

LEGISLATIVE ASSEMBLY OF SASKATCHEWAN
Fourth Session - Fifteenth Legislature
4th Day

Tuesday, February 7, 1967.

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

WELCOME TO STUDENTS

MRS. SALLY MERCHANT (Saskatoon City): — Mr. Speaker, I know that Members of the House would like to join with me in welcoming a group of students from the University of Saskatchewan, the Saskatoon campus. The International Student Club is with us, accompanied by members of the Debating Directory from the University of Saskatchewan at that campus. They are going to be with us all day and they are going to be with us at dinner tonight. I hope that as many Members as possible will join us at dinner. I know Members will join me now in welcoming them here.

SOME HON. MEMBERS: Hear, hear!

MR. A.M. NICHOLSON (Saskatoon City): — Mr. Speaker, I would like to add a word of welcome too. I might say that I had the honour last week of acting as Speaker at the Student Assembly. I tried to keep in mind the traditions that you've established in this Chamber, Mr. Speaker. I would like to say to all the House that a very high standard has been set by the students at this forum and I hope that many of the young people will some day participate in politics at municipal, provincial or national level. We are all delighted that so many international students have decided that Saskatoon or Regina, Saskatchewan, at any rate is the place to come for postgraduate work and we're delighted to have the international students with us again this year.

SOME HON. MEMBERS: Hear, hear!

MR. M.P. PEDERSON (Arm River): — Mr. Speaker, I would hope that Members of this Assembly would join with me in welcoming a group of students from the constituency of Arm River, and specifically the village of Liberty. They are accompanied by their teacher, Mr. Thompson. They are up in the Speaker's gallery and from this position, I can see two or three of them. I hope that they will have a very pleasant stay here this afternoon and I want specifically to wish them well in their basketball game this evening against the Regina Girl Champs. I think it takes courage for a little community to tackle a team like that. I wish them well.

SOME HON. MEMBERS: Hear, hear!

MR. E. KRAMER (The Battlefords): — Mr. Speaker, I would like to draw the attention of the House to the fact that there are a group of students in the Speaker's gallery, accompanied by some drivers. They are mostly members of the New Democratic Youth Party and there are also a number of high school students among them from North Battleford. Mrs. Boskill is with them, Mr. Voegell and Mr. and Mrs. Dean. I'm sure all members would like to welcome this group to the Legislature.

SOME HON. MEMBERS: Hear, hear!

HON. D.V. HEALD (Lumsden): — Mr. Speaker, it is my pleasure to advise you and all Hon. Members of the House this afternoon that seated in the Speaker's gallery are 36 students from Pilot Butte, the village of Pilot Butte in my constituency. They are accompanied by Mr. Dousz, the principal, Mr. Antochow, one of their teachers, and Mr. Norman Lolacher, the bus driver. I know that you would want me, Sir, to welcome them most sincerely to the Legislature. They've had a very interesting day thus far. I hope that the proceedings which follow will not detract from the interesting places they've been and the interesting things they have heard earlier today. I am sure that we would all like to make them welcome. While I'm on my feet, I hope the Member from Arm River (Mr. Pederson) will forgive me if I too welcome the students from Liberty because I was born in the village of Liberty and spent the first half of my life in that village. And I'm like him, I haven't been there for awhile and I don't recognize very many of them either. I think if their fathers and mothers were here, I would recognize them. I'd like to welcome them to the House as well.

SOME HON. MEMBERS: Hear, hear!

MR. E. WHELAN (Regina North): — Mr. Speaker, I'm pleased to introduce to this House a 110 students in the east gallery from Sherwood school in northwest Regina. They are from a team teaching wing of that school. There are two classes of grade six students and two classes of grade five students. Their teacher, vice-principal, John Harvey, Mrs. Stusek, Miss Cooper and Mr. Leachman, are with them. I'm sure our Members join me in expressing the wish that their stay with us will be informative and educational.

SOME HON. MEMBERS: Hear, hear!

ANNOUNCEMENT RE PURCHASE OF LAND APPLICATIONS

HON. D.T. McFARLANE (Minister of Agriculture): — Mr. Speaker, before the

February 7, 1967

Orders of the Day are proceeded with, I thought it would be of interest to Members of the Legislature to learn that applications are now being invited for 25 quarter sections of land purchased by the Department of Agriculture in the southern end of the Broderick district of the South Saskatchewan River Development project. The land that is to be made available lies in the area south of township 29 in which most of the irrigation system will be constructed this year and for which we expect water will be available in 1968, perhaps during the latter part of that year.

It is expected that these lands will be used for three purposes. One, for the enlargement of farms that are near the project; two, for the establishment of complete units; and three, for forage project plots by nearby dryland farmers who have cattle. The forage plots will be leased. The land to go into an irrigation unit, whether to enlarge on existing ones or to make up a new one, will be offered on a ten-year lease basis with a firm option to buy any time after the fifth year. Prices in the option will be related to productivity under irrigation and take into account the cost of development. They will be scaled to recover as nearly as possible the full cost to the Government of the acquisition program based on the 1966-67 purchase schedule. While a rigid approach to farm sizes is not being taken, the average target size will be roughly 320 acres irrigable, rating four dry land acres the equivalent of one irrigated acre. In selecting applicants, I may point out resources and ability must be main factors. Preference will generally be given to those for whom irrigation cropping will be their main enterprise.

SOME HON. MEMBERS: Hear, hear!

QUESTION RE COST OF FARM IMPLEMENTS

MR. F.A. DEWHURST (Wadena): — Mr. Speaker, before the Orders of the Day, I would like to ask the Government if it is planning to submit a brief to the Federal enquiry on the cost of farm implements which is meeting in this city tomorrow.

HON. W. ROSS THATCHER (Premier): — No, Mr. Speaker.

MR. PEDERSON: — Mr. Speaker, before the Orders of the Day, I would like to direct a question to the Minister of Agriculture in connection with the announcement he made. Did I understand him to say 25 full sections or 25 quarter sections and could he also give the House the information where application such as this can be made? Who are they to be made to?

MR. McFARLANE: — The Lands Branch, the Department of Agriculture or to

our office in Outlook.

HON. D.G. STEUART (Minister of Natural Resources): — Mr. Speaker, I wonder by leave of the House if we may leave the questions further until later on this day. If this is agreeable to the House, may I ask any of the Ministers who have the answers to questions that appear on the Order Paper if they would file these with the pages and have them turned into the Clerk.

MR. SPEAKER: — Request has been made that we will leave questions until later this day and return thereto.

Questions deferred.

ADJOURNED DEBATES

ADDRESS IN REPLY

The Assembly resumed the adjourned debate on the proposed motion of Mr. J.B. Hooker (Notukeu-Willowbunch) for an Address In Reply.

HON. W.S. LLOYD (Leader of the Opposition): — Mr. Speaker, first of all I would like to join in the welcome that has been extended to our various visitors in the Legislature this afternoon. We enjoy each year an increasing number of younger people from our schools around the province. I will join with the Attorney General (Mr. Heald) in his expression of hope that nothing that happens from now on will detract from the pleasure of the visit they have had so far. I am pleased to see back with us again also, Mr. Speaker, representatives of various groups from the university. This has been a practice in the House for many years. It was interrupted briefly last year and I am pleased to see it was interrupted very briefly. Now all of us welcome students from our own province. I am sure that all of us in particular have a very warm welcome to those who come to Saskatchewan to study from outside of our province and outside of our country. We can only hope that we live up to their expectations in coming here.

SOME HON. MEMBERS: Hear, hear!

MR. LLOYD: — Mr. Speaker, when I spoke yesterday, I used most of my time in making reference to the comments made by the mover and the seconder of this motion that is now before us. This afternoon I want to comment on a number of matters in the Speech from the Throne and more particularly on a number of matters that are not in the Throne Speech but which ought to be there. I'll speak of the Saskatchewan economy, the things we can't learn

February 7, 1967

from the headlines but which we might learn from the statistics. Something about some policies for agriculture, some needed policies in the field of transportation in the province. I want to comment in regard to our Indian population and what we as a Province might do to assist them in their difficulties. Certainly I want to have something to say about education. Before proceeding to proposals in these various areas, I want to first of all attempt some analysis of the Speech from the Throne, also some analysis of the Government approach to the problems of Saskatchewan.

You may recall, Mr. Speaker, that the Leader Post in the byline the day after the Speech, said this:

Consumer protection, back-bone of legislative program.

Well, it may be but if so it is a back-bone consisting of one vertebra and one vertebra only. That one vertebra was the reference to legislation which will be placed before us to provide disclosure of the cost of credit. This is a proposal which the Member from Hanley (Mr. Walker) put before this Legislature last year. We welcome it. May I say it represents the absolute minimum which the Government could get away with. I submit that one vertebra doesn't really make a back-bone. But that was the Leader Post byline. The headline said this:

Hints of Saskatchewan Tax Increases.

Probably the most definite statement in the Throne Speech was this one:

You will be asked to consider ways and means of finding additional funds to support hospital services.

Now, in plain English that means increased taxes. It means the second increase in taxes for hospitalization purposes by this Government in its two years of office. The first increase you will remember began in 1964. At that time the premium for medical and hospital insurance was raised by \$20 a family or by some 38 per cent. If consumer protection was the back-bone, I am not quite sure what part of the anatomy is represented by tax increases. When the Liberals sat over here they seemed to suggest that tax increases were useless and unnecessary. Probably we have to think of it as an appendix. It is a part of the body which can give government some difficulty as the Government now is finding out, as the Government of Manitoba has evidently found out as well.

Then considering the snail's rate of progress of providing additional technical education facilities, I wonder what part of the anatomy one could call a statement like the claim:

Great strides have already been taken for expansion of facilities for trades and technical courses.

What could one call the claim that there is at Weyburn, an "advanced technical training centre"? Certainly nothing less than some badly diseased glands could produce such a distorted vision of that kind.

Then consider this gem in the Speech with reference to:

The giant South Saskatchewan project is now nearing completion.

Nothing less than gall would allow a Liberal Government to attempt to take any credit for that particular project.

SOME HON. MEMBERS: Hear, hear!

MR. LLOYD: — Most of us will remember that it began in 1958. It began after an enraged Canadian people had kicked a Liberal Government out of office at Ottawa. It began after a Conservative Government and a Provincial Government went to work to build what is now called the Gardiner Dam. I submit that only one project in all Canadian history has ever been delayed longer or has ever been used as bait in more election campaigns than the South Saskatchewan River Dam. That project — everybody knows the answer — is the Liberal promise to produce medicare for Canada. I can hardly wait to see the glowing terms and the superlative phrases which the next issue of the Government's propaganda sheet will use to tell us how lucky we are to have such an all-embracing Throne Speech put before us on Thursday last.

