

LEGISLATIVE ASSEMBLY OF SASKATCHEWAN
Fourth Session - Fifteenth Legislature
8th Day

Monday, February 13, 1967

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

WELCOME TO STUDENTS

MR. T.M. BREKER (Humboldt): – Mr. Speaker, I would like to draw to your attention and the attention of the House, a group of grade seven, eight and nine and ten students in the west gallery from Annaheim. These students have journeyed some 150 miles to see the fair city of Regina and to see the Saskatchewan policymakers in action. They are accompanied by Sister Thomas, Mrs. Shultz, Allan Doepker, Mr. Tony Holtvogt, as well as being accompanied by their bus drivers, Mr. Don Niekamp and John Draude and Clarence Ehalt. It is the wish of the entire Assembly that their visit be both entertaining and informative, and we wish them a safe journey home.

SOME HON. MEMBERS: – Hear, hear!

MR. W.E. SMISHEK (Regina East): – Mr. Speaker, I want to welcome the 60 grade eight students from the Regina Imperial School. The students are accompanied by Mrs. Hagen, the assistant principal. They are seated in the east gallery. On your behalf, Mr. Speaker, I want to extend to them a warm welcome and express the hope that their stay here today with us will be both enjoyable and informative.

SOME HON. MEMBERS: – Hear, hear!

MRS. SALLY MERCHANT (Saskatoon City): – Mr. Speaker, could I draw your attention and the attention of the Members of the House to a group of students who are seated in the Speaker's gallery from King Edward School in the city of Saskatoon. This is one of the very oldest of the schools in the city and the school that draws its students now from every part of the city in all kinds of special classes in which the school board in Saskatoon has pioneered. I know that you will want to welcome them to this House and wish them, with me, a very happy day.

SOME HON. MEMBERS: – Hear, hear!

MR. H.H.P. BAKER (Regina East): – Mr. Speaker, I too, would like to extend a warm welcome to the Imperial School students whom I have the privilege of representing during these sessions of the Legislature. I want to thank their teachers for taking an interest in them and having them come to our parliamentary institutions where democracy is seen in action. At the same time I extend a warm welcome to all the other students from other parts of this province to the capital city. We wish you a pleasant stay here and a safe journey homeward.

SOME HON. MEMBERS: – Hear, hear!

HON. G.B. GRANT (Minister of Health): – Mr. Speaker, we have a special guest in the Speaker's gallery today that I would like to bring the attention of this House to, in the person of Mr. Henry Thompson of Ghana. Mr. Thompson is the editor of The Evening News there and has been touring the United States under the auspices of the U.S. State Department and is currently travelling across Canada under the visitors program of our own department, the Department of External Affairs in Ottawa. I would ask Mr. Thompson to stand. I trust he will enjoy his stay in the House with us today and we welcome him.

SOME HON. MEMBERS: – Hear, hear!

HON. D.G. STEUART (Minister of Natural Resources): – Mr. Speaker, it is a pleasure to welcome in the Speaker's gallery 40 of the finest-looking young ladies ever to grace this Chamber, the Squirettes from the city of Prince Albert accompanied by Mrs. Gaudette, Mrs. Laliberte, Mrs. Fournier and Mrs. Crandon. I hope that they have enjoyed their stay here and found it educational. I wish the ladies every success in getting them all back home safe and sound.

SOME HON. MEMBERS: – Hear, hear!

CONDOLENCES

HON. W. ROSS THATCHER (Premier): – It was with deep regret that Hon. Members learned yesterday of the death of the Hon. John Cuelenaere, a Member of this Government. For many years Mr. Cuelenaere has been one of the outstanding figures in public life in our province. As Mayor of the City of Prince Albert he served the northern area of Saskatchewan. He was recognized by thousands of our citizens and by his fellow members at the bar, as one of the finest legal minds in Western Canada. As a Member of the Legislature and Member of the Cabinet no man earned more respect from his colleagues. His intelligent, forthright carrying out of the business of government is unsurpassed in our province. His death is a personal loss to many of us who worked closely with him. We enjoyed his good company and wise counsel. His loss will be felt throughout the province.

I am informed by the Deputy Premier (Mr. Steuart) that the funeral will be on Thursday, and probably Hon. Members will wish to adjourn the House for that day. I think the Hon. Member for Prince Albert (Mr. Steuart) will move a motion in that regard later this day.

I should like to move, seconded by the Hon. Leader of the Opposition (Mr. Lloyd):

That this Assembly, deeply moved by the death on Sunday of the Honourable Mr. John Marcel Cuelenaere, respected Member for the constituency of Shellbrook, records in profound sorrow on the loss of a valued friend and colleague, and extends to the members of his family its sincerest condolences, praying that Divine Providence may comfort and sustain them in their bereavement.

