely more than a hole in the ground at this point. The Miller and O'Neill high schools are a little bit further on. So it wasn't 800. Some 147 less than 800 were opened. The minister or the Provincial Treasurer sought to suggest that this was a record in the history of Saskatchewan. If he would go back to the report of 1963-64 he would find there the report signed by the same minister, that there would be 863 in that particular year. Sixty-three more than the one above which the Premier sought to establish as a record.

May I just give one more example of the unreliability of this budget. The Budget Speech said very definitely that there was a vocational school under construction at Lloydminster. But you should ask the Lloydminster people where it is. Like the car that was lost last year, the school isn't there. There is no agreement signed with Ottawa with respect to this school. There is no agreement signed with the province of Alberta with respect to this school. There is nothing definite even, I submit, from the Department of Education here. There is no construction underway. Yet the Premier in the Budget Speech gets up and says that construction

is under way in Lloydminster with regard to this same kind of school.

We find too that the target for vocational education is much less than what we need. The Minister of Education (Mr. Trapp) speaking at the local government conference said "We have 1,900 places now. We need a large number more by 1969."

We are told that there is some money in the budget for a start to increase our capacity at Saskatoon but we were told that last year. There are no tenders called for as yet to the building of the school. We don't know when it will be finished. We are told something is going to be done at Moose Jaw. We don't know when it is going to be started. Even when these new additions as described by the gentlemen opposite are finished, we still have a deficit of over 1,600 places in meeting the target that the Minister of Education (Mr. Trapp) said we ought to be trying to reach.

Mr. Speaker, this is a budget which moves away from ability to pay as the basis of taxation. It's a budget which discriminates unfairly against that 27 per cent of Saskatchewan people who live in rented accommodation. It is a budget which conceals facts. It is a budget which is unreliable in what it purports to be facts. It fails to meet Saskatchewan's needs for education. It fails to provide any relief for redress for a number of persons who are mentally ill and who have been shovenly and callously treated by the government opposite. It fails to recognize at all the problems of agriculture. It is completely silent with respect to the crisis of transportation for moving Saskatchewan goods to market. Mr. Speaker, I cannot support the motion, I will support the amendment.

**Some Hon. Members:** — Hear, hear!

**Hon. G.J. Trapp (Minister of Education):** — Mr. Speaker, in taking a moment to answer the hon. member, the Leader of the Opposition (Mr. Lloyd), I want to say that the Premier's figures used on the classrooms were equivalent classrooms and were correct, and they did not include any rooms in Yorkton and Regina. These were some of his own hallucinations.

The hon. Minister of Health . . .

**Mr. Lloyd:** — On a point of privilege, Mr. Speaker.

**Mr. Speaker:** — Order, order! Just a minute. Just a minute. Are you rising on a point of privilege or a point of order? I didn't hear what you were rising on.

**Mr. Lloyd:** — The minister has just accused me of giving wrong information to the house. I submit that if he looks in his own annual report he will find precisely the statements which I gave to the house.

**Some Hon. Members:** — Hear, hear!

**Mr. Speaker:** — Order, order! I must ask

**March 8, 1966**

the hon. members to refrain from interrupting speakers, to try to correct something they think was improperly said that shouldn't have been said. Those aren't points of privilege or points of order; they are points of interruption. One member has as much right to be listened to in silence as another and I draw the attention of the Leader of the Opposition; he's just been listened to in silence.

**Mr. Trapp:** — The hon. Minister of Health, (Mr. Steuart) did a very effective job last Friday, because I see the hon. member from Regina West (Mr. Blakeney) called on big daddy, the Leader of the Opposition, to rescue him today. If this son, Bennett, that he was mentioning today was so concerned about his old mother, why didn't he do something about her care. If this son has so much free time to write the CCF propaganda letters I should imagine he should do a little bit more about taking care of his old mother.

Mr. Speaker, I take great pleasure in participating in the Budget Debate. First may I remind all the hon. members that I represent the Touchwood constituency, that beautiful part of Saskatchewan bordered on the south by the Qu'Appelle Valley and on the north by the Touchwood hills. It is basically a rural area, a truly farming community. I represent Touchwood with more than usual pride, I think, because I am a native son. Not only was I raised in this area but I have taught school in this area for more than 34 years. I want to commend the Premier and the Provincial Treasurer, the Hon. W. Ross Thatcher, for his progressive and businesslike budget. One of our party's election promises was tax reductions. You will recall that last year we initiated this promise. We reduced the sales tax from 5 per cent to 4 per cent, we removed the tax from purple gas for farm trucks, we eliminated mineral tax on farm lands and we extended a list of goods exempt from sales tax. These tax reductions have been followed by other tax reductions this year. We have set up Home-owner grants which will provide a reduction in taxes to those who need it most. For an elderly couple paying \$100 taxes, the reduction will amount to 50 per cent. For a family paying \$150 in taxes, the reductions will amount to 33 1/3 per cent. This is a reduction and it will help those who need it most. We have reduced the provincial income tax surcharge from six per cent to five per cent, a cut of more than \$1,000,000.

This reduction brings Saskatchewan more in line with other provinces. We have provided for a tax reduction in the form of incentive grants to school systems. These grants are designed to give relief to individual taxpayers. We have provided for additional assistance to rural municipalities, for grid road construction and maintenance, and for grants to help in snow removal. We hope that this assistance will help reduce the local tax burden.

When one listens to the opposition members, Mr. Speaker, one would think they had created a Utopia during their 20 years of office. However, I know this is not so. In my constituency many people have no telephones, many people have no power. All towns and villages along the mainline of the CNR from Melville to Nokomis have no natural gas. I am pleased to be able to say that the present Liberal government is taking some steps to improve this situation. It cannot be accomplished in one year, of course, but it must be done. Touchwood constituency has no bus service; it disappeared during the CCF regimes. Previously there had been a bus service to Lipton, Dysart, Cupar, Markinch, and on highway

no. 5. When the CCF came into office these routes were discontinued. A report in the Leader Post indicated that the former Minister of Co-operation and Co-operative Development has been expressing disappointment in the program being made under the Liberal government in providing dust free roads in the Touchwood constituency. Let me remind the late minister that when I was nominated in that constituency there was a portion of no. 35 highway from Fort San to Leross that was dust free, that was all. Now I have a shock for the late minister. By the fall of 1966 every mile of regular highway in the Touchwood constituency will be dust free. I am convinced that the people of Touchwood will welcome what the present government has achieved in this respect in less than 2 1/2 years.

For the remainder of my time, Mr. Speaker, I want to turn to the work of the Department of Education. First a few words concerning staff. As many of you know, last fall the Deputy Minister, Mr. Harvey, joined the faculty of the University of Saskatchewan. I am certain that Dr. Harvey will continue to make an outstanding contribution to education in this field, as he will in any field of education that he may enter. The Assistant Deputy Minister, Mr. L.H. Bergstrom, moved into the position of Deputy Minister and Dr. L.M. Ready of the curriculum branch replaced Mr. Bergstrom as Assistant Deputy. Increased activities throughout the department have made heavy demands on staff. For instance six times as many student loans have been processed as were two years ago. The curriculum branch has been working at a feverish rate to have courses ready for new technical vocational high schools and there are more Grade XII students than ever before for the examination branch to look after. Mr. Speaker, I am proud of the dedicated work of the staff of the Department of Education.

Now I would like to correct some erroneous impressions implied by some members of the opposition. I want to make it clear to all that last year the Liberal government gave school grant increases of \$3,600,000 compared with the average grant increase made by the CCF in the last four years of only \$3,300,000, which was \$300,000 less than that contained in our first budget. This year our grant increases to schools will be greater than any grant increases ever given in the history of Saskatchewan by any government. The gross grant will be \$17,676,000 more than that provided by the CCF in their last year. I know that the hon. members across the way will say that I have used gross grant figures. Well after deducting federal government reimbursements for technical vocational education and so on, net grants will still be more than \$13,000,000 in excess of those of the CCF in their last and best year. I want to point out to the public these federal grants for technical and vocational training were available to the CCF from 1961 on, and that in no year did they avail themselves of \$1,000,000 of federal money. The CCF government of Saskatchewan was asleep while other provinces were taking advantage of the federal money. By 1964 British Columbia, Alberta, Ontario and Newfoundland had taken their full quotas of federal money. This year Saskatchewan will receive approximately \$4,700,000 in federal money for technical and vocational education. I say again that while the CCF were in office they were asleep in regard to federal money which was available to the province for education.

While I am dealing with technical and vocational education, I want to correct the inference which the hon. member from Regina West (Mr. Blakeney) made. The hon. member implied that no additional accommodation had been provided for technical institutes since the Liberals came into power. Here are the figures: 1964-65

**March 8, 1966**

total student intake, Moose Jaw and Saskatoon — 2,303; 1965-66 total student intake, Moose Jaw and Saskatoon — 2,801. This is an increase of 498 students, and he says no increase. It has been reported that the hon. member for Regina West (Mr. Blakeney) spent many hours on his Budget Speech. It would seem to me that he spent many hours twisting and torturing figures to suit his own purposes. However, the member for Prince Albert (Mr. Steuart) certainly taught him his A B C's and D's. Members of the opposition have said that we failed to build the new addition to the Saskatoon Technical Institute last year. Now all hon. members know that you can't build a \$4,000,000 building without plans, and the CCF had no plans for that building. The fact of the matter is that in the spring of 1964 they found themselves with a surplus. Instead of reducing taxes they had money in all sorts of places like a squirrel hides nuts but they had no plans for a \$4,000,000 addition.

Let us have a look at what happened when the CCF built the Technical Institute at Moose Jaw. Planning started on November 5th, 1956, construction on January 15th, 1959, and official opening on January 11th, 1961. Planning and construction took more than five years. Now I know the CCF realize that the Liberals are more efficient, but do at least give us half as much time as you took. We hope to get construction underway at Saskatoon as early as possible this spring. When completed the new building should give us space for 700 to 800 more students. I am proud to say that we are making outstanding progress with respect to technical and vocational high schools. One thing I want the opposition to remember. Their policies for regional, technical high schools were totally unacceptable, both to the boards and by the teachers. Our new policy is moving forward. Two of the new type schools are in the process of construction, and four others are at various stages of planning. I am very pleased with our policy for a number of reasons. The school boards elected by the people will operate these schools, all high school students in division 4, that's Grade X, XI, and XII, will attend the same school, each student taking the course that will best suit his needs. Some students will go from Division 4 schools to Technical Institutes for further training, others will go to the university, and some who have completed vocational courses will be ready to enter the labor force. We are making every effort to ensure that every child gets and will continue to get as much Liberal education as possible throughout his school career. I am firmly of the opinion it would be a serious mistake to narrow down a person's education too early. It is evident that most young people coming out of our schools today will encounter retraining during their life time, due to the phenomenal changes being wrought in this space age in which we live.

I want to say a few words about student loans. My department administers the Canada Student Loans, which in 1964-65 year amounted to \$1,800,000 and in 1965-66 more than \$3,000,000, with more than 43,000 students taking advantage of the program. I am proud to say that no student who applied for a loan, and who qualified as a full-time student at the university was turned down. Today in Saskatchewan, Mr. Speaker, no young person is denied post-high school education at the university level because his parents haven't the money. He may borrow up to \$1,000 per year, the loan is interest free until he starts to work. During the past year, the university has played its full part in expanding educational development in the province. Some of the highlights of the university year have been the first convocation of the Regina Campus, the official opening of its first buildings, the initiation of plans to develop a dental college in Saskatoon,

increases of 1,000 in student enrolment and over \$12,500,000 increase in operating cost, \$6,000,000 increase in capital cost. A rapid expansion of university buildings to meet immediate needs justifies a policy of long term borrowing to help finance the program. Such a policy has been absolutely essential to development.

Because much has been said on the question of autonomy for the Regina Campus I wish to reiterate my view that this is being adequately achieved by the university within the framework of its present structure under a single Board of Governors. I am firmly convinced that the steps already taken and those contemplated leave no reasonable doubt but that the two campuses will grow and flourish under a single Board of Governors with an ample measure of autonomy to serve the needs of the province.

During our 1964 election campaign, the Liberals promised free high school texts. We are beginning to fulfil this promise, this year by providing all grade IX students with free texts. We intend making some \$600,000 available in extra grants to school boards for this purpose. The grant is being given directly to school systems to allow for some flexibility in the choice of texts. I want to say something regarding trade training. Economists have pointed repeatedly to the direct relationship between the level of education in the country and its productivity. As a rapid industrial development in our province takes place, the need for trained manpower has increased. To meet this demand the following positive steps have been taken; the 1966-67 budget provides \$339,700 for upgrading courses, more than three times the allowance for unemployed taking vocational upgrading courses; thirdly, new courses are being added to meet the increased manpower needs of the potash, oil and secondary industries. For example, a course in chemical technology is now being developed. Graduates in this course will be in demand for the potash industry. A training in industry program has been initiated in the past year and will be greatly expanded in 1966. The government is taking over the Technical High School in Prince Albert and will develop it into a vocational training centre for adults in the region. Training programs for the handicapped have been expanded. An example is the domestic service training program for handicapped persons being offered in Weyburn, Regina and Saskatoon. A domestic service training course for Indian and Metis girls is being offered in Prince Albert. A short training course for heavy equipment operators has been offered at six locations in the province with a special course at Balcarres for Indians and Metis.

With respect to education in northern areas, in 1965-66, eight new classrooms were added to existing schools in the north and seven modern teacherages were provided. A personal visit to nearly all the communities in the north last summer convinced me of the great need for improved facilities. Consequently the 1966-67 building program will be the largest in the history of the north. Twenty-seven new modern classrooms will be added and eight new modern teacherages will be built. This expanded program will require the provincial expenditure of \$421,500.

I have just time enough left to mention a few other education highlights. The establishment of the Rosthern School Unit effective January 1st, 1966, resulted from the request of the Rosthern Superintendent of School Trustees Association. It was the wish of the people of this area. Secondly, the formation of the East Central Region Library in the fall of 1965. Thirdly, the

**March 8, 1966**

generous contributions of the school children and teachers of this province to the Mysore project, one of Saskatchewan's jubilee programs. The school objective was \$2,500, the donations to date are over \$10,000. I thank teachers and students for this magnificent response.

Mr. Speaker, I am enthusiastic about the 1966-67 budget, I intend to oppose the amendment and to support the motion.

**Some Hon. Members:** — Hear, hear!

**Hon. D. McFarlane (Minister of Agriculture):** — Mr. Speaker, in rising to take part in the Budget Debate, I must point out that I am particularly proud to be a member of a government that in just 19 months has done more to get the economy of this province rolling than the previous NDP government did in the past 20 years. The personal income for 1965 is forecast at \$1,904,000,000, some 20 per cent above the 1964 level. Farm income is expected to rise almost 65 per cent above 1964 to about \$600,000,000, an increase of seven per cent. Agricultural production in 1965 in gross valued terms will rise above \$1,000,000,000, while the value of production in non-agricultural commodities of the industries combined will amount to about \$750,000,000. Net farm income will also set a new record of close to \$628,000,000, more than 40 per cent above the five year average, 1961 to 1965. Economic conditions are much improved compared to the last five year average and I submit, Mr. Speaker, that is what is bothering the Leader of the Opposition, (Mr. Lloyd) when he whimpers and whines and bellows and rants and raves like he did here this afternoon and as he has done for the past 19 months in this province. The per capita of personal income of the people of Saskatchewan is higher than the national average of the people of Canada and is higher than the average of the three prairie provinces. We intend to do everything in our power to maintain this buoyancy. We intend to reduce the burden on the taxpayer while we increase the services he receives. In our record budget this year we have increased expenditures by \$48,000,000, over 1964, yet last year effected a reduction of \$12,000,000 to the taxpayer and this year it will be a further \$7,000,000 reduction. Yes, Mr. Speaker, in just 19 short months we have reduced taxes for the people of this province by \$19,000,000 yet we have increased expenditures by \$48,000,000. We hear cries of foul from our whimpering opposition. They say two taxes up, they say two taxes down; they say we are just jugglers of figures. They say we are not helping education and that we are not concerned with the people of our rural areas. I submit, Mr. Speaker, that it is our opposition across the way who are doing the juggling. It is the opposition who are driving a wedge between our rural municipal councils and our urban people.

The opposition will tell you that one per cent increase in gasoline tax is a penalty on urban people to build municipal roads. But, Mr. Speaker, the farmers pay for their own roads, they build them and they maintain them from funds taken out of property taxes. Right now they are responsible for the maintenance of 71,000 miles of grid and municipal roads in this province, made up of 16,000 miles of grid road which they share with the provincial government, and 55,000 miles of primary and secondary roads for which they assume full responsibility with help from no one. This year, Mr. Speaker, we are going to help the

farmer and the rural municipalities. For the first time in this province's history monies have been set aside to help the rural people with snow removal on these municipal roads. Our government, by virtue of this, has set aside \$250,000, a quarter of a million dollars for this purpose alone. For 20 years the NDP have called themselves the friend of the farmer and what a friend they have been, but they did nothing to help in this important area. Farmers have had to band together in snowplow clubs in order to clear their own roads, the farm access roads, the school bus routes and, of course, 55,000 miles of municipal roads. The member from Regina West (Mr. Blakeney) complained that our budget is giving an advantage to the rural people of this province, but I can tell you, Mr. Speaker, that while I was Minister of Municipal Affairs I received many letters from farmers all over the province who still had to use teams of horses to take their children to the school buses after twenty years of NDP government in this province. These are the people who must be helped, Mr. Speaker, and these are the people we will help.

In other municipal areas, Mr. Speaker, the previous government set up a special grant supposedly to help the municipalities in the event of wash-out of bridges and roads and culverts, and let me say here that in most cases municipalities in Liberal constituencies were not even aware of these grants. And in other cases the money sent out from the Regina planners bore no relationship to the actual cost. I am sure that I don't have to remind the members here today about the proposed county system from these so-called friends of the farmers. I don't have to remind you about the fight the NDP across the way brought into local government in this province. In 1956, the CCF called a Provincial-Municipal Conference. At the conference friend Tommy Douglas and Clarence Fines — remember them? — lectured the municipal people on how inefficient and outdated they were. We all recall how the great Regina planners were going to solve all the rural problems by putting us in big counties. No one, I am sure, will ever forget how they refused to allow rural people so much as a vote on the new system because the Socialists were so sure that they were right and our farmers were wrong. Well, our rural people got up on their hind legs, they threw out the county system; then they threw out the planners, and for good measure, Mr. Speaker, in 1964 they threw out the Socialists as well. That is why today my whimpering, whining friend, the Leader of the Opposition, is forever hollering sour grapes because he has the poorest record in Canada of any political leader. Five by-elections out of six lost, general elections, seven losses out of eight. Certainly the worst record of any political leader in Canada today.

Well, this year we called a Provincial-Municipal Conference and instead of telling our local government what they should be doing, we asked them what they wanted us to do. And, Mr. Speaker, what a difference. I can tell you, Mr. Speaker, that the reaction of our municipal people was also quite different on this occasion. They told us what they needed to solve their problems of rising taxes, their inadequate sources of revenues, and their ever-increasing demand for services. We are making a start to give them some of the things they require. Those same special grants for wash-outs and repairs, Mr. Speaker, that the Socialists should have used for that purpose were handled fairly by our government last spring. There was extensive damage because of fast run-off but we asked our municipalities to submit estimates of the flood damage incurred. Members of our Grid Road Authority inspected these claims. We asked and received a

**March 8, 1966**

supplementary warrant of \$100,000 over and above what was already put in the estimates to assist these municipalities. I am very pleased to announce now, Mr. Speaker, and I am sure the people of Saskatchewan are very happy to know that six rural municipalities received 65 per cent of their estimated damage; 12 received 60 per cent; 13 or more RMs received 55 per cent; five more received 50 per cent; 19 RMs received 45 per cent of the cost of damage incurred by way of these flood grants. This is what the Liberal government means by co-operation with rural municipalities.