There are some items, Mr. Speaker, in that Speech which we welcome very heartily. As I have indicated the Throne Speech proposes a Bill to be presented dealing with the disclosure of the cost of credit. Since this is similar, I trust it will be, to a bill which the Member from Hanley (Mr. Walker) attempted to introduce last year, we obviously will welcome this Bill.

In regard to consumer protection, I suggest it is unfortunate that the Government didn't go further and follow more completely the lines urged by a Resolution moved last year by the Member from Saskatoon (Mr. Robbins). I regret that in the list of items under Citizens' Safeguards I find no reference to the establishment of an office of an Ombudsman or a Legislative Commissioner. You may recall this was urged in the Legislature last year and the year before by the Member for Regina West (Mr. Blakeney).

In this respect, Mr. Speaker, there is one more omission which I trust the Government will correct this session. I believe the Attorney General (Mr. Heald) has already indicated some interest in it. Recent events in Canada should have suggested to the Government that this one more measure was obviously needed to protect the rights of citizens. In recent months many Canadians have been shocked and some have been robbed by the failure and the bankruptcy of some financial institutions. The most recent episode is of course that surrounding the Prudential Finance Corporation. The tragedy of these events is that so many small depositors lost their life savings, lost them at a time when they had every reason to believe that these assets were perfectly safe. We don't need to be concerned about the speculator. The Windfall investors were looking for a windfall. Certainly we must be immensely concerned about the person who is looking to these investments in the form such as those offered by Prudential as some degree of freedom from fear and freedom from want in their old age.

February 7, 1967

Now that the horse has been stolen for many people, the Federal Government I am glad to hear is taking action. Last week Bill C-261, called an Act to Establish the Canada Deposit Insurance Corporation, was introduced in the House of Commons. Under this legislation all financial institutions under federal jurisdiction will be required to take deposit insurance. Provincially incorporated finance companies will be included, as I understand it, only if the company makes application and if the Provincial Government concerned gives its consent. I hope that the Government will introduce whatever legislation is necessary and take whatever action is necessary to bring these companies in Saskatchewan under this kind of umbrella. This would mean that there would be some added degree of protection for our consumers. Credit Unions, as we know, have already taken some such action in this respect. A year from now may be too late to protect some people who deserve some protection. The time to do it is now, this session.

We welcome, Mr. Speaker, the legislative proposals based on the report of the Committee on Highway Safety. And again some Members will remember that this committee was proposed in 1964 session of the Legislature. A motion with respect to it was introduced by two of our Members in 1965. A committee was subsequently set up. We welcome what looks like beneficial legislation flowing from it.

Last year in this Legislature the Member from Moose Jaw (Mr. Davies) urged action regarding the portability of pensions. This year the Throne Speech says that some action in this respect will be taken.

The Throne Speech also reminds us that we have a Royal Commission on the cost of living, and so we have. I think perhaps it's relevant just to repeat a little bit of the history of this Commission. It will be remembered that on September the 7th, last year, we put a Resolution on the Order Paper urging an inquiry into the cost of living. Subsequent to that we had housewives' boycotts and meetings and questions raised throughout the province. The Government finally began talking about some form of inquiry. All the while price increases were continuing. Then the Premier of Alberta announced from Edmonton that they and we were going to have some kind of inquiry in this regard. Then on December 7th, 1966, the day before the Legislature was to meet, the Government passed an Order in Council setting up this Commission. On December 6th we tried to introduce our Resolution on the agenda. The Member on the Government side argued that because a Royal Commission had been established the subject consequently became untouchable by mere Members of the Legislature. In fact, Mr. Speaker, the Government at that time used its majority to apply closure on that particular discussion. On December 9th the next day, one member of the Commission who had been appointed on December 7th resigned. On January 19th the Commission advertised formal meetings in the city of Regina to begin just three or four days later on. Now on February 2nd, the Government in the Throne Speech tells us again that a Commission has been set up.

Mr. Speaker, Members on this side of the House have already presented a brief to this Commission. It is not my intention this afternoon to review our presentation. I do want to say something about some of the remarks in this respect

which were made by the mover of the Speech from the Throne, (Mr. Hooker), yesterday. You will recall he was talking about costs of living particularly as it affects our farm population. He came out with the resounding statement that both management and labor had some responsibility to show more responsibility. Nobody is going to disagree with this statement. Having then placed himself solidly on the side of motherhood he began to put all the blame for the increase of cost of living on one party. He pulled out all of the hoary, hackneyed, purple prose phrases about trade union leaders that people such as sit opposite too frequently pull out. He forgot to mention any of the other reasons as to why living costs have been going up. As a matter of fact he used statistics for one year and suggested that because in that particular year wages had gone up more than productivity the fault was due to just wages. Now, Mr. Speaker, I will admit that there is room for a great deal of discussion. I am sure all groups of people are interested in getting some better answers to the solving of these problems.

Now I want to read for the benefit of the Member just one or two quotations which we used in our brief to the Royal Commission, in commenting on this matter of costs. The first that I read is from the September 7th, 1966 issue of the newspaper, The Prairie Messenger, which is printed in Humboldt and which quotes a point of view somewhat different from that which the mover of the motion (Mr. Hooker) seemed to be supporting yesterday. It said this:

Figures prove that profits generally across the country are better than ever. If the business barometer is better than ever why shouldn't the laborer be more worthy of his hire than ever? If the laborer has more than enough to get by won't his additional spending power contribute to the consumption of goods and general productivity? Canadians are having their patience put to the test by the growing number of strikes. In our opinion it is unfair to put the blame on labor for the present labor management unrest.

As I commented the Hon. Member used one figure with respect to one year to illustrate the relationship between wages and productivity. Now let me quote a statement which appeared in the Toronto Globe and Mail just a few months ago by their business columnist, Ronald Anderson. This is what he said:

Between 1961 and 1965 average hourly earnings increased by 15.8 per cent, output per man in the commercial industries rose during the same period by 18.5 per cent.

Average hourly earnings up 15.8, output per man during the same period 18.5 per cent. Finally I want to read a comment which come from a Federal Department of Labour study on wage determination in Canada and which was published in April, 1965. This study said this:

On the whole wage behavior in Canada tends to be dominated by economic factors; therefore, under present conditions there appears little likelihood of wages being a casual factor in price inflation. In the past decade at least, on the basis of what little

February 7, 1967

evidence there is wage movements do not appear to have exerted a serious push on prices.

Mr. Speaker, there is enough in those to at least cast serious doubt on the kind of conclusions which the mover of the Resolution came to, or suggested in his remarks yesterday. I would urge one thing that is necessary with respect to the Royal Commission and that is that the government see that the Royal Commission has enough funds for research and hopefully we can find some better answer. In spite of the Government's dislike and distrust of research generally, I hope it gives the Commission some staff so that they have a chance. In the meantime I trust the Government doesn't feel that it has discharged all its responsibility without respect to consumer protection; some of these we are certainly going to raise on another occasion.

Mr. Speaker, the real statements in the Speech from the Throne are those that aren't there. The real test in this Government's plan for Saskatchewan are not in the anaemic document put before us last Thursday. The real test lies in first the problem ignored; secondly in the promises broken and (they hope) buried beneath piles of newsprint. Let me comment on some of these problems and some of these promises. I want to state from 15 or perhaps 16 ways in which promises have been broken and problems ignored.

First of all there is a need for a Municipal Finance Corporation, something that has been urged by municipal organization and something that has been supported by Members on this side of the House. We need to do better than we have to ensure that there is capital to finance some essential community services - school, hospitals, water and sewage systems. This is a need which should have been crystal clear to anyone who attended the Provincial-Local Government Conference in December of 1965. Obviously the Government failed to recognize the need as stated at that conference. It did nothing at all to meet it in 1966. As a result the Local Government Board in instance after instance has found itself later in 1966 having to deny communities the opportunity to go ahead with some very essential developments - schools, hospitals, sewage disposal systems. The Speech from the Throne completely ignores the problem for 1967. The question before this legislature then is how many more communities in 1967 will be denied the chance to provide themselves with necessary community facilities. Will, for example, the North Battleford Comprehensive School for which Liberals have been claiming credit for over two years be again postponed? Will, for example, Saskatoon be still unable to go ahead with necessary improvements in its sewage system? There are a dozen other questions about a dozen other communities that could be asked also.

Secondly, in 1964 the Liberals waxed eloquently about a promise to provide prescription drugs as a benefit under medicare. The 1967 Speech from the Throne is as eloquently silent in this area as were the others in 1966 and 1965. One more promise broken.

Thirdly, of the need for a government agency to represent and advance the interest of the consumers generally, nothing is said. One more hope delayed.

Fourth, about a base hospital in Regina to serve southern Saskatchewan, another 1964 Liberal promise, nothing is said. One more promise broken.

Fifthly, a needed further extension to the base hospital at the University of Saskatchewan in Saskatoon, already delayed by the present Government, nothing is said.

Sixth, of measures to reverse the continuing drop in Saskatchewan's livestock population and the resulting decrease in agricultural diversification practically nothing is said.

Seventh, there is no assurance that fees for university students won't increase again this year as they did last year immediately after the session of the Legislature finished. Nor is there any recognition on the part of the Government of the principle of universal accessibility to educational opportunities.

Eighth, of a speed-up in plans to provide an adequate supply of nurses nothing is said.

Ninth, of a speed-up in plans to provide an adequate supply of teachers, nothing is said.

Ten, of any measure to check the increasing rate of depopulation of the province, nothing is said.

Eleven, of plans to assist small communities daily becoming more and more threatened by abandonment of branch rail lines, nothing is said.

Twelfth, of plans to deal with needed assistance for farmers with limited acreage to alleviate the cost-crush squeeze on them and to check the unplanned exodus of such farmers, nothing is said.

Thirteenth, a protest about the conspicuous increases of costs as those of farm machinery and truck tires, nothing is said.

Fourteen, of the promise of the Liberal party to reduce local property taxes, nothing is said, indeed the opposite is almost certain from what's in the Speech from the Throne.

Fifteen, of the serious decrease in building homes for Saskatchewan people, nothing is said.

Mr. Speaker, 15 ways there in which pressing problems of Saskatchewan people go unrecognized in the 1967 Liberal program. Surely a record, Mr. Speaker, even for the Government that sits opposite.

SOME HON. MEMBERS: Hear, hear!

MR. LLOYD: — It is a function of government to be aware of needs which are not being met. It is a function to be aware of needs of the individual people or the total economy which are not being met. After awareness can come plans and programs to meet those needs. Without awareness there will be no such

February 7, 1967

plans and I suggest the present Government is not even aware of the necessity of many of these things I have been talking about.

