

LEGISLATIVE ASSEMBLY OF SASKATCHEWAN
Second Session — Fifteenth Legislature
22nd Day

Wednesday, March 9th, 1966

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

WELCOME TO STUDENTS

Mr. D.G. MacLennan (Last Mountain): — Mr. Speaker, on behalf of the Premier, I would like to draw to the attention of this assembly 25 grade seven and eight students from Tugaskie. These students are accompanied by Mrs. White, Mrs. Daniel and their bus driver, Mr. Gulek. They are seated in the Speaker's Gallery. These students, Mr. Speaker, have had the opportunity to tour the building and to meet with their MLA, Premier Thatcher. I am sure this assembly wishes them a pleasant visit and a safe journey home.

Hon. Members: — Hear, hear!

Mr. C.P. MacDonald (Milestone): — I would also like the opportunity of introducing to the house a group of students from Yellow Grass in the Milestone constituency. There are 20 students seated in the Speaker's Gallery and they are accompanied by their teacher, Mr. A.L. Wagner. I certainly hope that their stay in the legislative building and in this assembly is an educating and informative one.

Hon. Members: — Hear, hear!

Mr. A. Thibault (Kinistino): — Mr. Speaker, I would like to ask the house to join with me in welcoming a fine group of students from the Yellow Creek High School. They came here this morning. They toured the city and they are going to see more of it this afternoon. I want to say that Yellow Creek is in the news pretty often when it comes to soccer champions for this province. The last two years they have been taken out by Mount Royal, Saskatoon. When you consider the size of the city and the size of the village of Yellow Creek, I say they are really going some.

Hon. Members: — Hear, hear!

Mr. Thibault: — We certainly have the quality in Yellow Creek. Now, I want to say, this being education week, that this trip to Regina will certainly contribute a great deal in furthering their education. I also want to say that they are accompanied by the principal, Mr. Senyk, their teacher, Mr. Zipp, and the bus drivers, Mr. Nameth and Mr. Wojcichowski. I want to also wish them a safe journey home.

Hon. Members: — Hear, hear!

Mrs. Sally Merchant (Saskatoon City): — Mr. Speaker, I almost feel I should apologize for the fact that the group of students in the west gallery don't come from Yellow Creek. I am not apologizing. We are very proud of our students from Saskatoon and this is a group from Bishop Murray's School in the city of Saskatoon, led today by their

March 9, 1966

teacher, Sister St. Antoinette. They are in the city visiting Regina and the legislative buildings; and I know the members will want to welcome them here as I do.

Hon. Members: — Hear, hear!

Mr. H.H.P. Baker (Regina East): — Mr. Speaker, I was very pleased when the hon. member from Kinistino (Mr. Thibault) asked me to also welcome the high school students from Yellow Creek to this assembly. I am very pleased to do so, to welcome them to our capital city. I hope they will take time out to visit the many sights in our community and that they will have a pleasant stay here. A warm welcome is also extended to the others from other areas and we also have, I believe, a group of students from the Holy Rosary School with their teacher here this afternoon. We hope that the proceedings here this afternoon will be of great value to all of them.

Hon. Members: — Hear, hear!

Mr. A.E. Blakeney (Regina West): — Mr. Speaker, I want to add my word of welcome to that of the mayor's to the group from Holy Rosary. They are a group in the east gallery consisting of 38 grade eight students. They have with them their principal, Mr. Halter. They are, he advises me, engaging this year in the study of the operations of governments and I am sure that their stay here will be interesting. I also trust that it will be an edifying example of government in operation. I am sure that all members would want to join with me in extending a warm welcome to them.

Hon. Members: — Hear, hear!

STATEMENT BY MR. SPEAKER (NO. 1)

Mr. Speaker: — Before the Orders of the Day, I wish to make a personal statement. Yesterday I caused the hon. member from Regina East (Mr. Smishek) to withdraw a passage from his speech in which he referred to the despicable conduct of the Minister of Social Welfare (Mr. Boldt) in debate and asked the Premier to dismiss him. I had in mind that at my request the minister had earlier withdrawn certain words which I had ruled out of order and I had hoped that members would regard the incident as closed. On reflection and on perusal of the Hansard record, I realized that while the language used by the hon. member was abusive and as such is to be deprecated, he was within parliamentary rights in suggesting or requesting the dismissal of a minister. The occupant of the chair must always be firm, but it is not always easy to achieve exactly the right balance in making a judgment on the spur of the moment. If I was too terse with the hon. member, I readily apologize for any offence I may have given. My general practice has been to avoid this as much as possible by deferring my rulings pending perusal of the script and sober reflection. And this is, I believe, indicative of the correctness of this practice.

STATEMENT BY MR. SPEAKER (NO. 2)

Mr. Speaker: — In debate yesterday, I undertook to consult the authorities on the priority which should be accorded to a member who raised as a point of privilege an alleged misrepresentation by another member of the content of his speech.

Beauchesne's Parliamentary rules and Forms gives useful guidance on this matter and I draw the attention of all hon. members to the following relevant excerpts therefrom:

At Citation 108(1) Beauchesne defined privilege as follows:

Anything which may be considered a contempt of court by a tribunal is a breach of privilege if perpetrated against Parliament, such as wilful disobedience to, or open disrespect of, the valid rules, orders and processes of the house, whether by disorderly, contemptuous or insolent language or behaviour or other disturbing conduct or by a mere failure to obey its orders.

At Citation 112, Beauchesne states:

Members often raise so-called "Questions of Privilege" on matters which should have been dealt with as personal explanations or corrections, either in debates or the proceedings of the house.

Citation 105, section 3 states in part as follows:

A dispute arising between two hon. members as to allegations of facts hardly fulfils the conditions of a privilege question.

These citations make clear the distinction between questions of personal explanation on the one hand — which Beauchesne describes as "So-called Questions of Privilege" — and genuine matters of privilege. It may be that it is so long since a genuine matter of privilege has had to be raised in this assembly that members have come to assume that they are speaking to matters of privilege when they raise matters of personal explanation or correction.

Nevertheless, it is genuine matters of privilege which can, and should, be raised at the first opportunity. Beauchesne gives clear guidance on the right time to raise matters of personal explanation or correction.

Nevertheless, it is genuine matters of privilege which can, and should, be raised at the first opportunity. Beauchesne gives clear guidance on the right time to raise matters of personal explanation or correction.

At Citation 142 he states:

A member . . . may . . . be heard to offer explanation of some material part of his speech which has been misunderstood . . . The proper time for explanation is at the conclusion of the speech which calls for it: But it is a common practice for the member desiring to explain to rise immediately the statement is made to which his explanation is directed when, if the member in possession of the house, gives way and resumes his seat, the explanation is at once received. But the explanation cannot be offered if the member speaking declines to give way.

Again, at Citation 143(1), Beauchesne states:

Whilst a member is addressing the house, no one has a right to interrupt him by putting a question to him or by making or demanding an explanation, a member will at times allow such interruptions through a sense of courtesy to another, but it is entirely at the option of the member in possession of the floor to give way or not to an immediate explanation.

March 9, 1966

I trust that in view of the foregoing our debates will henceforth proceed with fewer interruptions.

Mr. R.A. Walker (Hanley): — On a point of order, just so that there will be no misunderstanding as to the scope of your honor's ruling, I would like to direct your honor's attention to Citation 155, subsection 1. Your honor's ruling is, of course, correct where a member alleges that a false statement of fact has been made. But the situation that arose at least once last night was where a misrepresentation of the language of another member was made. In other words, if I say that the hon. Minister of Public Health said so and so, he is entitled to rise on a point of order immediately and demand that the matter be withdrawn and this is referred to in Citation 155, subsection 1, which reads as follows:

It will be useful to give examples here of expressions which are unparliamentary and call for a prompt interference. These may be classified as follows:

1. The imputation of false or unavowed motives.
2. The misrepresentation of the language of another.

Now, if any hon. member of this house misrepresents what I have said in debate, of course, it is clearly understood that I have the right to rise immediately on a point of order and draw that misrepresentation to the attention of the house. If, on the other hand, if I say that the population of Saskatchewan has dwindled, no member has a right to interrupt me to say that the population of Saskatchewan has increased. But if he says that I said it dwindled when I in fact said it increased, then I have the right to raise the point of order immediately and have the matter dealt with at once. And that was the situation that arose on at least one occasion last night, your honor.

Mr. Speaker: — I should have prefaced my remarks by saying that I had indicated last night that I would have a further matter under advisement. I have to tell the house, and I should have done so previously, but I do have it under advisement and I haven't got the Hansard copy yet, purely and simply because the good ladies in the Hansard Office haven't got it done. When I get the copy then I'll have it under advisement. I think this is the matter to which the hon. member refers.

ADJOURNED DEBATE

BUDGET DEBATE

The assembly resumed the adjourned debate on the proposed motion of Mr. Thatcher (Provincial Treasurer) that Mr. Speaker do now leave the Chair, and the proposed amendment thereto by Mr. A.E. Blakeney (Regina West).

Mr. W. Robbins (Saskatoon): — Mr. Speaker, when I adjourned the debate last night I was making remarks with respect to my home city of Saskatoon and some of the problems which confront it. I mentioned the fact that there was a problem with respect to pollution control in the river. I mentioned that there was a problem with respect to financial arrangements because of the potash development on the periphery of the city. I also mentioned the fact that there was an immediate problem with respect to the centennial auditorium and the rising estimated cost for that particular project.

Mr. Speaker, today I will turn my attention specifically to the budget.

Mr. Speaker, I am perpetually amazed by the man who occupies the position of Premier and Provincial Treasurer in this province. He is a remarkable person, remarkably inaccurate, remarkably bombastic, and remarkably vindictive.

An Hon. Member: — Hear, hear!

Mr. Robbins: — Last year, Mr. Speaker, in his budget address he argued that the new Liberal government had reduced the cost of borrowing to the citizens of Saskatchewan by reason of an improved investment climate. At that time in the Budget Debate, Mr. Speaker, I pointed out that the election of a Liberal government had nothing whatsoever to do with the more favourable borrowing rate of the province. I pointed out that there was a gold drain in the United States and that if the gold drain continued, American authorities would not hesitate to raise interest rates in order to protect their gold reserves. At the end of 1965, United States gold holdings totalled \$13,807,000,000 — down \$1,774,000,000 from the previous year. The result is sharply higher interest costs generally in both the United States and Canada. The Provincial Treasurer can therefore logically take credit for the higher rates now in effect if he could in fact claim credit for the reductions which occurred in the preceding year.

I note, Mr. Speaker, that the Provincial Treasurer lists \$17,218,500 secured from series 5, Saskatchewan Savings Bonds sales and claims a new record. This is correct. The Provincial Treasurer continually changes the rules and makes things not comparable. How did he attain this new record? Previously the Saskatchewan Savings Bonds series, initiated, Mr. Speaker, by the previous CCF administration, had a limit of \$10,000 per purchaser and could only be sold to corporate bodies which had their head offices in this province. The Provincial Treasurer raised the maximum to \$15,000 per purchaser one year ago. In announcing the series 6, Saskatchewan Savings Bonds the Provincial Treasurer increased the maximum to \$20,000 and made the security available to any business with an office in this province. Big no. 1 is after a new sales record again in 1966.

Mr. Speaker, the Provincial Treasurer should take reasonable heed of realistic warnings. These bonds are in effect a blank cheque held over the head of the Treasury Department of the province of Saskatchewan. The initial idea of the CCF in instituting these bonds was to provide an opportunity for Saskatchewan citizens to invest in their own province and retain the interest payments here. This was commendable and reasonable. This is why a reasonable maximum limitation was placed upon the annual sale and some limitation placed upon purchases by corporate entities. A downturn in economic conditions, a light or below average crop and redemptions in this type of security could become unusually heavy, proving financially embarrassing to the Provincial Treasury. I hope, Mr. Speaker, the present Provincial Treasurer will not ruin an eminently sound initial proposition simply because he is now shooting for a new accolade, the salesman of the sixties.

Mr. Speaker, the Provincial Treasurer always has a good deal to say about crown corporations. He consistently and repetitiously condemns particularly crown corporations started by the previous CCF administration. Mr. Speaker, this is done not

March 9, 1966

only in an attempt to blacken the previous CCF administration but to create the impression amongst Saskatchewan citizens that public enterprise is somehow wholly and totally reprehensible. The thoroughly reprehensible part of it, Mr. Speaker, is the Provincial Treasurer's attitude and his action in this regard. Last year, Mr. Speaker, I pointed out that a former Liberal member of this legislature had at one time made the remark that "not a single oil well would be discovered in Saskatchewan as long as we had a CCF government." I pointed out that this gentleman was wrong 5,337 times. Later he was a candidate for the Liberal party in a federal election. He was not selected. Surely it wasn't because he was wrong on the oil development theme. This should have eminently qualified him to represent the Liberal party. For the record, Mr. Speaker, clearly indicates they have been consistently vociferous and consistently wrong.