A further change, Mr. Speaker, brought about by this government enables the municipalities to receive assistance for second regraveling of the grid roads when they apply, instead of having to wait five years as they did under the previous government. Where, Mr. Speaker, is the so-called friend of the farmer?

I was interested yesterday afternoon when the member for Kelsey (Mr. Brockelbank), former Minister of Mineral Affairs, got up and tried to pooh-pooh the cancellation of the mineral tax. He said that he still had his mineral rights. He said that he leased his mineral rights and only had to pay 1/7th of the tax. He said the only people that were benefiting by the removal of this tax were the big oil companies. Well, Mr. Speaker, he isn't going to tell that to the people of this province . . .

**Mr. I.C. Nollet (Cutknife):** — Except Pearson . . .

**Mr. McFarlane:** — . . . when I indicate to you . . .

**Mr. J.H. Brockelbank (Kelsey):** — The hon. member is not quoting me correctly.

**Mr. McFarlane:** — I am quoting you correctly.

**Mr. Brockelbank (Kelsey):** — No, you're not quoting me correctly. I have a right to . . .

**Mr. Speaker:** — Order! Order! We can't have these interruptions. If a member wants to rise on a point of privilege he can do so. Now state the point of privilege.

**Mr. McFarlane:** — Mr. Speaker . . .

**Mr. Brockelbank (Kelsey):** — If the hon. member will sit down, I will state my point of privilege. My point of privilege is that he said that I said that I only paid 1/7th, it isn't 1/7th, it's 1/8th. I didn't say that the only beneficiaries were the oil companies. I said the oil companies benefited far more than the farmers.

**An Hon. Member:** — That's hardly a point of privilege.

**Mr. Speaker:** — Now, just a minute, just a minute. I would ask members to give other members a chance to speak. Now the Leader of the Opposition was listened to with a reasonable degree of silence and I would ask that other members be listened to in the same manner.

**Mr. McFarlane:** — He ran out the radio time because it was a very disturbing

point and he didn't want the people of the province to hear this, but I am going to give them the facts if that is the way he wants to act. Well, he said while he was Minister of Mineral Affairs, he was able to make this deal for the leasing of his land. But by virtue of the act that he and his government brought into this province they deprived 5,000 farmers in this province from ever sharing in the future production of oil wells on their own land, 5,000 farmers representing 755,564 acres of land. The sad part, Mr. Speaker, is that many of these farmers came out from areas of Europe, from the Ukraine, from Poland and other areas of Europe that were represented by Socialist governments and they knew what a Socialist government was. To this day they will never forget their kissing cousins in this country for depriving them of their mineral rights.

Mr. Speaker, there is another area where our Socialist friends excelled in community relations in this province. When we took office the hospital plan was in difficulty. The costs were rising far too fast and relations between the hospitals and the Department of Health were, of course, very poor. The Socialists had the answer, close down our rural hospitals and force everyone to go to larger towns and cities. You remember the master plan of the hospital that was submitted to the government. Today, Mr. Speaker, our government sat down with the hospital authorities and established a better spirit of co-operation. By working with these people we have been able to improve standards that have slowed seen the rate of cost increase, and preserved the hospitals in our rural areas that the NDP were going to close down. Then in my own area in the eastern part of the province we have preserved such hospitals as Qu'Appelle, Montmartre, Maryfield, Lampman, just to name a few.

The member for Regina West (Mr. Blakeney) was very critical of our spending on education, as was the whimpering, whining Leader of the Opposition here this afternoon. Let me point out, Mr. Speaker, that we are providing \$23,000,000 more than any NDP Socialist government ever did to assist education in the province; \$5,000,000 of that is a direct grant to cover normal increases and salaries and operating costs. A further \$3,000,000 was set aside to enable municipalities to lower the mill rates, and we have set aside large sums to assist universities in their expansion. We are now paying over 50 per cent of the operating cost of our public schools, the highest percentage of operation costs to our rural people in spite of the sanctimonious Socialist statements made by the members of the other side. Nine private high schools have qualified for these grants; and Mr. Speaker, this is the record of a government interested in education.

Now I want to deal with the member from Melfort-Tisdale (Mr. Willis). The member from Melfort-Tisdale has also been doing considerable whining about government spending of money. He talks with scorn about the number of miles of grid road brought into our highway system. Well, Mr. Speaker, people knocked on their door seeking improvements and seeking assistance. His answer was the only decisive thing about the former government and that, of course, was definitely "No". The cost would be too high and we must save the people money. We cannot give the people these services that they are begging for. So after 20 years and a change of government and a minister who could administer the highways department, in my area alone, no. 35, that section of no. 35, that stayed out of the highway system for 20 years was brought into the highway system last year to help the municipalities.

**March 8, 1966**

That section of highway that should have been in the highway system for 20 years, no. 47, was brought into the highway system of this province. People along no. 33 highway that went to the former Minister of Highways pleading to have oil were turned down on every occasion; they got it a few months after the Liberal government went into power. People along no. 16 highway, after sending delegation after delegation to the former minister finally got action on no. 16 highway. It was quite significant, Mr. Speaker, that he talks about political discrimination. Prior to that time all the oiling that was done went to the end of the constituency misrepresented by a CCFer and stopped at a Liberal constituency. This has been taken care of; this has been done away with. Now these people have the privilege of travelling on the type of highway they should. Well, Mr. Speaker, our government's only regret is that we cannot spend more money for services to our rural and to our urban people.

We all heard, Mr. Speaker, the budget brought down by the province of Alberta our neighbor to the west. It is almost three times as large as ours. We would have those monies and a budget comparable to that size if we had retained the industries the Socialists have chased out of this province during the last 20 years. We are on the right track now, Mr. Speaker, and we have arrived at a point in our development where we can increase expenditures for service to our people in Saskatchewan, while we are effecting net tax reductions. That is what a Liberal government means for Saskatchewan and that is just the forerunner of what the Liberal government will do in the years ahead for progress in our province.

Now, Mr. Speaker, the member for Turtleford (Mr. Wooff) has been crying that there is nothing in the budget. Firstly he says to offer assistance to individuals for developing irrigation on privately owned land. He says there is nothing to offer assistance to individuals for regressing submarginal privately owned land and that we have provided nothing to assist individuals in clearing privately owned land. Well, Mr. Speaker, there is none so blind that will not see. If he had read the estimates, he would see that for the first time in the history of the province monies have been set aside for these projects totalling \$285,000. But we cannot blame the member for Turtleford (Mr. Wooff) for his blind objections for he is only playing "follow the leader". Most of the members opposite are playing the same game. Instead of reading the estimates, instead of reading the annual reports of the various departments, the opposition persists in asking inane questions to occupy the time of the government and their staffs. The ultimate was reached the other day when the Leader of the Opposition asked for a SGIO calendar, and then the crowning one of all was the member for Melfort (Mr. Willis) yesterday asking how many trees there were on the legislative grounds. But, I suggest, Mr. Speaker, that the hon. member for Turtleford is more to be . . .

**Mr. C.G. Willis (Melfort-Tisdale):** — Mr. Speaker, on a question of privilege. Mr. Speaker, I have been quoted as having asked the number of trees on the grounds. I did no such thing.

**Mr. Speaker:** — I want to draw our hon. members attention to the Standing Order no. 29:

No member may speak twice to a question except in explanation of the material from his speech which may have

been misquoted and misunderstood.

Now that is what our Standing Order says. Now I want to add a little more in regard to some of these interjections that are taking place. If a member desires to ask a question during a debate he should first obtain the consent of the member who is speaking. If the member indicates that he is willing to give way and allow the question to be asked he will take his seat. The question can then be asked and the member who is speaking will decide whether or not he answers it. If the latter ignores the request — that is the member who is speaking and has command of the floor at the time — the former cannot insist even if he thinks he is being misrepresented. He cannot make a denial during the speech but he must wait until the member has resumed his seat and then he may ask leave to make a denial or explanation, or he must wait until his turn comes to address the house which, obviously, if he has already spoken he couldn't do. I want to draw your attention to the orderliness of the procedure. If a member thinks he is being misrepresented he should wait until the member that is making his speech has taken his seat and speak to it in an orderly manner.

I continue further. No one has a right to interrupt a member who is addressing the house by putting a question to him or by making or demanding an explanation. A member may allow interruptions but it is entirely his option whether or not he wants to give an immediate explanation. These citations are from Beauchesne's Parliamentary Rules, Citation 126, for the identification and information of members in regard to interruptions taking place while a member is speaking. I am firmly convinced that such things should wait until the member resumes his seat after the conclusion of his speech. Then I think if anybody wants to ask a question he can do so or if he wishes to make an explanation he would also be in order in rising to do so at that time.

**Mr. J.H. Brockelbank (Kelsey):** — Mr. Speaker, on a point of order, I would like to say first of all that I agree with you in regard to questions or asking members who are speaking to make a statement and that if the member speaking doesn't wish it then the other members have no choice but to wait until the member finishes. Then if he wishes they can ask him a question. But questions of privilege are in a little different class, I think, and one of the questions of privilege that often come up is when a member is misquoted. This is a different situation. Or when a member uses unparliamentary language, it would be quite improper to let this go by and wait until the member has finished speaking and then raise the point. A point with regard to privilege, points with regard to unparliamentary language, I think, according to the rules, must be raised at once and if they are left they can't be raised at all.

**Mr. Speaker:** — Might I add that points in regard to unparliamentary language are considered a point of order and I agree with the hon. member. A point of order should be raised at the time the breach of order occurs. I don't think we were arguing about that. What we are arguing about is somebody who wishes to rise on a question of privilege to say that he is being misquoted. Well, it depends how widely you interpret the term "question of privilege" and I personally think if the member doesn't choose to give way, although I'll hunt up the relevant citations in regard to this, but I think questions and corrections are better left to the end to the member's speech.

**March 8, 1966**

**Mr. McFarlane:** — Thank you.

**Mr. Brockelbank (Kelsey):** — I would just like to say one more word, Mr. Speaker. This matter of a member putting words into another member's mouth is pretty important and I know you will give it your very careful consideration.

**Mr. McFarlane:** — I thank you for your decision, Mr. Speaker, and in the mean time I am sure that the member for Melfort (Mr. Willis) has had plenty of time to go out and count the trees that he asked for yesterday. I just want to point out here, Mr. Speaker, that by virtue of some of the supercilious questions asked, as I pointed out, and by virtue of the fact that some of their members don't even take time to read their annual reports or to read the estimates and then make these types of statements, in the case of the member for Melfort (Mr. Willis), the case of the member for Turtleford (Mr. Wooff) they are more to be pitied than censured.

It was these members opposite, Mr. Speaker, that have aligned themselves with some of the labor bosses and that call themselves a friend of the farmer but sat idly by last fall during the grain handlers strike at the west coast. They stood back and they watched labor bosses fighting for a contract that would give the sweepers in the terminals an annual income of \$8,000, while the prairie producers, whose average income is only \$4,200, couldn't even sell their grain. Then the member for Regina East (Mr. Baker) has the audacity to get up in this house this afternoon and mention the fact that 35,000 farmers in Saskatchewan had received an income of less than \$2,500, but I suggest to the member for Regina East that he go back to some of his labor boss friends and explain to them the serious situation the farmers have had to put up with by virtue of the actions of some of his kissing cousins.

While I am on the subject of grain shipments, I wish to point out to this assembly, Mr. Speaker, that within the next five years we are going to have as many boxcars of potash leaving the province as we have now full of wheat. The railway companies must be aware of this tremendous need for engines, for boxcars, in the immediate future and must take action now to see that they have these facilities to move the products of the farms and industry and to ensure that no future markets are lost because of these conditions. Mr. Speaker, neither the farmer nor the manufacturers should be made to suffer because the railways do not make adequate preparation for acquiring more rolling stock to meet present and future demands.

Mr. Speaker, I want to spend the next few minutes on a matter the opposition have classed as an emergency facing the people of the province. This, Mr. Speaker, is the American ownership of land in Saskatchewan. The member for Regina West (Mr. Blakeney) was on TV during the Bengough by-election crying out in fear that giant corporations are buying up land in Saskatchewan, squeezing out the small farmers, and taking Saskatchewan capital to the United States. Well, Mr. Speaker, in a survey recently completed, we found there are no incorporated American agencies buying land in southern Saskatchewan. If the member for Regina West (Mr. Blakeney) by virtue of the fact that he is a lawyer and doing business with some of these farmers knows of it, I wish he would bring it to our attention. Furthermore, most of the purchases of these lands were one section or less per purchaser. I wish to quote from an article which appeared in the Leader-Post, February 18, 1966:

Purchases of Saskatchewan farm land by Americans, particularly from North Dakota and Montana, increased considerably in the 1962-64 period over that of the past years, but a reversal of the trend was noted in the later stages of the period.

Now, Mr. Speaker, from March 31st, 1961 to December 31st, 1964, the American ownership of land south of township 10 increased from 1.8 per cent to 2.1 per cent of the total acreage in that area. And this is a period for which the NDP must take the responsibility. They did absolutely nothing, Mr. Speaker, to arrest this situation. Since that time, our government has taken steps to arrest that trend. We are providing more farm management assistance to our farmers in that area. We are selling crown lands which provide farmers with a good economic base on which they can approach lending institutions, lending agencies, to provide cash to further expand their holdings. And we have made representations to federal lending agencies to expand their services and reduce the length of time needed to process these loans.

These steps, Mr. Speaker, are having the effect of placing Saskatchewan farmers on a competitive plane with American bidders for these Saskatchewan lands.

Now, Mr. Speaker, I want to deal with one or two of the other remarks made by other members opposite. I want to deal with the remarks made by the member for Pelly (Mr. Larson) when he said that nothing was being done for agriculture in this province. I want to remind him of the stand he took along with some of his CCF colleagues in the house last year when we introduced legislation doing away with the tax on purple gas for farm trucks. He was one that stood up in this house and violently opposed it. That was just before the weekend. Well, Mr. Speaker, he went back home for the weekend, went back among his farmers from Pelly, and lo and behold when the vote was taken the next week he came in here trembling like a leaf and then he stood up and voted for this proposal.

Then I want to refer to some of the remarks made by the member from Regina West (Mr. Blakeney) when he was talking about Benjamin Disraeli in this house and a few remarks he made about William Ewart Gladstone and, of course, tried to relate them to the Premier. Well, I am going to quote some of the remarks made by the greatest statesman in the British Empire of all times and that is Sir Winston Churchill. These remarks were not directed to Mr. Disraeli or Mr. Gladstone. He was directing his remarks to the Socialists and Socialistic governments and how did he describe a Socialist, Mr. Speaker, and a Socialist government? He said the Socialist government was a government of the duds, for the duds and by the duds, and then he was backed up just recently by another statement made by one of the younger CCF MPs in the House of Commons at Ottawa. If the hon. member for Cutknife (Mr. Nollet) had read the magazine he would have seen where this young CCFer was complaining because he said all that they had ever been able to elect in the past into the CCF movement were a bunch of relics. And so I think that the statements of these two eminent authorities can compare with the remarks made by the member for Regina West (Mr. Blakeney).

I want to bring one more complaint to the attention of this house this afternoon, Mr. Speaker, before I go on with the major part of my remarks. It was established yesterday afternoon that this true and false column or the comic strip that is now appearing in some of the weekly newspapers in this province under the

**March 8, 1966**

by-line E.P. Henry; it was established that she is the wife of the member for Regina North (Mr. Whelan). But all I would want to say in this respect, Mr. Chairman, is that I have five weekly newspapers in my constituency, but this so-called comic strip which is at variance with most of the facts only appears in two of them. Now I say, Mr. Speaker, that this is rank discrimination because the only two papers that it appears in are those papers that are sympathetic to the NDP point of view. Why couldn't they have made it fair to all and at least put the comic strip in the whole five weekly papers in my constituency. Mr. Speaker, I hope that the member for Regina North will take the matter up with his wife and the authorities concerned and see that there is no further discrimination and that all these five weekly newspapers have a chance to look at this comic strip.

Now, Mr. Speaker, it is my pleasure to speak on Saskatchewan's only billion dollar industry. Our government is seeking ways to help develop agriculture further, and to enhance its economic well-being. In a province like Saskatchewan, it is not only the farm people that rely heavily on the continued well being, stability and growth of agriculture, but the whole economy is directly affected. Therefore, I am indeed proud to present the highest agricultural budget in the history of this province. A total of \$12,353,950. The estimates show that this is an increase of practically 20 per cent over the agricultural estimates introduced last year. In 1965, agriculture produced about 44 per cent of the gross value of the provincial commodity production and 51 per cent of the net value of commodity production. Several important industries have developed to service this large volume of production by our very energetic farmers.

A combination of several factors has given Saskatchewan agriculture a complexion of health and prosperity during the last few years. One of these factors has been good crop yields. Even though we had a short crop in 1961, the average wheat yield during the past ten years was 19 bushels compared to the long-term average of 16 bushels to the acre. The last four-year average was 22 bushels to the acre, Mr. Speaker. Wheat prices during the last six years have been considerably better than during the 1950's and marketing quotas have been much less restrictive. There are several concerns, however, that we must take into account as we develop policies and programs for this great agricultural industry. A major concern is that not all farm families have shared in the general prosperity.

Many of our non-commercial farms lack sufficient resources for earning an adequate living from the farm alone, and recent indications are that some are supplementing their farm income by part or full-time jobs off the farm. For many beginning farmers, high costs of land and other imposts are making it very difficult to get established on an adequate basis.

Our commercial farms are also vulnerable. Recent favourable crops and prices have made it possible for farmers to absorb the steadily increasing costs of production, but the high level of mortgage financing plus increasing costs has made the farm economy much more vulnerable to crop failures or price declines.

Many of our policies and programs are aimed towards bringing greater security to the farm family. These are problems difficult of solution. The ones that we can do something about are being approached with vigor and imagination in this budget. The budget for the Crop Insurance Board shows considerable expansion. It provides the capital necessary to increase the number of insured

by about 50 per cent. Effective April, 1965, we entered into a reinsurance agreement with the government of Canada whereby the government of Canada shares the risk of major crop losses in Saskatchewan. This will enable us to expand our crop insurance program without endangering the financial position of the province. At present, we are offering crop insurance in most areas of the province east of the third meridian. We have undertaken a completely new and more equitable basis of determining coverages and premiums. Starting in 1966, they will be based on land productivity for each quarter section insured.

The market outlook for livestock and livestock products as well as for the major field crops is most encouraging. In line with these apparent opportunities the budget makes provision for maintaining and, in some cases, strengthening the traditional service branch of the department. We have increased the appropriation for the Agricultural Information Division which carried regular TV and radio programs and prepares many special informational items on farming. We are aware of the necessity of a sound extension service to help our farmers increase their productivity and improve their farming operations.

Last year's grant of \$30,000 to start off a new Soils Testing Laboratory in Saskatoon is an example of a much-needed service that will, we expect, be in operation next fall. This will be one that will, we expect, be in operation next fall. This will be one of the largest and best-equipped facilities of its kind on the prairies and will do a great deal to increase production as a result of better utilization of different types of soils throughout the province. We have further increased the appropriation for the Economics and Statistics Branch, which services the department and the government, and also the farming community with beneficial information on the economic aspects of the agricultural industry.

I know all members will join with me in recognizing the very fine work done by the 40 Agricultural Representatives in the province in paying tribute to the voluntary workers in this area. Members of the municipal Agricultural Committees and Agricultural Representative Districts devote their time and energies to the extension program. The hundreds of dedicated 4H leaders in the province give most freely and unselfishly of their time and talents to make the 4H program the very notable influence that it is now.

At the provincial level, five specialists of the Plant Industry Branch, six in the Animal Industry Branch, and five in the Agricultural Representative Districts on soils, weeds, pests, horticulture, livestock production and farm management. The administrative, supervisory and technical personnel from the various other branches of the department also provide special services in such fields as veterinary, engineering, irrigation and project development. Budgets in support of the Earned Assistance Program both for pasture development by local associations and for the various projects such as persistent perennial weed control, field shelterbelt planting and so on have been increased.