It will be evident that to meet these needs requires the expansion of many kinds of activity. In particular it requires a great expansion in the public sector, education, hospitals, health care, housing water supply - both in quantity and quality, recreation, community planning. For many people these needs will be filled by public programs or they will not be filled at all. That is why, I submit, they won't be met by the Government that sits opposite. The party which presently directs government in Saskatchewan will reject any major emphasis on enlarging the public sector. Every public utterance of the leadership rejects such emphasis. This is particularly true when the leadership makes speeches to certain kinds of people in the United States, about which I am going to have something to say very shortly. This party rejects the enlargement of public action as a matter of principle and as a matter of philosophy. Their basic emphasis since becoming the Government has been to shift a share of the public sector of activity to private responsibility. This is what they did, for example, with regard to care for mentally disturbed youngsters. You will recall the closing of Embury House. You will recall now the inviting of private groups to come in and fill the gap which was caused by the closing of this public facility. This has been true with respect to education costs where there has been a shift to the local governments and a shift to the individual student. This shifting away from public responsibility is true in the field of health. We have already had an increase in personal premiums. We are told this year we are going to have some more increases. Well, Mr. Speaker, I understand there is going to be some new charges on water introduced. I read in one paper that one town councillor looking at this made the comment, "When are they going to start charging us for air?" I admit now that I am guilty of quoting headlines rather than statistics, I will try not to copy any of the other bad habits of the parties opposite, Mr. Speaker.

But there has been undoubtedly a rejection of the value of public programs by the Government that sits opposite. Because of this rejection the Government is on a collision course with the future. It's a collision between a 19th century philosophy and a 20th century world of expectations and needs.

SOME HON. MEMBERS: Hear, hear!

MR. LLOYD: — I want to demonstrate, Mr. Speaker, some of the reasons why I come to that conclusion. I will demonstrate the willingness of the Government to punish the public sector by referring to two separate sets of facts. Some of these facts indeed demonstrate not only their willingness to punish the public

sector but an anxiety to get on with the job of punishing it. The first set of facts to which I refer is the Public Accounts for the year 1965 and 1966. This is a record of the Government's actions during the year as reflected by its spending. This record indicates the Government's readiness to deny many public programs, the Government's readiness to hold back on many programs most necessary for some of our most unfortunate citizens. These Public Accounts demonstrate the willingness of the Government to weigh dollar against people's welfare. They demonstrate the fact that in such a way people have lost. My particular reference is to the ways in which the Government under-expended money voted by the Legislature. Very frequently this under-expenditure is on projects which were introduced with a great deal of political fanfare. Let's look at some statistics, not at the headlines, to get some of the facts.

Take first of all the expenditures under Capital for Public Works. I refer to six items of under-expenditure:

(a) Education, 75 per cent of the approximately \$120,000 was not spent. It should be noted that for every dollar not spent the province had to forgo the use of some three dollars of Federal money along with it. (b) The South Saskatchewan base hospital in Regina, \$100,000 voted, 100 per cent of it not spent. (c) The Sanatorium at Saskatoon, \$111,000 or 85 per cent not spent. (d) Provincial Correctional Institute for Women at Prince Albert, 75 per cent not spent. (e) Dales House in Regina, the home for the care of unfortunate children, 98 per cent of the money not spent. You will note, Mr. Speaker, that all of these are developments particularly related to human values, the range of human values. The range of under-expenditure in all of them was from 75 per cent to 100 per cent.

Secondly, take under-expenditure of (a) the Department of Welfare, over a quarter of a million dollars (almost 10 per cent of the money voted) for assistance to our old people, not spent. (b) The Bureau of Alcoholism, 42 per cent, almost half not spent. (c) During a period when Saskatchewan lost many of its valuable Social Welfare Workers, almost 20 per cent of the educational assistance money available to help train more workers, unspent.

Thirdly, for Northern Housing, almost one third of it not spent.

Fourthly, for education, 70 per cent of the money for international student scholarships not spent. Since then the program which should have been expanded has been wiped out altogether. (b) The grant to the Student Aid Fund for Scholarships was another source tapped by the Government to add to its surplus. Over \$120,000 remained unspent. Over 60 per cent of the total voted was not spent. If it had been spent, it could have provided help for over 500 Saskatchewan students. This

February 7, 1967

goes a long way toward explaining the remarks of the Member from Moosomin (Mr. Gardner) yesterday when he said that Government of Canada loans had made other forms of assistance to students obsolete. As I said then the thing that's obsolete is the idea of the Liberal party about assistance to students.

SOME HON. MEMBERS: Hear, hear!

MR. LLOYD: — Let's have a look at expenditure with respect to health. (a) Venereal disease control, 70 per cent unspent. (b) The operation of the Psychiatric Centre at Yorkton, 30 per cent unspent. (c) Recruitment of health personnel - a very competitive area - 70 per cent underspent.

Take a look at the Department of Municipal Affairs. In the very essential area of Community Planning over 20 per cent unspent. For municipal winter works over 40 per cent not spent, and finally some \$3,500,000 provided for loans to municipalities for various purposes was not spent.

All of these I suggest - others that could be compiled - indicate the willingness of the Government and its readiness to restrict its spending on public programs at the expense of the needs of the people. That is one set of facts.

The second set of facts, Mr. Speaker, to illustrate the attitude of the Government toward public programs are statements made by the Premier of our province. He made frequently repeated talks outside of Canada. It's important to notice not only the substance of what he said. It is important also to notice at whose invitation these speeches were given. Let me first of all refer to a speech given at the Town Hall in Los Angeles last year. This impressed the Southern California Edison Company so they thought they should summarize it and comment on it in a very handsome kind of pamphlet like this. They begin by saying, "It's a shame that so few people heard his speech and that so little news coverage was given to it." Well, maybe so. They felt it necessary to reveal it under the title of Saskatchewan's Experiment in Socialism for the benefit of their employees. I wonder why they were so keen on having their employees hear this or read it. I doubt very much if it was to influence their employees in favor of, say, public ownership and operation of power utilities. I doubt very much if it was to influence their employees that such things as public medical care programs were good.

Since so many people saw it and it was so poorly reported, the Edison Company then invited our Premier back, and somebody was good enough to send me the text of the speech made by the Hon. W. Ross Thatcher, Premier of Saskatchewan, at the 34th annual Edison Electric Institute convention in San Francisco, California, Wednesday, June 8, 1966 at 10:00 a.m. Well, more

people should read that too, Mr. Speaker. Well, we raise the question: who is the Edison Electric Institute? Who were the people so anxious to hear these kind of comments about Socialism? Well, the Edison Electrical Institute has a membership of some 200 private electrical power companies in South America, private power companies who are ready to fight to the death against public power, who are ready to fight to the death against any public utility, private power companies who are ready to fight to the death against any public utility, private power companies who are ready to fight to the death against any public program, be it for development or people's welfare in general. These are the cream of corporate enterprises; these are Goldwater people, these are Reagan people and these are the hosts and sponsors of the Saskatchewan Liberal leader as he added to the mental smog of California. Let me just give you a few examples of the things he says when he is away from home: "Every fisherman who caught a fish, forced by law to sell to the Government" - false.

SOME HON. MEMBER: — Did you . . .

MR. LLOYD: — Yes, it was false and if you don't know it, you should know it. "Every purchaser of auto license forced to buy his insurance from the Government" - false. Some basic insurance, yes, not all. Let me ask the next question. Does the Premier object? Does he object to this procedure? He's had two years to change this and the only change has been to increase the cost and decrease the benefits. He complains about it down there. He talked to them about a mass exodus of population and the reference was that the population trend was better. Absolutely and completely false. He was speaking in June and at that moment, Mr. Speaker, the increase in population for the previous 12 months had been a lowly 3,000, the lowest it had been for many years in this province. He is quoted as saying, "Royalties and bonus bids for oil last year was \$40,000,000 compared to \$18,000,000 the last year under the Socialists." Not only false once but false twice in one sentence. Only a master mind like the Premier could arrange to be false twice in the same sentence. The entire speech, Mr. Speaker, a cleverly designed, if poorly concealed attack on the value of public programs. But finally in the speech came one bit of light. Referring to these representatives of the cream of corporate enterprise, the private power companies, he said: "We are all aware that your policies largely determine our destinies". Well, no wonder he doesn't care, as he said yesterday, "who controls the affairs of the Bank of Western Canada." No wonder he says that he didn't have time to think about that. He didn't have time to think about that, but lots of time to go to San Francisco and on a couple of occasions to other places and make statements of this kind.

Now a summary of this most flagrant misrepresentation about our Province of Saskatchewan was picked up by one of these

February 7, 1967

private companies, the Pacific Gas and Electric Company. They sent it around, not only in their staff bulletin, but they sent it out with their light and power bills to the customers and quite a few of them they even sent to me. Now does one think that the Pacific Gas and Electric Company and private power companies in the States are really that much concerned about fishermen or that much concerned about Saskatchewan farmers? But what they are concerned about, Mr. Speaker, is protecting the privileges of private power down there; they are concerned about stopping such community public developments as Medicare. And they find in the Premier of Saskatchewan, a new Messiah to help them along with their aches.

And then finally, Mr. Speaker, another sponsor and supporter, applauder, and probably financier of Saskatchewan's Liberal leader distributed some more. This time the helpmate was the California branch of the American Medical Association, an organization which has spent millions to hold back public medicare of the simplest kind.

Now, to get the significance of these remarks, two questions are necessary. First, who is helping to spread these outright distortions about our province? Who is helping to do it? Private power companies who oppose every progressive measure ever taken any place, companies who would dearly love to own Saskatchewan Power Corporation, companies who would gladly help the Premier find a buyer for Saskatchewan Government Insurance, companies who would gladly finance the sale of Saskatchewan Sodium Sulphate which the Premier said it was willing to sell at a price last year, probably companies who would like to do something else and who do something else, that is to contribute large sums of money to any political party willing to oppose the extension of any public program anywhere.

The second one is a very natural ally of the Saskatchewan Liberal party, namely the California Branch of the American Medical Association - the world's two leading opponents of public health programs together in the same breath, Mr. Speaker.

The second question is this. Who is feeding them these kind of distortions? The answer I have already given you. It is the leader of the Liberal party who happens now, on a minority vote, to be in command of the Government of Saskatchewan, a leader, I suggest, prepared to sell the reputation and birthright of his province for a mess of pottage made up of some congratulatory newspaper clippings and probably contributions to the Liberal party of Saskatchewan. I suggest that his own supporters in the Legislature and outside the Legislature ought to be saying to him, something like this, - "When you leave our country, you ought at least to pretend that you represent all the people of the province and tell the truth about this province."