Mr. Speaker, the Provincial Treasurer states in his budget address that three crown corporations were sold last year. Even here, Mr. Speaker, he exaggerates. Only two were sold, Saskair and Saskatchewan Guarantee and Fidelity. The third one in his classification is Wizewood. Mr. Speaker, if Wizewood was a crown corporation and it was not, the proposed Prince Albert Pulp Mill will simply be a many times larger crown corporation. I would like to say a few words about this a bit later. However, a few remarks with regard to specific crown corporations.

The Provincial Treasurer says he doubts whether the government should be in the printing business and implies that Saskatchewan Government Printing will be sold. He states it is government policy to distribute more printing to other sources. Nevertheless, it is eminently sound for the government to own its own printing establishment if for no other reason than to act as a check on printing costs to the government from other sources. Saskatchewan Government Printing had net earnings of \$51,573 in 1965 and has returned \$990,793 to the Provincial Treasury since its inception. Almost \$1,000,000 then, Mr. Speaker. Not one dollar of that amount would have been available to the people of Saskatchewan had we not had a CCF government from 1944 to 1964.

Some Hon. Members: — Hear, hear!

Mr. Robbins: — Mr. Speaker, in my opinion, the most successful crown corporation established by the CCF was the Saskatchewan Government Insurance Office. The Liberals opposed it consistently from the beginning implying it was a fraud and I believe, Sir, that they have plans which will eventually remove it from the Saskatchewan scene, provided we are unfortunate enough to have them in power long enough. I hold in my hand two Star-Phoenix clippings, one entitled, "No explanation on high SGIO Bid", dated December 21, 1965. The second one where Mr. Boldt, the minister in charge of SGIO said he had received complaints from other insurance companies that its bids were too low to permit proper competition. Mr. Speaker, I presume it depends on your interpretation of what proper competition is. It reminds me of the story of the two sailors discussing their marital status. One fellow said to the other, "I'm a sailor and I've been married nine times". The other fellow said, "You are not a sailor. You are a wholesaler".

Some Hon. Members: — Hear, hear!

Mr. Robbins: — It all depends on your interpretation, you see. Can

anyone really believe that the recently fantastically high bids and the recklessly low bids on commercial business by SGIO are the result of inexperience or incompetence? The high bids will lose customers and the low bids will lose money. In this way the publicly owned insurance office can be publicly discredited and eventually destroyed. Saskatchewan citizens should never forget that here is a crown corporation which returned \$556,767 to the treasury last year and has returned a total of \$5,542,769 since its inception. In addition, Mr. Speaker, it should be remembered that the assets of this organization exceed \$22,500,000 and that there are \$17,100,000 invested in bonds, mostly provincial, municipal and school debentures. It administers the unique Automobile Accident Insurance Act commonly referred to as "license insurance" and this has paid \$94,100,000 on behalf of Saskatchewan citizens since it came into force. It provides annual grants to the Driver Training Program and eliminates in a large measure the tremendous backlog of litigation cases related to automobile accidents which commonly occur in other Canadian provinces. If for no other reason than this, the Saskatchewan Government Insurance Office would have been well worthwhile.

Some Hon. Members: — Hear, hear!

Mr. Robbins: — Mr. Speaker, not one dollar of those earnings, not one dollar of those investments would have been available to the citizens of Saskatchewan had we not elected a CCF government in 1944 . . .

Some Hon. Members: — Hear, hear!

Mr. Robbins: — and, Mr. Speaker, all of this eminently successful, publicly-owned crown corporation's attainments may well go down the drain simply because Saskatchewan electors elected a Liberal government in 1964. There's an old saying that all too often we lock the barn door after the horse is stolen. Mr. Speaker, it's really not "cricket" that we have the competitors permitted to make entry and appraise the horse for eventual removal, and rely on a "defective bolt" on the door to guard this necessary and extremely successful, publicly-owned thoroughbred. Mr. Speaker, I hold in my hand a sessional paper, no. 102, lodged in this session by the minister in charge, Mr. Boldt. It clearly indicates that in my home city of Saskatoon the rate after April 1, 1966, on homes will be 35 cents. The rate I paid on fire insurance on my home, Mr. Speaker, was 25 cents prior to the election of this government. It was raised by 5 cents per \$100 of rates on the first of September, 1964 and will be raised an additional 5 cents per \$100 of rates on the first of April, 1966. A 10 cent increase and no one can deny it, whether or not he uses the new mathematics. In addition, Mr. Speaker, I would point out that the \$25 deductible is now deleted. It becomes a \$50 deductible and the right to buy it out is removed. And quite frankly, Mr. Speaker, when this is done on extended insurance this simply means that the rate increase exceeds 50 per cent in my home city.

Some Hon. Members: — Hear, hear!

Mr. Robbins: — Mr. Speaker, I would like to say a word or two with respect to two other crown corporations, and I will put these two together because they are associated with transportation.

March 9, 1966

Saskatchewan Transportation Company is a good bus company. It had net earnings in 1965 of \$216,955 and has returned \$1,491,133 to the treasury of this province since its inception, almost \$1,500,000. Mr. Speaker, the major fear I have with regard to our publicly owned bus company is that the minister (Mr. Cameron) who was in charge of the publicly owned airline, Saskair, is now the minister in charge of the publicly owned bus company. Mr. Speaker, he shot down our airline. I wonder if there is a possibility he will blow up our bus system. I was shocked in more ways than one when I opened the annual report of Saskatchewan Transportation and was confronted with the "handsome visage" of the hon. member for Maple Creek (Mr. Cameron). Mr. Speaker, the Minister of Mineral Resources, the member for Maple Creek and his seatmate, the Minister of Welfare, the member for Rosthern (Mr. Boldt) are what I would term the sanctimonious self-made man and the arrogant self-made man. I would remind them that one wag has said that a self-made man is a horrible example of unskilled labor. Mr. Speaker, in my opinion the accolade fits both of these gentlemen extremely well.

Some Hon. Members: — Hear, hear!

Mr. Robbins: — Mr. Speaker, Saskair was a publicly owned airline system and it is gone. Others have discussed this at some length and I will not weary members further other than to say I opposed its sale and I feel certain this opposition was justified. A year ago in Budget Debate I stated Saskair should have been retained as a vital communication link in the north and have had its air routes extended from Prince Albert through Saskatoon to Regina. I stated Transair, a private operator, which got concessions from Canadian and Saskatchewan taxpayers through its arrangement with Air Canada, a publicly owned federal crown corporation, would shortly be in trouble. Recent newspaper reports indicate this is so. Indeed the hon. member from Yorkton (Mr. Gallagher), has a resolution on the Order Paper requesting federal government action with respect to proposed termination of air service by Transair. Crying to Ottawa, Mr. Speaker. We have had CPA, PWA, TCA and Transair on these routes in recent years. Saskair's proposal to utilize this route when we had a CCF government in this province and to utilize twin engined turboprops of modern design and moderate size on the Prince Albert-Saskatoon-Regina route made eminent economic sense. Mr. Speaker, last Friday I cut a tape on a TV interview on "Spotlight Saskatchewan" which will be on some Saskatchewan stations tonight at 5:55 p.m. I predicted the next applicant for the Prince Albert-Saskatoon-Regina route would be — you guessed it — NorCanAir — which received Saskair as a Liberal sacrifice on its shrine of so-called free enterprise.

Mr. Speaker, another crown corporation I would like to spend a little bit of time on is Saskatchewan Minerals. It is located in the main, in the Premier's constituency. The Sodium Sulphate Division of this publicly-owned crown corporation has returned \$4,613,054 to the public treasury of this province, \$854,593 of it last year. Mr. Speaker, actually this organization made a profit of \$1,021,593 last year but \$167,000 was set aside for future development. Mr. Speaker, I do not object to this but one should remember that the people of Saskatchewan would not have had a single dollar out of that \$4,613,054 had we not had a CCF government, and we would not have this tremendously successful industrial enterprise, publicly-owned by the people of this province, had we not had that government.

Some Hon. Members: — Hear, hear!

Mr. Robbins: — We may well lose it because we elected a Liberal government in 1964. I quote directly from the Provincial Treasurer's budget address:

The government does not rule out the ultimate sale of the company to private enterprise.

I thought I heard the hon. member from Athabasca (Mr. Guy), shout something about a shoe factory. It is natural, Mr. Speaker, that he should think of shoes. He usually has both feet in his mouth.

Mr. Speaker, the Premier and Provincial Treasurer was in Montreal speaking to the Montreal Advertising and Sales Club last fall. If accurately reported in the Star Phoenix, he said Saskatchewan was no longer a "have not" province, implying no doubt that this was a rather new situation, and neglecting to inform his audience that this was a situation which was true as far back as 1952. Typically he said:

In 20 years the Socialist crown corporations suffered colossal losses.

Yet the reports of these crown corporations, tabled by the responsible ministers, including himself, indicate accumulated net profits of \$20,458,755 from sodium which he says he will sell, insurance which they are hacking to pieces, forest industry — the timber board's in jeopardy, transportation, the airline is gone and the bus system may be in jeopardy, and the printing operation which he says he will sell. Yes, there were losses, Mr. Speaker. There were losses on a tannery, a shoe factory, a woollen mill, a box factory, a fish filleting plant and there have been losses in another division of the Saskatchewan Minerals which is still being operated, clay products, but they total, Mr. Speaker, \$1,675,220, and if those are colossal losses what are the \$20,458,755 in earnings? Mr. Speaker, the Provincial Treasurer always uses a Liberal interpretation in an attempt to depict anything associated with public enterprise in an unfavourable light. There's a reason for this. He wishes rather desperately to remove the glare of publicity from his own bombastic blunders. For example, the announcement in the last session of a \$46,000,000 heavy water plant at Estevan. Mr. Speaker, when questioned by the hon. member for Regina West (Mr. Blakeney) concerning the contract he had to admit it was a verbal one. As it turned out it wasn't worth the paper it wasn't written on.

Mr. Speaker, last year I had a fair bit to say about the Saskatchewan Power Corporation. Those to your right, Mr. Speaker, opposed reorganization of Saskatchewan Power into a crown corporation with a properly organized power and gas grid. Yet how can any area attract industry without assured sources of power? Then after the generating capacity, the transmission lines, the distribution system were established in rural and urban areas, they cried the debt is a millstone about the necks of Saskatchewan taxpayers, even though, Mr. Speaker, it is a self-liquidating debt. The Minister of Public Health (Mr. Steuart) in charge of the Power Corporation told the Implement Dealer's Association in Saskatoon last fall, and also this house, that the previous administration had borrowed some \$270,000,000 to pay back some

March 9, 1966

\$245,000,000 in acquired assets. "They borrow money", he said, "to pay off borrowed money." Well if you borrow and issue 20 year bonds to build a dam which will be depreciated over 50 years on the 'straight line' method of depreciation, you will obviously borrow again when the bonds mature. The asset is still there. I have never heard of borrowing money related to the depreciating asset if it is an asset of value for a particularly long period of time. The minister claims he is a member of a businesslike government. I don't know what principle the Minister of Public Health (Mr. Steuart) is involved in here, Mr. Speaker, but it certainly isn't a business principle.

Now, Mr. Speaker, I am not surprised at the Minister of Health (Mr. Steuart) knowing a good deal about a line. However, it is quite understandable that he would not know very much about a 'straight' line. I suggest any connection here would be purely coincidental.

The Provincial Treasurer says in his budget address that,

The overall profit picture in the past year for Saskatchewan Power has increased from \$5,100,000 to \$8,500,000.

Much of the credit he asserts is due to the new minister and the new board. Mr. Speaker, the water flow on a river is measured in terms of cusecs. One cusec equals a flow of 1/2 million gallons per day. A 4000 cusec flow would mean a flow of two billion gallons per day. The cusec flow at Squaw Rapids probably appreciably exceeds this figure. Mr. Speaker, I doubt whether the Minister of Public Health would know a 'cusec' from a 'Cossack'. The increased earnings of SPC in 1965 are essentially due to the earnings from the Regina City utility which became part of SPC in 1965, and to the increased proportion of the generated power flowing into the power grid coming from hydro sources rather than from thermal power plants. According to the Provincial Treasurer's White Paper, December, 1965, 44 per cent of all power used in Saskatchewan in 1965 came from Squaw Rapids, a plant built by the CCF and bitterly opposed by the Liberals. Although capital costs related to hydro plants appreciably exceeds that of thermal plants, operating costs are much lower.

Mr. Speaker, the next point I would like to deal with for a short time is the financial and economic position of the province. I would like to say a word about it in relation to composition of gross debt and the net asset position as of March 31st, 1964, the last fiscal year and when we had a CCF government and as of March 31st, 1965, the first fiscal year of the present Liberal administration.