Saskatchewan leads all other provinces in the ROP beef program, with 125 herds and 3,800 calves on home test and 40 sire groups from 34 herds on test at our Bull Test Station on the university campus in Saskatoon. This station is now in its second year of operation. It was full to capacity in its first year of operation and it is full again this year.

**March 8, 1966**

Last year we added 31 new herds to this program and we now have applications from nine more owners wanting to go on test. Last spring, 1,447 bulls were weighed off test and many of these will be up for sale as breeding bulls, this coming season. Our objective is to encourage our producers to improve production through the use of tested cattle which are known to possess high gain ability.

A new Boar Premier Policy gives breeders the opportunity to select their own boars of ROP breeding and earn a grant of 25 per cent of their purchase price up to a maximum of \$25. In its first year, this policy was used more extensively than the old policy was a year ago. This government has also introduced an Elite Swine Herd Policy. Under this policy, our outstanding herds of registered swine will be recognized and publicized so that the superior breeding stock they produce will be more widely and more effectively used throughout the province. We have to date approved five Elite Swine Herds and have five additional applications under consideration.

A serious concern of this government is the need to integrate our Indian and Metis people into the overall provincial economy. As a step in this direction, the Department of Agriculture has taken over the operation of the Cumberland House Farm, with the view to demonstrating good agricultural practices for the area, and to provide the opportunity for native families to get started on livestock enterprises of their own. It is anticipated that with the completion of the present development program, ten native families will be established in a beef cattle operation. A total of \$37,060 has been allocated for this project in the fiscal year of 1966-67.

Mr. Speaker, the Master Farm Family Award was introduced by this government to give recognition to outstanding farm families who provide examples to their community of the best farming practices. In 1965, the first year of this competition, there were 33 nominees named by district boards in 33 of our 39 ag. rep. districts. Two Saskatchewan farm families were named Master Farmers under this policy. They were, of course, Mr. and Mrs. J.H. Broeder and family of Assiniboia for southern Saskatchewan, and Mr. and Mrs. Norman Babey and family of Lloydminster for northern Saskatchewan. This is a program for which we are justly proud. It emphasizes the role that the leading farm families of our province are filling. It has aroused much interest particularly at the local level and has demonstrated its value in accomplishing some of the objectives visualized in this project.

Good farm management practices are becoming an increasingly important part of successful living. Our department is meeting this challenge through increased emphasis on the general farm management extension program. This budget provides for three part time Farm Management Specialists during the winter months to supplement the work of five full time specialists. The 2,000 farmers involved in about 100 farm management clubs receive a three year study program covering such areas as farm accounting, farm analysis and, of course, budgeting. Information obtained from the 500 odd account books is published annually and provides the best information available on the economics of agriculture.

Members are familiar with the work of the Family Farm Improvement Branch. This branch is continuing the program of farmstead modernization and completed a very successful year in the past twelve months. About 6,000 farmers were given services towards modernizing their homes and their farmsteads so that we now

estimate that perhaps as many as one-third of the farm homes in the province have at last a partial system. An important part of our rural scene is the small town, hamlet and village. We have to our credit a major accomplishment in bringing to the people in these small rural and urban communities the advantages of water and the sewage systems. Last year installation of 12 systems was in progress. We are preparing reports on systems for 61 communities during the current winter. Time will not permit mention of all of them but names such as Crane Valley, Sylvania, Minton, Keeler, Handel, Zelma, will remind many members here of what this can mean to these small service centres.

In this branch we have lent added emphasis during the year to the development of specialized businesses. The engineers in the branch work closely with the Animal Industry specialists in producing plans and designs for service barns of many types and sizes, and structures and planning for the various types of cattle enterprises throughout the province.

The remarkably successful exhibition staged in Regina and Saskatoon last year were part of the overall program in which some 5,200 farmers and 90 exhibitors that took part.

A persistent problem and a recurring one in Saskatchewan is that of fodder shortage. Instead of spending all our funds on freight assistance we are attempting to develop a long range program to meet this problem. One aspect, of course, is fodder storage. Fodder can be kept successfully for many years in silos or good hay shelters. Spoilage losses both in the fall and spring can be largely eliminated by virtue of this protection. A positive step towards improvement introduced by our government is the Fodder Storage Demonstration Policy. The policy first introduced last year resulted in 80 demonstration projects being built. In the estimates before you this year, Mr. Speaker, we have doubled the appropriation for next year and I expect that one year from now I will be able to tell you that the farmers have been assisted in the construction of somewhere between 900 and 1,000 of these shelters.

Under the first ARDA agreement, which terminated on March 31st, 1965, 135 projects committing a shareable total of \$12,600,000 with \$6,300,000 claimable from the federal government were also undertaken. Under the second ARDA agreement, completed on April 9, 1965, Saskatchewan is allotted \$14,300,000 over the five year term. To the present, 32 projects have been submitted or are in the process of submission. The shareable value of these projects is estimated at \$7,000,000 of which nearly \$3,000,000 will be recovered through ARDA. Before the end of the coming fiscal year it is expected that another 10 or 20 projects will be submitted. Under both agreements the major emphasis and expenditure has been on community pastures. The reasons for this are obvious. They provide grazing land to smaller surrounding farmers as a base for developing a secondary enterprise through which they can increase their income. The submarginal land involved is taken out of cultivation and unimproved land is developed, which adds to the income base of the area.

Secondary effects are also noted in the improved quality of livestock that follows and the encouragement toward expanding livestock numbers and the livestock industry in the province.

Drainage and flood control projects of cultivated land also have the effect of increasing farm size and net farm income, while at the same time reducing the hazards of fluctuating income

**March 8, 1966**

through inundation. Although drainage and flood control projects are important in some areas, water shortages are a common problem in most of Saskatchewan. Under both the first and second ARDA agreements the Saskatchewan Research Council is conducting research to conserve and better utilize surface water supplies and to discover simpler means of discovering groundwater supplies. Our government, Mr. Speaker, has changed the emphasis in the nature of some of the ARDA projects.

Indian and Metis are being given more attention. Two community pastures are being developed on Indian reserves, wild rice is being planted in northern lakes to provide income, and the new Indian and Metis branch of the Department of Natural Resources is meeting with considerable success in locating employment for Indians and Metis. Further, our government has undertaken a research project that deals with a study of manpower supply and the demand over the next five years.

However, the major expenditure under the ARDA agreement for the next fiscal year will continue to be for community pastures operated by the Department of Agriculture. It is expected that 30,000 acres will be purchased at a cost of \$850,000 and \$1,600,000 will be spent for building 360 miles of fence, including corrals and water development, clearing out some 27,820 acres, breaking 32,000 acres, and seeding up to 50,000 acres depending somewhat on the type of season we encounter.

By the end of the 1966-67 fiscal year with ARDA financial participation, a total of 232,000 acres will have been purchased for provincially operated community pastures, 839 miles of fence constructed, 103,000 acres cleared, and 157,000 acres seeded to tame forage. Under the new agreement with ARDA the federal government will share the cost of purchases of land on a 50-50 basis rather than on a 1/3 and 2/3 basis. Partly as a result of this, but more because of higher interest on the part of neighboring farmers and higher land prices, it will be noted that we are estimating less money for land acquisition than we did last year. I would note that during the current year, and in fact in the previous year, the land utilization division were unable to spend all the funds allocated to it. We are not losing interest in the program, but we consider the estimate a realistic one in view of changing conditions on the farms in the province.

Important new projects on which land acquisition is proceeding are the Smeaton project, just south and east of the Hanson Road; the Wingard project north-west of Duck Lake; a major extension in the Nokomis area north of Last Mountain Lake and to the existing Fielding and Pontrilas pastures. We consider that improved and enlarged grazing facilities will be eagerly welcomed by the farmers in these communities.

Now, Mr. Speaker, I would like to mention a few of the projects for which major land development and construction are provided in these estimates. We expect to spend over \$100,000 in each of Paddockwood, St. Walburg, Swan Plain and Pathlow projects. Over \$75,000 will be expended in development of the Blueberry pasture near North Makwa and the Fairholme west of Glaslyn, and the Insinger and Whitebeech pastures. We feel this important project type of development under ARDA is very important, but consider that the aspect of assisting the individual farmer under the program has been neglected in the past.

These estimates, Mr. Speaker, will include three new policies that are shareable under ARDA and that will assist the individual

farmer to meet special problems. Thirty-five thousand dollars is included to make provision for the first time for assisting the individual farmer develop small private irrigation schemes. Not all details are worked out but we propose to offer engineering assistance on a per acre grant to defray part of the heavy development costs associated with this project.

We are spending a lot of money seeding major reclamation projects to grass. This year we are providing \$100,000 in order to pay a grant to farmers who seed submarginal lands to perennial forage crops. I need not remind members in this house that these programs are associated with our general program of increasing forage production in a long range program.

The third new program is to assist small farmers to develop their farms by paying a grant to defray part of the clearing costs. You are asked in this budget to appropriate \$150,000 for this new program. The program will apply in the Rural Development Area, roughly the park belt area of our province. We hope to use the grant to encourage small farmers to work together in hiring clearing contractors, thereby reducing travel time and costs. These programs will bring the whole ARDA program to many farmers that have not been able to share in this program before.

I would like to mention briefly our Water Development and Irrigation and Flood Control Program. The two main areas of services provided by the Conservation and Development Branch of the department are agricultural services for land development, mainly in the community pasture program, and engineering services and financial assistance for irrigation and flood control projects. Engineering services are provided also for special projects such as the Water Control Structure on Lac La Ronge, reconstruction of the spillway on Condie Reservoir just outside Regina, and engineering services of a related nature for other department of government. Our staff has developed a high degree of competence and accumulated experience which is of major value in meeting the increased service needs of these programs and, of course, the South Saskatchewan Irrigation Project.

It has been an important factor, too, in a rapidly developing preliminary plan for the multi-purpose water supply scheme to the Saskatoon south-east area. Ten staff positions are being added this year to service the regular program.

The Department's Water Development program, aside from the South Saskatchewan project, is expected to reach a new high of \$1,300,000 for what might be termed normal development, as compared to emergency programs carried out in the very wet years of the 1955 period. This compares with about \$820,000 in 1964-65 and about \$600,000 in 1965-66.

I want to emphasize, Mr. Speaker, that the Water Development programs are essentially local programs, initiated, constructed, operated, maintained by the local organizations with technical and financial assistance from the Department of Agriculture.

In the Flood Control Program particularly, the pace of development has largely been set by the adoption of work programs and related assessments by local people. A few projects are undertaken on areas that are mainly crown land with lessees forming an area authority. About 35 local Conservation and Development Area Authorities have more than 200 projects in various stages of the planning, construction, and operation and maintenance.

**March 8, 1966**

A nearby example would be south of Regina, the Souris Area Authority. This construction program of main channel improvement over a four year period involves some \$328,000. The program this year involves an expenditure of about \$119,000 for completion of the main channel program and a start on the 125 miles of laterals which will be emptying into the main channel.

Other examples of beneficial flood control programs include the Good Lake Conservation and Development Area west of Canora. The Strathcona project proposes some 38 miles of channel construction in the 1964-70 period costing some \$164,000.

The Rollo Park Project near Meadow Lake is a fodder project of about 10,000 acres mainly on crown lands affecting some 60 farmers. About 20 miles of drains are being constructed over a four year period at a cost of nearly \$200,000, and of course, some land clearing is also involved.

In the Shand Creek area 30 miles south-east of Tisdale, near Porcupine Plain, some 18 miles of main channel were improved from 1963-65 at a cost of about \$176,000. Improvement of this main outlet will make water control possible on seven streams totalling 140 miles in length. Ultimately about 140,000 acres and 400 families will benefit from this project.

Improvement of three miles of McNab Creek, one of the main tributaries, at a cost of \$46,000 was started in 1965. Other areas mainly in the north-east and north-west have programs of varying size. These programs are valuable to the individual farmer and to the province as a whole in helping farmers to improve production efficiency and increase farm productivity.

An increased budget, with ARDA sharing half the province's construction costs of approved projects, and with a policy of 90 per cent financial assistance for main channel improvement in recent years has made it possible for local area authorities to construct most of the main outlets which were needed for these areas. These measures have helped to increase the pace of development and to gain an increasing acceptance of local levies as the benefits of the program are realized. The capital cost sharing was reduced to 75 per cent this year since this was the ceiling imposed by the new ARDA agreement and because it was felt that the program was now entering a phase where a 25 per cent local share represented more nearly the local ability to pay.

Turning to irrigation, the department has completed the two year renovation program of the 700 acre Chesterfield project north of Leader. Using water stored in the new Avonlea reservoir downstream farmers were given technical assistance in developing 135 acres for irrigation this year. Development of about 150 acres south of Midale and the renovation of about a 2,000 acre project at Herbert will be started this coming year. This will essentially complete the program of renovation of the seven group irrigation projects in south-west Saskatchewan.

Water Users' Association have been formed to operate and maintain the projects built at 100 per cent provincial cost. Operation and maintenance agreements are made with the water users with a grant on a decreasing scale for the first five years. To give the program the emphasis it deserves, the department will add this year a new policy of technical and financial assistance for individual irrigation projects. On the South Saskatchewan River project, PFRA will complete the embankment and spillway in

1966, and, according to present plans, reservoir filling will commence after the major summer flows of 1966 have passed. It is anticipated that the reservoir will fill in the summer of 1967 to the minimum level required for pumping at the eastside pump plant. Accordingly, a contract for construction of the base structure of the pump plant was let to Piggott Construction for approximately \$640,000 in August, 1965. Tenders for the supply of the first two of four pumps are being evaluated and, of course, were announced the other day. A contract for auxiliary equipment will be let in May, and one for completion of the pump house will be let in October.

Contracts for construction of the main canal to Broderick for the Broderick reservoir and for aggregate processing will be let in June of this year. This basic planning and construction will make it possible to deliver water in the last half of 1967 to the Saskatoon south-east water supply system. Other contracts for the irrigation distribution and drainage system will be let progressively with construction in the Outlook-Broderick area to be completed in 1970. A policy for the purchase of lands required for the irrigation works has been developed and negotiations with the farmers concerned are currently underway.

For the past year the department has been conducting an extension program with farmers in the area who are considering the factors involved in converting to irrigation farming.

The department has been purchasing agricultural lands offered for sale on both sides of the river with the largest amount concentrated on the east side of the river. In 1964-65 about 2,810 acres were purchased. Expenditures in 1965-66 are expected to total \$1,280,000 for 16,526 acres with 6,875 acres irrigable. The program will be continued so that farmers who do not wish to irrigate will have the alternative of selling their land at excellent market prices. I am, however, very pleased to report that we expect, as a result of requests from farmers in the area, to undertake levelling on not less than about 500 acres in this Broderick project this summer.

In the Lands Branch, when our government took office we were confronted with many problems attendant on the administration of provincial lands. Ninety per cent of crown lands are in community pastures, or under cultivation and grazing leases, or under sale agreements to farmers. As of March 31st, 1965, we were administering 8,861,000 acres of land and more than 8,000,000 acres were being used by about 20,000 farmers and ranchers or more than one in every five in this province.

The sale of cultivation and small grazing leases was one of the first matters to receive our attention. We wanted to accelerate the purchase of cultivation leases by lessees and to make it possible for grazing lessees to purchase where a lease did not exceed a half-section and where location in relation to deeded land made the lease essential to the farm unit. We have now adopted a policy so that lessees can add rentals and other debts to the purchase price and we have given an incentive discount of \$50 per year for each year served as a lessee to a maximum of \$500, or 10 per cent of the purchase price. Discounts, this is on cultivation leases, totalling \$365,000,000 have been allowed to 985 lessees who have purchased under the new cultivation lease sales policy this year.

My government is pleased with the response of the lessees

**March 8, 1966**

who have now purchased for we are convinced that ownership is the most secure form of tenure. In addition to cultivation lease sales, 300 small grazing leases have been sold and about the same number have inquired about purchasing.

I must emphasize, Mr. Speaker, that there is no compulsion. Lessees do not have to purchase if they wish to continue with a lease. As provincial lands have become available for new dispositions the department is making them available under a carefully revised lease allocation policy. Mr. Speaker, for the first time in 20 years people are able to obtain land from the crown without having to purchase a membership in a political party. We have removed the disposition of crown land from the political sphere. We insist that each application for a lease be checked and scored under a system that allows a maximum of 100 points that are allotted after weighing the factors of ability determined by age and farming performance, resources with which to farm, need as evidenced by family responsibility and assessment value of existing land holdings, and proximity; and, of course, merit is given for war service. The competition for any provincial lands . . .

**Mr. Brockelbank (Kelsey):** — Liberals . . .

**Mr. McFarlane:** — The competition, — yes there are a lot of Liberals that had war service in this province.

**Mr. Brockelbank (Kelsey):** — If he's a lessee . . .

**Mr. McFarlane:** — They didn't get very many under the former government. The competition for any provincial land that becomes available is keener than it has ever been before, and I might add, Mr. Speaker, that the majority of unsuccessful applicants would themselves make quite satisfactory lessees. However, the allocation policy is designed to pick a farmer in the vicinity whose unit has the greatest need of the provincial land if the unit is to attain or remain in above marginal status. The government believes its allocation point system is the fairest that has yet been devised. The scoring is being done by professional agrologists, but each unsuccessful applicant has the right of appeal and a final review and decision by a completely independent board nominated by provincial agricultural producer organizations, not by the former CCF government. Since the advent of the new allocation policy, 702 grazing, 396 cultivation, and 200 hay leases have been allocated; and it is expected that another 1,000 allocations will be made before March 31st, 1967.

The government is extending the community pasture program to serve more patrons. The accomplishments we expect in new community pasture development were mentioned when I spoke of the ARDA program. All the lands included in provincial and co-operative community pastures are made available under the Provincial Lands Act. A 10 per cent expansion of this service was realized in 1965 and a 20 per cent expansion is being provided for 1966. Our government has revised the provincial community pasture allocation policy to make a fairer distribution of the benefits from these projects. A point allocation system, using the same basic approach as the lease allocation system, is being employed for 1966 allocations.

Farmers who use community pastures will be entitled to graze a minimum number this year, but eventually will be required to

reduce to a maximum that will enable a greater distribution of the benefits of this service that in 1965 was a source of income to 2,720 patrons and is expected to serve 3,000 farmers in 1966. In 1966 for the first time the department will open a community pasture for sheep in the Crooked River district intended to provide all the special services such as shearing, protection from predators, etc., while the sheep are on range from early summer until fall. This government believes there is a great potential for sheep production in Saskatchewan. It is, therefore, providing this special service for the benefit of the sheep industry.

This government will make a special effort to have lessees finish clearing and breaking arable land not yet under cultivation. There will be adequate funds appropriated for this project. A new settlement project east of Smokey Burn has been opened up with 300 acres already cleared on each of the 10 units. New leases are being allocated. Breaking will proceed on these lands as soon as leases are allocated. Clearing is now underway on 1,700 acres in the Whitebeech area. This land is presently being allocated to 17 vicinity farmers whose units needed to be enlarged. Breaking will be completed on these new leases in the coming summer.

The administrative task of the Lands Branch in the present fiscal year and in the coming fiscal year has been and will be subject to unrelenting pressures and demands of the 20,000 farmers who presently use provincial lands and from more than 1,000 farmers each year who receive new dispositions.

The classification of new lands for leasing, the appraisal of developed leased lands for sale, the supervision of community pastures, the investigation of leased land under use, and the allocation of leases under a point system require a highly specialized and trained staff of 21 professional agrologists. The successful management of provincial community pastures requires skilled cattle handlers because the job of receiving 2,000 cattle, as an example, in the spring in a single community pasture owned by 100 farmers, and of returning them in the fall, after providing adequate grazing and breeding services, is much more difficult than looking after a ranch herd of the same number.

The accurate recording of lands administered by the department, posting of the land to be leased, correspondence with applicants, lessees and purchasers and just curious general inquirers, require constant attention by the clerical and administrative staff. While one naturally thinks of the Lands Branch as an agency that serves Saskatchewan farmers, the branch is called upon to help with other programs.