I want to read, Mr. Speaker, a few comments that came from a letter written by a native of California. It is a letter which was sent to the Premier; it tells how deeply disturbed he is by this comment which he has seen. He says, "The image of Saskatchewan" Would the \$18,000 MLA over there just keep quiet for a while. "evoked by this editorial allegedly based on your Premier's speech, is so distorted that I felt I couldn't allow the editorial to go unchallenged." And then he said to the Premier, "You know the facts - the facts are that under your Administration the following systems continue: Compulsory hospital and doctor care. 2. Provincial Government ownership and control of power and gas distribution. 3. Provincial ownership and control of the telephone system. 4. Inter-city public transportation throughout the province, largely by the Saskatchewan Government Transportation. 5. Compulsory basic auto insurance through a Government agency or corporation." Then he asks this question and the Premier ought to be good enough to answer to the people of California. "Honestly, would your Administration stay in power after the 1968 election if this Socialist program was abandoned?" He knows he dare not abandon it but he can go outside of the province and criticize it. And the man closes with a request which ought to be that of every person in Saskatchewan. "Please set the record straight for the people of California." He owes this province that much.

I submit, Mr. Speaker, that a party that refuses to ask its leader to do these sort of things can't be relied upon to give the emphasis needed to public activity in this province. They will as a result be unable to help many people of Saskatchewan with pressing problems. Consequently the Liberal party is on a collision course to the future.

Let me turn to talk about Saskatchewan economy. We have some remarks about it in the Speech from the Throne. Basically, the greatest benefactor we have had - this was mentioned yesterday - is the one more excellent wheat crop averaging something like 27.7 bushels per acre this year. This wheat crop has been sold, large amounts to Russia and China and other countries as well. The forecast is I believe a farm cash income of something close to one billion dollars. But we shouldn't be misled by the fact of the large size of this income. For example in the North Battleford News Optimist which arrived on my desk this morning, I read in an article this comment. One farm expert summed up the situation by stating, "While many farmers will have increased tax receipts, it will be difficult for them to end the year with a bigger bank account." While more money has been coming in, more money has been going out. Higher costs, more interest charges, more property taxes. I'm told that the interest paid by our farm population on their debts has approximately doubled in the last five years. What about the future? Well we have one indication of it from an announcement made by the Saskatoon representative of the International Harvester Company. A few months ago he pointed out that in 1967 the price

February 7, 1967

of their tractors would go up by \$150 and the price of their combines would go up \$325.

The second main component of our agricultural economy is of course livestock. Now, the mover of the motion yesterday, Mr. Speaker, said this about livestock, "There is no danger of over-producing." How right he was when we look at the records. Because when we look at the records, we find production of cattle down and hogs down and sheep down and eggs down and of milk down. The only thing that is up is wild ducks and sandhill cranes, Mr. Speaker. Cattle, December 1, 1966, the number on Saskatchewan farms is down by 5 per cent from the year before. Hogs, on December 1, 1966, down 4½ per cent from two years ago. Sheep, down in 1965 by 9 per cent, down in 1966 by another 8 per cent. Even the poor little lambs have lost their way. Milk production, down almost 8 per cent, egg production down 8.6 per cent from last year. Mr. Speaker, even the chickens won't lay and the cows won't give under this Government. All of this of course reflects a number of circumstances – or maybe they need a new bull, maybe that might help them.

SOME HON. MEMBERS: Hear, hear!

MR. LLOYD: — All of this reflects a number of circumstances, some admittedly over which the Government doesn't have any control. It reflects, for example, the pull away from livestock production because of high wheat deals and sales. This means a slowing down of the diversification of agriculture. It reflects added production costs in agriculture. This means an added exodus from the farms of Saskatchewan. It reflects lack of confidence of livestock producers in continuing livestock prices. This means we need more stability with respect to prices. This reflects the need for more attention by the Federal and Provincial Governments to the problems of the livestock industry. It reflects the need for leadership and support for producer Marketing Boards to extend the power of the farmer in the marketing place. I find it very interesting that one exhaustive study on the price of food conducted in the United States recommends as one of the remedies the giving to the farmer of more bargaining power in the market place. These shifts mean that we need more specialized assistance on an individual basis to our livestock producers. It means that we need an extension of our veterinary service. The organization of veterinary districts has done a fine job. The building of a Veterinary College at the University which had its beginning in about 1963 proceeding now will be an addition. We need to go further. We need, I suggest, to consider making Provincial Government money available to enable clinics to serve the producers in those areas.

But it reflects something else too. It reflects the need for a provincial government which will read a very useful

statute that was put on the books of this Legislature in the spring of 1964. I refer to the Agriculture and Adjustment Development Act. I would hope the Government would read it and I would hope it would understand it. I would hope it would say, "Let's make full use of ARDA in implementing it," because I don't know about the present year but the year before about one million dollars of ARDA money which could have been available was not used. This legislation says, in fact, that the people in various regions of the province would have first of all assistance - trained, technical, skilled people to help them in planning their agricultural development. They would take part in making the decisions. Today, many of the decisions made by the people of these kind of regions are decisions which are forced on them by economic conditions. They have no choice, they simply have to go where the pressure of economic circumstances directs. This legislation would mean the extension of more multi-purpose credit in order to intensify production on our farms. And the full use of this legislation would mean that we would do something to assist in transfer off the farm land in an orderly sort of way, provide money for pensions, provisions for the farmers who have to retire because of age, provide money to enable those who want to leave for other reasons to train to go into some other occupations. The frame work has been there since 1964 and I urge the Government to start using it.

Let me turn to some of the non-agricultural industries. One would have thought from listening yesterday and one would have thought from reading the headlines and reading the Premier's speeches when he is with his buddies down in Los Angeles in the smog there, that potash came up in this province when the Liberals crossed the floor into the government chambers. The facts of course are simple, but they seem to be missed so often let's restate them. Saskatchewan has potash, lots of it, the world has a need for potash, lots of it. The supplies elsewhere in North America are declining in quality and quantity. The growth of the potash industry in this province has been assured since the late 1950's.

Potash continues to grow, will continue to grow. One potash mine which went into production in 1962 has continued to expand. A second mine which was opened in 1958 until water problems forced it to close down is back in operation. A third mine which had started construction in 1963 came into production in Saskatchewan in 1964. Alwinal potash announced in 1963 has continued with its development. The Allen potash mine for which arrangements had been made prior to May, 1964, continued its development. Three other mines, all of which commenced exploratory work before May, 1964, have continued their development. I would wish that the Government would start paying attention to facts not only when it is in California but when it is at home.

Let's look at oil production increases from the previous year and see if we get there, the kind of picture which the

February 7, 1967

Members opposite speaking yesterday thought we ought to get. The increase in 1966 was 5,000,000 barrels from the year before. The increase in 1965 was 7,000,000; in 1964, 10,000,000 barrels. In 1963, 7,000,000 barrels; in 1962, 8,000,000 barrels. Let it be noted, Mr. Speaker, that the 1966 increase was the smallest increase in oil production in any one of the last five years. The amount of the increase has in fact got smaller every year since the Liberals were elected. This isn't what one gets from the headlines or one gets when one reads the propaganda in the city of Los Angeles.

Let's look at some other oil statistics. Wells completed in 1966, less than 1965, less than in 1964. Drilling licenses issued in 1966 less than in 1965 and less than in 1964. Now, everybody is encouraged by the fact that we have had some oil discovery at deeper levels. I want to read a bit from the Financial Post, November 26, Mr. Speaker, which says, "The Devonian find may ease the crisis in respect to Saskatchewan oil." But it goes on to give some warnings which I hope are not true. "A sudden increase in market demands is directing industry exploration and development interest on large deep-well fields in Northern Alberta." Secondly a spokesman of a major international company said this, "Except for protecting ourselves through land acquisition we're going to have to let the Saskatchewan play wait." It goes on to say that Saskatchewan at its present rate of production, unless we get some more reserve, "will be out of oil within about eight years." All of us hope that this is the most gloomy, pessimistic picture which can be presented.

Now, the oil discovery which has been found at deeper levels in the southern part of the province, Mr. Speaker, has been given a number of explanations. But maybe the best one was given in the Government's White Paper in 1965. Here is what it said at that time. "A deep find in Montana promises to stimulate greater interest in South Mississippian horizons in Saskatchewan." The work done in Montana stimulated the interest in Saskatchewan. Since that time the Government has pretended that the Liberals did it all with their little shovels. More specifically, it says it is because it offered an oil resource sale at less than bankrupt prices. No royalty until 1971. Let me say again, as we have said many times, Mr. Speaker, that this was an unnecessary give-away. It was a better deal than the oil companies could get in any of the other provinces. The incentive of markets and of prices and of finds just across the border was there. But the Liberals had to add, you know, the same offers as in the cents off when buying soap or as with the set of cutlery which we get when we are buying breakfast food. This decision can cost Saskatchewan people tens of millions of dollars. I suggest that it is small wonder that the Federal Government turns a deaf ear to the weeping and wailing of the Saskatchewan Government about how hard up we are. Small wonder it turns a deaf ear when the Government gives away natural resources in this way, when

the Government gives away the recognized right of the public to benefit from the exploitation of our resources.

Let's look at natural gas production which dropped by 5½ per cent in 1965, did recover some in 1966. Even so we are only about 2½ per cent about 1964 so the increase is one per cent per year over the last two years.

Let's look at investment in manufacturing. It was in 1963 - \$25,800,000; 1964 down a bit, \$23,000,000; 1965 (the preliminary actual figures) \$23,500,000. And in 1966 (intentions stated earlier in 1966) another drop to \$20,400,000. Let's note, this doesn't compare with the headlines which we often read. The 1966 intentions were actually 21 per cent below the actual figure of 1963. But to judge the final results, you have to consider increased costs. So the 1966 figure in real terms for manufacturing investment is almost one third less than the actual was for 1963.

Again, Mr. Speaker, there are two questions to be asked. One of them is this: is our position in the non-agricultural field improving at a rate comparable to the increase in Liberal propaganda about it? The answer is obviously No. The second question is how big is the credibility gap applied to Liberal propaganda? The answer is that it is bigger than anything that has appeared in science fiction yet.

I would like to look at just one or two other sets of figures. Per capita investment in Saskatchewan in 1963 was 25 per cent higher than it was in all Canada. Per capita investment in Saskatchewan in 1965 was only 20 per cent higher than it was in all of Canada. We are higher than the rest of Canada, but this certainly doesn't bear out the statements we get continuously from the Government's propaganda mills.