One year ago in Budget Debate I perused the White Paper published by the Provincial Treasurer, dated November, 1964. This year, Mr. Speaker, I would like to peruse the latest issue published in December of 1965. Mr. Speaker, all the members have copies available to them and they can check these figures if they will. In March 31st, 1964, this province had a funded debt of \$559,120,000, they had treasury bills outstanding of \$36,153,000. From these figures you would have to deduct \$7,402,000 in sinking funds. This leaves a total of \$587,871,000. Offsetting that figure, Mr. Speaker, were \$52,286,000 in cash and investments; \$9,192,000 in working capital advances; \$556,198,000 in loans to revenue-producing organizations, basically power and telephones, and \$3,198,000 in other loans. A total of \$620,874,000. If you take that latter figure from the initial one you will find the net asset result of \$33,003,000.

Mr. Speaker, when the CCF government left power in this province the financial position of this province was excellent. Mr. Speaker, my colleague from Melfort-Tisdale (Mr. Willis) asked a question about the net assets as of March 31st, 1964. The Premier came back with the answer "net assets of \$33,033,495" and then it says in the quotation the Premier adds something. He always adds something. Mr. Speaker, he says:

The gauge of the financial position of the province is that we have net assets of this figure of \$33,003,000, but in addition we have a gross debt of \$595,273,939, when we take into account borrowing for power and telephones.

As at the end of March 31st, 1965, and we had a Liberal government from May 22, 1964 on, the funded debt had grown to \$595,740,000. To this had to be added \$40,410,000 in treasury bills outstanding, up appreciably from the year before, and \$7,511,000 deducted in sinking funds for a figure of \$628,639,000. Offsetting this item was \$54,118,000 in cash and investments; \$10,382,000 in working capital advances; \$5,619,000 in other loans and \$599,767,000 in loans to revenue producing organizations, again mainly power and telephones, for a total figure of \$669,886,000. The latter figure exceeds the former by \$41,247,000, which is the net asset position of the province as at March 31st, 1965. Mr. Speaker, even this increase in the net asset figure is directly attributable to CCF policies. When the Liberals assumed office in 1964 in May they had promised to immediately reduce the sales tax from 5 per cent to 4 per cent and to call a fall session and give farmers the right to use purple gas in farm trucks before harvest. They did neither. The changes occurred in February — six months later. According to the Premier's Budget Speech a year ago, \$14,300,000 in savings to the taxpayer would accrue from the sales tax reduction and the purple gas legislation. Half of \$14,300,000 is \$7,150,000, the Provincial Treasurer reports a budgetary surplus for the year ending March 31st, 1965 of \$7,946,284. Institution of these proposals six months earlier would have reduced the realized surplus by more than \$7,000,000 and the realized surplus would have been less than \$1,000,000 and the \$8,114,000 increase in net assets simply would not have been realized.

The Provincial Treasurer made much of the \$595,273,000 in gross debt, the vast majority of it in self-liquidating form when the CCF was in power. Well, the gross debt has grown to \$636,150,000, by March 31st, 1965 after his first year in power. I do not argue that this is bad. I merely cite it to illustrate the utter paucity of his argument and the idiosyncratic nonsense we've heard for years from the Saskatchewan Liberal party. Most of the increase is in power and telephones, the former rising from \$440,782,000 as of March 31st, 1964 to \$469,328,000 a year later and the latter from \$99,697,000 to \$112,688,000.

All this, Mr. Speaker, merely goes to show the fallacy of the Liberal position. It is 'Liberal' thinking, not 'logical' thinking.

According to the press, I caused an uproar, Mr. Speaker, in this current session because I asked a series of questions. The Premier referred to them as stupid questions. Well, Mr. Speaker, I would like this assembly to know none of the 33 questions he referred to which I placed on the Order Paper would have been asked had I received a forthright answer to question no. 64.

March 9, 1966

The Premier says:

We have brought 30 new industries into the province in the 20 months since June 1st, 1965.

I asked him to name them, give their location and the service or product provided in each case. The question stood on the Order Paper for a week and the hon. Minister of Industry, the member for Regina South (Mr. Grant) comes in with a list of 58 industries which he says were started in the 20 month period from June 1, 1964 on, and an additional list of expanded industries, 46 in all. The latter included companies like Imperial Oil, Saskatchewan Co-op Creameries, Purity Dairies, Intercontinental Packers. Mr. Speaker, I didn't ask for a list of companies incorporated since the province was formed, I asked for the companies the Premier referred to. Let's look at the answer to question 64. One or two examples will illustrate.

In this list from June 1, 1964 on is Kalium Chemicals — Potash (Belle Plaine) \$40,000,000 investment — in production September, 1964. I asked a supplementary question no. 206. When did the construction (day, month, year) of the Kalium Chemical Plant begin? The answer, May 1, 1963. Now, Mr. Speaker, how can an industrial plant which was begun 13 months prior to the date, June 1, 1964, the government uses as its cutoff, be included as a new industry in the 20 month period after June 1, 1964? I drove by that plant on more than one occasion prior to the announcement of the April 22, 1964 general election. The plant was there. It was obviously built to produce. The people concerned could not know there would even be an election in 1964. Then, Mr. Speaker, the hon. member for Souris-Estevan (Mr. MacDougall), asked the government question no. 286. When did the Kalium Chemical Plant go into production? The answer — August 3, 1964. This answer does not even jibe with the answer given to question no. 64 which says September, 1964. I am disappointed in the Minister of Industry, the hon. member for Regina South (Mr. Grant). I have always thought him a competent minister along with the Attorney General (Mr. Heald), and the Minister of Natural Resources (Mr. Cuelenaere). I can only assume he is being pressured by the big boy, the mighty manufacturer of myths, whose industrial growth is basically publicity and not performance at all.

Mr. Speaker, in the second list of expanded industries — which was not asked for — the minister listed Canadian Pittsburgh Industries, without location. You will recall, Mr. Speaker, that the original question asked the name, location and the service or product provided. No location was shown. We not only have a lost car, Mr. Speaker, we now have a lost industry. I suggest the Minister of Labour and Co-operatives (Mr. Coderre) be sent out to look for it. He will certainly not be missed here.

Mr. Speaker, problems which confront governments are real problems. They are not artificially created. They emerge from our dynamically changing pattern of society. It is this fact of dynamic social change which makes the policy of maintaining the Gladstonian theories of the Premier and his government reactionary and illusory. These facts are elementary yet he persists in his terminological inexactitudes. The province is burdened with huge debt. The figures prove him wrong. The province was stagnant under the CCF. The figures prove him wrong. The hon. member from Maple Creek (Mr. Cameron) would have us believe all development occurred because of the Saskatchewan Liberal party. To prove how stagnant the province was under the CCF he talks

about the near record revenues from bonus bids on mineral rights sales on crown land of \$11,200,000 in 1965 and then has to admit the record of \$11,900,000 was set in 1956 in a year he claims was stagnant and when we had a CCF government. It reminds one of the husband sweating over his budget and remarking to his wife — "We should have saved during the depression so we could live during this prosperity".

Mr. Speaker, perhaps I could summate the budget and this government and its members with a bit of verse. It should really be blank verse to match the capabilities of the members opposite. However, it isn't. It has a bit of rolling rhythm:

Budget day has come and gone
 Things somehow have turned out wrong
 The Thatcher tune is 'boys come clean
 Your'll now pay more for gasoline'.
 And while you see a ray of hope
 He slaps the 4 per cent on soap;
 But then he strikes a different pose
 He brings relief, and aptly chose
 A bright and new enlightened course
 Harness tax removal for your horse.

Wes Robbins.

I ask the Provincial Treasurer to be realistic and come out of this dream world. Traditionally, a money crisis brings high interest rates, which cause bonds to decline, followed by declining stock prices and a general downturn in business. High bond yields, now at a 40 year peak, generally comes in the later stages of a business boom when demand for borrowing exceeds the formation of new savings. The danger signals are flying but what does the Premier and his government so? They sing the rollicking song of faith in a hoary old myth. It goes like this:

The economy's buoyant
 So say Thatch and Stew
 Everything's booming
 Everything's new.

Bread prices have climbed
 Auto rates hit the sky
 So 'live it up' laddies
 Don't ask us why.

The years of stagnation
 Have passed from our sight
 All 'our boys' claim
 We have turned to the right.

Work hard my hearties
 Be gay and benign
 Stand firm for the party
 Hang 'tight' to 'the line'

We'll drink long and deep
 From the large flowing cup
 Everything now
 Is on the way up.

And when your turn comes
 And we need a new tenant
 We'll move 'Argue' over
 Make room in the Senate.

Wes Robbins.

March 9, 1966

Mr. Speaker, I support the amendment and I shall vote against the main motion.

Some Hon. Members: — Hear, hear!

Mr. A. Mitchell (Bengough): — I would like to thank the members on both sides of the legislature for the warm and cordial reception they have accorded me. I do appreciate this courtesy as a newcomer to this legislature, and as the newest member it is indeed an honoured privilege to take my seat with such ladies and gentlemen as assembled here who have senior service and experience and all dedicated to a common cause, which is the welfare of our people and the economic growth of our province of Saskatchewan which to me stands second to none in the Dominion of Canada.

At this time, Mr. Speaker, I would like to take a moment to thank all my supporters and constituency workers in Bengough constituency for their untiring efforts and moral support throughout the recent campaign. The weather was cold, the roads not always in the best of condition owing to a winter campaign, but they all worked their hardest and at no time did they doubt the outcome of the election results. I would like to give special thanks to all the MLAs and Cabinet Ministers who canvassed the constituency on my behalf.

At this time, Mr. Speaker, I would like to pay a tribute to the man whose work I have the privilege of carrying on, namely the late Sam Asbell.

Sam and I entered politics together, Sam as a candidate and I as one of his workers and later constituency president. It was working with Sam that I gained experience and knowledge of politics. Sam had the interest of his people at heart and worked for their betterment. He made their problems his regardless of political affiliations. He dedicated himself to the betterment of his constituency which is shown by the work accomplished in the short time he was given to carry it out. I consider it an honor, Mr. Speaker, to have been elected to carry on the work so ably started by Sam, and I promise to do my utmost to carry on his work and to fulfil my promises in the interest of the people of Bengough constituency.

I feel, Mr. Speaker, that winning the seat in Bengough is of great importance to our Liberal government. It has traditionally been a difficult seat to win, but after twenty years of Socialist government the people took it upon themselves to correct this situation in 1964 when they elected Sam Asbell, and now again in 1965, in a difficult by-election they have chosen to put back into the legislature a member on the government side. A proof that the people of the constituency have faith in our Premier, this legislature and the free enterprise form of government. The people have given their answer. Surely that speaks for itself.

The economy of our constituency consists of farming, ranching, some oil production and sodium sulphate, but being principally a farming and ranching area, we are vitally interested in the achievements of the present government. For example, the use of purple gas in farm trucks, the Home-owner grant of \$50 each, to a total expenditure of \$8,000,000, the creation of an independent appeal board that was set up for reviewing of grazing leases, the reduction of income tax, the reduction of the sales

tax from 5 to 4 per cent, the expansion of the grants to municipalities for grid roads, the snow removal grants to municipalities, the 1 cent a gallon increase in gasoline to be used exclusively for the building and maintenance of grid roads — this amounts to \$2,200,000 a year — and the greatly increased expenditure for education including \$15,000,000 capital spending for the University of Saskatchewan. All of these are of direct benefit to our people.

While I am principally interested in provincial government matters which affect Bengough constituency, I am also aware of situations which are the responsibility of our federal government. I would like the federal government to give consideration to the adoption of the 'two price system' for wheat. This measure would be a direct benefit to our smaller farmers, particularly with the present quota system in use at this time.

Mr. Speaker, in regard to the rumors regarding rail line abandonment of our branch lines, it would appear the chief complaint of the railway companies is maintaining a schedule service on these branch lines. I feel a scheduled service is unnecessary as all that is required is railway cars when and if grain movement demands this. This would seem to me to be a more logical approach to this problem and still retain rail service to our rural areas.

I am also reminded of two other problems which concern a large number of our people. The lack of unemployment insurance for farm labor and the precarious position of our old age pensioners. I trust, Mr. Speaker, the federal government will introduce at the earliest possible opportunity both the extended unemployment insurance program and the 'Senator Croll Old Age Proposal' to aid in the alleviation of hardship among this particular group of our aged citizens over the age of 65 years.

Mr. Speaker, just this afternoon I received a resolution from a Wheat Pool Committee in my constituency wherein they state:

In view of the fact that China has become one of our large grain importers we urge the federal government to have China represented at Expo-67.

I think, Mr. Speaker, consideration should be given to this matter.

Mr. Speaker, during the past twenty-two months in our constituency we have had more highways hard-surfaced than in the previous twenty years under the Socialists. We look forward to this year when at last the provincial highway system within our constituency will be brought to a standard that is long overdue. And here, Mr. Speaker, I would like to mention the highway program for our constituency for the coming spring and summer: the rebuilding and the oiling of highway no. 36, the completion of the rebuilding and oiling program on no. 13 highway. While the completion of the oiling program on no. 34 highway is not indicated this year, I will strive to have this project completed within the next two years. This last-named highway as the people of our constituency realize is a road to United States Customs and an important link in our highway system particularly for the Big Beaver and Bengough areas.