As an administrator of one acre in eight of all the land in the settled part of the province the branch is called upon to provide rights-of-way for roads, power lines, telephone lines, reservoirs, gravel pits, park sites, sites for oil drilling, etc., wherever they may occur on provincial land. In every instance the branch notifies the farmer or the lessee affected by the right-of-way that has been granted. The Lands Branch assures lessees of compensation to which they are entitled.

Mr. Speaker, I have given you some indications this afternoon to support our contention that this is the best government this province has had in over 20 years. I have given you some indication this afternoon that it is the intention of this government to sustain, maintain, preserve and above all increase the economic unit of our rural people of this province.

**March 8, 1966**

You will have seen by the estimates presented to you that we are doing more this year than any previous government did in 20 years. Mr. Speaker, I want to congratulate the Provincial Treasurer for bringing down a budget directed to serve the interests of all the people of the province, a budget that will certainly get the economy of the province rolling again. By virtue of what I have indicated to you this afternoon, I am sure you are aware that I will not support the amendment but will support the motion, the budget.

**Some Hon. Members:** — Hear, hear!

**Mr. I.C. Nollet (Cutknife):** — Mr. Speaker, in accord with your wish to leave any questions to the end of a minister's speech, I would like the hon. member, who made that statement "that for the first time, farmers in Saskatchewan can either lease or buy land without a CCF membership". I want him to support that statement and prove it.

**Mr. McFarlane:** — I didn't say that.

**Mr. Nollet:** — He did say that. The hon. minister made the statement "that for the first time". And I want him to bring forth some evidence that this was the case when I was administering the Department of Agriculture.

**Mr. McFarlane:** — All I have to do, Mr. Speaker, is to listen to some of the remarks of the people of the province when they come in to see me about land problems. Some of them mention this to me, and I take their word for it.

**An Hon. Member:** — Pretty high evidence.

**Mr. Nollet:** — Mr. Speaker, I want to ask the minister another question. He also talked about an independent Review Board and emphasized the independence of this board. I ask the minister then why is it that when this board was appealed to, made a final decision on a particular parcel of land at Langbank, and a commitment made on behalf of the board, a legally binding commitment, that the then minister endeavoured to reverse the decision of that board.

**Mr. McFarlane:** — I'll tell you why that was done because there was an election on in the Moosomin constituency and one of the fellows who was tramping around the Moosomin area, walking into this particular parcel of land was the member for Cutknife (Mr. Nollet). He was going in to see if he could agree with some of the decisions made by the board and as the member for Cutknife tried to indicate now that this isn't an independent board. Is he trying to say that because one member appointed was a name suggested by the Saskatchewan Wheat Pool, the board is not independent. Is he trying to say that when we adopted the suggestion of a name from the Saskatchewan Farmers Union it isn't independent? Is he trying to indicate that because we adopted the name suggested by the Saskatchewan Growers Association, it is not independent? Then, Mr. Speaker, I say that he should take that complaint to these organizations in the province and not here in this legislature.

**Mr. Nollet:** — Mr. Speaker, the hon. minister has asked me questions

now and I propose to answer them. I say to all of the points raised; it is not an independent board because the minister interfered with a decision made by that board, a legally binding one, and you did not issue that lease although you made a legally binding commitment until January 16, 1966.

**Mr. Speaker:** — Order! Order! I think the last statement or interjection wasn't a question, it was a statement.

**Mr. Nollet:** — Well, he asked for it.

**Mr. Speaker:** — The member for Melfort-Tisdale (Mr. Willis).

**Mr. C.G. Willis (Melfort-Tisdale):** — Before the hon. minister takes his place, I have another question which I would like to direct his way and I hope he can give me a less political answer than the one he gave to the member from Cutknife (Mr. Nollet). The question is — how much of the increase in the budget for agriculture is attributed directly or indirectly to the South Saskatchewan River Dam?

**Mr. McFarlane:** — I haven't got the figures here. I said this afternoon that if you people had read your annual reports and if you read your estimates and did your homework you wouldn't be asking all these silly questions.

**Mr. Willis:** — Would the minister say it would be 95 per cent?

**Mr. McFarlane:** — The estimates are there before you. I haven't got mine in front of me at present but I will get my estimates and I will give you the figures.

**Mr. W.G. Davies (Moose Jaw City):** — Mr. Speaker, I listened this afternoon with great interest for 75 minutes to the Minister of Agriculture (Mr. McFarlane). The last 45 minutes was replete with statistics and facts about the farm and I don't take this in bad part. They were about his department and I congratulate the minister for having brought those facts before the house. But the first 30 minutes of his discourse was taken up, I suggest, with a series of trivial, sometimes abusive, frequently erroneous and usually irrelevant remarks about many things which had nothing whatsoever to do with his department. I think I should begin by making just brief mention about some of these matters that he has raised.

The tired old question of the labor bosses has come up from the same source, the Minister of Agriculture (Mr. McFarlane) this afternoon, Mr. Speaker. Amusingly, he has exceeded even the Premier who as you know increased the wages of all the grain handlers by \$2,000 or \$3,000 a year at the start of this session by making this an annual increase of \$8,000. Even he must see that his figure is absolutely ridiculous, that no grain handler has got \$8,000 a year increase in his wages. Such gross exaggerations do nothing to make better relations between groups in our society.

I would like to suggest to members of the house that the minister might be better engaged in trying to promote a joint committee that would establish means by which a more effective

**March 8, 1966**

consultative and conciliation contact might be made between the workers concerned and the farmers on the prairies. It is very easy, you know, to raise questions that play one class of people against another. It is not, in my opinion though, a solution and I don't think the minister should do it as often as he seems to do in this house.

I was thinking of the contrast between his federal counterpart, the Minister of Agriculture (Mr. Greene) who was on the prairies a month or so ago and who made very forthright remarks about the CPR, rail line abandonment, and the failure to get enough boxcars to move farm grain. He also said that what farmers needed most of all at this time was an investigation into farm machine prices. No matters of this kind were touched upon by my friend, the minister of Agriculture (Mr. McFarlane). He might have done well to have echoed the remarks of Mr. Greene and to have left the other matters alone.

You know, while he was dealing with the question of hospitals, he said, as I got it, that his government was slowing down the rate of increase of cost of the hospitalization plan. Well, this is certainly not indicated by the estimates. The estimates for this year have a figure of \$45,676,000 as against \$40,000,000 for the current year. This is an increase of 13 per cent. I am not criticizing the government at this point for the increase, but I am saying that it is absurd for the hon. minister to suggest that in some magical way his government has been able to slow down costs in hospitalization that haven't arisen for numerous reasons, that I am sure we all know about.

Then again, his remarks about local government and the municipal conference that was held last fall where he said they had at last achieved a situation where as he put it, instead of telling local government what to do, "they told us what to do." He made unfavourable contrasts with the previous government in this regard.

I couldn't help but recall the remarks of Mayor Barsky of Prince Albert, not precisely an enemy of the members of this government and also president for the Saskatchewan Urban Municipalities Association. He was quoted last fall as saying there is a "great unrest among the municipalities" over the handling of social aid problems and that there were 182 municipalities involved. So again, it seems to me that my friend the Minister of Agriculture, wants to watch his exaggerations because they may catch up with him.

The Minister of Agriculture was preceded in this debate by the Minister of Education (Mr. Trapp) and I think it is fair to comment that in this debate as in the last, the Minister of Education was given 15 minutes time in each case to make his statement. During this debate I heard a good deal about what might be done in some other directions. The minister spoke about 27 new classrooms that would be created in the north as well as some teacherages. I think this is a very good thing. I also suggest that these sums, the capital sums in this connection, will be taken from the school grants in the estimates. I don't know what this would amount to, possibly \$300,000 but the additions here of 27 new classrooms must be weighed against the fact that they will probably reduce the total amount in school grants.

I did want to lay stress on the fact that the minister has

risen in this debate and has told us nothing whatsoever about the plan, about the government incentive plan as I believe it is called. Many municipalities in this province are in my opinion, distinctly worried about these matters.

He talked about the procrastination of the former CCF government. I think that many who know the real situation will find this quite amusing. He said that we had expected too much of a Liberal government when we had asked them to spend the \$2,000,000 that was in the budget of the CCF government that just preceded it, and the \$465,000 that was in the budget of this government for the current year.

He said "you can't build a \$4,000,000 building like that without some planning". This may be true, Mr. Speaker, I would say this to the minister, however, that the procrastination of this government of almost two years has just put the construction of those buildings that much further off. There can't be any doubt whatsoever that the progress of technical and trade training in Saskatchewan has been hindered by the fact that the present government has just sat on building plans for a period of almost two years. You know, this is perhaps in keeping with the record of the Liberal party in Canada. Remember that all through the thirties there were no training, no apprenticeship programs, by which the young people and the unemployed of the day could have got the training that would have stood us in good stead in the years from 1939 to 1945. Nor did they in the post-war period right up to the time of their defeat in 1957, provide the kind of technical training that everyone was beginning to realize was to be absolutely necessary for the development of this country.

The Minister of Education must at this time accept a valid measure of criticism for the failure to create educational facilities that the Economic Council of Canada has told us in a very forthright way must be produced in the shortest possible space of time if we are to keep our people employed and keep the economy of this country buoyant.

Mr. Speaker, in rising to speak in this debate I want to congratulate my seat mate the hon. member from Regina West (Mr. Blakeney) for what I consider to be a great contribution. I say he made a great contribution to the debate because I think it truly merits that description. Not only did it keenly dissect the various parts of the Budget Speech of the Premier but it did a great deal to raise the standards of debate within this house. I may say that I have heard these remarks, not only from the supporters of my party but from many others whose party affiliations usually bring them into opposition with our general policies. They were alive to the fact that his contribution to the debate enhanced the status of our parliamentary institutions.

Much has been heard in this debate about taxes and allegations of how the Liberal party of this province has done something to relieve them. My friend, the member from Milestone (Mr. MacDonald) the other day said, I think I'm quoting him exactly, "We Liberals have long believed that the people of Saskatchewan are the most highly taxed in Canada". Mr. Speaker, there is no doubt whatsoever that they are now the most highly taxed under the present Liberal administration. They are more highly taxed indeed than they have ever been before in the history of this province, because in round figures, the present Liberal administration will take from the people of this province during the coming year just in one set of taxes, some \$27,000,000 more than they did during the preceding fiscal year when their total tax take

**March 8, 1966**

was again considerably more than it had been during any other year in the history of this province and I'm only taking, as I say, one set of taxes.

Let's take the education and health tax. It will be increased almost \$7,000,000 more than it was during the fiscal year that will end on March 31st. Almost \$5,000,000 more will be taken in gasoline tax. The new tobacco tax of the Provincial Treasurer, will net almost \$4,000,000. These are only some indications of the higher imposts that the people of the province of Saskatchewan will pay as a result of living under a Liberal government.

There is a set of taxes entitled "total privileges, licenses and permits". By this the Liberal government will reap revenues of \$8,000,000 more during the coming year than during the current fiscal year. Under the heading of "fines, forfeits and penalties" more money again will be taken than will be taken during the current fiscal year. You can go on to the heading "sales, services and service fees". This will be up \$1,000,000 to \$7,240,000 in the next year. Liquor profits will advance from an astronomical sum of \$16,800,000 to \$19,100,000 almost to the \$20,000,000 mark.

Mr. Speaker, my seat mate the member for Regina West (Mr. Blakeney) said that the budget was a fine example of the juggler's art. How true this is upon examination. No matter how much my friends in the government may take, the inescapable fact is that more taxes will be taken from the people of Saskatchewan during the second year of Liberal administration than in any other year of the province's history and that situation, I may remind you, was also present during the first year of Liberal occupation of government.

Put it this way, Mr. Speaker, we will be seeing in total budgetary revenues during the next fiscal year \$48,000,000 more than the already high, all-time high, budgetary revenues of the fiscal year that is due to end March 31st, 1966. The people of this province are being told of the great advantages and greater benefits that will accrue to them, and here there has been an immense effort, an assiduous effort made to woo the young people of the province to the Liberal banner. There are some prime indications by the way at the university level that young people are somewhat less entranced and fascinated by the flow of language and the philosophy of the Liberal party and its chief exponent, the Premier, than might be imagined. But in any event, one of the gimmicky attempts that were used by the Liberal party in an attempt to entice young people to their cause was to announce a remission on sales tax for household effects of newly married couples. Our friend from Milestone the other day again said forthrightly, "We help the newlyweds". Well, how much were the newly weds assisted during this last year, Mr. Speaker.

We can note the results of this policy because the Deputy Provincial Treasurer is quoted in the Leader Post of January 15th of this year, as saying that up to December 31st, of 1965, the treasury department had paid some 275 refunds. Mr. Speaker, there were some 6,300 marriages in 1965 in the province. I believe it can be assumed that most of these are among young people. It will be seen, therefore, that there was less than five per cent of the couples concerned that were affected who claimed refunds. Of course, there could be some duplicates that might reduce this number from the more generous figure that I have given. If we put it this way then, 95 per cent or thereabouts of the young couples who entered matrimony in this province, last year, got no assistance whatsoever from the highly touted benefit or remission of sales tax. But on the other hand, Mr. Speaker, every newly married

couple buying a home last year had to pay extra taxes caused by the insufficient grants to education that were made by this government. For example, if half of the couples that married last year bought a home and had to pay the increased taxes that they would have to pay on those homes because of the failure of this government to put forward proportionate increases and grants to education as they did in the cities of Regina, Moose Jaw and many other urban localities, their extra costs that can be easily seen would far, far outweigh any benefits they got from the so-called newly weds benefits.

Then again, every couple that entered matrimony in 1965 had to pay an extra \$20 for hospital and medical care premiums. What does this mean in the aggregate? It means another \$125,000 was paid by young people that at the start of their married life they could ill afford.

Every one of the newly-married couples in Saskatchewan during 1966 is going to pay more for another reason. It doesn't happen to be because of the Liberal government of this province but it does happen because of the national Liberal party in this country. Because of the higher mortgage rates, approved at Ottawa, the interest rates on mortgages, which are the responsibility of the federal government, you will find that in the lifetime of a home mortgage perhaps \$1,500 more will be paid in the value of that home before the title is secured by the couple concerned.

If you take the 3,000 figure which I said might be fairly reasonable as an estimate of the young people who were married last year who bought homes, you can see that there would be a total of \$4,500,000 that would be paid in extra mortgage charges during the lifetime of mortgage agreements on these 3,000 homes because of the activities of a Liberal government; because of Liberal party policy. Now, I think all of these figures indicate only one thing, that this benefit was nothing but a gimmick. It was not something that will in the final analysis help young people. The record shows indeed that very little advantage was taken of it. So, we say that this budget is a juggler's budget. There is every reason to believe that young people believe that this is the case.

Mr. Speaker, I listened again the other day to the Minister of Labour (Mr. Coderre). I found again with respect that his remarks on many matters were rather irrelevant. But still I listened with patience and with interest. I was intrigued at the time to hear him making a reference to something about "creeping socialism" and "that the CCF were trying to destroy municipal institutions" if I got his language correctly when making notes at the time.

So I wonder that the Liberal party in this house at this time could have the temerity to talk about destroying municipal institutions. There was also by the way some reference made briefly by the minister of Agriculture (Mr. McFarlane) again this afternoon. It is, after all, the Liberal government of New Brunswick that is currently engaged in a life-and-death struggle with the municipalities of that province, trying to establish legislation that would abolish the rural municipal units and the county districts and put all authority for administering these units under the province. Authority for this can be found in the CBC "Today's Editorial". I see, Mr. Speaker, that it is now 5.30 and I wonder if we might call it so.

The assembly recessed until 7.30 o'clock p.m.

**March 8, 1966**

Mr. Speaker, when we rose at 5.30 I had just finished commenting on the fact that the Liberal government of New Brunswick is currently engaged in a life-and-death struggle with the municipalities of that province in attempting to abolish rural municipal units, and county districts. I was about to make some comment and some reference to the CBC "Today's Editorial" of December, 1965. This editorial in brief, said that the government of New Brunswick took the position that only by "trimming municipal powers and centralizing them" could essential services be given. I would just like to make a very brief reference to this editorial. I won't read all of the sections and I should add that the author of the editorial, a Mr. McDonald, rather seems to favor Mr. Robichaud and perhaps the editorial is all the more significant for that reason.

But it speaks first of all of the Byrne report upon which the government of New Brunswick acted, saying that it also advocated that the rural municipal units, county districts, governed by an elected council be abolished. Authority for administering these units also would go to the province. The editorial goes on to say that there was a reaction of "genuine shock" to the Byrne report and that it was believed the government would not go ahead with it. But in a special session, the editorial goes on to say, the New Brunswick legislature now meeting, approximately 130 bills have been introduced in connection with "municipal reform":, 20 of them of major significance. The most important of Byrne's recommendations have been adopted in government policies.

The chief aim of the legislation is to centralize authority and hand to the provincial ministers and their civil servants the authority to direct all education, welfare, and health standards. This editorial goes on, and I won't read it all, because it is rather lengthy, commenting that county councillors, municipal officials of towns and villages and cities have "come down hard" on the government for its stand. There you have it, Mr. Speaker. This has been done in a Liberal government, the Liberal government of New Brunswick. One can expect to see perhaps the same arbitrary approach taken here. I don't want to pass judgment on Robichaud proposals in their entirety. I would, however, say that the means by which the government is going about it is questionable indeed. In any case, I believe that municipal officials in Saskatchewan should be very much on their guard in the time ahead against any attempt in Saskatchewan to duplicate the efforts of the Liberal government of New Brunswick.

Mr. Speaker, not to be forgotten is the fact that while Liberal information media in this province just several years ago used millions of yards of newsprint to belabor the CCF over a simple investigation of country organization and while the Liberal party in this province took an almost unforgivable position in misrepresenting the effects of that investigation, both the media and the Liberal party of Saskatchewan have remained absolutely silent about the nature and effect of the New Brunswick proposals. They have remained silent except for one thing. We now begin to notice some covert approval by the Leader Post, formerly an active opponent of the CCF and its investigations, with regard to rural reorganization.

The Leader Post of January 24th, 1966, speaks about the "stubborn opposition to change that had to be overcome in the establishment of larger school units." Shades of a few years ago is all I have to say when I read those words! The editorial goes on to say:

Another consolidating job remains to be done replacing our 296 postage stamp rural municipalities with 65 counties.

Mr. Speaker, what a change! Had the Liberal party of this province and the media that so slavishly supported its shameful position taken a more constructive attitude a few years ago, instead of trying to intimidate the people of this province, and distort the issues, we might have been able to go ahead with some of the positive endeavors that would have assisted the progress of the RMs and local government. The attitude of the Liberal party during the past decade has frustrated and has blocked reasonable efforts to bring a larger measure of assistance and more hope for the government of rural municipalities.

I was glad to find, however, that the Minister of Labour, (Mr. Coderre) did make some favourable comments about certain aspects of his department. He told us that industrial peace had in a large measure continued in the province, that collective bargaining was working as well as it had before. I thought, Mr. Speaker, that no other statement could have been more revealing of the success of the CCF labour department policies built up during its period of office, because, of course the Liberal party has done absolutely nothing to add to these services. That they have continued to function well is a fortunate thing. There is no special credit in this though to the present administration. The Minister of Labour also referred in his speech in this house during the debate, Mr. Speaker, to a statement that he had made at the North Battleford convention of the Saskatchewan Federation of Labor in 1965. He said that in the past year there was a 20,000 increase in the number of people who had obtained employment in Saskatchewan. I have not had the opportunity of reading the record, but I did make a note of his comments, and I hope I am quoting him accurately. I think he will admit that he has continued to say here that, what he said at the Federation of Labor convention, about the additional 20,000 new jobs in the province of Saskatchewan. But he will admit that we have had a pretty buoyant time in this province and across Canada in the last year, perhaps on the fine foundations that were laid by a CCF administration. But the figures that the Minister of Labour gives do not appear to be borne out by the figures of DBS.