Let's look at one other statistic, the value of manufacturing shipments. We have the figure from January to November. During that period in all Canada, they are up by 8.4 per cent, but in Saskatchewan up by 7.9 per cent. This is not what the headlines claimed. It does suggest how the Members of the Government seek to magnify their assumptions. Some may remember that in November, the Minister of Industry rushed into the press with a statement that September manufacturing shipments were up 14 per cent and claimed this was a record broken. In fact, of course he was playing a broken record. The statistics later showed that the growth wasn't that much, but the Minister didn't rush into print to correct it. When the statements came out to show that in October manufacturing shipments in Saskatchewan were up three per cent as compared to six per cent, no statement from the Minister. In November our manufacturing shipments were up 2½ per cent compared to Canada's 4.7 per cent, no Minister's statement.

February 7, 1967

One or two other articles of this kind. Housing, read the paper last night to see that the cutback in Saskatchewan was extremely great and troublesome, 30 per cent cutback in housing compared to 19 per cent in Canada. In the city of Regina, the cutback even worse, some 42 per cent.

Population. Nothing demonstrates better the credibility gap with respect to government news than this matter of population. As I mentioned yesterday afternoon, the year-end White Papers issued by the Government have for years included population statistics. This year they were left out. Last year the Government used a 15 month period to compare with the previous 12 months in order to get something which would justify its statements. This year it couldn't even do that so it left them out entirely. As I mentioned just a minute ago, the increase in population for the 12 months up to June of 1966 was 3,000. For the 12 months, June 1, 1963 to 1964, the increase was 10,000. The average for 1951 to 1961 was 10,000. I think it is plain to see why they left out this figure. This is an attempt at managing the news. The increase up to June was 3,000. I suggest that if it studies the family allowance statistics since that time, it may come to the conclusion that it was probably even worse than that by the end of December. "We've stopped exporting people", the Premier used to shout. Members yesterday said, "People no longer have to leave Saskatchewan."

SOME HON. MEMBERS: Hear, hear!

MR. LLOYD: — Mr. Speaker, last year 9,300 people left Saskatchewan. In two years of Liberal Government nearly 16,000 people left Saskatchewan. We used to hear a lot about poor little Prince Edward Island. In 1966 the percentage increase in population in Prince Edward Island was almost one per cent. Not much, but three times the rate of the one-third of one per cent in Saskatchewan under a Liberal Government.

I submit that no single other set of statistics portrays as well the extent to which the Liberals have attempted to mislead the people of Saskatchewan. The credibility gap as applied to the Government sits on your right, Mr. Speaker, isn't a gap. The credibility gap isn't a gap, is not even just a gorge. It is a canyon beside which the Grand Canyon looks like a prairie coulee. The unfortunate circumstances for Saskatchewan are not only that the gap is so large, it is as I said yesterday that the Liberals are believing their own propaganda and as a result proposed nothing in the Throne Speech.

I turn now to the very important matter of transportation which once again as last year gets no mention in the Throne Speech. No, this year it doesn't even mention highways. I can't say that considering the condition of the highways last spring that I blame them for not mentioning them. Or considering the

fact that it had to add some \$6,000,000 to its budget this year without getting any more mileage out of it, perhaps it can be forgiven for having left out mention of highways. But I want to talk about rail transportation and rail transportation costs.

These are most significant for farm production, for industrial production and for all consumers. We in Saskatchewan are greatly dependent on out-of-the province sources. Consequently any increase in already burdensome freight rates creates problems. Mr. Speaker, the pattern in rail legislation in Canada over the years has given to our railways something of the characteristics of a public utility. Rates were supervised somewhat. There was room for some public decision. The area of service and the kind of service was supervised somewhat. This procedure that gave to railways some characteristics of a public utility is questioned and to some extent rejected by Bill C-231 recently passed by the Canadian Parliament. This Bill results in a decreased scope for public decision regarding rates and services. At the same time it results in an increased influence of the decisions of corporations about railway rates and services. Perhaps it was this shift from public to corporate influence that helped to make the representations of the Saskatchewan Government so lacking in power and so lacking in power to the committee that was investigating it. Perhaps this explains why the presentation was made not by a Cabinet Minister but by an Ottawa lawyer. Perhaps this explains why the Government of Saskatchewan withdrew from an agreement to support some expert witnesses. The provinces of Saskatchewan, Manitoba, Alberta, Nova Scotia, New Brunswick, Prince Edward Island and Newfoundland had agreed to engage the services of a Dr. Williams and a Dr. Borts. Saskatchewan Government withdrew from this decision or at least so it was announced to the committee by Mr. Frawley who appeared for the Province of Alberta and by the chairman of the committee when the two witnesses appeared. Let me just comment, Mr. Speaker, as to some of the references from the testimony of these two men with whom Saskatchewan was not associated. 1. Speaking of the Bill they said, "It eliminates provision with respect to the prohibition of unjust and unreasonable rates. It eliminates any control over the rate level as a whole." One would have thought the Saskatchewan Government would have been interested in adding weight to the argument against unjust and unreasonable rates and in favor of rate control. 2. "In substitution, therefore, the provision of the Bill", they said "seems a very inadequate type of protection for shippers lacking competitive alternatives." Many Saskatchewan shippers do lack competitive alternatives to shipping by rail. One would have thought the Saskatchewan Government would have been interested in supporting an argument of this kind. Yet they didn't support these two witnesses. 3. "Under the terms of the Bill, the shippers would be left in most instances to rely solely upon their bargaining power vis-a-vis the railways." Many Saskatchewan shippers are clearly unable to bargain with a corporate enterprises like the CPR. One would have thought

February 7, 1967

the Saskatchewan Government would have been interested in adding protection for such shippers.

The relevant question is: how much did these arguments lose because they were not supported officially by the Saskatchewan Government when they could have been? We've made our concern and our suggestions plain in a brief presented to the Parliamentary Committee in November, 1966. We believe, Mr. Speaker, that the freeing of the railways which the Bill proposes can increase the cost of interprovincial transportation. The impact on consumer prices and producer costs can well be imagined.

The Bill removes some protection previously provided against rate increases for many shippers. Again it's the small shipper with limited economic strength who is going to suffer. This is called freeing the railway - not to be called freeing the shippers.

Moreover, it is of great importance to us if rail abandonment proceeds without very extensive and intensive measurement of the total cost of other methods of getting things to market. If so there is going to be a lot of increased costs for a lot of Saskatchewan people. For example, such abandonment will necessitate, in many cases, the building of more and better market roads. For instance, in my constituency, Mr. Speaker, some people are going to have to haul 30-35 miles further to get their wheat to town than before. This is going to put demands on the local governments. It is going to put a demand on the Provincial Government for a bridge over the Saskatchewan River in the neighborhood of the Maymont Ferry. It is going to mean for many of the farmers buying newer trucks and bigger trucks and driving them more miles. The Provincial Government should be giving more and stronger leadership with respect to this. We suggest some things that we think the Government ought to do.

First, it should take a stronger stand to protect the interests of both producers and consumers. Many communities right now are genuinely dismayed and disappointed by what seems to them to be disinterest on the part of the present Government.

Secondly, we need an expanded program of studies to determine the impact on consumers and producers of transportation costs and freight rates. Some of the staff formerly available to do this should be replaced. Special studies in the case of areas threatened by rail abandonment are needed. The fact that our economy has been burdened with unplanned development of railways in the first place shouldn't mean that we should be further burdened by a further unplanned abandonment of railways in the future.

Thirdly, the services of the Government should be available to communities and areas threatened by abandonment. Such

services were previously available. Such services, I understand, have been withdrawn. These communities deserve the right to have some help in preparing representations. It isn't fair to leave them to meet the CPR alone.

Fourthly, the results of studies and research should be made public. Not only individuals, but farm, business and trade union groups are vitally interested. These studies can be the basis for transportation policy to give the producer and the consumer a square deal in the end.

I turn, Mr. Speaker, to some comments with respect to the situation of our Indian population in Saskatchewan. I wish I could give credit here to the Government for doing all that it claims to have done in respect to services to our Indian population. If in fact they had even done a small percentage of what they claim, I could give them a lot more credit than is actually possible. I submit that here again the exaggerations to which we are being subjected are in themselves harmful to our Indian population. There are some revealing comments and statements. I want particularly to comment on some substantiated facts of dealings on the part of our former Minister of Health (Mr. Steuart) and the MLA for Athabasca (Mr. Guy) with one organization of Native Canadians. I don't know whether the Member for Athabasca spoke in his capacity as MLA or in his capacity as Legislative Assistant to the Minister of Natural Resources or in his capacity as an official of the Department of Education. That isn't clear. Mr. Speaker, what is clear is a June 17, 1966 press release signed by the then president of the Indian and Metis Service Council of Prince Albert. I read from that press release:

At a special board meeting on Thursday, June 9th, attended by the Hon. D.G. Steuart, Minister of Public Health and MLA for Prince Albert, and Mr. Allan Guy, MLA for Athabasca and Legislative Secretary to the Minister of Natural Resources, we were informed that we would not receive a government grant this year unless Mr. Norris, then the executive director, either resigned or was fired by us. If we retained Mr. Norris as executive director, we would be faced with having only 25 per cent of our budget to meet the expenditures.

There has been some further elaboration on this, Mr. Speaker. It seems that earlier in the year, the Member for Athabasca (Mr. Guy) attended a meeting in Saskatoon of this council for all Saskatchewan. The report indicates that he was unhappy about some things that had been said in a publication of the Prince Albert organization. He objected to a statement that the grant had been cut. And he objected to an article in another issue which supported the group of Indians who marched on Kenora to demonstrate some of their problems. The Member is said to have said that the Government was displeased with these.

February 7, 1967

He brought the message, Mr. Speaker, that the Great White Father sitting in Regina was unhappy with his children and he had to tell them about it. He implied that unless Mr. Norris, then secretary resigned or was fired the Provincial grant would not be forthcoming.

Following this, on June 9th, 1966, some of the executive and directors met with the MLA from Prince Albert (Mr. Steuart) and the MLA from Athabasca (Mr. Guy). The MLA for Prince Albert is said to have stated that "as long as Mr. Norris was the executive director, it would be highly unlikely that a grant would be received from the Government." His justification for this position was mainly that Mr. Norris had made verbal attacks against the Liberal Government and its free enterprise philosophy. This is a justification for cutting off a grant from a voluntary organization that he had made verbal attacks against the Liberal Government and its free enterprise philosophy. In statements since then he has been saying of course he didn't tell them the man had to resign or anything like that. He didn't want to interfere with whom they hired - oh, no, no, no, nothing like that at all.

HON. D.G. STEUART (Prince Albert): — I'm . . .