I would also, Mr. Speaker, urge the government to consider the oiling of stub roads into the towns along our highway system.

March 9, 1966

While no. 13 highway passes completely through our constituency, I would urge the government to complete the rebuilding and oiling of this highway all the way across our province as this is the only across-the-province highway south of no. 1. Oiling of this highway would alleviate much of the heavy traffic from no. 1.

Mr. Speaker, the member from Elrose (Mr. Leith) spoke previously on the construction of air strips. I would also like to suggest to the government at the time of construction of highways they give serious consideration to building air strips paralleling the highway in areas adjacent to towns which would wish this service. This is a program that has become quite popular in the United States in the past few years and is a tremendous asset to any town. These strips could be either oiled or sown down to grass. There is in Saskatchewan and the rest of Canada a rapidly growing number of farmers and businessmen who are using the light airplane in their business today, and I am sure this method of transportation would grow much more rapidly if there were air strips of this type near our towns. May I suggest, Mr. Speaker, the use of the 4 per cent tax on aviation gasoline be applied to this use.

Mr. Speaker, we also have planned for our constituency this year a regional park in the Bengough-Big Beaver area and one in the Ormiston district. There is a definite need for recreational facilities of this type in the southern part of our province to provide at-home recreation for our people.

We are looking forward to the building this year of a nursing home at Bengough. There has in the past few years developed a great need for this type of home to fill the gap between the Pioneer Lodge and the hospital. The town of Bengough, I think, is an excellent centre for this institution, it being the largest point in a thriving farming and ranching district.

Our hospital at Coronach we hope to have renovated and rebuilt this year. This coupled with the new hospital at Assiniboia now under construction should put our constituency in a much better position regarding the care for our ill and aged. I think, Mr. Speaker, we must try to keep our local hospitals up to date if we are to encourage and keep the capable doctors we now have in our constituency.

Mr. Speaker, as I have already mentioned the economy of our constituency being chiefly agricultural, I would like to draw attention to courses which I think many of my constituents will be interested in. At the present time there is in Regina a course on farm spraying, both air and ground. In the past few years considerable interest has been created among farmers on the subject of grain dryers, particularly in the past year of 1965, when we had poor harvest weather and we were forced to give some thought to the mechanical grain dryer. The Department of Agriculture is conducting a course on the operation and maintenance of the farm type grain dryers in various areas of our province. The course applicable to Bengough constituency is being held in Regina on March 21st and I would suggest anyone interested attend this worthwhile course.

And while the hon. member from Arm River (Mr. Pederson) is not in his seat, I would like to state, Mr. Speaker, I take exception to the statement made by the hon. member when he said in effect that the government was building a highway to a "cow pasture" through barren waste to provide a recent Senate appointee

an "escape route" out the "back door". Mr. Speaker, the construction of this particular piece of road has been under consideration by the government for the past two years. It not only will be built to Kayville but as well to Avonlea and across to no. 39 highway at Corinne. It is in both Bengough and Milestone constituencies and the people in this area deserve road improvements the same as any other area of the province. The area referred to by the hon. member is perhaps one of the finest farming areas of western Canada, and I think these people will resent these caustic remarks, when their good farms are referred to as "cow pastures", "barren waste", "escape routes" or "back door" to anywhere.

Mr. Speaker, in speaking of the Bengough by-election, I want to say I enjoyed every moment of the campaign, and I would like to extend my thanks to all of the people of the constituency for their courtesy. But during the last few days a few incidents cropped up which did not appeal to me. One of these was when the Socialists implied that the Kern County Land Company which is a large United States company was buying up large tracts of farm land in our province, intimating this was for farming purposes. The truth of the matter is, Mr. Speaker, that this company in reality is in our province for oil exploration only and to help develop the natural resources of our province. I say, Mr. Speaker, in spite of these tactics, the people of Bengough constituency were not deluded and endorsed the government program by supporting myself and electing a government representative. I take this opportunity, Mr. Speaker, to say that I am enjoying my position in the legislature and find all the phases of the work interesting.

Mr. Speaker, I hereby support the motion but not the amendment. I thank you, Mr. Speaker, for the time accorded to me.

Some Hon. Members: — Hear, hear!

Hon. A.C. Cameron (Minister of Mineral Resources): — Mr. Speaker, I listened with some interest to the member for Saskatoon (Mr. Robbins), and a great deal of interest to the member from Bengough (Mr. Mitchell). I think all and sundry who heard them can draw the contrast of this new man making his maiden speech to the house under the nervous tension as it is and presenting in such a forthright manner the requests, the hopes and the desires of the people of his constituency.

Some Hon. Members: — Hear, hear!

Mr. Cameron: — Then on the other hand to hear the member from Saskatoon (Mr. Robbins) who got so carried away with his own verbosity, he couldn't throttle himself down. He ran over and took five minutes of this man's maiden speech time.

Mr. Robbins: — Mr. Speaker, on a question of privilege I did not . . .

Mr. Cameron: — During the course of his remarks it was evident that he was attempting to be a great wit and as someone remarked over here, he was only half successful.

Mr. Speaker, I wanted this afternoon to deal in my capacity as Minister of Telephones and outline the work of the department, and also in my capacity as Minister of Mineral Resources. But

March 9, 1966

before I do, Mr. Speaker, while I didn't intend to, I feel compelled to make some comment on the report in the Leader Post this morning on the remarks which the Leader of the Opposition (Mr. Lloyd) made in this chamber yesterday. I want to quote the substance of the report dealing with an unfortunate case of mental illness. The report says the Leader of the Opposition (Mr. Lloyd) tabled a letter from a Mr. John Bennett, 1450 Cameron St., and I quote the extract as carried in the Leader Post:

The letter from John Bennett to Mr. Blakeney flatly contradicted the statement by the Health Minister, that Mrs. Elizabeth Bennett had been transferred from Weyburn Mental Hospital to an Estevan nursing home with her family's consent. Mr. Bennett, who wrote that he was her son, said he had never met Dr. LaFave referred to by Mr. Steuart and had not consented to the move and didn't know about it until after it had taken place. He said he has asked specifically that she should be kept at Weyburn.

Now that accusation I don't quarrel with in that it was made by a private citizen. The occasion was used by the Leader of the Opposition (Mr. Lloyd) to unload a vicious and malicious attack on the dedicated public servants charged with this responsibility. In response to his attack yesterday in the legislature, these people from the Centre in Weyburn felt compelled again to come to their defense and to set the record straight. I have with me and we just received letters from these people in Weyburn setting the record straight once again. I want to quote extracts from these letters. I don't wish to table them because it contains confidential information about other members of the family. I am prepared to take full responsibility to protect these innocent people whose names have not as yet been raised. But I want to say this, Mr. Speaker, if the opposition demands that I table these letters and takes the responsibility for doing injurious harm to others, I shall do so. Here is the first letter, dated March 8, 1966 and I quote:

An Hon. Member: — First extract you mean.

Mr. Cameron: —

This, an office interview, was conducted with Mrs. Bennett's relatives on August 23rd, 1965. Five relatives were interviewed and the son John was present. The letter we feel reveals that the family had made several attempts to get the mother into a nursing home but were unsuccessful because of the long waiting list. The family felt that they could not provide funds for nursing home care. The family was in agreement that the administration of the mentally incompetent should be responsible for all financial matters. The family was in entire agreement with this course of action. Their family did not wish to assume responsibility in the planning of their mother's future.

And a separate statement is attached to this letter and it reads:

This is a true account of the report I gave concerning Mrs. Bennett and that her son, John, was present at this meeting. I will testify and take an affidavit to this extent.

Mr. R.A. Walker (Hanley): — But he won't reveal his name.

Mr. Cameron: — Signed, this official record.

Mr. Walker: — But he won't reveal his name.

Mr. Cameron: — Another letter dated September 15th, 1965, addressed to Mr. John Bennett of Cameron Street:

This is to inform you that your mother was placed in a foster home in Estevan September 14, 1965. The medical staff concerned with your mother's case have carefully watched her improvement during her stay here and now believe she will be able to function adequately in a community centre. The home is one of the best homes on our list and with close supervision we believe your mother will be adequately cared for. The Administrator of Estates will take responsibility for her financial matters. If there is anything more we can do for your mother, please do not hesitate to inform us.

And a notation at the bottom of the letter says:

This letter dictated on September 14th, immediately the mother was transferred, and was forwarded to Mr. John Bennett.

And on the bottom of the letter is a notation, "To this date there has never been a reply." Does this sound, Mr. Speaker, as if this mother was moved without the family's consent, without the family's knowledge, as if the son, John, had not consented to the move, he did not know about it until later? No, Mr. Speaker, the son, John, was present, he was informed of the plans, he was present when the family agreed to the plan and he was notified the day his mother entered the home.

Mr. Walker: — Phoney.

Mr. Cameron: — And I want to quote another letter, dated March 3, 1966, a letter written just two days before the member exploded this in the house. This is addressed to the lady in charge of the home and this is what I quote:

It has certainly been a brute of a winter.

I am not quoting all of it because there is some intimacy in there and I'll table it if you wish.

My husband remarked the other day that particularly during a winter such as ours has been it is a relief to know that his mother is warm and comfortable. We feel that she now looks upon your place as home and we both appreciate the good care you are giving her. Thanks again for your great kindness.

I ask you, Mr. Speaker, does this letter reveal that this relative of this lady has any ill will in her heart? Does it indicate in any way that the mother is receiving anything less than loving care? Mr. Speaker, it is most regrettable, most regrettable, not that Mr. Bennett went to Mr. Blakeney with a charge but that the member chose this chamber and the province of Saskatchewan as a forum in which to wash a family wash and used this

March 9, 1966

chamber as a launching pad in which to launch an attack against these people who had dedicated their lives to the care of the mentally ill. The Leader of the Opposition (Mr. Lloyd) and the member from Regina West (Mr. Blakeney), by the malicious attack upon Saskatchewan's mental program have brought nothing but discredit upon themselves and the party which they represent.

Some Hon. Members: — Hear, hear!

Mr. Cameron: — Their concern, Mr. Speaker, was not for Mrs. Bennett, their concern was not for John Bennett, and their concern was not for her family. The victim of their attack was the whole mental program in the province of Saskatchewan and the public servants who administer it. Mr. Speaker, they deliberately chose the time and the place to launch this attack and it was as cunningly devised to knife this health program and as ruthlessly executed as any act of the hooded clansmen in Alabama. These people speak of civil rights and civil liberties in one breath and in the next they would move to destroy the very people whom they profess to protect. It matters not to them how many innocent people over there cannot find it in their hearts to forgive the people of Saskatchewan for having reflected them at the polls. The people would rather see Saskatchewan and her great institutions wither on the vine and die than to see them flourish and prosper under any government but their own.

Some Hon. Members: — Hear, hear!

Mr. Cameron: — And I would hope, Mr. Speaker, because of compassion for other members of the family and the innocent people whose names have been bandied about, that this would be the end of this discussion. These charges, Mr. Speaker, have been refuted. These people are prepared to take the witness stand. The most charitable thing I can say about Mr. Bennett is when he went to Mr. Blakeney he must have been in a emotional state when he made these charges. I cannot, Mr. Speaker, however, forgive or forget the despicable manner in which the member for Regina West (Mr. Blakeney) and the Leader of the Opposition (Mr. Lloyd) used the plight of the mentally ill to attack the public service of this province.

Now, Mr. Speaker, I want to turn to the Department of Telephones. The past year has been one of great accomplishments by both the rural telephone companies and the Saskatchewan Government Telephones. The rural companies have continued their program of upgrading their services. Eight new rural telephone companies were organized in 1965, and at the same time the amalgamation of 17 companies into five has strengthened their ability to provide better service to rural areas. The rural companies to an increasing degree are taking advantage of the government's program, designed to improve rural telephone service. When all the accounts are in for the past year, the rural companies will have received approximately \$400,000 in assistance grants in upgrading services. Indications are this coming year this should exceed a half million dollars. The Saskatchewan Government Telephones has experienced a year of many achievements, over 17,000 new subscribers were added to the network. This brings, Mr. Speaker, the total number of Saskatchewan Government Telephone subscribers to a quarter of a million. Some 17,000,000 was spent in new plant facilities to meet the growing demand of telephone service in the province. I think the buoyancy of the

economy is reflected in the record number of long distant messages originating in Saskatchewan. This past year the corporation handled over 1,000,000 long distance telephone calls per month. The total number of long distance calls originating in Saskatchewan exceeds 14,000,000, an unprecedented number for the province of Saskatchewan. The extent to which Saskatchewan people use their telephones is to be measured also by the profit earned by the corporation. This year the corporation earned over \$6,000,000 in profit, a record never before achieved.