I have in my hand here, a sheet from DBS, known as "Estimates of Employees by Industry, Provinces and Canada". It does show indeed that between October of 1964 and October of 1965, all provinces enjoyed an increase in the number of employed persons, but Saskatchewan certainly shows no 20,000 increase.

Mr. Speaker, the figure for October, 1964, shows the total figure of employment in all sectors to be 114,200. The corresponding figure for October of 1965 gives the figure of 121,300. This is an addition of 7,100 jobs, Mr. Speaker. This is about 1/3 of the vastly inflated figure that the Minister of Labour gave to the labor convention at North Battleford in an attempt to convince them by Liberal propaganda that one quarter of the Premier's pledge of 80,000 new jobs in four years had been fulfilled.

In passing, a comparison on what is happening in other provinces might be useful too. In the same period of time that I have made reference to, there was a 35,200 increase in the number of employees in B.C., 17,200 in Alberta, 43,800 in Quebec and 107,500 in Ontario. Mr. Speaker, no one denies that

**March 8, 1966**

Saskatchewan has made progress. I think we are all delighted that this progress has been made. The kind of progress that has been made in new jobs is similar to that which was encountered in even less buoyant years in this province.

Mr. Speaker, it certainly does not justify the government inflating statistics for its own political advantage. I personally take great exception to what has been said in this regard by members of the other side of the house.

I want to turn to a matter in my own constituency, I notice again this year there is no action whatsoever towards the construction of a provincial office building in Moose Jaw. The house will recall that the Minister of Public Works (Mr. Gardiner) had on some previous occasion said that Moose Jaw had benefited more than any other community in Saskatchewan in getting government buildings located there during the last 20 years or so. This statement, I should digress and say, is considerably at variance with those of other local Liberals in Moose Jaw, who claim that Moose Jaw got very little benefit in the way of new public buildings under the CCF. However that may be, Mr. Speaker, a new provincial building is needed in the city of Moose Jaw. Now that there has been an amalgamation of the Moose Jaw Health Region with the Assiniboia Health Region, health officials and employees are complaining that better quarters are required. I know that the city council of Moose Jaw, certainly the mayor, wants me to tell the house that they are supporting what I am saying at this time. Indeed, I understand the mayor of the city of Moose Jaw, has already been in contact with the Minister of Health (Mr. Steuart) advising him that these new quarters are required.

Mr. Speaker, surely Moose Jaw as the third largest urban community in the province, and as the centre for many government activities, on a regional basis, has every right to see in the near future the construction of a provincial building. Now, I would hope that the Minister of Public Works (Mr. Gardiner) will alter his obdurate attitude and do something immediately during the coming year to see that a start is made in construction.

While I am dealing with the speech made during the debate by the Minister of Public Works (Mr. Gardiner) I can hardly fail to mention some of the figures he gave when he was speaking about the Central Vehicle Agency, which is to be. As I understand the minister, he claimed that over \$600,000 in savings has been achieved to this time by the Liberal government in its period of office and said that there was more to come. I think he said that some 415 cars formerly used by employees have been disposed of. Well, Mr. Speaker, we are coming to the estimates shortly, and we will then be able to discover what in fact is happening. What the estimates do show is that there is an amount of \$3,350,000 for the creation of a Central Vehicle Agency. Quite a lot of money. It would pay for a lot of vehicles and a lot of gas and oil.

I suspect what has happened during the last period, Mr. Speaker, is this, that the cars that were formerly bought by the government for the use of its employees, at very substantial savings, (the government, of course, paid all the operating costs of gas, oil and repair) are now privately purchased by employees who get a mileage payment and other considerations, and, in effect, cost the public much the same as did the vehicles when they were operated with the government paying the costs directly. As a matter of fact, in Public Accounts Committee the other day, we were questioning the Minister of Labour (Mr. Coderre) on the number of cars in his department. He informed us that there were three cars

less in the period under review than there were in the previous year. On questioning he told us that there were three cars which employees were driving on mileage payments, at 11¢ per mile. So I suggest, Mr. Speaker, that few savings, if any, have been achieved by this method. It is simply another slight-of-hand, means by which an attempt is made to convince the public of Saskatchewan that they have gained something through a change in methods of operation and financing only.

I was pleased, however, to note reference in the speech of the Minister of Public Works (Mr. Gardiner) to the continuation of improvements in the Legislative Buildings. As all members know over the last decade a considerable amount of money has been spent in improvements in this building, and I think all of us would want these improvements to continue. I would estimate that over the last decade something in the order of \$1,000,000 has probably already been spent.

As I now understand it, the minister has employed the services of a prominent architect and a number of improvements are being made to provide more facilities, especially for the satisfaction of the general public. Mr. Speaker, I would like at this point to appeal to the minister and to appeal to the government, to consider in this investigation, the rights of the members of the Legislative Assembly, because originally, Mr. Speaker, the principal use of this building was to revolve around legislative activities. Over the years because of the increasing needs for space, and in some years a tight financial situation, space for members became more restricted. I think, therefore, that members have not because of this secured all the space that would enable them to operate and function to their maximum efficiency for the purposes for which they were elected. This has been a recurrent problem over the years when I became Minister of Public Works in 1960. Some steps at that time were taken to provide more space for the opposition members of the day. However, it was acknowledged by all, that improvements would need to continue. I am suggesting that at this point, it would be a good time for us to make more progress. Now that the architect is to survey the building, now that other uses are to be considered, this is the opportunity for us to make sure that the members of the assembly are to gain that space, to gain those opportunities that will enable them to function as well as they can for the benefit of the constituents that put them here.

Of course, while I mention space, space is not only necessary so that people can sit down in some quiet to work out correspondence with their constituents, preparation of speeches in this house, research and also technical work. In some of the offices now we have six, eight or ten people. It is quite clear, I think, that members cannot operate to maximum efficiency under these circumstances. So I sincerely hope, Mr. Speaker, that everyone in this house, including the members of the cabinet, want to see us in a position where members can perform adequately and that an eye be given to this before new uses and a new look at the building are taken by the architect. We all know that we have been cramped by space, and in the investigations that are to be carried on, there is an opportunity to rectify some of the deficiencies that probably began to arise as early as 30 or 40 years ago.

I am not at this point, and I want to make this clear, reproaching anybody. The situation has simply come about for all the reasons I have tried to give. I do say that now is the time when we can do something about it. Now we have the opportunity.

**March 8, 1966**

Mr. Speaker, when the Minister of Labour (Mr. Coderre) spoke in this debate he mentioned the Labour Management Committee of Review of the Trade Union Act. He said according to my recollection that he expected that this report would be brought down very soon. The minister at the same time said that the members of this house would be given an opportunity to examine the report. I do hope that this opportunity will be given in fact and that we will be given notice well in advance of any legislation that might be introduced in this house. I followed the hearings of the Labour Management Committee of Review, Mr. Speaker. I believe there is one outstanding fact in all of the representations that were made by management bodies before the committee, that is, that no one succeeded in establishing that the record in Saskatchewan over the past 20 years has been anything but one, on the whole, of exemplary freedom from major labor disputes. I have before me the reproduction of one of the tables of the Department of Labour report of two or three years ago, that shows from the period 1952 to 1962, 10 years, there were 891 disputes between labor and employers, of which only 42, or some 4.7 per cent ever came to the strike stage. Now mind you, a dispute to be a dispute, has to come to that point. So besides these 891 disputes, there were, of course, thousands of agreements that were satisfactorily settled without resort to any kind of trouble at all. But there were almost 900 disputes and only 42 of these came to the strike stage.

The figures speak for themselves. Certainly no one can argue that there has in this province been anything but a successful operation of conciliation and conciliation practices and that, in a very large part, the labor legislation of the Trade Union Act has been responsible for this. These facts, and these figures haven't been disputed successfully by anybody. It shows that Saskatchewan has the best record of any province in Canada in respect to labor disputes in the last 20 years. I am speaking here not only with regard to the number of disputes but to the proportionate number of disputes that have taken place in this province. I am referring to this, Mr. Speaker, because as you recall at the last session, in the very last dying days of the session, a labor bill to amend the Trade Union Act was brought down without any warning whatsoever. Labor and, I believe, some management organizations were quick to protest both the quickness with which this was brought down and the contents of the bill. The government, however, had the wisdom to listen belatedly to the protests, and to withdraw the bill and to set up the Labour Management Legislative Committee of Review. I would hope, Mr. Speaker, that we would not see this year the action taken last year duplicated. If there is to be any legislation at all with respect to labor or the Trade Union Act, I say that the members have a right to see the amendments well in advance and that the promise of the Minister of Labour to lay the report of the Labour Management Legislative Review Committee report before us well ahead of any legislation should be kept.

The members of this house should have the fullest opportunity of pre-study of these questions. Certainly these items which took a committee so long to deliberate on should not be the subject of hasty consideration by this house. While I am on the matter, Mr. Speaker, may I suggest the government should also sit down and decide the means by which the disputes in which it is involved itself can be settled as between itself and its employees. I say that a means has to be found where the government can find the basis for settlement without involving itself in charges of bias. The Trade Union Act provides, of course, that a Chairman of the Conciliation Board can be chosen, where the labor and management

members of a conciliation board don't agree on the selection of a chairman. This is all very well when it pertains to private enterprise but where there arises a dispute, Mr. Speaker, within the government or crown corporations, then this just isn't an effective answer. What we need is an agreement by the government that where there is a major disagreement, that requires the setting up of a conciliation or an arbitration board, the government should refer the selection of a chairman of that board, in the event of a disagreement between representatives of the two parties, to an impartial source. There is nothing new about this, Mr. Speaker, this has been the practise in past years in a number of disputes between the former government and trade union employees.

It is simply not fair or just where the government is a party to the dispute, that the government should be the party that selects an arbiter, or the conciliation board chairman to review the dispute. I can recall the creation of a board some 12 or 14 years ago, in a dispute between the employees of government and the government where Dean F.C. Cronkite was selected as chairman on the mutual acceptance of both parties. On other occasions during such disputes someone from outside the province was brought in.

I would like to appeal to the government at this time that in the future this is they way in which the dispute should be resolved, and this is the only way to remove from itself any charge of bias.

I would like before I close this evening to say a word about manpower education needs in Saskatchewan. It seems to me that this is an extremely important matter for the consideration of every political party in the province and in this country. We know that after a great deal of delay at Ottawa, a manpower education body is beginning to evolve. As I understand it, it will be calling for the co-operation of the provinces. There is a great opportunity for the province in these arrangements. Nothing is needed more at this time than a co-operative approach by the provinces and the federal government to manpower education needs. At the moment I fear that not only is there much disagreement and uncertainly on what to teach and how to teach it but on the needs of industry but as to the needs of the country and the needs of the economy. One thing that must be discovered is the likely shape of industry and its needs in say the next five or ten years. To go on educating tradesmen, carpenters, bricklayers, plumbers and what have you, indiscriminately, without much plan or knowledge of what the requirements of labor will be is it seems to me a spendthrift method of considering our manpower needs; apart from the great waste of time and human resources.

Mr. Speaker, I think we need to take a very good look at the curriculum and at the courses offered for adult people who need to up-date their skills and up-date their training. I think we have to devise a means by which academic attainments for one thing can be acquired much more rapidly, over a shorter space of time. I feel that we have to make courses of all kinds open to employed people, because those who are employed today, as everyone knows, may very well be unemployed tomorrow as the result of the onrushing economic trends and what is known commonly as automation.

What I am saying is this. We need, as quickly as we can, to undertake meetings of government departments and educational authorities to the end that we can evolve the most practical and

**March 8, 1966**

expeditious ways of insuring that the training that is so much needed today and which so many people are not able to get for one reason or another can be secured.

Now, I think all the old ideas about adult education during the evening hours are just inadequate to meet this kind of demand. We are going to have to promote adult education that releases people from industry on periods of leave of absence and provides education during the daytime. In the first place there just simply isn't time enough to achieve the extent and the degree and the kind of up-dating that we need without this kind of daytime educational approach. I am not saying that we should discard what we have. I am just saying that it isn't enough in itself.

Mr. Speaker, the Liberal government of Saskatchewan has acknowledged, however briefly, the need to face the consequences of automation and cybernation. I hope they will take cognisance of the Freedman report on run-throughs that came down just a month or two ago. The judge who was chairman, undertook to make a digest of the report so that it could be assimilated very quickly. But as members may know, one of the high points in the report called for legislation to ensure that negotiations would take place between unions and employers on all matters involving automation and change. I think it is unfortunate, indeed, Mr. Speaker, that the Pearson government at Ottawa has to this time disregarded this main proposal on the Freedman report as well as the requests of organized labor that would require legislation to make for negotiations on matters of automation and cybernation, and among other things to require proper periods of notice to employees. I wonder, Mr. Speaker, if the present Labour Management Legislative Review Committee, when it is though with its present task, might not very well be called upon by the provincial government to continue studies on the effects of automation and cybernation in Saskatchewan so as to recommend those measures that could be designed to avoid adverse social and economic effects as a result of technological change.

Here, I would like to inform the house, in case the house was not aware of it, that there is presently a resolution before the Manitoba legislature on this very question. The resolution in Manitoba calls for the implementation of measures by which employers would be required to notify employers or their representatives, six months in advance of the intent to institute changes in working methods or facilities which will involve the suspension or termination of any employee; and by the resolution, employers would also be requested to co-operate with the government in every way possible in training and re-training of any employees concerned.

The resolution calls for the payment of severance pay, equivalent to one week's pay for each year of service in the employ of the employer, to be paid to every employee whose services are terminated by reason of cybernation or automation. I see no indication in the budget, or hear nothing from the Minister of Labour (Mr. Coderre) that measures such as are contemplated in the Manitoba resolution, will be undertaken by this government. I would like to request this evening that some positive expression of policy should be outlined just as soon as this is possible.

I emphasize as I have done before on other occasions, that a committee of this kind is not only of interest to the urban population but to the whole rural sector as well, because it is

after all, in the rural areas where thousands of our young people every year are encountering displacement to the urban centres because of the enormous technological changes that have taken place in the countryside during the last several decades. So that if any government needs to be concerned about automation and technological changes it is the government of Saskatchewan. Because everyone knows many, many of our young people from the countryside because of lack of opportunity do not have the requisite training, particularly the academic attainment, to be able to perform many of the tasks that have to be done today in modern day industry and in business.

Mr. Speaker, I turn now just for a minute to some of the matters that affect the people of Moose Jaw and district. I want first of all to talk about recreational facilities. I am glad the minister of Natural Resources (Mr. Cuelenaere) and the Minister of Highways (Mr. Grant) are in their seats and I hope they will give a favourable reception to my comments this evening.

Buffalo Pound Lake Provincial Park just to the north of Moose Jaw, and the White Track Ski Resort offer facilities that are used by thousands of our citizens. As a matter of fact, I think it will be found that the increase in attendance at Buffalo Pound Lake Park has been the greatest in any of our public parks. It has become a park area not only for the people of Moose Jaw and district but for thousands of Regina people. Anyone who lives in either one of the two cities knows just how difficult it is getting to be to provide recreational opportunities for our people in the two areas.

I suggest that at Buffalo Pound Lake a swimming pool be constructed. There is just simply no pool at the moment. The bathing beach is full of algae during the months of July and August when there are 5,000 or 6,000 people around that beach on a Sunday afternoon. If there is any place that needs a swimming pool and where such construction is justified in a public park, then I think it is at Buffalo Pound Lake.

I am happy to say that Moose Jaw ski enthusiasts working with the past and the present government have been successful in establishing the most unique winter activities at Buffalo Pound Lake. Besides the fact that it is successful for its purposes, I think it is pointing the way for all of our provincial parks in the way of utilizing those parks, not for six or seven months a year, but perhaps very soon for twelve months of the year. If anyone has gone down there and seen all the children, all of the young married couples on a Saturday and Sunday they will appreciate what I mean. The opportunities are here for us to take parks like the Buffalo Pound Lake Park and other public parks and transform them to a 12 month operation.

Mr. Speaker, I can't sit down tonight without making some comment on the speech that was made by the Premier when he rose first in this Budget Debate. Mr. Speaker, what I object to most in the talks that are so characteristic of the Premier is an almost unparalleled and audacious exaggeration and distortion of the facts. You know, the statements, Mr. Speaker, such as "only when the dead hand of Socialism was removed did private capita move into this province", are typical of the kind of comments that were made throughout his speech. As other members have commented from our side of the house, it is almost as though members of the government are trying to rewrite history by obliterating the entire CCF record of the past 20 years. Everyone knows that this is a monstrous fabrication. Everyone who gives any thought

**March 8, 1966**

at all to anything knows that not only did the CCF give good government and good social benefits during this period, but provided the whole base for industrial expansion.

**Some Hon. Members:** — Hear, hear!

**Mr. Davies:** — The Premier, Mr. Speaker, has attempted to take major credit for an economic expansion that is going on at present all over Canada, and in Saskatchewan, of course, as well. But it has really been built on the foundation laid by the CCF administration. He is trying to take credit for this whole forward movement. But you know the Premier finds himself in an ironic position because after all the flurry and the fog of his argument has settled, it emerges that there is really only one large single change in the industrial picture in this province, apart from the potash plants that everyone knew were coming into the province long before the advent of a Liberal government. I refer, Mr. Speaker, to the fact that we now have in the offing, not at this time for sure, a pulp mill. But, how did the pulp mill come even this far in formation. It came only because the overwhelming proportion of the capital to be invested had been guaranteed by this government. In other words, the pulp mill will not be built on the foundation of free enterprise at all. It is being built on the basis of public promotion and public credit. The pulp mill, Mr. Speaker, is in some way skin to the development of IPSCO, the steel mill in Regina, the origin and operation of which the Liberal party in opposition at the time, constantly excoriated and derided . . .

**Mr. Thatcher:** — We got it on its feet.

**Mr. Davies:** — . . . in almost every speech that they made in this house at that time. The signal difference I say between the Liberal party of Saskatchewan and the CCF party, Mr. Speaker, is that the CCF party did encourage the investment of private capital, but only on a basis that made it fully responsible to the people of this province. We were never prepared to fall down on our knees and worship and become subsidiary to outside capital interests simply because they had the money to develop resources which were, after all, our resources and those of no one else.

Another peculiar thing, Mr. Speaker, is that the Minister of Health (Mr. Steuart) and the Premier who have devoted a great part of their time in speaking about the Power Corporation and the development of our water resources have ignored again the fact that they had nothing to do with the creation of these two great foundations. Who then laid the foundation for the emerging growth of these facilities? Well, certainly it wasn't the Liberal government in this province . . .

**Mr. Thatcher:** — The Liberal government . . .

**Mr. Davies:** — The Premier says the Liberal government created the Power Corporation, a very humorous utterance indeed!

**An Hon. Member:** — Heavy water . . .

**Mr. Davies:** — But if we talk about water, because we have been reminded so often it is the foundation of industry, (no industry can function without an adequate quantity of water) we would never have

had the Saskatchewan River Dam if this had been left to a Liberal government. As has been pointed out so often it took the defeat of a Liberal government at Ottawa before we got a Saskatchewan River Dam in this province.

**Mr. M.P. Pederson (Arm River):** — That's right, that's right.

**Mr. Davies:** — The great flaw in thesis of the Liberal party in Saskatchewan, as expressed by the Premier, is that free enterprise, pure and simple, and as such only, has been the dominant force behind our national growth during the past 10 or 15 years. Actually we have had growth because we have applied the brains of our people, in and outside of the industrial empire, to combine a mixture of co-operative and public and private growth to the benefit of the nation. This, too, is really the experience of the United States of America. However, Mr. Speaker, had we left our development to the tender mercies of the giant corporations of the United States and Canada and had not publicly regulated them to a large extent in the course of our endeavors, — and I am now speaking of Canada and the United States as an entity — we would have had the same kind of booms and busts which were so well known to us, especially in the years before the sixties.

All one has to do really, is to read a few chapters of the Report of the Economic council of Canada to see that it is not the CCF party that is out of step with modern times. It is the Premier. The Premier does not echo the philosophy of modern day Liberalism, big "L" or small "l" any more than he echoes the philosophy of modern day economics. He fluctuates somewhere between the economic theories of Adam Smith and Herbert Hoover with a somewhat more worshipful attitude to big business than either one of these two gentlemen ever had.