MR. LLOYD: — Yes, I can imagine you are. You're just the kind of a guy that's proud of having a big whip and you use it on some people that can't fight you back. That's the reputation you have - that's the reputation you earn.

MR. STEUART: — So . . .

MR. LLOYD: — Mr. Speaker, members of the board told the two MLAs that "Mr. Norris had been a very competent employee." But the Athabasca MLA replied that the Government "was not questioning Mr. Norris' competence." It didn't matter that he could do his job, it didn't matter that he was competent. The only thing that mattered was his unwillingness to bow down to the Liberals' idea of free enterprise philosophy. How well he did his work was of no consequence.

Finally, Mr. Speaker, in summary, "the Government's position was made crystal clear. Malcolm Norris had to leave our employ one way or another or we would receive no grant from the Province. Mr. Norris solved the dilemma for the association by tendering his resignation." Mr. Speaker, and Members of this Assembly, there can hardly be a more damning indictment of the Government of this province and of the MLAs directly concerned who perpetrated this particular action. With that action dictatorship was again let loose in this province. This Government is afraid of free speech. A couple of years ago it said to the city of Saskatoon, "You can't employ a man whom you have

employed who is confident and at the same time get our grant." They said to the Power Corporation - this same Minister who brags of how he used his authority - Any words about politics and your jobs are in jeopardy." Last year the United Church said something the Government didn't like. They were scolded. The students at the University, they too displeased the Great White Father sitting in Regina, so they had to take their turn of scolding.

All of this, Mr. Speaker, helps to explain why the Liberal Government last year rejected so vigorously and vehemently our amendments to The Saskatchewan Bill of Rights Act and The Fair Employment Practices Act. These, it will be recalled sought to guarantee freedom of political opinion and freedom of political action within the law. These same actions explain why such amendments are necessary. They explain why in Saskatchewan we could make use of a human rights commissioner to administer the Saskatchewan Bill of Rights.

Mr. Speaker, let me make some reference to some policies and programs which are essential if we are going to properly respect the place of our Indian citizen in the community. These are both Federal and Provincial policies. They have to be applied obviously in consultation with the Indian population.

One, it is imperative that we recognize the need to assist this group to take a greater part in both devising solutions and carrying out solutions. We need to do more to help the chosen leaders of the Indian people to work with their people. This involves such things as these: (a) Seeing that there is office accommodation and equipment and staff for the relevant provincial Indian organizations. (b) Providing grants to enable sufficient communication by these chosen leaders of the Indian population with other Indians and with government departments and other agencies. (c) Seeing to it that they have freedom of communication, not saying just what the Government thinks they ought to say. (d) The development of other forms of communication, bulletins, tapes and so on. (d) The availability of the services of dedicated and informed people to work with the Indian leaders.

Secondly, let me urge an extension of opportunities for the Indian population to take part in local government both on the reserve and off the reserve.

(a) We should urge the Federal Government to pay full local government taxes with respect to property on the reserves. We should amend municipal and school legislation to give the Indian population the right to elect representation on municipal councils and school boards. (b) There should be grants for necessary local improvements placed at the discretion of the Indian resident, assistance to improve the water supply, roads, recreational opportunities and to initiate and continue community

February 7, 1967

planning. (c) There should be a great deal of emphasis placed on the possibility of co-operative development on the reserve and participation in co-operative developments outside the reserve.

Thirdly, Mr. Speaker, there can be no doubt about education being one of the most important ways in which the Indian population can be helped to the starting line of equal opportunities. We need a program of a kind that is sometimes referred to as "operation head start". Kindergarten training and special tutoring. At the level of grade 11 and 12, we should give the Indians the chance to spend some time on the campus of our university and our technical institutes. This is particularly essential for those who are continuing their education. We need arrangements for special tutoring for those who come in for the first months and the first year at university or technical institute. These are just some of the ways in which all of us can do a much better job. I do want to recognize, Mr. Speaker, some of the activities of the Department of Education with respect to providing more opportunities to learn skills, congratulating them on taking some courses to the reserves as mentioned yesterday. But even the most optimistic would have to admit that these are a very limited kind of advance.

Finally, Mr. Speaker, also the kind of legislation to which I referred to previously, amendments to The Saskatchewan Bill of Rights Act and The Fair Employment Practices Act.

I turn finally, to a section dealing with education. It's now accepted as fact, I hope, that the returns from investment and education are high, both in economic terms and in terms of individual satisfaction. We discussed this somewhat last year in December. It is realized also that the costs are very high and we have to, I think, face this fact better than we have, Mr. Speaker. Only if we value the things we buy with our taxes as much as we do other things, are we going to meet this problem of education. We have to distribute the costs better than we have. I agree with what the Government said in December about the need for a more clear statement with respect to the Federal Government's share and portion of these costs.

I hope that the Provincial Government doesn't continue to do something it started last year. In 1966 it introduced something which must be called the monstrosity of the year. It appeared in December as under the title of "tax reduction" grants. By February it became "incentive" grants. These grants caused dissension, created dissatisfaction, contributed to confusion in school board budgeting. I doubt if even this Government will dare to perpetuate such a monstrosity for a second year.

I want to make some predictions about the Government's 1967 program for education, Mr. Speaker. First there'll be a rush to use up the federal money which is left for the

construction of technical facilities. It will be quite a lot. Three-quarters of it will be Government of Canada money, not Government of Saskatchewan money. So we have a big increase in the budget for technical education structures; three-quarters of it from the Federal Government, one-quarter of it from the Province. Maybe there'll be more money there for university education as well. The Provincial Government is going to stick in its thumb and pull out a lot of federal money for technical education. Stick in its thumb and pull out a lot more federal money for university education and then say, "Now what brave boys, what good boys we are." There's going to be more money and a lot of it is going to come from that source.

Secondly, based on the experience of other years, the amount of money voted for technical education will only be partly spent at the end of the year.

Thirdly, operating grants will go up for schools - sure they will, but only by a relatively small amount compared with probably - what - \$4,000,000? Too optimistic? Not enough I submit to keep down the increase in property tax.

So, my predictions: More money is going to be spent, a lot of it Federal money; secondly, much of the money for technical education will remain unspent at the end of the year; thirdly, operating grants will go up and fourthly so will local government taxation.

I want to say something, Mr. Speaker, about technical facilities. They have lagged behind the need for them in this province. They have lagged behind other provinces. The need was demonstrated in the Return that was tabled in the Legislature at the end of last session. It showed that in the previous 12 months, there were 800 people turned away from our technical Institutes who wanted some kind of training. In October of 1966 this year, I submit that from one institution alone there were some 125 students who wanted to take first year technology and couldn't get in. There were a couple of hundred who wanted to take some pre-employment classes who couldn't get in at that time.

What's been the Government's response? In 1964, the Saskatoon Technical Institute - \$2,000,000 voted, nothing spent. In 1965, \$405,000 voted, \$85.65 spent. In 1966, \$2,600,000 voted, how much spent, we don't know. Very surprising if anything like half of it has been spent. Tenders were called in the spring, some construction began late last fall. No new space available there until the spring of 1967.

The Saskatchewan Technical Institute at Moose Jaw, \$125,000 voted in 1966, how much spent? Precious little, I'll suggest. Some plans there to move courses to Saskatoon hardly qualifies as an extension.

February 7, 1967

Thirdly, the only added provincial space for technical training has been as a result of the conversion of the buildings at Weyburn. How much? On November 29 there was a press release saying that there were 185 enrolled since September; certainly the press release wouldn't under-estimate. There'll be more by this time - but at the end of November, at the end of two and a half years of Liberal Government, the total addition to Provincial Government space for technical education was 185 more places in a renovated building. Useful, but not good enough. It certainly doesn't justify the statement in the Speech from the Throne which said "great strides taken toward expansion of facilities." But this kind of description calling this "great strides" is an indication of how the Liberals measure the problem.

Now local school boards have provided some expansion. Twenty per cent of this is paid by the Provincial Government, only 20 per cent. Yorkton and Regina have completed their projects. In Lloydminster, the Premier in his Budget Speech last year stood in that place and said, "A vocational technical school is under construction in Lloydminster." So I got in touch with the Lloydminster school authorities. First they had heard of it. They were calling for tenders some eight or nine months later. And the Premier said in the Budget Speech it was under construction.

North Battleford, on February 17, 1965, the Minister of Education said "a regional vocational project had been initiated" in North Battleford. On February 17, 1966, nothing had been done. Some eight or nine months later, the Local Government Board was refusing permission to proceed with financing.

At the same time it refused permission to proceed with the extension of the Balfour Technical Institute. Even with the goodwill of local boards, the only new projects operative, I believe, are Yorkton and Regina. This hardly qualified as "great strides" even if you throw in the technical schools which are 80 per cent money other than that of the province.

I want to say something also about university facilities. The seconder of the Speech from the Throne yesterday referred to the Premier's speech at Melville I believe, in which he noted the great expansion of university facilities measured by the increased amounts of money which students were borrowing from the Federal Government. I could mention some reasons for that increase in money borrowed. The increase of fees last year, the increase in residential costs at Saskatoon last year on top of another increase the year before go a long way to explain this increased student borrowing which a mathematical genius like the Premier gets around to somehow describing the success of the university program by.

The question is what of 1967, the future? More money

obviously. Higher fees? We don't know. we do note that the Premier told student representatives that they should be paying another three per cent of the cost through fees. On October 20th the Star Phoenix reported this:

'Tuition fees for University of Saskatchewan students will be soon increased,' said Eric Malling, the external vice-president of the Students' Representative Council.

Higher fees? Controlled enrolment. Even with higher fees whatever that means. It is to be hoped, Mr. Speaker, that some time during this session somebody on the opposite side will make a complete and clear-cut statement about university prospects for Saskatchewan's young people. Let's have some measurements which are more relevant and meaningful than: 1. the amount of money borrowed by students or 2. the comparison of present government grant with those of 20 years ago when enrolment was a fraction of the present and costs a fraction of present ones.

The Government has slammed the door on any reduction in fees. Will it assure this Legislature there won't be any increase this year? We on this side, Mr. Speaker, will submit three points: First that there should be changes introduced which would give the faculty representation on the Board of Governors, and secondly, which would give to the students the right to select representation on the Board of Governors, and third, which would recognize the principle of universal accessibility to education; university, technical and other forms.

We realize in saying that that large sums of money are involved admittedly. We submit that productivity studies including those of the Economic Council of Canada justify and indeed urge these kinds of added expenditures for technical and university education.