I think, Mr. Speaker, that the people of Saskatchewan have reason to be proud of both the rural telephone companies and the Saskatchewan Government Telephones. Mr. Speaker, tremendous as this achievement might be I don't believe we have room for complacency when we realize that there are still thousands of Saskatchewan farm homes that have never known what it is have a telephone in the house. All we need to do is to take a trip beginning west of Meadow Lake, near the Alberta border, and continue eastward south of Prince Albert clear to the Manitoba border, to find this huge number of people. We only need to travel a couple of hundred miles south of the city of Regina to find another area that has never known telephones. We can go to the extreme southwest of the province to find another, and interspersed throughout the province we will find other areas. This all adds up that, excluding the vast area of the province north of Prince Albert and excluding the Indian Reservations, we have in the agricultural area of this province some 7,000 farm families without telephone service. These farm homes are without telephones, Mr. Speaker, not by choice, rather because these areas do not lend themselves to service by rural telephone companies. These are areas where the cost to bring telephone service is beyond the financial ability of rural telephone companies to cope with. This does not, however, in my thinking, relieve the province of its responsibility to these farm homes. Surely, Mr. Speaker, these farm people are as deserving of an opportunity to secure for themselves amenities so many of us have come to take for granted. We in the government believe that these farm families have been forgotten for far too long. Mr. Speaker, we intend to do something about it.

This year, Saskatchewan Government Telephones will be allocated funds over and above that required for expansion of its own facilities. These additional funds will be used to launch a \$7,000,000 program to bring telephone service to those unserved farm areas. The program, Mr. Speaker, will get under way this spring. Saskatchewan Government Telephones has undertaken to make this one of its major projects this year. The program will be undertaken on a shared-cost basis between Saskatchewan Government Telephones and the farmer. Cost will be worked out on the basis of each area served. All costs above that assessed to the farmer will be absorbed by the Saskatchewan Government Telephones. Saskatchewan Government Telephones will assume full responsibility for designing the project, it will assume responsibility for constructing the lines and for service. Once the farmer has paid his portion of the cost he will assume no further liability.

This policy, Mr. Speaker, is somewhat different than that of rural telephone companies in that there will be no land tax imposed to support the service. I wish to make it very clear, however, that this program is designed not to supplant the services of the rural telephone companies but to parallel the work that they are doing. This program does not envisage the taking over of the rural telephone companies by the Saskatchewan

March 9, 1966

Government Telephones. The program is designed to serve these unserved areas beyond the capacity of the rural telephone companies. I would hope, Mr. Speaker, that the rural telephone companies will continue to take advantage of the grants available to them in order to upgrade their service to their subscribers. The program to be launched by the Saskatchewan Government Telephones is only made possible by serving groups of farmers. It is not designed for service to the individual farmer who can obtain service from an existing rural telephone company. You can understand, I am sure, that a program of this magnitude cannot, of course, be completed in one construction season. It will require several construction seasons, and because of this we must consider first those areas which show the greatest interest and secure the greatest number of subscribers. Cost analysis is now being completed and I am now in a position to announce that the cost to each individual farmer under this program will be \$400 to hook up. Once the 'phone is installed the service charge in most all instances will be \$6 per month. Needless to say, Mr. Speaker, it is with a great deal of pleasure that I am able to announce today the launching of this program. Mr. Speaker, this is just one more challenge which this government is prepared to meet in order to provide more of the amenities of life to an ever increasing number of Saskatchewan people.

I should like now, Mr. Speaker, if I may for a few moments to turn to my Department of Mineral Resources. The charge has been levelled, and often by the opposition, that the rate of growth in the development of Mineral Resources has declined since the Liberals took office. Mr. Speaker, my department has just finished a compilation of statistics for the year 1965. All I need, I think, is to lay before the house some of these statistics to put that myth to bed.

We'll deal with oil development. At the end of 1964 there were 25,000,000 acres of crown land under exploration; at the end of 1965 there were 36,800,000 acres out under disposition. Compare this to 12,500,000 out under disposition in 1963. The land sales netted in the province in 1963, \$5,300,000, increase in 1964 to \$8,300,000; in 1965 it rose to 11,300,000, and I have just received the results of the last sale held for the fiscal year ending March 31st. This sale was held, Mr. Speaker, yesterday and we were busy all morning balancing up the amount. The total of this monthly sale is \$421,968. The total of land sales for this fiscal year just closing reached a total of \$12,918,000, an unprecedented record in the history of the province. During 1965 too, we saw and witnessed the discovery of seven new oil pools. There were 1,457 wells drilled in 1965 which far exceeds any previous record ever set in the province. Active oil and gas wells at the end of 1965 exceeded 7,200. Oil production reached 250,000 barrels per day in October. The total oil production in 1965 — total 86,500 barrels. The oil production for this fiscal year just closing will exceed 88,000,000. Compare this, Mr. Speaker, with 71,000,000 barrels produced in 1963. The only record left unbroken by the oil industry are the records they established this year. This fiscal year just closing, Mr. Speaker, the government will have extracted \$12,800,000 in royalties from the oil companies. I ask you, Mr. Speaker, if this is sell-out our resources. I say let's have more of the same.

What, Mr. Speaker, has this exciting phase of mineral development meant to the people of Saskatchewan? It means that in the past year the government will have taken in revenues \$41,000,000 from our mineral resources. \$41,000,000, Mr. Speaker, compared to \$29,000,000 when this government came to office. It

means that we have \$12,000,000 to support such measures as the Home-owner grant, free text books in Grade IX, increased aid to the hard-pressed municipalities and the schools. It means \$12,000,000 less, Mr. Speaker, to be extracted from the taxpayer's pocket.

Mr. E. Kramer (The Battlefords): — Increase in medicare . . .

Mr. Cameron: — This is what mineral resources mean to the people. Mr. Speaker, I make no apology for the incentive program which we instituted in order to get this movement under way. The oil industry, the mining industry have dug in with hard work backed up by massive sums of cold cash and the people of the province are the beneficiaries.

Time does not permit a review of each sector of the mineral resources. However, the Year Report indicates that salt production is up, sand and gravel production is up, sodium sulphate production is up. The new interest in sodium sulphate because of the increased pulp production, and the coming of a pulp mill to Saskatchewan have led to the announcement of three more sodium sulphate plants scheduled for Saskatchewan which will come into production next year or early in 1968. I don't need to speak of the potash story. That amazing story is well known to the people of Saskatchewan.

I want to turn for a moment to mining in the north. Here again for the first time world wide mining interests are allocating a portion of their budget to Saskatchewan. And today, Mr. Speaker, the mining industry with 62 companies is blazing new trails into the mineralised areas in the north. This is just a beginning of this activity in the Precambrian Shield, and I wish to reiterate here that this government again makes no apologies for the mining incentive program for the north. We are of the firm conviction that if Saskatchewan is to reach her full potential of economic growth we must push back our northern frontier. We believe that the mining industry must be in the vanguard of that great challenge. We don't believe that this alone can be left to the mining industry. Because of this we formulated a mining incentive program tailored to the mining needs of northern Saskatchewan. It is true this program may make some demands on provincial funds but in the interest of Saskatchewan as a whole, we believe we are justified in taking some of the revenue of mineral production in the south and plowing it into the opening up of the great mineralised areas of the north. If the opposition wishes to express its dislike of this program it will have an opportunity to do so when the estimates are before the house, because this year we are asking this legislature to vote another \$700,000 to this program. Mr. Speaker, let them see if they act on the vote the way they talked on the hustings. The Liberal party in seeking a mandate from the people of Saskatchewan said simply this:

We believe that the challenge facing Saskatchewan today is to lift ourselves from that of a have-not province to that of a have.

We said that for far too long Saskatchewan has languished in the shadows of a have-not province, and we said that we believe that the key to this would lie in the tapping and extracting and utilizing of the tremendous resources we have in Saskatchewan.

My report today will indicate that during our term of

March 9, 1966

office the foundation has been set, a working partnership has been arranged between government and industry. The record of the buoyancy of the year just ended, the air of confidence now permeating in Saskatchewan indicate 1966 and the years ahead are extremely bright. I would make this one request of members of this house, namely if we are interested in the growth and development of this province, if we are interested in making opportunities available for our young people to make their niche in life at home, then I say that we should give our whole-hearted support to the efforts that are being put forth in every sector of the mineralised areas of the province in order to extract this wealth and make it available to the people of Saskatchewan. This is a massive program in itself. The people of Saskatchewan today are more conversant and more interested in every facet of mineral development than they have ever been in history. It is an exciting phase that we have entered into and each month is bringing up new records. For the people of the north it indicates to them that today help is on its way and money and brains and hard work are in there opening up these tremendous mineralised areas, not only for the people of the north but for the people of Saskatchewan as a whole. If we pursue this great challenge with confidence and with conviction and with the support of the Saskatchewan people, we will reach that goal sooner than we dared hope a few months ago.

I will not support the amendment, I will support the motion.

Some Hon. Members: — Hear, hear!

Mr. A.E. Blakeney (Regina West): — I wonder if the minister before he takes his seat would mind answering a question? I wonder if he would make clear to the house that the letter he read allegedly from a Bennett relative did not come from the Mr. and Mrs John Bennett who were mentioned in the discussion?

Mr. Cameron: — Which letter was that?

Mr. Blakeney: — I believe the minister read a letter form one of the Bennett relatives . . .

Mr. Cameron: — It came from her daughter-in-law, married to one of her sons.

Mr. Blakeney: — It wasn't from the John Bennett. That's the point I wanted to make clear.

Mr. A.M. Nicholson (Saskatoon City): — Mr. Speaker, I listened with a good deal of interest to the minister who has just taken his seat. Like the Minister of Health he did raise his voice, he read a letter without disclosing the writer, which is contrary to the rules of parliamentary procedure.

Mr. Cameron: — Mr. Speaker, I shall table them. I will not tolerate this casting of reflections. Come as it may, these are the letters, peruse them and you'll get the information. Do what you like with them on your own responsibility.

An Hon. Member: — You don't know what you're

talking about anymore than you did when you spoke.

Mr. Cameron: — I'm not lying and you know it.

Mr. Speaker: — Order, order! The member from Saskatoon.

Mr. Nicholson: — The member who has just taken his seat has been a member of this chamber for a longer period than I have been and should know the rules. He should not read a letter without making it available to members of the house, and I am very glad at this late stage he has observed the traditional rules in a democratic legislature. He ignored the facts, he made it clear he doesn't rate highly the Leader of the Opposition (Mr. Lloyd), or the member for Regina West (Mr. Blakeney), which came as no surprise to most of us sitting over here. He did discuss their personalities and their capabilities rather than the facts of the case. The members on this side share with the Minister of Health (Mr. Steuart) and the government, the desire to move people from a lifetime in the mental institutions back into the community. All we ask is that in making this move the welfare of the patient should be considered.

Shortly after the present government took office, the federal government amended the National Housing legislation so that now funds are available on a generous basis so that communities all over Saskatchewan can share with the federal government and the provincial government providing excellent nursing accommodation for our people, including people who might be discharged from mental hospitals.

Mr. Speaker, since the budget was brought down, most of the virtues of the budget have been mentioned by members opposite. My colleagues have drawn attention to most of the objectionable features, but there are a few more which need to be identified. I must congratulate the Premier for presenting a carefully prepared speech in his capacity of Provincial Treasurer. There is never any difficulty in hearing or following the Premier. However, I must give the first prize to the opposition financial critic for his budget address, which represented a tremendous amount of preparation whether or not you agreed with his enumeration of the defects of the budget or his brilliant speech. I think all the speeches delivered by members here were outstanding. I would like to mention two delivered by members opposite. Two private members, the member for Kindersley-Kerrobert (Mr. Howes) and the member for Elrose (Mr. Leith), should be commended. I must say that I moderated the tone of my own speech somewhat after listening to their presentation. I suggest that members of the chamber should read at their leisure the presentations made by these two younger members. And I hope that they will take an opportunity to give a little good advice to the Minister of Welfare (Mr. Boldt). I think there were at least two unfortunate statements made during his speech in referring to the uncle of the member from Redberry (Mr. Michayluk), and to the wife of the member for Regina North (Mr. Whelan). Mr. Michayluk in spite of the difficulty of acquiring an education was for over 20 years the secretary of his local school district. He was for many years a member of the local Wheat Pool Committee and has been on the council. Hon. members might be interested in knowing that their son, Julian, was given the first Queen Elizabeth award in 1959. Julian was chosen by the University of Saskatchewan as the outstanding student of the year.

March 9, 1966

Some Hon. Members: — Hear, hear!