Mr. Speaker, it is absolutely impossible in modern days for us to permit the enormous power held by the controllers of concentrated capital in North America to be exercised without increasing public regulation and in some cases restraint. This is not regimentation, Mr. Speaker. Some of my friends opposite might like to make it seem so. We are speaking about two different things. It is simply an exercise of public authority over private minority license. It is really another expression of rule by law and reason and moderation.

We are discussing an expanded budget in an expanding economy. There is no province across this country which will not be adding to its revenues and to its expenditures this year even as is the federal government of our country. Therefore no region or no party can take unto itself all credit for the growth that we are experiencing. It is a phenomenon that is based on a variety of circumstances, none of which can be as easily explained as the simple and sweeping formulations of my friend, the Premier.

We are, however, becoming increasingly concerned with making government responsive to the needs of people. We are becoming concerned that we have not been able to do, in more prosperous countries like Canada and the United States, things that have been accomplished in European countries with far fewer resources many years ago. We are becoming concerned that we develop not a narrower but a larger conception of democracy. Perhaps, Mr. Speaker, you might say that these matters are far apart from a minute dissection of the budget. I think rather that they are germane to every clause and every page in the estimates and also to the speech made by the Premier last February 26th.

**March 8, 1966**

For all these reasons that I have tried to indicate, I am quite unable to support the motion, Mr. Speaker, I do, however, support the amendment made by my seat mate, the member from Regina West (Mr. Blakeney), which I have had the pleasure of seconding.

**Some Hon. Members:** — Hear, hear!

### **ANNOUNCEMENT RE BOB PICKERING RINK**

**Mr. J.B. Hooker (Notukeu-Willowbunch):** — Mr. Speaker, I regret to have to inform this assembly that the Bob Pickering Rink of Milestone lost to Alberta this afternoon. However, they are running neck and neck with the rest of the pack. Having had the opportunity of watching them perform in the north-south finals we know the type of shots they can make. I think you would all like to join with me in wishing them well and hoping that we will be able to greet them on the floor of this assembly as the Canadian Champions.

Mr. Speaker, in rising to take part in this debate, I must first take a moment to congratulate the Premier for the excellent manner in which he delivered his address. I congratulate him not only on his delivery but also on the contents of the budget itself. It complements the budget laid down last year by containing tax reductions and at the same time increased government spending.

It contains provisions for the implementation of election promises made two years ago. It proves to the people of this province that the Liberal party intends to do something about the increasing tax load which falls on the shoulders of the property owner. It gives encouragement to people involved in local government at all levels. It recognizes the obstacles facing our rural people in outlying areas. It proves that we in Saskatchewan are keeping pace with the rest of Canada. I would also like to compliment the financial critic, the hon. member for Regina West (Mr. Blakeney) on his reply. We know that the budget itself did not give him much ammunition for his speech. He did a creditable job with what he had to work with. Probably this is why he avoided most items contained within the budget and devoted most of his address trying to defend policies of the former administration. His omissions of items contained in the budget makes one wonder if they were deliberate. I had expected he would take the budget apart piece by piece.

It appears that most members opposite have carefully avoided criticism of the highway program; I would imagine they should. However, the former Minister of Highways (Mr. Willis) did get into the act with statements to which I would now like to reply.

I would challenge the hon. member for Melfort-Tisdale (Mr. Willis) former Minister of Highways, to go to the constituency of Notukeu-Willowbunch and criticize the present highway program and compare it to his own. Seven miles of oiled surface in the constituency of Notukeu-Willowbunch under 20 years of Socialism. Still the hon. member stands in this assembly and states that in 1963 half the highway system in this province was dust free. If so, in which constituencies and where?

If it appears we are getting more than our share now it is

only because we had nothing under the previous administration. I know that my hon. friend is going to say some 490 miles of oiling was on the program when they left office. This I admit but how did it get there? Not in his original estimates, but brought in the following day after probably being informed that the CCF candidate had been promising this oiling program while he was out on the hustings. If this were not the case, Mr. Speaker, I suggest that he refrain from asking questions about lost cars and lost highways because he himself lost part of his estimates, approximately \$150,000 of construction costs. However, we are extremely pleased that he was able to find them before he left office.

By the end of this construction season we will have 134 miles of dust free surface besides approximately 30 miles of new construction and over 40 miles of grid road taken into the highway system, I would like to inform the members opposite that 28 miles of this grid road were removed from the highway system by the former administration.

The former minister refrained from mentioning this stretch of road while speaking on the air the other day. However he has referred to it on previous occasions. I would hope, Mr. Speaker, that as the municipalities complete their portions of the grid that this road will be expanded to connect from Val Marie west to Minton in the east. If anyone cares to refer to a highway map this is the only portion of southern Saskatchewan not presently served by a highway running east and west, south of no. 13 highway. Our people are pleased with the treatment we have received from the Minister of Highways (Mr. Grant). We are no longer the forgotten constituency. Our thanks must go out to the minister of Highways (Mr. Grant) and the expanded highway program of the Liberal party.

I must make mention of the Home-owner grant included in this budget. It is amusing to watch our friends opposite trying to criticize the Home-owner grant, the first step by this government to lift the tax load from the shoulders of the property owner. It will be more amusing watching their actions when this bill is voted on in this assembly.

I would briefly mention the one per cent reduction on income tax. This was a promise made by the Liberal party during the last election, another promise that was made, another promise kept. I most heartily agree with this type of legislation. I know of no fair reason why people living in Saskatchewan should be penalized for doing so.

The opposition members are all having their fun because of the increase of one cent a gallon tax on gasoline. I would like to inform the members opposite that while serving on a municipal executive we met with the former cabinet twice asking the government of the day to impose such a tax. What was their answer? They said it was within our power as municipal bodies to impose our own tax, either on gasoline or on an increase on vehicle licenses. Could you imagine the confusion and the administrative headaches of each municipality trying to impose its own tax. I well recall one former cabinet minister's reason for not imposing this tax. Here was his answer:

It's o.k. for you people to ask us to impose the tax. You don't have to seek re-election.

I think it took an awful lot of courage for one of the former

**March 8, 1966**

cabinet ministers still sitting in the house to make a statement such as this.

**An Hon. Member:** — Who would that be?

**Mr. Hooker:** — The people in our constituency will not complain about this tax. They have been assured that the monies collected will be funnelled back into their municipalities in the form of grid road maintenance; \$1,000,000 the first year this program has been on; grid road construction, 15 per cent increase. It wasn't too many months ago that I heard members from the opposition going around the countryside saying that the Liberal party was going to dispense with the grid road program, and I am pleased to say it has not been dispensed with. It is increased by 15 per cent. The grid road regravelling program has been increased by 20 per cent. Snow removal had had a grant this year of \$250,000. This is the first time we have had a grant for snow removal and I would like to suggest that this grant be continued. Equalization grants are up 233 per cent from \$600,000 to \$2,000,000.

People working in local governments will be encouraged to give better administration. They are no longer rubber stamps but elected officials working in conjunction with the senior government. I personally have every confidence that these people will do the job we expect of them.

I congratulate our junior cabinet minister the hon. member for Wilkie (Mr. McIsaac) for the steps he has taken to provide our municipal people with extra financial assistance so that they may give better service to the people that they represent.

I listened with interest to the former Minister of Municipal Affairs (Mr. Wood) during his debate in this budget. He chastised the present minister because of a reduction of grants for water assistance. I congratulate the Minister of Municipal Affairs (Mr. McIsaac) for the stand he has taken in reducing these grants. Almost everyone knows that practically every town and village that has available water supply has already installed their utilities. The reduced grants should more than cover the request of those municipalities still contemplating installing a water and sewage utility.

I heartily agree with the principle of the water assistance grants. However, Mr. Speaker, I do not agree with the manner in which these grants were distributed by the former administration. Plums for some and nothing for others.

La Fleche installed their utility the year prior to the introduction of the grant structure. Naturally one does not expect grants when they are not available. However, on year after the grants became available we found it necessary to spend another \$25,000 on increased water storage and pumping facilities. We applied for a grant from the Water Assistance Board. Our answer was "You don't qualify because your utility is self-liquidating", even though our financial statement showed we were losing money on the year's operation. Being the mayor of La Fleche at the time, I considered it my duty to try and find out why we couldn't get one of these grants, while our neighbors were getting large grants and putting in deluxe equipment. I contacted a friend working with a consulting firm who had been successful in arranging grants for their clients, asking how they were able to qualify. His first question was "Which side of the house does your member sit on?" When I informed him that he sat in the opposition, he politely

stated that I might as well forget the grant because the manner in which they were being distributed amounted to nothing but political plums.

**Mr. R.A. Walker (Hanley):** — You know that's not true.

**Mr. Hooker:** — And my friends opposite have the audacity to speak of "pork barrel" tactics of the Liberal party.

**Mr. Walker:** — Shame on you.

**Mr. Hooker:** — I would hope, Mr. Speaker, that the hon. Minister of Municipal Affairs (Mr. McIsaac) as long as he is in charge of the administration of this department will see that every municipality's request will be handled in an equal manner.

I have listened intently during the last session of this assembly and also during this debate to the members opposite extolling their virtues as the champion of the little man . . .

**An Hon. Member:** — Oh, here we go again!

**Mr. Hooker:** — as the only party who are considerate of the position of the under-privileged or those who may by circumstances be deprived of the services enjoyed by the majority of our citizens. I heartily agree with their sentiments, however, I have grave doubts about the sincerity of their statements. If their hearts bleed for the people less fortunate than others why didn't they do something with regard to those people living in areas not presently served by telephones.

While the members opposite were busy extolling their virtues and wiping away their tears, these people were without the most modern type of daily communication, the telephone. I would like to say to the members opposite that they need not tell me that this situation did not exist when they were in power, because I have letters on file from constituents stating that they had on previous occasions approached the former administration in this regard only to have their pleas fall on deaf ears.

How long did it take the Liberal administration of this province, who according to our friends opposite are only concerned with the so-called "fat cats" of our society? Less than two years to do something to rectify this situation.

The people of the constituency of Notukeu-Willowbunch who live in areas not presently served by the telephone will be ever grateful to the hon. member for Maple Creek (Mr. Cameron) the minister in charge of telephones for the action he has taken on their behalf. We realize that this program of assistance on a cost-sharing basis has just recently been announced. If the members opposite had taken the trouble to look at the budget they could well see that \$500,000 of an estimated \$7,000,000 is earmarked for construction this year. These people have not been asking for something for nothing. They are prepared to pay their fair share but unless they could get assistance from the government treasury the individual cost was prohibitive.

Mr. Speaker, in our present society the trend appears to be towards more centralization. Centralization of schools, centralization of medical services, repair shops, machinery agencies,

**March 8, 1966**

veterinary services and household supplies. These are all inclined to be placed in larger urban centres farther removed from people living in sparsely settled areas. For these people telephone service is a necessity rather than a luxury. I can well imagine the concern of the parents wondering whether their children were safe going to or coming from school during periods of inclement weather; no opportunity to call for help or assistance in cases of sickness or accident, unnecessary trips to town for urgent repairs or medical supplies, when a phone call could have the children bring the necessary items on their return from school. I would have thought that the former administration would have considered these points rather than tell these people that there was no provincial help available.

We realize that the proposal recently announced by the hon. member for Maple Creek (Mr. Cameron) to bring telephone services to these areas has just recently been announced and is a new program. Not too many people can be served this year. However, these people not included in this year's program know that their turn will soon come. I urge the government to greatly increase the amount for this service in next year's budget. Many people have waited fifty years for a program of this nature. Let us not delay any longer. I would urge that we get on with the job and complete this program as soon as possible.

Mr. Speaker, I will take great pleasure in supporting the motion and I will vote against the amendment.

**Some Hon. Members:** — Hear, hear!

**Mr. A.R. Guy (Athabasca):** — Mr. Speaker, I am pleased to hear that even before I make my first comment the ex-Minister of Highways (Mr. Willis) is opening his mouth as usual with nothing coming out of it.

**Mr. Willis:** — . . . civil servant . . .

**Mr. Guy:** — He will find that by the time I am finished here tonight I may not be quite as civil as he has reason to believe at the present time.

I'll tell you one thing, Mr. Speaker, I will never be a servant to the Socialists because their philosophy and mine have never agreed and never will. The member from Hanley (Mr. Walker) has made one speech. I know that he is going to make two or three more before the night is over but if they are of his usual calibre we will have nothing to worry about.

As I rise to participate in the Budget Debate I want to commend our Premier for his preparation and presentation of this budget. It was certainly an enlightened, free enterprise document. I think you know, Mr. Speaker, that I am not a friend of Socialism. I never have been and I never will. It is an insidious philosophy that can only result in complete subjection of the individual to the will of the state. From my appraisal it appears that their main support comes from those who are afraid to compete in a free enterprise society. They thrive on monopoly. They thrive on privilege. They would rather take welfare than do an honest day's work. They have been failures in their own field of endeavor so they turn to the state to protect them, willing to give away their rights and their dignity for this protection. For these people the budget will have little appeal but for the majority of the people in this province who want equal

opportunity to carve out their own destiny, this is a welcome budget as it allows those who are willing and able to help themselves.

The members opposite have futilely attacked this budget and have proved their incompetence in doing so. You know, Mr. Speaker, that at their worst under Tommy Douglas they were better than their best under the present Leader of the Opposition (Mr. Lloyd). Their smear tactics, negative attitude have reached an all-time low. The all-time low came last week when the member from Regina West (Mr. Blakeney) used the mentally ill as a weapon against our government. Needless to say it backfired against him and his performance has effectively killed any hope he may have had to succeed to the leadership of the NDP.

This smiling member for Regina East and mayor, who as usual is not in his seat this evening, must have got a real lift from that performance knowing that now he is left as the undisputed leader in the leadership race.

**Some Hon. Members:** — Hear, hear!

**Mr. Guy:** — And if, as the MLA for Biggar (Mr. Lloyd) said today that the MLA for Regina West (Mr. Blakeney) made his finest speech in this legislature, I am glad that I wasn't here when he made his poorest. And it certainly doesn't say much for the other members of that side of the house if that was the best speech that was ever delivered.

But I couldn't help notice the repeated references by members opposite to our first two year spending program. They continually say that in two years you only spent so much for this. You only spent so much for that. Therefore, I went back to their first two years as a government to see how their record compared and I came up with some interesting figures. I found that in their first two years the increased the health expenditure by \$4,000,000. We increased it in our first year by \$24,000,000. In education they increased expenditures by \$1,200,000 in two years. We have increased it by \$65,000,000. Now it is true and I know the member from Cutknife (Mr. Nollet) is going to say, well, times were a little harder then, etc., and it's true that in these two areas that the percentage increase was higher under the Socialists than it was under the present government because of the large figures that we are dealing with; but I will tell you this, Mr. Speaker, that was the only two areas where even the percentages were higher.

And want to look at a few more examples. Agriculture, you remember in 1944 when the Socialists were elected to power on the basis of being the friend of the farmer. In their first two years of office, in their first two budgets, they increased the expenditures for the Department of Agriculture by \$106,000 or 14 per cent. In our first two years we have proved we are the friend of the farmer by the increasing our expenditures by \$2,200,000 or 22 per cent.

Highways, and this was the department which the member for Melfort (Mr. Willis) eventually took over when no one else would take it, increased spending by \$1,200,000 at a time when they said highways were deplorable; \$1,200,000 or 36 per cent increase over what the Liberals had spent in their last year. What have we done? In two years we have increased the spending by \$24,000,000 or 98 per cent over the last Socialist year.

**March 8, 1966**

**Some Hon. Members:** — Hear, hear!

**Mr. Guy:** — Municipal Affairs. This was another field where the Socialists said they were going to help the municipalities, the cities and the towns, \$25,000 increase in two years, 11 per cent. This year, coupled with last year's budget, we have increased the expenditures for the Municipal Affairs Department by \$8,000,000 or 103 per cent. Certainly this shows who the friends of the municipalities are.

There was only one department, Mr. Speaker, where their increases were substantially higher than ours in their first two years and that was in the welfare department where during the first two years they increased it by \$3,700,000 or 140 per cent, compared to our decrease of \$8,800,000 or minus 5 per cent. This more than anything else shows the basic difference between the Socialists and the free enterprise philosophy. They would rather pay welfare to gain control of the electorate than to provide a economic climate where the people can help themselves.

**Some Hon. Members:** — Hear, hear!

**Mr. Guy:** — So I would suggest that members opposite fall far short of our accomplishments in any way, for any year, or in any manner in which you wish to compare or measure it.

I was surprised to hear the member for Cutknife (Mr. Nollet) challenge us to an election this year. He certainly is a bear for punishment. Last year he challenged us to call one in Moosomin. We did. They lost. They challenged us again to call one in Bengough. We did. They lost again. And I would expect, Mr. Speaker, that if we call an election this summer, that this would be the third time and out for the Socialists.

Mr. Speaker, I was sorry to see the bitterness that has assailed our lonely Tory since the Bengough by-election. No doubt the dismal showing of the Conservatives is partly responsible. But he shouldn't feel badly because he should be used to losing by those margins by this time. One thing the member for Arm River (Mr. Pederson) should learn is how to lose graciously because he is no doubt going to have opportunities to practise it many times.

**Mr. Pederson:** — I could teach you a lesson or two in that regard.

**Mr. Guy:** — However, more serious than the showing of the Tories is the growing realization from the rank and file of the Conservative party in Saskatchewan that they are reaching the same position as the federal Conservative party. They have a leader who will never be able to produce a victory yet he is unwilling to hand over the reins to a more competent man.

**Mr. G.T. Snyder (Moose Jaw City):** — How's Mike?

**Mr. Guy:** — His Budget Speech was a fiasco. One would have thought that he would have taken the opportunity to prove his right to the leadership by a statesmanlike exposition on the Conservative program for economic development and their theories on budgeting matters.

**Mr. Pederson:** — How would you know? You weren't even here.

**Mr. Guy:** — Instead he wasted the time of the house with his concern for our new senator, patting the member from Melville on certain spots of his anatomy . . .

**Mr. Pederson:** — And you . . .

**Mr. Guy:** — . . . then he made several references to myself which I appreciate.

**Mr. Pederson:** — You lucky man.

**Mr. Guy:** — One can only reach the conclusion that the Tories are leaderless, programless and are drifting aimlessly in the sea of Saskatchewan prosperity. However, this shouldn't prevent the leader of the Tory party from carrying out his responsibility to those few supporters that he has across the province. I would suggest that it is his responsibility since he was so anxious to appear on the Public Accounts Committee to show up on occasion even if he only stays for five minutes. His appearance in this house appears to coincide mainly with the time that the radio broadcasts are being beamed across the province.

Mr. Speaker, last evening will probably go down in the history of this house as nuts and bolts night. The Boldt on this side of the house certainly brought the nuts on the other side out of their shells.

**Some Hon. Members:** — Hear, hear!

**Mr. Guy:** — The member for the Battlefords (Mr. Kramer) and again he is not in his seat, proclaimed with large noises that construction had started from the Borden Bridge through Radisson last May 18th, and believe it or not, it wasn't completed yet. I would like to remind him that it was promised in 1944 and in 1964 it wasn't even started yet. I was amazed at his statement that it is against human rights to hire Indians and provide them with work. Of course, in the case of the former government it was not surprising to hear this. When one considers their dependence on welfare payments and handouts to kill incentive and human dignity, not only for our Indian people but for every citizen of this province.

The member for the Battlefords' detailed explanation of what he considered mismanagement in the DNR could only come from an expert in mismanagement and expert he was. No department under the former government was mismanaged as successfully as the DNR under the member for the Battlefords. We are still reaping the fruits of this mismanagement. After listening to his speech it is apparent that his finest contribution to this house continues to be his hearty thumping of his desk.

I noticed today also that it appeared to be old home week on the other side of the house and I was pleased to see and to welcome the defeated member for Rosetown, the defeated former member for Lumsden, and the defeated former minister for Last Mountain. I hope that they enjoyed their stay here today.