May I say, Mr. Speaker, that I welcome the announcement recently by the Government that there is going to be a considerable expenditure on housing for students. The press statement made it appear that the Premier almost had to force this on the university or part of it. I doubt if that was true, but anyway the amount is welcome. We urge every consideration be given to the assistance and encouragement of those students and cooperative groups who are working on cooperative housing projects. These can make a contribution in the cost of housing to students and make also an academic and intellectual contribution as well. Housing groups operated at the University of Toronto are claiming a savings of some twenty-five per cent for their students. For the married groups they are claiming a savings of some \$20 a month.

Mr. Speaker, the equality of education opportunity has had a great deal of discussion. It needs much better

February 7, 1967

recognition than we give it. However, I suggest that as we enter Canada's second century it's no longer good enough to be talking about just equality of educational opportunity. We need to talk about equality of opportunity to develop intelligence. This involves not just schools. It involves homes and it involves communities.

Mr. Speaker, for those and other reasons I want in just a very few moments to move the following amendment of the motion:

but this Assembly regrets that Your Honour's advisers have failed to make adequate provision for the technical education, in particular, of Saskatchewan's young people; have failed to make provision to enable the necessary construction of needed houses, schools, hospitals and sewage systems; have failed to provide promised prescription drugs as a benefit under the Saskatchewan medical care program; and further, have indicated, that without comparable increase in services, new tax burdens will be imposed on the people of Saskatchewan in a period of unsurpassed government revenues.

Mr. Speaker, the Throne speech contains too few proposals, in particular too few proposals of substance. It omits too many essentials, provides too little hope for the future and too little reason for faith in the present. Let me - although it is not necessary - remind all of us that we are entering our second one hundred years as a part of the Canadian Nation. Saskatchewan has had an even shorter history than that. We who live in this Great Plains region in particular and all of Canada have made great progress. I have frequently said that I doubt if there is another area in the entire world which has in such a short time made as much progress as have those of us who live in this Great Plains region. And we should - we have ample resources, people industrious and resourceful, not many of the handicaps which have plagued other parts of the world. We have reason to be proud and much of it. Let's enter our second one hundred years as a part of Canada with confidence and with resolution. We will not do so by looking back to the 1930's which is a third of a century away, or looking back to the 1940's which is now almost a quarter of a century away. We do it only by looking ahead to the 1970's and the 1980's. There lies the test of our adequacy. Let's be aware of the reasonable expectations of our people. Let's demonstrate that we can meet the expectations if we have the will and the courage to do so.

Mr. Speaker, I do not support the motion. I do move, seconded by Mr. Davies (Moose Jaw) the Resolution which I read just a few minutes ago.

SOME HON. MEMBERS: Hear, hear!

MR. SPEAKER: — I have here an amendment to

the Address in Reply moved by the Leader of the Opposition (Mr. Lloyd). I'll draw the attention of the Members of the House to the fact that the Member (Mr. Lloyd) moved the adjournment of the debate yesterday. Citation 165 Beauchesne states that having moved the adjournment of the debate a Member has spoken on the question and cannot make a second motion during the same debate excepting I presume with leave of the House. Is leave granted?

SOME HON. MEMBERS: - Agreed.

MR. SPEAKER: — I have the motion and would draw to the attention of the mover thereof, that to be in order he should have placed the following words in the preamble of the motion: "That the following words be added to the motion", and I have accordingly placed them therein. I will now read the motion as I have amended it. It has been moved by the Leader of the Opposition (Mr. Lloyd), seconded by the Member from Moose Jaw (Mr. Davies) that the following words be added to the Address:

but this Assembly regrets that Your Honour's advisers have failed to make adequate provision for the technical education, in particular, of Saskatchewan's young people; have failed to make provision to enable the necessary construction of needed houses, schools, hospitals and sewage systems; have failed to provide promised prescription drugs as a benefit under the Saskatchewan medical care program; and further, have indicated, that without comparable increase in services, new tax burdens will be imposed on the people of Saskatchewan in a period of unsurpassed government revenues.

I find the amendment in order and in accordance with the past practice of this House the debate in this instance will continue on the motion and the amendment concurrently.

HON. W. ROSS THATCHER (Premier): — Mr. Speaker, my first words ordinarily would be addressed to the university students who are visiting us, but apparently they have left the House while the Leader of the Opposition was speaking. Pardon me, I note three or four in the back. May I extend a welcome on behalf of the Government Members.

Mr. Speaker, my initial remarks this afternoon must be to congratulate the mover and the seconder of the Throne speech. One of the strengths of the Liberal party over the years has been the fact that it has been able to attract able and capable candidates who become MLAs. Yesterday we heard from two of our farm Members. May I say as Leader of this party how pleased I was with the grasp of the various problems which they displayed. A Government Member certainly knows that when farmers are prosperous in this province the rest of the people are prosperous.

February 7, 1967

That is the reason why we try to give agriculture a top priority. That is also probably, Mr. Speaker, the reason why most of the farm constituencies in Saskatchewan today are represented by Liberal Members.

The Hon. Leader of the Opposition (Mr. Lloyd) this afternoon discussed one or two trips that I had made down to the United States. After the many years of stagnation in this province under the Socialists, Mr. Speaker, this Government believes we must obtain new industries. And in order to get new industries and new mines we must seek capital wherever we can find it. We wish to obtain American capital because there are not sufficient Canadian funds available. When I took trips to the United States, talking to various business groups, I found that there was a great suspicion about Saskatchewan. They said "You fellows have had the only Socialist Government on this continent aside from Castro's." We have had to dispel the resulting fear and concern. One of the reasons we now have a pulp mill, Mr. Speaker, is because I made a few trips of that nature. I want to tell you, Sir, that whenever I speak in places other than Saskatchewan, whether it's Ontario, Quebec or the United States, or British Columbia, I do tell them the story of our ex-Socialist Government. I do tell them that 20 years of Socialism gave this province industrial stagnation, gave us major depopulation, gave us oppressive taxation. I tell people in those areas that anyone who is inclined to be a Socialist should come up to Saskatchewan and see the mess that our Liberal Government inherited. That would discourage their interest in the philosophy.

Mr. Speaker, over the past few months, the Liberal Party has been nominating candidates across this province. During the process I hope you have noticed that we are attracting a good deal of young blood, a good deal of new blood. I was particularly pleased a few days ago to note that Alderman Harry Swarbrick of Moose Jaw proposes to let his name stand for a Liberal nomination. I believe that this event has some major significance. After all Alderman Swarbrick has been a long-time railroader in Moose Jaw. He has been a long-time alderman in the city. Above all and even more important, he has been a prominent member of the Socialist party. As a matter of fact in the last election, the senior Member for Moose Jaw at this nominating convention asked Mr. Swarbrick to nominate him. Thus the Moose Jaw MLA (Mr. Davies) must feel that this gentleman is a man of influence and ability in the city of Moose Jaw.

But you should note, Sir, that Alderman Swarbrick has become disillusioned and fed up. Like thousands of others, he has come to the conclusion that there is nothing wrong with Socialism, except that it won't work. And he decided that Liberalism could do more for the trade union movement, and more for the city of Moose jaw than Socialism.

In announcing his departure Mr. Swarbrick made some rather interesting comments. I think some of the Members of the House might be interested in those comments. I quote the Leader Post January 21, 1967:

He believed Saskatchewan would have a Liberal Government for some time to come. If so, Moose Jaw needed representation on the Government side.

Who would disagree with that statement?

Alderman Swarbrick said labor members must show maturity and be willing and able to accept their responsibilities. He believed this could best be done by not putting all their eggs in one basket and by having responsible representation in all political parties.

Mr. Speaker, the Liberal party is pleased indeed to welcome a man of the stature of Harry Swarbrick onto the Liberal team. I have been particularly pleased to receive so many letters from Trade Union Members in the city of Moose Jaw, indicating their satisfaction with the alderman's action. Surely this is as it should be, because no party has done more for labor than the Saskatchewan Liberal party. Instead of giving them a lot of fancy legislation, the Liberals have given labor in this province jobs and good wages.

Now I want to talk about my old home city of Moose Jaw for a moment. Socialist policies for the last few years provincially and at the Council level, lost them industry after industry like the Robin Hood Mill. Moose Jaw has been a city which has not been progressing like other centres. The Liberals have tried to help the city. We have given them two new industries in the last few months - a winery and a wire plant. I believe that many people in the city of Moose Jaw will decide that the best way to get more industry and more development, is to get some Members on this side of the House. As Mr. Swarbrick says - this Government is going to be here for a long time.

Mr. Speaker, the Hon. Member for Biggar (Mr. Lloyd) this afternoon touched upon many problems. Some of them were serious but none of them are new problems. Indeed most of them have been with us for many years. Socialists were in power from 1944-64. I ask them today why they failed to solve some of these problems when they were in office? Let me give you a few examples. The Leader of the Opposition (Mr. Lloyd) this afternoon said that they had been demanding a bill which would disclose the cost of credit. The Socialists were 20 years in office, yet failed to deal with this problem. But in the Throne Speech, the Liberals are acting.

The Leader of the Opposition cried with copious tears this afternoon about the problems of the consumer. "Why," he said,

February 7, 1967

"prices are going up and up."

Mr. Speaker, prices have been going up steadily and consistently since 1945. What did the Socialists ever do about the problem when they were in power? Liberals on the other hand have set up an interprovincial committee. We hope that committee will accomplish something.

This afternoon the Hon. Leader of the Opposition said in the Throne Speech there's no talk of a base hospital for Regina. My honorable friends had 20 years to build that base hospital but took no concrete action. Oh, we had a little talk a few months before an election, but they did absolutely nothing.

Later the Leader of the Opposition said this afternoon, "Why hasn't the Government introduced a drug program?" The Socialists had 20 years to build the base hospital but nothing happened. The Liberals have been in office for two years and nine months. We are studying the costs of a drug program. I may say that those costs are staggering. We have found that even if we introduced a drug program with \$100 deductible - that is a heavy deductible - it would cost the taxpayers of this province between five and six million dollars. A drug program could be financed by increased taxes or it could be financed if we wanted to cut down other programs such as education or health. However before we do proceed with a drug program, we must be very certain that this is the kind of priority the people of Saskatchewan want.

This after the Leader of the Opposition said, "Why don't we have an ombudsman?" They had 20 years but no ombudsman.

What really intrigued me however was his Indian program. He had a six point Indian program. Mr. Speaker, if ever in Canada there was a Government that did less for the Indians, in a 20 year period, I don't know which one it would be. They did virtually nothing, they failed to lift a finger to help the Indians. This Government has a program and it is taking action.