Mr. Nicholson: — Here is a picture of Julian Michayluk and the caption reads:

A native of Krydor who received the first Queen Elizabeth scholarship for graduate studies in education. The \$1,200 scholarship is a gift to the Queen from the province and will be presented to Her Majesty during her visit to Regina on July 23rd. She will then make the first award to Mr. Michayluk. Mr. Michayluk now with the degree of Bachelor of Education and Master of Education is now on leave studying for his Ph.D in the University of Toronto.

I suggest that it isn't in good form in a legislature of this sort for one member to make reference to an uncle of another member in this disparaging way when the uncle and his family are so highly regarded in their community. I believe members on both sides of the house were hurt when my colleague, the Whip for this party, had a Minister of the Crown suggest that he and his wife were living common-in-law. Mrs. Whelan before her marriage and since has been a very brilliant writer. Before her marriage she wrote under the name Elizabeth Primrose Henry and, like many competent writers, after her marriage she has continued to write by this name. She is not ashamed of the name of her parents. Why should a member of this assembly, a Minister of the Crown, who has a special responsibility of trying to do something about a family life and the problems of children, make this sort of reference in the chamber? I appreciate the fact that Your Honor, after due consideration, considered that the remarks made should be withdrawn.

I would be most ungrateful if I didn't acknowledge a few things in the budget which deserve commendation. There will be a dental college on the Saskatoon Campus. It will offer hope to our province of eventually having enough dentists to adequately supply our needs.

The spending during the next two years of \$4,000,000 and \$2,600,000 this year on the facilities of the Saskatchewan Technical Institute in Saskatoon is especially good news. By the time the CCF government brought down the 1964-65 budget, the Technical Institute just a few months old was so crowded that an extension was needed. Consequently we included almost \$2,000,000 in the budget for that year. By spending none of this money it was possible to show a \$2,000,000 savings, but it has been a great loss to the province to delay for two years the starting of the necessary extension. Well, I shouldn't say that nothing was spent, for during the present fiscal year a return tabled recently indicated that \$10 has been spent.

Everyone agrees that Saskatchewan farmers have been caught in the cost price squeeze and consequently are not receiving their fair share of Saskatchewan's buoyant economy. It is good news to hear that the farmers will no longer be required to pay the educational and health tax on poultry nests, turkey saddles, farrowing crates, cow trainers, halters, tying chains for livestock, harness for horses. However, I must report, Mr. Speaker, that my friend, Art Stone, checked the large stores in Saskatoon where they have for years tried to supply everything from a needle to a haystack, and believe it or not, Mr. Speaker, it wasn't possible to buy any of these articles in the several stores that

Mr. Stone checked. They all said that no doubt they could supply the articles but he would have to wait until they sent somewhere else. So I would gather that these reductions in taxes will not make a great deal of difference in the cost-price squeeze to the farmer.

Before mentioning a few of the deficiencies of the budget, I must note that Saskatchewan's fastest growing city is still without a representative in the Cabinet. Saskatoon, now 60 years old, throughout its entire history when it has had a government supporter in the legislature has always had a Cabinet Minister to make sure that our needs would not be forgotten by the Cabinet. Once we had Premier Anderson and Howard McConnell, two from the city in the Cabinet between 1929 and 1934. Saskatoon ballots last election contained the names of five well-known Saskatoon Liberals. The lady member for Saskatoon was the only one elected. Had any of the four men been elected without doubt Saskatoon would now have a Cabinet Minister. This would seem to be clearly discrimination against the fair sex and it is not appreciated by the women of Saskatchewan.

The vacancy caused by the defeat at the polls of Mr. Pinder has never been filled. At least three of the Cabinet are carrying very heavy loads. I, of course, refer to the Premier, the Ministers of Health and of Highways, Mr. Steuart and Mr. Grant. They are normally very good-natured persons but the workload this past year seems to have made them much more irritable. To have three of the legislative secretaries continue in their assignments and the lady member (Mrs. Merchant) for Saskatoon dropped is hard for Saskatonians to understand.

I must also comment on the victorial attitude of the Minister of Welfare (Mr. Boldt) for withholding \$48,000 from the citizens of Saskatoon before he has been able to establish how much, if any, has been spent which should not have been spent. Although this dispute has been before the public for more than a year, the minister has not laid any charges against anyone. I note in the Star Phoenix of March 3rd that the Minister of Welfare, speaking at a Liberal meeting, said:

Mayor Cole and I see eye to eye on many of the problems that exist on the question of social aid. If Mayor Cole had more support from some members of City Hall, the social aid question would have been solved by now.

I note by last night's Star Phoenix that Mayor Cole was confronted with this. It appears that the Minister of Welfare will now have to make some comments to indicate whether or not Mayor Cole is representing the minister's views on the problems of social aid and welfare in general. But I am sure that when the facts are all known that there will be a great many people in Saskatoon, indeed throughout Saskatchewan, who will be interested in the comments of Alderman Taylor as reported in the Star Phoenix, February 22nd, when he said:

There was in the recent provincial social aid administrative review of social aid in Saskatoon a penny-pinching disregard of ordinary human consequence.

Alderman Taylor said he could not understand why the matter had not been pursued by council more vigorously than the record showed. I don't understand why this city has to be put to the expense of engaging a lawyer when the Minister of Welfare has never established to the satisfaction of city council that there

March 9, 1966

is in fact \$48,000 or any agreed amount owing. If a court of law has to make the decision, the taxpayers of Saskatchewan or of Saskatoon, or of both, will have to meet unnecessary additional taxes.

Since I spoke here recently, I note that the Provincial Treasurer has included \$100,000 in supplementary estimates for the planning of the proposed extension and renovation of the University Hospital at Saskatoon. The Minister of Health (Mr. Steuart) when interviewed by Mike McCourt, of CFQC on Friday, last, indicated that this amount would be spent on the extension and that more would be made available if necessary. Mr. Speaker, this \$100,000 that was mentioned is just \$10,000 more than was appropriated more than three years ago by the CCF government to get on with the planning. We were convinced that if we were to attract and retain the outstanding doctors, we had to act at once. If we were to continue to have the University Hospital and Saskatoon a more popular medical and hospital centre for Saskatchewan people than the Mayo Clinic in Rochester, the University Hospital needed at once (a) a service wing, (b) a rehabilitation wing with accommodation for 100 geriatric patients, and (c) a pediatric wing. Mr. Speaker, three years ago this decision was reached. The member for Regina, in a letter to the University Hospital Board, on January 4, 1963, confirmed that the Cabinet had approved of proceeding at once. The essential building program costing at least \$10,000,000 would have been well along were it not for the change in government two years ago.

What happened? Well, three valuable years have been lost. One of the Premier's first decisions after becoming Treasurer and Premier was to request a slash of ten per cent in all government expenditures right across the board. This worked out for the University Hospital of a cut of about \$700,000. This was why we have lost from Saskatoon and Saskatchewan so many brilliant doctors. This was why we had 100 beds which were not in use at the University Hospital for part of last summer. Hon. members had placed on their desks a few days ago the story of Michelle Siba of Middle Lake who had been featured in Canada and the United States in connection with Canada's crusade for the mentally retarded. One of the persons who played a leading role in making it possible for Michelle to be such a beautiful and promising child is Dr. John Gerrard, head of Pediatrics at the University of Saskatchewan. Hon. members will note that under this picture the women's editor for the Western Producer, Doris Hearn, writes:

Not many young ladies of sixteen months can entertain a room full of press, radio and TV representatives plus a dozen or so doctors, interns and medical students. Little Michelle Siba of Middle Lake, Saskatchewan, took it in her stride. She is a happy, healthy baby, unaware that had it not been for recent research she would already be showing symptoms of retardation which would become worse for she is a PKU baby, one born without the ability to digest protein. She is shown here with her mother, Mrs. Mike Siba of Middle Lake.

Michelle's mother is a nurse. Michelle is the fifth child of parents who are carriers of PKU. Fortunately she can look forward to living a normal, healthy life because of the work of Dr. Gerrard. Dr. Gerrard since coming to Saskatoon was granted the John Scott award. He shares this honor with Madam Curie for radium, Dr. Banting, insulin, Sir Alexander Fleming, penicillin,

Dr. Salk, the polio vaccine. Dr. Gerrard was selected because of his work in providing a cure for Phenylketonuria or PKU as it's more commonly known, one of the causes of mental retardation.

It is estimated that at least two children each year will be born in Saskatchewan with this disability and they and their parents will be forever grateful to Dr. Gerrard and those who are associated with him in the research in this important field of mental retardation. Dr. Gerrard came to Saskatchewan about 10 years ago. He came during the period when some of the brightest young people in the medical field considered Saskatchewan to be a very exciting place to work. How can we expect such an internationally famous person as Dr. Gerrard to remain with us if we do not provide him and his associates in pediatrics, space and facilities to see and care for sick children? I am sorry the lady member for Saskatoon (Mrs. Merchant) is not in the chamber. I am sure if she was here and was speaking in this debate she would agree with me that we cannot delay long in the providing of the essential services in pediatrics that have been recognized for years.

Mayor Baker of Regina and members from other urban centres outlined the shortcomings in the budget in a period when cities are expanding so rapidly and provincial governments in other provinces seem to be doing so much more to relieve our hard-pressed taxpayers. I recently had a copy of Road Administration in Canada, 1965, published last November by the Canadian Good Roads Association. I note in this publication that in British Columbia, 50 per cent of the cost of construction and 40 per cent of the cost of maintenance of highways through cities are provided by the provincial government. I realize that before the member for Melfort-Tisdale (Mr. Willis) gave up his work as Minister of Highways, he introduced a program that did result in the provincial Department of Highways sharing the cost of these urban roads. The municipalities feel that in the very affluent Saskatchewan economy that we have in 1966, the Provincial Treasurer should be sharing to a larger extent. The Minister of Highways (Mr. Grant) should have the authority to share with the cities for the maintenance within the cities, at least part of the maintenance,, part of the snow removal costs. In Alberta the provincial government is responsible for 100 per cent maintenance and construction on the freeways, 100 per cent construction between the curbs on the arterials, 50 per cent construction and 40 per cent maintenance on secondary. Manitoba also shares 100 per cent construction and maintenance on the provincial trunk highways. Ontario, Quebec, New Brunswick, all these provinces share in the maintenance costs of highways running through the cities. I hope that the Minister of Highways will use his good office to persuade the Provincial Treasurer to make available to the cities a higher share of the costs of the maintaining of these important links. I am grateful that the government did not apply the 10 per cent cut on assistance to urbans when cuts were made across the board. But in a year when the Provincial Treasurer has been able to put over \$28,000,000 of the surplus for the year in a supplementary estimate, I think it is unfortunate he didn't make the urban people happier by assuming at least part of the snow removal and maintenance costs of highways running into the cities.

Mr. Speaker, another serious omission in the budget has been failure of the Premier, in such a long speech, to say a word about housing. Although this has not been mentioned in either the Throne or the Budget Speeches, legislation is before the house which would suggest that the major responsibility for housing

March 9, 1966

is being transferred from the Minister of Welfare (Mr. Boldt) to the Minister of Municipal Affairs (Mr. McIsaac). I must commend the Premier for making this change. The federal government has since the change of government in Saskatchewan, broadened the provisions of the National Housing Act. I am hoping that a new minister will provide leadership which will bring to Saskatchewan some of the federal dollars which are available in this very important field of housing. I must take my share of the blame that while I was minister in charge of housing we didn't take full advantage of all the provisions of the existing National Housing Act. However, during that period we started and completed Saskatoon's first low rental housing project. I started negotiations with Mayor Buckwold as soon as I became the minister. I would like to thank the Saskatoon city council, especially Alderman Wedge and the junior member from Saskatoon, who before he was elected was very active as a member of Saskatoon's housing authority, for their part in making available the low rental housing units in Saskatoon. We all thought at that time that by the time the first two projects were completed, there would be a demand for additional houses so that additional projects would start. At the time the government changed, Saskatoon was ready to purchase the RCAF houses and property out at the airport with a view to developing a second low rental area. But the Liberal government preferred to see this valuable property go to a private developer. I have not read of any leadership being provided by the provincial government to increase the number of low rental housing units in Saskatoon or in fact in many places throughout the province.

With the urban renewal advantages now offered by the federal government and provided for in legislation that has been before us, I hope that Saskatchewan will provide, the provincial government will provide, real leadership in encouraging the larger and smaller communities to take advantage during our centennial year of the generous arrangements to improve the housing conditions that exist in so many places.

The trouble with existing national housing legislation is that the houses that are available are beyond the reach of those who really need decent housing. The average income of national housing borrowers in the last report I have seen indicates the figure of \$6,375. When I submit, Mr. Speaker, that people in those income brackets somehow or other would be able to manage housing on their own, I am delighted that people in these income brackets have been able to get money on mortgages at lower rates than the conventional mortgage rate would be. They have received assistance with their plans and a large number of people all across Canada have taken advantage of these loans. Professor Murray who did a survey of housing needs in Ontario recently said, "We have in housing socialism for the rich and private enterprise for the poor". For those in the higher income brackets the National Housing Act has been a success and has reduced costs considerably. But all across Canada people in the lower income brackets are still living in housing which should not be used in this day and age.