**March 8, 1966**

The member who just sat down for Moose Jaw (Mr. Davies) seemed quite concerned about the coming of the pulp mill. In fact, I believe he said if it is coming. He says the only reason that we got this pulp mill was because of the overwhelming guarantee of this government. But it has already been proven in this house, Mr. Speaker, that the former government guaranteed even more and acquired much less. The truth is that no pulp mill would ever have come to the province of Saskatchewan as long as the Socialists were in power. However, I agree with one statement that he made that it is true that water is a basic requirement of industry and I can assure the former minister and senior member for Moose Jaw (Mr. Davies) that we will guarantee the water as long as they continue to provide the wind.

Now, Mr. Speaker, as I listen to members opposite criticize and deride the work of the Indian and Metis Branch, it becomes more and more apparent that ignorance of the facts is the common denominator of the Socialists. I propose in the time at my disposal to outline the work and progress of this branch which is still less than a year old. I will leave the question of our success or failure to provide a positive program for the benefit of people of Indian ancestry to you, Mr. Speaker, to the people of Saskatchewan and to the Indian people themselves to decide.

I do know that for the first time in the history of our province we have a government that has kept its promise to do all in its power to improve the social and economic conditions surrounding our people of Indian ancestry. For 20 years the members opposite gave lip service to helping these people but their only concrete action was to give the Indian people the right to vote and to buy liquor with no place to drink it and to provide it free during election campaigns. The Indian people promptly used their franchise to help oust the Socialists from power and replace them with a government pledged to help them to help themselves . . .

**Mr. Pederson:** — You're an expert on that subject.

**Mr. Guy:** — . . . and to resort the dignity and pride that Socialist paternalism and interference had helped to destroy.

As you will recall the Indian and Metis Branch was established during the last session of the legislature. The first job to be done was to recruit a director and staff. This was done carefully as we wanted no fuzzy-headed Socialist planners cluttering up the branch.

**Mr. Pederson:** — Liberal . . .

**Mr. Guy:** — Our director, — well, I'll tell the member from Arm River (Mr. Pederson) that a Liberal is far better than a Conservative any day.

Our director assumed his responsibilities on May 10th. Since then we have recruited a director of economic and community development, a supervisor of employment placement and counselling, a liaison officer, five placement officers, 3 community development officers and the necessary clerical staff. More field staff will be recruited as our programs expand and the need arises.

We were most fortunate in our selection of staff to find people sympathetic to the needs of people of Indian ancestry,

experienced in their ways and anxious to assist them to become a part of the free enterprise society being created in this province. I want to pay tribute to our staff for the tremendous job they are doing and for their willingness to work long hours if necessary to assist the people they are working with. The accomplishments of this branch are a direct result of their energy and devotion to their work. In keeping with our policy to hire Indian or Metis people we have three such people employed with our branch.

Our staff during the year have travelled thousands of miles acquainting themselves with the varied problems existing in the many areas of Indian and Metis population and seeing for themselves the failures of the former government to give direction in this field. Since the main role of the Indian and Metis Branch is one of co-ordination rather than providing another Indian Affairs agency, a great deal of time is spent meeting with other agencies to co-ordinate programs and establish good working relations.

A major involvement is with the federal-provincial co-ordinating committee which reports to the senior government on the cabinet level. This is a committee with members from the federal Indian Affairs Branch, provincial government departments and our branch.

This committee meets at regular intervals to discuss the extension of provincial services to all people of Indian ancestry and the orderly planning of programs, so duplication and waste can be avoided. This committee has several sub-committees on health, welfare, education, community development and placement.

I must comment the Indian Affairs Department for their co-operation with our branch. Our relationship has been excellent and is a far cry from the relationship that existed between the Socialists and the Indian Affairs Branch. This is not hard to understand when one considers the constant sniping attacks at Indian Affairs from members opposite, particularly from the member from Cumberland (Mr. Berezowsky) and the former member from Meadow Lake. Instead of belittling the work of Indian Affairs we meet in an atmosphere of mutual respect for the efforts we are making individually and together to assist our Indian people.

A committee at the provincial level on which we play a major role is the interdepartmental committee, composed of deputy ministers and senior officials. This committee affords the opportunity of providing a meeting ground for co-ordination at the senior provincial departmental level. This permits the integration of the needs of the people of Indian ancestry and enables our branch to guide and stimulate the various departments to plan actively for their expansion and application of services to Indian people. It also ensures for the appropriate authoritative direction to be transmitted by each department to their field service levels.

We are also represented on the Friendship Centre committee organized under the federal-provincial Friendship Centre Agreement. As well as these formal committees our staff members meet and consult regularly with Indian organizations such as the Federation of Saskatchewan Indians, church groups, service clubs and other private sectors to outline our program and suggest how these interested groups can best assist in providing assistance to Indian and Metis people.

**March 8, 1966**

Our branch also participated actively in the potash show, trappers convention, public relations institute, and the provincial municipal conference last fall, as well as on several out-of-province conferences. Here again the response to our program from these groups has been most encouraging and helpful to us in carrying out our programs. In less than a year our branch has become a showpiece for the rest of Canada, and our work is being watched with a great deal of enthusiasm. We are told that it is hard to believe a branch could accomplish so much in such a short time, and they can't help but wonder why the former government neglected the problem for so long.

The first programs the branch became involved in were based on priorities determined and resulting from the conference of Indians and Metis held in Saskatoon in the fall of 1964 and by programs available through Indian Affairs and our own departments.

It was obvious that an area of immediate major concern was the large number of Indian people unemployed and the small number employed in government services, industry and business. Our first efforts were aimed at correcting this. We think we have had major success in this field. Since April 1st, 1965 to February 15th, 1966, we have placed 782 Indian and Metis people in jobs. Of this number 115 have been placed in government positions and 667 in industry; 241 were placed in positions classed as permanent and 541 in temporary. The 115 in government is impressive when one considers the former government had less than 10 and they were not directly responsible for any being hired in industry. To assist in this program financial assistance on a loan basis has been developed so they can be helped until they receive their first pay. Supernumerary placements on a training basis were arranged with existing government departments to provide skill and work-conditioning opportunities and experience.

I am certainly not going to try and mislead this house into believing that all 782 are presently employed. Many of the temporary positions were of seasonal duration, and ended with the coming of winter. There were some who quit their jobs and returned home to the reserve. I am pleased to emphasize that there were very, very few who were dismissed from their job and this must be to the credit of our placement staff, the favourable attitude of employers and the interest, efforts and co-operation of the Indian people themselves in their determination to acquire and hold jobs. After all, the idea that jobs were and could be made available to Indian people was new to them. Socialism had been unable and unwilling to provide them with employment opportunities. Their answer to unemployment was more social aid which does little to add to the dignity of the Indian people.

The placement of Indian people is not easy and involves a great deal of work. It is not just a case of finding a job, finding an Indian and bringing the two together. Each candidate for placement needs to be carefully selected and prepared for a particular position. Many need further training, employers need preparation also. Once a candidate is placed regular follow-ups are necessary to prevent problems arising, to give him encouragement and to assist him to adjust himself in many cases to his new environment. Unless all these steps are followed casualties will be high and frustration and misunderstandings will result.

During the coming year we hope to take full advantage of the increased employment opportunities arising in the pulp, mining and other industries that our government is attracting in large numbers to our province. We are pleased that Indian Affairs

Branch has become aware of these new opportunities and it too is greatly increasing its placement staff to take full advantage of the economic boom. Thanks to our close consultation no overlapping in this program is anticipated as we are in the process of determining specific areas of action.

One of our main difficulties in placing people of Indian ancestry in many cases is their low educational level and lack of skills. Therefore, our second priority is raising the educational standard of these people. Our branch in co-operation with the Departments of Education and Industry and Indian Affairs Branch, instituted academic, vocational and technical upgrading and training programs in the following areas: Heavy Duty Equipment Operations, I had the pleasure of officiating last Friday at the graduation ceremony of the first group of 60 Indian graduates from this course on the Peepekekesis reserve. We have also enrolled other Indian and Metis in heavy duty equipment courses in Prince Albert, Regina and Yorkton and we are studying the feasibility of instituting a course in the north for 60 applicants from Beauval, La Loche and Ile a la Crosse areas.

Academic upgrading — in addition to the regular northern education upgrading courses for Indian and Metis students in Prince Albert, we have 53 Indians from the reserves in the Broadview area in three upgrading classes being held on the Cowessess reserve. These are young adults 40 years of age and under, many walking many miles to attend these courses. One example, I think that should be brought before this house is of a married man, who has his wife away, maintains his home, gets his children ready in the morning for school, drives 25 miles to deliver his children to the Broadview Town School, then goes back to the reserve and attends an upgrading course.

**Some Hon. Members:** — Hear, hear!

**Mr. Guy:** — Institutional Training Program — a pilot project is being held in Prince Albert with the co-operation of the Hoy Family Hospital where 10 Indian and Metis girls are receiving training in all aspects of food preparation, household duties, nursing care and laundry. This is a six month course and similar courses are being planned for other centres as the need arises.

Survey and Rodmen course — this course for 25 Indian people is starting this week in Regina in preparation for the spring survey season. Further to this, eight Indian geological crews will be sent out for summer training in northern Saskatchewan.

Motor Vehicle Operation and Highway Driving Course — this course is to accommodate 20 Indians from the Mosquito and Red Pheasant reserves in the Battleford area and is being planned for later this month.

Pulp Operations — a subcommittee of the interdepartmental committee has been formed to work with the Department of Industry, Prince Albert Pulp Company and others involved to plan training programs for Indian people necessary for their employment in the pulp mill and related operations.

Adult education and leadership training courses for Indian people are being planned for early implementation as we recognize the need of leadership from their own people in the field of education and all its aspects.

**March 8, 1966**

We also found that suitable living accommodation was often a problem when Indian workers had to leave their reserves to work outside. It was this difficulty that prompted us to embark on the Esterhazy housing project. In spite of what the Leader of the Opposition (Mr. Lloyd) and other members have said this program was a success. A question answered in the house the other day shows that all 20 houses have been sold and a profit realized. Two of the 20 are owned by people of Indian ancestry which is a better ratio than the number of Indian workers to the number of non-Indian in the area. In a press release dated December 31st, 1965, the Leader of the Opposition (Mr. Lloyd) stated that the plan had failed because consultation with the Indian people was lacking and that we had misled the Indian population.

Although the Leader of the Opposition (Mr. Lloyd) was hoping the plan would fail such was not the case, and his attempt to gain cheap publicity at the expense of the Indian people and the government was in bad taste to say the least and only served to show his ignorance of the true facts.

The truth is that the Indian people working at Esterhazy were consulted and were in favor of this pilot project. In fact, at one time we had 12 applications for houses. However, the Indian people did say they were not anxious to leave the reserve if another solution to their problem could be found. To the credit of the Indian people involved they did come up with the alternative suggestion of a bus run from the reserves to the mine. On looking into the feasibility of this we found it was an excellent idea and assisted them in acquiring a bus, training an Indian driver and to this day the bus is running on schedule. This is a good example of what Indian people can do to help themselves if free from government interference.

Since plans were underway for the housing project we decided to proceed as planned since there was a need for housing in the area, and we still thought that several Indian people might want to move closer to the mine. We also have a housing project of 10 homes underway in Hudson Bay and we have three applications to date from Indian people.

The Leader of the Opposition (Mr. Lloyd) tried to equate the housing project in Esterhazy with the DNR housing project in northern Saskatchewan. Of course, there is no similarity as anyone with any knowledge of the situation knows. You can't place an unmodern building project in the middle of an industrial town, and this is what the Leader of the Opposition (Mr. Lloyd) is forgetting. Since the Leader of the Opposition (Mr. Lloyd) raised the question of northern housing in his press release and the MLA for Cumberland (Mr. Berezowsky) made his usual untrue statements the other day, I am sure the house would like to know the facts concerning the northern housing development during the past year.

The MLA for Cumberland (Mr. Berezowsky) said that since our branch was established we had built only 13 small houses. Our branch, of course, is not involved in any way, shape or form with the construction of those houses, and if the member from Cumberland would pay attention to the facts he wouldn't be making misleading statements in this house. However, it will come out in the Commonwealth probably and that is all his intention was in the first place.

The truth is that during the year the DNR had three housing projects on the go which have been overwhelmingly successful. Their grant program provided 47 homes for Metis, their construction program provided 67 units and under a federal-provincial

agreement 12 homes of a 100 home low cost housing project were completed for a total of 126 units for the year, more than the Socialist government built in 20 years.

During the year a start was made by our branch in the field of community development. We have established to date three community development areas, Meadow Lake, Green Lake, La Ronge and Cumberland House. We hope to establish a fourth area this year. However, since the federal Indian Affairs Branch is moving rapidly in the community development field close co-ordination and planning are needed to ensure our services do not overlap. In fact at the present time we are drawing up a definite proposal which we will be submitting to cabinet within the next few weeks. We are also in the process of concluding a community development agreement with the federal government. Meetings have been held to discuss a much wider agreement than was originally planned. We are hopeful that we can include our placement program under the agreement so we will be eligible for federal cost-sharing for this program as well.

Three community development officers have been hired. One of these has completed a course at La Val University, and the other two are presently attending the same course. To date, the more practical aspects of community development have been emphasized.

Negotiations have been conducted with the Power Corporation and Indian Affairs and I am pleased to announce that this year for the first time the federal government will share the cost of bringing power to Indian homes on reserves. During the 20 years of Socialist administration they managed to bring the benefits of power to only four Indian reservations with a total of 170 hook-ups. Since taking office less than two years ago we have brought power to seven reserves with total hook-ups of 367. During the coming year we hope to bring this modern convenience to another eight or more reservations.

Our branch has also held discussions with the federal Indian Affairs Branch and the Municipal Road Assistance Authority on the question of grid road construction, grants for grid road maintenance and possible feeder road construction to major road arteries on reserves. Since taking office we constructed 28 miles in 1964, 15 miles in 1965 and we plan an additional 50 miles for the coming year. This compares with a total of 74 miles in 20 years by the former government.

During the past year we were fortunate to negotiate an agreement with ARDA on behalf of the Metis people of this province. This was a first for such a program in Canada. Under this agreement we will recover from the government of Canada fifty per cent of our placement and community development program for Metis communities. This will mean a refund of some \$38,000 for these programs.

We are presently negotiating with the provincial Department of Agriculture and Indian Affairs to promote agricultural development on Indian Reserves. We have received a favourable hearing and it appears that Indian Affairs is prepared to assist in this field as part of the overall community development process. For the first time provincial agriculture representatives are making their services available to Indian bands on reserves. This appears to be one where a great deal remains to be done but we recognize also the requests for assistance in developing agricultural programs must come from the Indian people themselves.

**March 8, 1966**

During the past few months another exciting development has provided our branch with the opportunity for additional assistance. We have met with the regional field representatives representing the Company of Young Canadians for the prairie provinces who outlined the services this group has to offer.

We have been asked to submit several projects under this program which we intend to do. If accepted we will be able to supplement our staff in the fields of research, adult education, public education and leadership courses with no additional cost to the province. This could prove to be of great benefit to our branch.

It is also the responsibility of our branch to negotiate the grants for Friendship Centres throughout the province. We are trying to implement a system whereby the grant will be in proportion to the services provided by each individual centre. Under the Socialists the grants were paid with no concern as to programs or financial need. Centres providing a real service to their community received the same grant as dormant centres. We hope that by providing grants on the basis of services provided that each Friendship Centre will become an active and vital force in its community, working for the best interests of the Indian people.

Finally our branch is responsible for the Green Lake Farm and Forestry Operation. This has given us considerable concern since it is almost inconceivable to believe the mess that the former government left this project in. However, we are gradually straightening out leases, and providing efficient administration. There is a good possibility that during the coming year steps will be taken to place the operations under the department to which they are closely allied.

From the above, Mr. Speaker, I am sure you will agree that the claims of members opposite that we have not accomplished anything during our first year of existence are false. They are only weak hopes in the hearts of a former government who realize they failed to represent adequately our people of Indian ancestry in this province. I continue to be amazed by statements from members opposite which are in direct opposition to accepted recommendations from those concerned with the problems of our Indian people, and of Indian leaders themselves.

One such statement from the member from Cumberland (Mr. Berezowsky) that the Indians do not wish to be integrated shows again how far out of step he continues to be. For his enlightenment I would refer him to a statement of the only Indian member of a provincial legislature in Canada, a member of his own NDP party, and an acknowledged authority on the problem of his people. In a bulletin of the Indian and Eskimo Association of Canada, April, 1965, Mr. Calder, MLA advocates, "the complete elimination of the Indian reserve system. The natives are moving out from the reserves to places where work is and where they can educate their children. They don't feel the old inferiority complex so much any more".

The member from Cumberland's suggestion that Indians want national areas set aside for them would only compound the present problem of reservations on a greatly enlarged scale. During the coming year we will continue to place emphasis on the extension and expansion of all existing government services. Educational and leadership programs will be emphasized as these are the basis for all other programs. Close consultation will continue with Indian Affairs and other non-government agencies and

above all with the Indian people themselves.

I was amused by the resolutions passed by the provincial NDP convention last fall. According to a press release in the Saskatoon Star of November 19th, 1965, they were calling for a provincial placement service and an educational program. Of course, the first question arising was why hadn't they done this when they had 20 years in office. But it also showed how far behind they were getting this resolution ready for their convention we had already started a placement program which had placed more than 600 Indian and Metis people by that time. Another good example of NDP thinking and Liberal action.

So, Mr. Speaker, we on this side of the house are pleased with the progress of our branch during its first year and above all we are pleased with the comments of the Indian people themselves, when they tell us that for the first time in the history of the province we have a government that is interested in the people of Indian ancestry in a sincere and forthright manner.

Now, Mr. Speaker, I would like to make a few references to my own constituency. Of course, since my constituency is made up of Indian and Metis communities, the work of the Indian and Metis Branch that I have just mentioned, will have a tremendous impact. Of major importance also was the announcement of the pulp mill for Prince Albert. It will provide jobs for many of my people and the need for new services.

Last year was a good year for northern Saskatchewan. The mining incentive program had reactivated La Ronge and Uranium city. The opening of two new mines has resulted already in providing new opportunities for employment. Increased tourist spending last year and for the coming year will pay big dividends. The rebuilding of no. 2 highway north of Prince Albert, completion of the connecting link between no. 2 and no. 106, continuation of the road to Pelican Narrows and the road to McLennan Lake are welcome announcements which will greatly assist the tourist, fishing, mining and lumber industries.

Last year the air strip at Stanley was completed, and an air strip at Wollaston Lake was built in keeping with the Liberal government belief that our northern communities deserve year round access to the outside. The announcement that the La Ronge airstrip will be paved is of major significance to that community and to the north in general. A significant event of the past few months was the annual Trappers Convention. For the first time since they began it was planned by the trappers themselves. They are to be commended for the magnificent job they did. In the past, government officials planned their convention, told them who would speak, what they would discuss. This time they met prior to the convention, set up their own committees, invited their own speakers, determined the topics and problems they wished to discuss and as a result went home feeling that something worthwhile had been accomplished. Many favourable comments were heard about the new policy of allowing them to determine their own problems and suggest their own solutions.

For the first time since we became a province, northern Saskatchewan is receiving the attention it deserves. We know that we have seen only a small beginning of the development of this potential. I want to thank the Premier and his government for what they are doing and tell him we hope they will keep up the good work. Their faith in our northern areas will be amply

**March 8, 1966**

repaid.

**Mr. R.A. Walker (Hanley):** — Why don't you say something nice about your minister?

**Mr. Guy:** — I certainly wouldn't say anything nice about the former Attorney General (Mr. Walker).

**Mr. Walker:** — Are you putting me in the same class?

**Mr. Guy:** — Even his own constituents won't do that.

Before concluding my remarks I wish to make a further reference to the Neestow project. I have been gratified by the correspondence that I have received from the Green Lake area thanking us for making known the true facts concerning this project and their motives, and the assurance from the community that they are prepared to remedy the situation in the very near future.