The Leader of the Opposition in his remarks yesterday and today intimated that the Liberals have not found 80,000 jobs since they came to office. Mr. Speaker, I remind you that while the Socialists were in office, year after year, there were thousands of unemployed in this province. Month after month, hundreds of people graduated from university or collegiate and were forced to leave the province and go somewhere else to find employment. This Government has only been in power for two years and nine months, but how things have improved! With our potash mines, with our sodium sulphate plants, with our new copper mines, with the secondary industries like the Minister announced today, with our pulp mill and so on, we have created

thousands of new jobs, and we have with our policies been able to bring full employment to this province. Not only is there a job for every single person today, Mr. Speaker, but we are short thousands of workers. Ask any farmer in this province who is trying to find a hired man. Ask any hospital about the shortage of doctors or nurses, or cleaning staff and so on. Ask any contractor how easy is it to get a carpenter or a bricklayer today. Ask any businessman in the retail field just where he goes to find a clerk. Ask any garage man about the shortage of mechanics. Ask any deputy of this Government how difficult it is to find civil servants. So I say, Mr. Speaker, this Government has done what the Socialists never were able to do. There are jobs for all persons who are able bodied and willing to work in this province. We may be short of people, Mr. Speaker, but we're not short of jobs. As the ball player would say, we're batting about a hundred per cent as far as employment is concerned. And when we've been in power as long as the Socialists were in power, Mr. Speaker, we'll have 200,000 or 300,000 jobs.

Mr. Speaker, this afternoon the Leader of the Opposition did omit one or two subjects that were in the Throne Speech. I note that he didn't have very much to say about the homeowner grants. I really don't blame him for this. Even though the Socialists don't like this measure, this is progressive legislation which is being universally accepted.

I watched with a good deal of interest the news reports of the last socialist convention sometime last fall in this province. According to those reports four CCF constituencies, Morse, Wadena, Touchwood, Kinistino, urged that the homeowner grant be abolished. I can understand Wadena, maybe Kinistino, but I was surprised at Morse. The Socialist executives in those four constituencies, Mr. Speaker, moved that the homeowner grant be abolished. Those resolutions, Mr. Speaker, brought some of the CCF MLAs to their feet in horror. I quote the Leader Post, November 18, 1966:

Mr. A.E. Blakeney, the MLA for Regina West was one of the first to speak against the resolution stating, 'it has appeal. It is a popular measure . It's not all bad because Ross brought it in. We should hold off . I realize this may be waffling or dodging the issue, but I think we should take a close look at it.'

Mr. Speaker, such principles, such motivations!

Then there was a statement from the hon. gentleman from The Battlefords (Mr. Kramer), I'm sorry he's not in his seat. He really spoke from the heart. He really expressed real concern and conviction for the little man. Said the Member from The Battlefords:

February 7, 1967

I don't like the grant. It stinks. It's political bribery. But don't underestimate John Doe. We did it in 1964 and we lost the election. Mr. Kramer said there are many more who like the grant than those who do not. From a politician's point of view we can't afford to annihilate the people who like this grant. We can't tell people their little plum is going to be taken away. We have to accept it and gild the lily.

So then the Hon. Member for the Battlefords (Mr. Kramer) who called this a "stinking bribe", a "political bribe" moved that not only should the Government give the grant to homeowners, but it should extend it right across the board to renters and almost everyone else. That resolution brought the old war horse from Kelsey (Mr. Brockelbank). He said,

If we extend it to cover all householders we're endorsing the Liberal program. Maybe that's how I'll have to do it. But I don't want to see us tie our hands at this time.

Finally, it was the turn of the grass roots. According to this same report John Vershagen of Kinistino - I guess that's one of Arthur's delegates - had this to say about the homeowner grants:

Some of you fellows may take a holier than thou attitude about such things as the homeowner grant, but don't forget it's working. Unless we have some of these things you'll keep Thatcher there for a long time.

And so, Mr. Speaker, the resolution to abolish the homeowner grant was defeated at the CCF convention. Not because the Socialists liked them. Rather because they didn't care just before an election oppose them. The Socialists did pass an amended resolution. I'd like Hon. Members to listen to the amended resolution:

That a CCF Government would examine the grant to determine that the benefits from the money used are available to the people in the fairest possible manner.

Mr. Speaker, those are weasel words. The election of a CCF Government would mean that the homeowner grant would be abolished. Let me assure you, Mr. Speaker, that not only does the Liberal Government intend to keep this homeowner grant, because we know it is a help to local taxpayers, but we intend to gradually increase the amount of the annual grant.

Of course, the time when the Leader of the Opposition (Mr. Lloyd) really cries, is when he comes to education. He did so yesterday, and does so again today. What a dismal job he intimates are the Liberals doing as far as education is concerned.

What are the facts? Members on this side of the House are indeed proud of the Liberal spending record, as far as education is concerned, particularly when you compare it to the penny-pinching days of the CCF NDP. In their last year of office the Socialists spent on all forms of education - elementary, technical and university - \$54,600,000. The average Socialist spending over the 20 years for all forms of education was \$20,600,000. This year the Liberals will spend \$92,600,000 on education, more than four and a half times the Socialist average when they were in office. Yet they say we're not giving enough for education.

I always am amazed when the Leader of the Opposition (Mr. Lloyd) and some of his friends say, "The Liberals are not doing enough for the University." As the Hon. Member for Moosomin (Mr. Gardner) pointed out yesterday that in all the 20 years the Socialists were in office, their average spending, operating and capital, to the University of Saskatchewan was less than \$3,000,000 per year. In their last year in office, the CCF gave their highest amount \$11,500,000, to the University. Let no one in Saskatchewan who is interested in education forget that this year the Liberals will be giving \$28,500,000 to our University, this is in one year. I think the Liberal record looks pretty effective. Then, I enjoyed the remarks of the Leader of the Opposition (Mr. Lloyd) when he talked about the plight of our students, what great problems they were having in financing their courses at university. The Socialists have recently been calling upon this Government to abolish university fees. They had 20 years to take such action. Instead they did precisely the opposite. May I remind you today, Sir, that in 1949, the Leader of the Opposition who was then Minister of Education, raised university fees 39 per cent. One year later the Socialists raised them again by 40 per cent. In 1955-56 they raised fees by 6 per cent. In 1958-59 they raised them by 8 per cent. In 1964 the Socialists increased them again, this time by 32½ per cent. In other words, Mr. Speaker, when they were in office, the CCF raised fees five times. Yet now, they say to the university students, "If we were in office we would eliminate fees." As usual, the Socialists preach one thing when in opposition, and certainly act very differently when they are the Government.

Liberals are very proud of the fact, Mr. Speaker, that fees in the University of Saskatchewan are the lowest in all Canada. We are also very proud of the fact that university students today pay only 17 per cent of the cost involved, 83 per cent of the university costs today in Saskatchewan are absorbed by the state. I heard the Leader of the Opposition this afternoon talk about universal acceptability. The Socialists claim that we should be giving more bursaries, more scholarships, more loans, and so on. Again, Liberals are very proud of our record in this regard. The Hon. Member for Moosomin (Mr. Gardner) yesterday pointed out that in 1964-65, the Federal Government

February 7, 1967

embarked on a whole new program of university loans. Of course we weren't going to duplicate them. I'd like to compare student loans made in the last three years of Socialist Government with the three first years that the Liberals have been in office. In 1961-62, the Socialists made 1,541 loans. In 1962-63, they made 14,052 loans. In the last year before they were defeated they made 1,422 loans. In the first of Liberal office, with Federal assistance, 2,992 loans were made. Last year 4,866 loans were made. This year, Mr. Speaker, 5,771 students attending the University of Saskatchewan are doing so because they are able to take advantage of loans made available by a Liberal Government either here in Regina, or in Ottawa. And then in addition, Mr. Speaker, another 596 students are there because they were able to obtain scholarships or bursaries from this Government. These are Department of Education figures. In short this year in Saskatchewan we have 11,417 students.

There will be 6,367 or 56 per cent attending university as a result of major financial assistance from this Government, or the Government at Ottawa. Compare these figures to the Socialist record. Today, in Saskatchewan, under a Liberal Government I say categorically there is no student who has the ability and wants to go to university, who cannot obtain entrance. This Government will continue to give education a major priority, because we believe there is no better investment a Government can make than in its young people. But we don't just talk about education; we act.

The Hon. Leader of the Opposition (Mr. Lloyd) talked about the need for a municipal finance fund. He said, "We certainly support such a motion on this side of the House." Since when, since when have the Socialists supported such a fund! Not while they were the Government, Mr. Speaker. Because the SUMA and the SARM time and again went to the previous Government, to the Socialists, asking them to set up the municipal fund. This was the same request they recently made to this Government. Just as often as they went to the Socialists they were turned down flatly.

I happen to have the minutes of one of the meetings of SUMA that was held with certain Government officials. To make this precise, I wish to quote from it. This is a report of a committee consisting of Mayor J.H. Stavely of Weyburn, Mayor H. Greenwood of Rosetown and J. Connor, the Hon. C.M. Fines, Provincial Treasurer, Mr. A.W. Johnson, Deputy Provincial Treasurer, and Mr. L. Jacobs, Deputy Minister of the Department of Municipal Affairs. Now compare what the Socialists are saying today with what they said in 1959. They say today we need a municipal fund. What view did they take formerly on many other occasions. I quote:

Discussions revealed that the Government felt it would

be impractical to place money in a revolving fund, for the purpose of purchasing municipal debentures. The demand for capital by other sources make it necessary for the Provincial Government to go out of the Province for much of its requirements. This is having a tendency to push up the interest rate. Setting up a revolving fund would make no appreciable savings to municipalities in interest charges and would make no appreciable difference to the debenture market other than making it easier to dispose of small debenture issues. Moreover it would tend to make it increasingly difficult for the province to meet its requirements. The Government is of the opinion that it cannot risk its own credit by a guarantee of municipal debentures. It appears that by spreading its resources too thin the Government may find itself unable to give guarantees to its creditors to the extent that they require.

Mr. Speaker, today time after time we heard the Government advocate things which they have bluntly refused themselves to do when they were in office. I accuse them of rank hypocrisy - rank hypocrisy.

SOME HON. MEMBERS: Hear, hear!

MR. LLOYD: — Oh come on!

MR. THATCHER: — I shall have more to say on this subject at a later date. I know as I said a minute ago that the Leader of the Opposition had a difficult time today. It's hard to talk gloom and doom when everything is so prosperous. It is difficult to tell the people of Saskatchewan that this is a party of business when everyone is working at good jobs, and has full dinner plates. The Leader of the Opposition says this Government is on a collision course with history. I say that under a Liberal Government Saskatchewan has a rendezvous with destiny.

SOME HON. MEMBERS: Hear, hear!

MR. THATCHER: — May I adjourn the debate, Mr. Speaker.

Debate adjourned.

The Assembly adjourned at 4:53 o'clock p.m.