In Saskatchewan during the famous 20 years, we established the finest housing program found anywhere in Canada for senior citizens. I must give credit to my predecessors, Jack Sturdy and Tom Bentley, for their outstanding work to involve three levels of government in providing excellent housing in places like Zenon Park, Middle Lake, as well as in our larger towns and cities.

This shared housing activity initiated in Saskatchewan has

been recognized across Canada. The late Jack Garland, while he was the minister in charge of housing, drafted the most recent changes in the National Housing Act, and he met the requests that we made repeatedly to use federal funds to assist with the construction of nursing homes for non-profit organizations.

Had I continued as Minister of Welfare we would have acted on the recommendations of the committee on ageing which recommended that the provincial government make grants up to 50 per cent of the construction costs of non profit nursing homes, to be operated in connection with the existing or new Senior Citizen Housing projects being built by three levels of government or church organizations, but operated by local community groups.

And so, Mr. Speaker, I repeat again that the budget is defective in that the Premier as Provincial Treasurer, did not find it necessary to say anything about this important activity.

My next comments will deal with one of the highlights of last year's budget, the section that provided gifts for the married couples. I am reading from page 36 of the Premier's Budget Speech last year, February 19th, he said:

During the last election campaign the Liberals promised to introduce an amendment to the Sales Tax Act which would allow newlyweds a refund on their first \$1,000 of household goods purchased. Newlywed couples, after February 19th may within a 12 month period, apply for refund of the sales tax paid on up to \$1,000 worth of major household furniture and appliances. It is estimated that this exemption from the sales tax will save married couples approximately \$300,000 annually.

Well, that sounded very interesting, didn't it? How is it working out? The Premier answered a question yesterday. In the first six months of the operation of the act, 49 couples had a refund.

Mr. Thatcher (Premier): — Over 500 now.

Mr. Nicholson: — We'll get that total another time. If the \$300,000 was correct there should be 7,500 couples a year and the legislation is over a year old now and for the first six months 49 couples received an average of \$38.70, a total of \$1,769. Well, that's a long piece from \$300,000. We're indebted to the young son of the member for Regina West (Mr. Blakeney) who introduced the word 'big deal'. This was a 'big deal'. It will take a long time yet before this \$300,000 goal is reached.

However, this isn't why I raised this particular question, Mr. Speaker. I have raised it on behalf of the disappointed young people in Saskatchewan. The other day I asked the treasury department to supply me with the forms that are used to get this refund. I sent for two copies and I have the two copies in my hand. I also have the correspondence from one of my constituents. This constituent tried to get the forms to apply for the refund in all the stores where they bought their supplies in Saskatoon. Not one of them had them and none of them seemed to be very keen about the legislation. So these people were sent from one place to another and finally got an application form where they get their automobile license. Now here are the instructions:

1. Answer all questions.
2. Forward one copy to treasury branch.

March 9, 1966

3. Application for refund must be presented not more than 12 months after purchase. (That's fine)
4. Must be attached to the application:
 - a. Documentary evidence such as an invoice, sales contract, bill of sale, showing that the tax in respect of which the application is made has been paid to the vendor.
 - b. A photostatic copy of the marriage certificate or reasonable facsimile thereof.

Well, this really was a roadblock. These people went to six different places in Saskatoon trying to get a photostatic copy of the marriage certificate. Now, they asked me, does the Premier think we are dishonest? Can he not find out in Regina whether or not we were married? Why do we have to have this red tape? This particular marriage certificate was in a 32 page book and the book wouldn't fit into the machines that usually make photostatic copies; but one man at last took the book apart. The certificate is in two languages and it took a good deal of work. The man who did the work was so annoyed with the government that he didn't charge for his time. They did everything that this document suggested including sending the photo copy of the marriage certificate. Now, what happens when they send this in and expected their money? Well again they got a form letter.

Dear Sir:

It happened to be a woman who did the correspondence, the wife.

Re: education health tax act.

On reviewing the documents submitted with your request for refund on purchases of household furniture and appliances, we found a number of discrepancies indicated below in the space marked X. In view of this we are returning your documents which must be resubmitted with your properly completed application form.

All right, first:

We require separate invoices from each place of business showing the individual amount of each purchase and the tax shown separately. The statement submitted by you shows only the total amount of purchases and . . .

And they circled in red the items that are out and here is one, here were drapes for one window, \$22.95.

All right here is a really good one:

Merchandise which costs less than \$25 may not be taken into consideration for the refund. We have circled in red the purchases on your invoices which may not be used in the tax computation for refund of tax.

I asked the Premier why did they not set this out when he brought in the budget last year? Why did he not set this out in the only instructions that I received in request for this information the other day? Why does this young couple have to be told at this stage that the drapes for one window costing \$22.95 have to be scratched out? For another window \$22.95, they are scratched out. And the drapes costing \$45.95 they can be included.

An Hon. Member: — Good salesman, boy!

Mr. Nicholson: — \$45 out of a total of \$95.15 is all that Saskatchewan's generous Minister of Finance will consider in establishing what a refund should be.

A photostatic copy of your marriage certificate or reasonable facsimile thereof has not been attached.

Will the Premier tell me any good reason why people living at Birch Hills or Valparaiso or Archerwill, or any of the thousand places in Saskatchewan, must be put to the expense of getting a photostatic copy of a marriage certificate or a reasonable facsimile thereof? Why? All the Premier has to do is to phone Vital Statistics and find out whether the people were married or not. Then this next one is a good one:

All the invoices do not indicate that the education and health tax has been paid to the supplier. Kindly have the supplier mark invoice tax paid.

Well, now here is one for \$20.75 for a coffee table. That's out. It didn't cost \$25 so the tax was 80 cents. No refund. But it was a big bill and it was marked "\$20.75 paid". According to the Premier there must be a separate bill for each item, they have to write on each one, tax paid. And for this other one, for the drapes, there would have to be a separate bill for each item and each item would have to have written on it, tax paid.

Oh yes, here is one. The Premier is asking each firm to write out for each item: Drapes, \$25.00 — tax paid. The fact that the bill is marked paid apparently isn't adequate — it must have tax paid. Purchases made more than 60 days prior to the date of the marriage may not be used in the tax computed for the refund. This says the date is February 20. In the speech last year the Premier said February 19th. He chiselled one day. When the Premier is closing the debate, I wish he would tell the house why he cannot check with vital statistics and find out whether in fact Mr. and Mrs. Brown were married on a given day. Would he be good enough to tell the house why he asked for a statutory declaration? Why does he send a young couple to a lawyer? I have some lawyer friends here. I don't know what they charge for this but apparently \$2 is not an unreasonable amount.

An Hon. Member: — Public service . . .

Mr. Nicholson: — Well, not all the people do that. There is at least one couple in Saskatoon that had to pay \$2.

Mr. Thatcher: — I'll answer you then.

Mr. Nicholson: — There are lawyers who are not members of the legislature and who do not do as much for free as members who are elected and get elected. Will the Premier tell the house why it is necessary to have a photostatic copy of a marriage license and why is it necessary for him to have an affidavit?

That I have not or has my spouse previously received a refund of education and health tax pursuant to section 13 of the Education Health Tax Act.

March 9, 1966

That the facts contained in the application for refund of tax on the reverse side of this declaration are true and I make this solemn declaration conscientiously believing it to be true and knowing that it has the same force and effect as if it had been under oath and by virtue of the Canada Pension Act.

I ask the Premier how much trouble would it be to have his staff 'phone to another branch of his department and find out for these 49 persons concerned whether or not they did receive a refund of tax paid. I think it is quite an easy matter to check the address, check the signature. I hope that the Premier will make some changes so that the young couples are not suspected of being dishonest the first time they have an application to the Premier of the province, as a result of his promise made a year ago that there would be \$40 made available to every couple. This young couple bought very modestly. They only bought \$542 worth of goods and in reply to the letter, "Wouldn't you like to wait till you have bought \$1,000." They can't buy a \$1,000. This is all they can buy in the first 12 months and I submit that the Premier should consider changing these regulations by doing two things; eliminating the request for the photostatic copy and eliminating the request to go to a notary public or a lawyer or a JP to make a sworn statement to give information which he has in his department.

I realize that the Premier needs a little time to answer. Just two or three things before I sit down.

The school authorities in Regina, Saskatoon, North Battleford, are all coming up with their plans for next year. Regina is expecting an increase in school rate 3.47; Saskatoon collegiate 3.06; Saskatoon separate, 3.06, and the North Battleford unit expects three mills increase unless the department helps by incentive grants. In all of these places they are saying that they hope to meet the Minister of Education (Mr. Trapp) and find out what the incentive grant is going to do for them. But after listening to the minister (Mr. Trapp) in the Throne Speech and the Budget Speech, no one here, no one anywhere, has any idea what plans the minister and the Provincial Treasurer have to distribute \$3,000,000 among the hard-pressed school authorities throughout the province.

Well, Mr. Speaker, it is obvious from what I have said the I will be voting for the amendment and against the motion.

Some Hon. Members: — Hear, hear!

Hon. W. Ross Thatcher (Premier): — Mr. Speaker, I have a few minutes to answer some of the arguments that have been made in this debate. Initially I suppose I should refer to the remarks made by the member for Saskatoon (Mr. Nicholson) who just took his seat.

I have known the hon. member for many years. I must say, although I don't agree very often with what he says in this house, that I think he is a pretty nice fellow. I have always got along not too badly with him.

In connection with the newlyweds' tax that he mentioned this afternoon, I can hardly believe that our department would have red tape of the kind he suggested. If it has, we will certainly take a look at the act tomorrow morning, and see if it can't be rectified. I may say that this tax exemption for newly-

weds is designed to help the little man, people who are having financial problems commencing their marriage. This is one more indication that the budget is not designed to help the rich as my hon. friends have suggested from time to time. Instead it is helping the kind of people who need help. In the first year about 411 married couples received this kind of assistance. We expect, of course, that there will be more in the coming year, because as young people learn of this legislation they will take advantage of it.

This has been a rather lengthy and somewhat humdrum debate. Many people perhaps would describe it as being a dull debate. Some of the speeches have been constructive. Others, in the main, have been political. Actually I have been amazed, Mr. Speaker, at the failure of the opposition to pin point any major weakness in this budget. Most of their criticisms, to say the least, have been pretty picayune.

Mr. J.H. Brockelbank (Kelsey): — You weren't in your seat.

Mr. Thatcher: — Here we have the financial critic and the Leader of the Opposition (Mr. Lloyd) both speaking in this debate and what was their big point? That mental patients aren't being carefully looked after! Most of the debate was whether the rooms that some of these patients were put in, were 12 x 14, or 20 x 27 and so on. Most of the time, the Socialists didn't talk about the budget at all. I suppose it's such a good budget, that they couldn't say much against it. Although in general the Socialists, most of them, wouldn't know a balance sheet from a load of hay. What were the main lines of argument of the CCF? First of all they said that the tax cuts of \$7,000,000 were not sufficient. Others said the budget did not contain tax cuts at all, or that they were given to the wrong people. Another argument was, that the increases in spending which amount to about \$40,000,000 were inadequate, or that in making the increases this government used the wrong priorities. Let us examine those two propositions.

First as to the suggestion that the tax cuts were not sufficient. Mr. Speaker, when they were in office whether it was in good times or in bad times, the Socialists introduced one budget after another sharply increasing the tax burden on our people. And it didn't matter whether the hon. member for Regina was the Treasurer or when the Leader of the Opposition (Mr. Lloyd) was the Treasurer, or when the member for Kelsey was the Treasurer, they all raised taxes and raised them sharply. I'll never forget back in 1961 when we were in the opposition, we asked a very simple question on the Order Paper. How many taxes and levies have been increased by this government from 1944 to 1961? Order no. 38 tabled in 1961 showed that in their first 16 or 16 1/2 years of office, the Socialists increased 650 taxes and levies and had introduced 600 completely new taxes and levies. In 1963 we wanted to know how many there had been in their first 18 years of office. My friend, the member for Kelsey (Mr. Brockelbank) wouldn't answer. He refused to answer the question, refused to give us information, Mr. Speaker.

Year after year and budget after budget, the Socialists always found some new way of milking the Saskatchewan taxpayer. In those two decades with one or two minor exceptions, in an election year the Socialists never brought in a budget with tax cuts. Socialist years and Socialist budgets, all had the same

March 9, 1966

trend, all had the same emphasis.

An Hon. Member: — Easy.