The only criticism I have received was, of course, by the students themselves, and some by the past president of the Student Union for Peace Action, the same group that has 61 of its members arrested by the RCMP in Ottawa last Friday for causing a disturbance in front of the parliament buildings. The past president — Oh, yes, there are the Reds tapping the desks — the past president denied there was any obvious relationship between the group and the NDP party, yet in the same release the Rev. Ben Smiley, another defeated NDP candidate took us to task. Mr. Speaker, I agree that there probably isn't an obvious relationship because the members opposite are ashamed of this role of using a student group to sabotage our Indian and Metis Branch program. However, the same relationship exists here as it exists between the Student Union for Peace, Ban the Bomb, Nuclear Disarmament Clubs, and every communist-oriented organization and the NDP. It is common knowledge that NDP members opposite, past and present, have belonged to the Communist Party of Canada, and, of course, they have the right to do so. All I wish is that they would stand up in their seats and admit that they are communists, instead of hiding behind the communist front organizations.

**Mr. Walker:** — Mr. Speaker, I hope the house is noting just how far we are straying away from maintaining the dignity and the decorum of this assembly by these accusations of communism on this side of the house. I suggest that the hon. member in his own sense of self-restraint ought to tell him that this is unparliamentary. Your Honour shouldn't have to call for order, nor should we have to object.

**An Hon. Member:** — Isn't it true?

**Mr. Guy:** — Mr. Speaker, that was no point of order, the Communist Party across Canada is a political party. They are free to belong to it if they wish. Why they want to stand up and deny and insist there is something wrong with being called a communist . . .

**Mrs. M. Cooper (Regina West):** — He is being absolutely ridiculous. I would suggest that he withdraw those remarks, they are unparliamentary, they are untrue and they are not fit to be made by a person in this house.

**Mr. Speaker:** — Order! Order!

To make a general accusation of the orientation of one group or another toward some particular proof, particular philosophy . . .

I can't find out about it. Did he pick out some individual and say he personally is something which he doesn't represent himself to be? That would be out of order.

Now, I didn't hear any particular personal representation of any particular individual . . .

**Mr. Walker:** — You can insult the whole house, Mr. Speaker, but you can't insult any one member.

**Mr. Snyder:** — No, Mr. Speaker, with respect to your particular point of order, and your ruling on it, sir, I humbly suggest that earlier in the day when there was a remark made from this side of the house, something with respect to the despicable performance of a member opposite you were very quick to draw this to the member's attention. It seems to me that on other occasions when this was drawn to your attention, your hearing was extremely bad, but mostly in your right ear, not in your left ear.

**Mr. Speaker:** — Order! Order! If any hon. member in this house wishes to criticize the actions of the Chair he can do it on a substantive motion and give the Chair the opportunity of replying.

**Mr. Nollet:** — Mr. Speaker, may I respectfully submit to you that while the hon. member may . . .

**Mr. Speaker:** — The member from Cutknife . . .

**Mr. Nollet:** — Mr. Speaker, may I respectfully suggest to you in respect to your ruling that since the hon. member didn't specifically name anyone over here, he did say that the group, he intimated very clearly that the group on this side of the house were associated with communists. I want to say, Mr. Speaker, that I have never had any such association and neither has anyone on this side of the house. I think, Mr. Speaker, that since he attributed this to everyone on this side of the house, he should retract that statement.

**Mr. Speaker:** — I draw the attention of the hon. members to the fact that I have heard other things being attributed to other members of the house, which other members of the house didn't particularly care for. I didn't myself. But I say again that if an insinuation or an imputation is particular and personal, it has to be withdrawn. If it is not particular and personal, if it is general, then it doesn't have to be.

Now, I say this again and again, and it is backed up by all the authorities, if the hon. members would like me to take a look at the transcript of the speech, to see if there was any personal imputation, I will do so, and I will treat it in exactly the same manner as I have treated all these other matters. Now, if the hon. members want me to do that, I will do it.

**March 8, 1966**

**Mr. Guy:** — Mr. Speaker, all I said was that the members opposite have a close affinity with the Communist Party. The Communist Party is not outlawed in Canada and they can belong to that party if they see fit. I would like to respectfully suggest that the members most closely allied to the Communist Party are the most sensitive about it on that side of the house.

**Some Hon. Members:** — Hear, hear!

**Mr. Guy:** — However, I want to remind the members of this assembly that whether the people on the other side of the house call themselves socialists, or communists, the differences are only a matter of degree. They both advocate the demise of the free enterprise system, and the substitution of a state-owned and operated economy. They are both anti-American and dedicated to the victory of Socialism throughout the world. We are assisting them by our apathy towards this growing threat. The time has come for governments in Canada and the western world to wake up to the fact that a deliberate attempt to undermine our security in government is under way. They should be particularly wary of hiring ex-Saskatchewan Socialists whose past activities will not bear close scrutiny and who have shown their close affinity to the philosophy of the far left.

**Some Hon. Members:** — Hear, hear!

**An Hon. Member:** — Make him withdraw that . . .

**Mr. Guy:** — Mr. Speaker, we have destroyed Socialism in Saskatchewan, let us not transplant it anywhere else in our fair nation. Needless to say, Mr. Speaker, I would be pleased to support the motion and oppose the amendment.

**Some Hon. Members:** — Hear, hear!

**Mr. E.F. Gardner (Moosomin):** — Mr. Speaker, I was pleased to note from the Budget Speech that agriculture is still being recognized by the government as the major foundation of the economy of this province. The spending estimates in this department for the coming year are up to a record \$12,300,000, approximately twice that of five years ago under the CCF. I would like to compliment the present minister on his efforts in bringing this department away from the stagnation which has plagued it for some 20 year.

Mr. Speaker, I am sure that all members in this house are interested in the dam being constructed on the South Saskatchewan River near Elbow. As an engineer I have been very interested in this project and I would like to say a few words about the proposed irrigation development there, simply as a matter of general information. I might say that when the dam was first discussed and proposed many years ago its importance I think, was considered in terms of irrigation, power and recreation in that order. However, I think the emphasis has gradually changed over the years and many experts now feel that the project should be considered on the basis of recreation, power and irrigation in that order of importance.

The reasons for this shift of emphasis are many, the most obvious I think, being the rapid development in dry land farming techniques in this province and the general increasing importance

of recreation today. This means, of course, that the government is soon going to have to start long range planning to utilize this recreation potential. I am quite sure that this will be done.

My remarks, Mr. Speaker, are not intended to either criticize or commend the irrigation project but merely to put the development in the proper perspective. First of all I would like to comment on the size of the project. The initial goal, I understand, is to irrigate some 50,000 acres. It is generally agreed, I think, that irrigated land will produce about four times that of dry land under an intensive type of irrigation farming such as sugar beets and about twice that of dryland farming under an extensive use such as growing wheat, oats or barley. Wheat for example, could average 38 to 40 bushels per acre under irrigation, oats 90 bushel and barley perhaps 70. However, if we take an average of three times, this means that the project, when completed, will have a dryland equivalent equal to about 150,000 acres. As the total cultivated acreage of this province is approximately 45,000,000 acres, we can expect that the production from the completed irrigation project will amount to only one-third or one-half of one per cent of the total production of the province.

Even if this project was expanded in the future to the maximum total acreage available in this entire area it would still amount to not much over one and one-half per cent of our total agricultural production. It would appear, therefore, Mr. Speaker, that dryland farming will be of overwhelming importance in Saskatchewan in the foreseeable future.

Now let us take a brief look at the possibility of acquiring new industries with the advent of irrigation. A sugar factory, for example, would require an annual sugar beet acreage of at least 20,000 acres. As three or four year rotations are used with sugar beets this would mean that a total irrigated acreage of about 70,000 acres would be required or more than the total contemplated project. Feed grains, of course, can be readily grown under irrigation. Most members know that oats, for example, have been in surplus supply in this province for years and the dryland farmers at the moment are able to produce any amount required at a price of 50 or 55 cents a bushel if someone would take them off their hands.

Mr. Speaker, I would hope also that those in charge of the project will benefit by some of the experience gained in irrigation in Alberta. For example, individual holdings must be large enough to allow the farmer some flexibility of operation. He should have at least one-half section of land so that he can enjoy a reasonable standard of living and engage in the necessary rotations and intensive or extensive type of farming depending on economic or other factors.

We all know that labor costs are very high in irrigation, and in recent years some Alberta farmers have given up sugar beets and onion contracts because of labor costs. These costs for some crops run up to \$100 per acre and there have been cases where crops have been left in the field because of lack of harvest help. However, perhaps new developments in mechanization may solve some of these problems. Mr. Speaker, I do not want to imply by the above remarks that I object to the South Saskatchewan River Irrigation project. I merely wish to have it viewed in the proper perspective. I would sincerely hope that the necessary land for the project can be speedily acquired to the satisfaction of all concerned and that the Broderick reservoir and necessary works can soon

**March 8, 1966**

be constructed to get this worthwhile program under way.

Mr. Speaker, I would also like to compliment the Department of Agriculture on its improved method of allocating public lands and as an example of the careful attention given, I would like to cite an instance with which I am closely acquainted.

Now, a little over a year ago a small parcel of grazing land came up for lease across the fence from my farm, and along with a large number of other farmers, I applied for this lease. This happened to be an inland quarter section with no road and not even a fenced road allowance leading to it. However, a tentative allocation was made to two brothers with no land adjacent to the leased land. About this time representations were made from local municipal officials indicating that they did not favor an allocation of this land which would involve the municipality in large expenditures of funds for a road. It also seemed unfair to the successful applicant to expect him to utilize the pasture without a road, and it was decided to hold up the leasing until a complete investigation could be made. The people who had the land previously were allowed to use it pending the results of the investigation, and they made us of it last summer.

Now about this time also, Mr. Speaker, it became obvious that there might be a by-election in the constituency of Moosomin and that I personally might become involved. Before the nominating convention was held, I made a special trip to the Department of Agriculture in Regina in order to officially notify them that I wished to withdraw any applications or appeals for crown lands. Despite a heavy work load in the Department of Agriculture, last summer, a complete investigation of this case was made, which included sending the head of the Lands Branch out to look over the situation. The Chairman of the Appeal Board and other officials also made separate investigations and viewed the leased land during the summer and fall.

Now, the results of this intensive investigation were not completely conclusive, but apparently it was decided that under most conditions the parties allotted the land would be able to reach it without a road, and under extremely adverse weather conditions they could likely get permission to cross the land of the neighbors. I know for example, they are welcome to cross my farm at any time. Now, these two brothers, who were allotted the land originally, were then given a lease which increases their farm size to about 1,000 acres which may seem like a large farm, Mr. Speaker, for our area, but these are progressive young farmers and I think they will be able to utilize this pasture in the future. I just wanted to bring these facts to your attention, Mr. Speaker, as an indication of how carefully these affairs are handled at the Department of Agriculture.

**Some Hon. Members:** — Hear, hear!

**Mr. Gardner:** — Mr. Speaker, as a new member I remained silent the other day under extreme provocation and I am no doubt justified now in making some unkind remarks about the former Minister of Agriculture (Mr. Nollet). However, I don't plan on doing this. I don't think it will add anything to the dignity of the house.

**Mr. Nollet:** — It sure won't.

**Mr. Gardner:** — I think we should be generous in these situations. After all this sort of thing could happen to any of us in our declining years.

I think it is obvious, Mr. Speaker, that I will support the motion and not the amendment.

**Some Hon. Members:** — Hear, hear!

**Mr. Nollet:** — Mr. Speaker, could I ask the hon. member a question? He says "no". Well, I'll raise it again.

**Mr. W. Robbins (Saskatoon):** — Mr. Speaker, this is my first opportunity to rise in a major debate in the second session of the 15th legislature of Saskatchewan and I would be remiss in my duty if I did not offer congratulations to the two new members who are presently in the house. I refer, of course, Mr. Speaker, to the hon. member from Moosomin (Mr. Gardner) who is just taking his seat, and to the hon. member from Bengough (Mr. Mitchell).

In addition, Mr. Speaker, I would like to express congratulations to Mr. Bradshaw, the Acting Clerk of the assembly on his opportunity to come from London, the "Mother of Parliaments" and witness "the colonials" in action. I sincerely believe exchanges of career civil servants are most commendable and provide the opportunity for us to benefit from the long traditions and the parliamentary practises of the British parliamentary system. I wish him, Sir, a pleasant year in Saskatchewan.

I also wish, Mr. Speaker, to offer my condolences to those members of this assembly who were unable to measure up to the onerous duties of the position of legislative secretary and lost their jobs. I refer specifically to the hon. lady member from Saskatoon (Mrs. Merchant), who was the legislative assistant to the Minister of Education and believe, Mr. Speaker, I know of no minister of the crown who needs an assistant more than the Minister of Education.

**Some Hon. Members:** — Hear, hear!

**Mr. Robbins:** — The hon. member from Milestone (Mr. MacDonald) legislative assistant to the Minister of Public Health, and the hon. member from Yorkton (Mr. Gallagher) who was legislative assistant to the Minister of Highways. I note that the hon. member from Nipawin (Mr. Radloff) received his legislative secretarial appointment not too long ago when he succeeded the hon. member from Wilkie (Mr. McIsaac) who was appointed to the post of Minister of Municipal Affairs. Mr. Speaker, perhaps I should digress for a minute here, to congratulate the hon. member from Wilkie who occupies the position of Minister of Municipal Affairs. He is one of the few members, quite frankly, in my opinion, of the present cabinet, who show reasonable promise. It is perhaps significant that the hon. member from Last Mountain (Mr. MacLennan) and Athabasca (Mr. Guy) were the only two legislative secretaries to retain their positions. Knowing these gentlemen and taking into consideration their retention in these posts merely reinforces the contention, Mr. Speaker, of members on this side of the house that the real purpose of legislative secretarial appointments was to place political organizers of the public payroll to do political work for the Liberal party in this province.

**March 8, 1966**

It is also particularly significant, Mr. Speaker, I suggest that the new legislative secretary to the Minister of Public Health is the hon. member for the constituency of Souris-Estevan (Mr. MacDougall) who has recently received this appointment and who is not currently in his seat. I believe this gentleman is a baseball devotee. Presumably he will now be the "water boy" to the Minister of Public Health (Mr. Steuart). Although these duties were too onerous for the hon. member from Milestone (Mr. MacDonald) and did not permit him to retain the position, it must be assumed that the new legislative secretary can meet these requirements simply because he will not have any "heavy water" to carry.

Mr. Speaker, I listened with interest to two or three speeches from government members this afternoon and evening, immediately following the hard hitting speech delivered by my leader the hon. member for the constituency of Biggar (Mr. Lloyd). The first one was delivered by the Minister of Education (Mr. Trapp), the hon. member for Touchwood. It really doesn't take very long to reply to the speech of the Minister of Education. There was very little meat in what he said. I sometimes sympathize with the hon. minister. He has a heavy department with heavy responsibilities. I wish I could find some clear evidence that he accepts them. He sometimes reminds me of the fellow who asked for a job, and when asked if he was a responsible person he replied "I must be, wherever I have worked when anything went wrong, they said I was responsible".

The minister, Mr. Speaker, did not even mention incentive grants. In this \$3,000,000 merely more Liberal window-dressing which will not even appear in the budgetary expenditures one year hence? He divulged very little in his speech with respect to what this government proposes to do in the field of technical education, a field, Mr. Speaker, which is crying out for action, a field which this government had done really nothing about. A year ago in the Budget Debate, Mr. Speaker, I said that in my opinion the Liberal government suffered a technical knockout in the first round with respect to technical education. Here we are in a new session and the minister should have been able to go on the offensive, but as in his first bout he again suffers an early technical knockout.

Mr. Speaker, the Minister of Agriculture (Mr. McFarlane) spoke much longer than did the Minister of Education. I regret that I cannot say he accomplished a great deal more. He did, of course review his department's work and agriculture is a key industry in this province. He had many facets and areas to cover. He is to be commended for this review but I had the feeling the dry-land farming somehow had considerable impact on the hon. member's speech. He coined a novel new phrase and I quote him "We have done more in 19 months than the Socialists did in 20 years". The hon. member from Qu'Appelle-Wolseley (Mr. McFarlane) isn't going to be accused of plagiarism so he conveniently lops off one month. The truth is they have been in office more than 20 months and to all thinking Saskatchewan electors, that seems an unusually long time.

The Minister of Agriculture also made reference to the broom-pushers who apparently are a certain category of the Grain Handlers Union at the Port of Vancouver. His leader says some of these broom-pushers get up to \$8,000 per year in income. The minister is not to be outdone by the salesman of the year, so he says the people in this category and I quote him "received an annual increase of \$8,000". Perhaps the hon. Minister of

Agriculture is thinking of his predecessor and had that \$8,000 per year pension for sterling senatorial duty entrenched in his mind hence the exaggerated error.

**Some Hon. Members:** — Hear, hear!

**Mr. Robbins:** — Mr. Speaker, I would like to say a few words about the city of Saskatoon, which I along with four other members of this assembly have the honor to represent.

A year ago in the Budget Debate I requested that this government give serious consideration to development of an Industrial Cities Act, somewhat similar to the Industrial Townsites Act passed by the legislature in 1963 in anticipation of the Alwinal Potash Development near Lanigan, Saskatchewan. The city of Saskatoon is being confronted with serious financial problems associated with the potash development on its immediate periphery. I refer to the Cominco Development at Delisle, the Duval Development just west of Saskatoon, the Potash Company of America Development at Patience Lake, which incidentally, Mr. Speaker, appeared on the list in answer to my inquiry with respect to new industries — incidentally I went down the shaft of that mine in 1959 — U.S. Borax at Allan and the Noranda Plant at Viscount. Many of the demands for schools, streets, roads, police and fire protection related to the developments around this city will fall on this city. But there will not be tax revenue accruing to the city because the actual sites are situated outside of the city limits. Action is needed here, Mr. Speaker, and I sincerely hope the government will see fit to take some action.

Secondly, the member from North Battleford raised the point with respect to pollution problems on the Saskatchewan River. I believe there are pollution problems on the South Saskatchewan River between the city of Saskatoon and the city of Prince Albert. I ask the Minister of Public Health (Mr. Steuart) to seriously study the problem here and take remedial steps immediately. Chemical plants on the river and sewage disposal from the city of Saskatoon are creating a real potential problem which will only worsen as time goes by. I sincerely hope the minister will take heed of these remarks. I have constituents who complain of this situation. It does exist. It is a growing problem.

This afternoon, Mr. Speaker, the hon. member from Regina East requested the government not to close the door to the possibility of additional grants for the Regina Centennial Auditorium if the cost related to that development grew. Saskatoon has a major problem here. The original estimate was for \$5,000,000 and this has now climbed to approximately \$7,250,000. If we are to have a Centennial Auditorium in Saskatoon in 1967 in celebration of our 100 years as a nation, additional help, I am convinced, will of necessity have to come from senior governments. I sincerely hope that the door is not closed in this respect.

Mr. Speaker, just recently the hon. member for Athabasca (Mr. Guy) took his seat. He discussed Indian affairs. Presumably the hon. member is an expert on Indian Affairs. One definition of an expert is a fellow who knows more and more about less and less until he knows practically everything about nothing. I am convinced that the hon. member from Athabasca (Mr. Guy) certainly fits this kind of definition with respect to an expert.

I have heard the story that an Indian at one time heard the hon. member from Athabasca make a speech and was asked to comment on it. He made this remark, "High wind, big thunder, no rain."

**March 8, 1966**

I note that the member for Athabasca who is not currently in his seat, usually approaches every debate with a chip on his shoulder. Mr. Speaker, I suggest that only indicates the possibility of wood higher up.

**Some Hon. Members:** — Hear, hear!

**Mr. Robbins:** — Mr. Speaker, I have additional comments I would like to make concerning the budget and I would, therefore, beg leave of the assembly to adjourn the debate.

Debate adjourned.

The assembly adjourned at 10.00 o'clock p.m.