Mr. Thatcher: — Socialist budgets included higher and higher tax rates, more and more new levies. We reached the point in 1964 where "per capita taxes" in Saskatchewan, if not the highest in Canada, were mighty close to it. The two Liberal budgets, including the one we are now discussing, were designed to reduce the tax burden. We cut taxes in our first budget net by \$12,000,000. This budget cuts taxes net by \$7,000,000. I think most citizens, regardless of their politics are going to welcome this trend, and they will want it continued. The opposition critic, the hon. member for Regina West (Mr. Blakeney) and others, criticized the 1 cent per gallon increase in the gasoline tax. Many of his colleagues screamed "inexcusable". Yet when they were in office, what did the Socialists do with the gasoline tax? They didn't increase it 1 cent, Mr. Speaker, they increased it 7 cents, from 7 cents to 14 cents a gallon.

Some Hon. Members: — Hear, hear!

Mr. Thatcher: — Not only that but they steadily and consistently refused the farmer permission to use tax free gas in his farm trucks — a reform that this year will save the farmer \$4,000,000. Now in view of their action when they were in office, how hollow the criticism of the last ten days looks!

Mr. Walker: — It's even more . . .

Mr. Thatcher: — They talk about a one cent increase. No one likes the one cent increase in this budget in gasoline tax. But, Mr. Speaker, we think the increase can be justified because of our massive highway construction program, and by the new road assistance that we are giving the municipalities. Our people want better roads. The Liberals are going to build better roads, and we must have revenue for that purpose.

What about income tax? When they were in office the Socialists imposed a 6 per cent income surcharge. Our people had to pay 6 per cent more income tax than the people in all the rest of Canada, except in Manitoba where they had a 5 per cent surcharge.

An Hon. Member: — I can't hear you.

Mr. Thatcher: — This 6 per cent surcharge is one of the blessings of Socialism in Saskatchewan. This was the way the CCF-NDP practised "togetherness", "my brother's keeper" and so on. Liberals see no reason why the people of Saskatchewan should pay more income tax than other Canadians.

Mr. Nollet: — I can't hear you.

Mr. Thatcher: — So in this budget we reduced the surcharge from 6 per cent to 5 per cent. I may tell my hon. friends opposite that we are going to continue reducing this Socialist surtax, until the level is not higher than in other provinces. The financial critic was scornful of this tax cut. Why, he said, it will only save the

average taxpayer a few dollars; it's insignificant. Well, Mr. Speaker, the individual reduction may not be great, but the overall reduction is \$1,200,000. Surely the cut is welcome, surely the trend is refreshing.

Mr. Brockelbank (Kelsey): — . . . quite a bit.

Mr. Thatcher: — When the legislation comes down, I challenge any Socialist over there to vote against it. You don't dare, not even my friend, Berezowsky, the member for Cumberland, who voted against purple gas.

An Hon. Member: — How do you know?

Mr. Thatcher: — A number of Socialist speakers blamed the government for the fact that local governments raised their mill rates modestly in the past year. They claimed the rise in local mill rates was caused by the fact that the Liberal government gave inadequate provincial grants.

An Hon. Member: — This is right.

Mr. Thatcher: — Somebody says this is right. Mr. Speaker, if it was right last year, it must have been right for the 20 years the Socialists were in power. I want to remind this house and the people of Saskatchewan today, that while my hon. friends were the government, local taxes went up 400 per cent. This government recognizes that land and property taxes are too high, and in this budget we have set out to do something about it. It's the first time, Mr. Speaker, in 20 years that any government has done anything except talk about property taxes. We're acting.

First of all, this budget provides for a Home-owner grant to be paid to every rural and urban resident, with one small exception up in the Lloydminster area. During the debate, I noticed that the Socialists have had a lot of criticism about this Home-owner grant. So also has the Leader of the Conservative party. They said, "The right people aren't being helped", "It's being paid in the wrong manner", "Other tax cuts would have been more useful", and so on. But always at the end of their speeches, there were a few "weasel" words: "Of course, I am going to vote for it". Of course, they're going to vote for it, Mr. Speaker. They don't dare to do anything else, because this is good provincial legislation which is going to save the taxpayers of Saskatchewan from 8 to 10 million dollars.

My hon. friend from Swift Current (Mr. Wood), said: "The renters don't get the Home-owner grant". No, they don't, because they do not pay property taxes. This is designed to bring tax relief to those who pay property tax. My hon. friend, the Leader of the Conservative Party (Mr. Pederson) said he would support the Home-owner grant, but he didn't like the way the cheques were being sent out. He said: "It smacks of political patronage". Mr. Speaker, before we decided how we should pay the grant, how we should mechanically pass on the Home-owner grant, we studied many methods. We concluded that the method used by the Hon. John Diefenbaker in sending out acreage payments had a good deal of merit. Now surely, my hon. friend wouldn't accuse Honest John of using political patronage. Surely if it is all right for John to pay by cheque, it is all right for the Liberals. Mr. Speaker, as we pay these Home-owner grants, we are pioneering

March 9, 1966

a new field in Saskatchewan. If industrial development continues, Mr. Speaker, next year we will increase the amount of the Home-owner grant. The year after that I hope we can increase it again. I consider this to be one of the highlights of this budget.

Now, may I comment on the speech of the hon. member for Regina East (Mr. Baker). Henry said we should have paid more than \$50, that this sum really wasn't enough. The hon. member also said that really we weren't doing a very good job of cutting taxes, and we should have done a lot more. Mr. Speaker, I like the hon. member for Regina East, we're old friends. I think he has many attributes, but financial knowledge isn't one of them. I asked my department if they would find out how Regina taxes had gone since my hon. friend had been mayor. In 1959, the mill rate was 72. Henry became mayor that year. In 1960, they jumped to 74.5, in 1961 to 77, in 1962 to 78, 1963 to 80.5, in 1964 to 83.5, 1965 to 87.75. Goodness knows where they will be this year. I have found the mayor a big-time spender when he is spending our money.

Mr. Baker (Regina East): — We saved it.

Mr. Thatcher: — As I say the hon. member may have many qualifications and many attributes, but an understanding of finance certainly isn't one of them.

We are helping the property owner in other ways. This budget brings major assistance to local governments. I want to remind the house what we are doing for municipal people this year. We are providing educational grants as has been pointed out, in the amount of \$9,000,000, equalization grants of \$1,400,000, increasing grid road construction by \$800,000. We are giving \$1,000,000 for the first time in history, for the maintenance of grid roads. We started the snow removal program of \$250,000. The Saskatchewan Assistance Plan which helps people on social welfare, will ease the financial burden on the municipalities. When you add it all up, Mr. Speaker, the government instead of talking about increased aid to local government, is giving \$15,700,000 more in cash. I can tell you that the RMs are happy to have such assistance. This is just one more case where the Liberals act, while the Socialists talk. We think that these measures will help local governments this year to hold their mill rates. We hope, in the odd case to reduce their rates.

Now I will proceed with the second main criticism which the opposition has made, namely that the increases in spending which we are proposing aren't big enough, or that the wrong priorities have been used. For example, the financial critic (Mr. Blakeney) in his speech said that this budget is "perverse in its priorities". Mr. Speaker, I want to remind the house again that this year we are spending \$40,000,000 more than was spent a year ago.

Mr. Nollet: — 48.

Mr. Thatcher: — You don't understand arithmetic, the 8 is for the Home-owner grant. I shall point out the priorities we have used. Our first priority was education. Will any Socialist across the way say that we have been wrong in giving education our first priority? But the financial critic said, and I quote: "That this budget fails to open educational opportunity". Let us examine that statement. I said a moment ago that this year we are giving \$9,000,000 more in ordinary grants than in 1965. This brings the grants to education in 1966 to \$54,300,000. Again I remind

you, Sir, and the Socialists, and the people of Saskatchewan, that this year in grants we will give \$16,800,000 more than was ever given by the Socialists in a single year when they were in office. Not only that, Mr. Speaker, this year we are paying 54.5 per cent of the proportion of total cost with the federal government on the total share — 54.5 per cent. I ask, indeed I invite my hon. friend, to compare that figure with the 30 or 40 per cent that the Socialists paid during most of the years they were in office. The Liberals haven't talked about educational facilities, we have done something about it.

Then the financial critic of the opposition said:

The incentive grants for education outlined in the budget will kill more incentive than they will generate.

Another hon. member said that school trustees would resent the method being used to pay grants. I will tell the hon. friends opposite that the trustees were consulted throughout, while this legislation was being prepared. I believe members of that association are enthusiastically behind this new proposal. The Minister of Education (Mr. Trapp) has already corrected an erroneous statement by the member for Regina West, who stated that the incentive grant would only be paid to those school boards which froze their mill rates. We are making these grants to school boards which have been able to reasonably control operating costs of each school unit and district, when the incentive grants are paid.

I indicated in the Budget Speech that this year we are giving our University \$23,700,000. I ask hon. members to note that this compares with \$11,600,000 which was the highest amount ever given by the Socialists in a single year. The second highest amount they ever gave was \$5,600,000. I asked my department to go back and check every year the Socialists had been in power, and see how much money they gave to the University. The first year they were in office their total operating and capital grants were little over half a million dollars. In 1945-46 they were a little over \$600,000. In 1946-47, they gave \$1,000,000 and so on down the line. Mr. Speaker, I have figures here which indicate that the average amount the Socialists gave in their twenty years of office to the University of Saskatchewan for operating and capital grants was \$3,031,000 — \$3,031,000 was the average. Compare the average with the \$23,000,000 we are giving this year. Yet the Leader of the Opposition (Mr. Lloyd) has the audacity and the temerity to get up and say the Liberals aren't looking after higher education. Mr. Speaker, this party has given education a top priority. We have provided expenditures for education that were undreamed of under the Socialists. We're proud of this fact, because we believe there is no better investment that a government can make than an investment in its young people.

We have given a priority to health. We are giving a priority to highways, a major priority. This year we are spending \$50,000,000 on highways, maybe more if the minister can find enough equipment. I repeat that we are giving highways priority, because we don't think our people want the dirty, dusty, gravel roads that they had for so many years under the Socialists. We think our people want better roads and we are going to build them. I was amazed at the statement of the former Minister of Highways (Mr. Willis). He said the government is going "too fast" in road building. I'll certainly admit we are moving fast when you compare what happened under the Socialists. But I have

March 9, 1966

news for the member for Melfort-Tisdale (Mr. Willis). In future years we are going to go a lot faster. Then he said, "Imagine this government building a four-lane highway between Moose Jaw and Regina." Mr. Speaker, with that kind of attitude is it any wonder we didn't get decent roads in this province for so many years? Almost every province in Canada, every state in the union for years had some four-lane highways. Why shouldn't the people of Saskatchewan also? The Liberals are going to build them, and they are not going to build them at the expense of rural routes elsewhere. We think we can have both.

In other words, Mr. Speaker, in this budget the Liberal priorities have been education, health, highways and agriculture. We have also increased spending on resource development, industrial development and recreation. We think these are good priorities. We think they are sound priorities. We think they are needed priorities. The Socialists have claimed that this is a budget for the rich man. It doesn't help the poor. Sometimes I get sick and tired, Mr. Speaker, of the sanctimonious trip peddled by the Socialists. Repeatedly they assume that no one could have any humane motives or any human thoughts of anyone except members on their side.

What does this budget do? Let's look at it. First of all, it's going to increase social aid payments across the board by 6 per cent. It's helping the indigents in this province, the unemployed, the old people. Is that helping the rich? I don't think so. Secondly, it's providing free text books for all students in Grade IX. Isn't that going to help the people in the ordinary brackets? I think it is. The \$50 Home-owner grant will help a lot of people in the lower income group. And we have exempted another 13 farm items. My hon. friends opposite can laugh if they like but the farm organizations asked for it. I remind you that in the two budgets we have now exempted 37 items from the farm class.

In addition, last year we reduced the sales tax from 5 to 4 per cent, we provided purple gas, mineral tax exemption, and so on. I could spend half the day telling how we are helping the little man.

I see I have two minutes so I have to hurry along. I want to sum this budget up, Mr. Speaker. This is an expanding budget.

Mr. Robbins: — It only takes . . .

Mr. Thatcher: — Well, my hon. friend, the pipsqueak from Saskatoon who is a second Shakespeare, should not talk so much.

This is an expanding budget, for an expanding economy and in an expanding province. It's designed primarily to encourage economic development which will provide jobs for our people. At the same time it permits a financial surplus, repayment of debt and tax reduction. When these accomplishments are compared with the budgets of the Socialists over a 20 year period, yes, and when they are compared with budgets of other provincial governments this year, I feel Liberals can take some satisfaction.

I will remind the house again of what happened in wealthy Ontario just a month ago, when the Tory government increased taxes by \$200,000,000. This budget reiterates the faith that Liberals have in private and responsible enterprise. It rejects the dead hand and stagnation of Socialism. It indicates that at

long last our resources are going to be opened up, developed, used to improve living standards for all our people.

Some Hon. Members: — Hear, hear!

The amendment was negatived on the following recorded division:

Yeas — 25

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

Nays — 32

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

Motion agreed to.

On the motion of the Hon. Mr. Steuart, the assembly adjourned at 5.28 o'clock p.m.