HON. W.S. LLOYD (Leader of the Opposition): – Mr. Speaker, I rise to

associate myself with the remarks of the Premier. The very untimely death of John Cuelenaere will be a great loss to his community, to his party, to the Government of Saskatchewan, and to this Legislature. He was a Minister for an extremely short period of time and I think all of us were impressed with the extent to which he gained a good grasp of the workings of his department. We were pleased with the way in which he was prepared to enter into discussion about that department and supply information with respect to its work. Prior to coming to the Legislature his services had been made available in a large number of ways, partly within his constituency where he had a fine record of service in local government and in other community activities as well. Outside of the constituency we will remember for example that he did serve as a member of the senate and a member of the Board of Governors of the University of Saskatchewan. He, like many other municipal leaders, was active also in the Association of Urban Municipalities. As the Premier has said, his ability not only in his chosen profession of law but his ability in fields of government at the local and provincial level, his willingness to give his services in other ways are such as to have earned for him a very real gratitude in many ways. We join with others in expressing our very great sadness and regret to members of his family.

MR. M.P. PEDERSON (Arm River): – Mr. Speaker, it is very difficult for me to add more to the words that have been expressed by the Premier and the Leader of the Opposition (Mr. Lloyd), but I would just like to express my personal feeling of loss in having lost a dear friend of many, many years standing. I appreciated his help to myself, while he was a Minister here in this House. I appreciated my relationship with him over the years. I want to express my sympathy to his family and place on the record my appreciation for the life that he led and the help that he extended not only to me but to countless of our citizens in this province.

HON. D.G. STEUART (Minister of Natural Resources): – Mr. Speaker, in joining with others who have spoken here in paying tribute to the late John Cuelenaere, I would mention that the funeral will be at 10:30 at the Sacred Heart Cathedral in Prince Albert this Thursday. I know many are interested in attending at that time and would want to know this information.

I worked with John. I knew him as a friend, and I worked with him as an alderman in the city of Prince Albert and as a Cabinet colleague in the Government of Saskatchewan. I knew him to be a fine man of outstanding character. He served his city and his province with distinction and with ability. I suppose he will be best remembered in Prince Albert for the outstanding work he did in putting that city back on its feet financially and in the short time he served as Minister of Natural Resources, the great work he did, the long and arduous task he had in the bringing of a pulp mill to this province. He will be missed by his many friends; his passing was a great loss to our community of Prince Albert and to this province. I join with others in expressing to his family our deep regrets.

MR. R.A. WALKER (Hanley): – Mr. Speaker, if I may be permitted to add a word or two to the words that have been spoken in this House. I would like to say that I have been acquainted with the departed Member for perhaps 20 or 25 years and I must say that I can

understand why so many of his friends and acquaintances feel this sense of loss at his passing.

John Cuelenaere was a distinguished member of the Bar of this province. I well remember as a law student watching him practise in the courts of Saskatchewan and being struck by the sense of fairness and humility with which he approached his tasks, with which he approached the practice of law. He always earned and received fair hearings from the courts and the cooperation of the members of the Bar. Even though they disagreed over legal issues, they always respected his sense of fairness and his gentlemanly courtesy. No matter whether he was an alderman or a mayor or a Member of this Legislature or a Member of the Cabinet, he never lost the touch of humility which earned for him a warm response from everybody who had anything to do with him.

It is a sad thing that we have to mourn the passing of a man who has been taken in the prime of his life as John Cuelenaere has, from the ranks of this Legislature and from the Province of Saskatchewan. I think perhaps he had a warmth and a human sympathy which one finds rarely, particularly in public officials, and this is probably one of the reasons why he leaves so many mourning friends who mourn his passing at this time.

I just wanted to add these words, as a member of his profession, to the condolences which go out from this House and to say that as a barrister, as a past president of the Law Society of Saskatchewan, he will be missed by all the members of that profession as well as by those who knew him in public life.

MR. J.R. BROCKELBANK (Kelsey): – Mr. Speaker, while I was the Minister of Natural Resources in Saskatchewan for many years I had a good deal to do with John Cuelenaere. I always found it to be very helpful and very pleasant to work with him. I am sad at the death of my friend, John Cuelenaere, and I want to add my expression of sympathy to the members of his family.

MR. W.J. BEREZOWSKY (Cumberland): – Mr. Speaker, I too was a friend of the late John Cuelenaere and I would like to express my sadness and also to pass on my condolences to his friends and his family. John Cuelenaere was a good man, there is a future for him. We are sad as to what has happened to him. May he rest in peace, Mr. Speaker.

MR. THATCHER: – Mr. Speaker, I am sure the relatives of the Minister will certainly appreciate the remarks which have occurred on both sides of the House this afternoon and as Premier and Leader of the Government I would like to thank Hon. Members for their remarks. I should like to move, seconded by the Hon. Leader of the Opposition (Mr. Lloyd):

That the Resolution just passed be communicated to members of the bereaved family by Mr. Speaker.

Motion agreed to.

ADJOURNED DEBATES: ADDRESS IN REPLY

The Assembly resumed the adjourned debate on the proposed motion of Mr. Hooker (Notukeu-Willowbunch) for an Address In Reply and the proposed amendment thereto by Mr. Lloyd (Leader of the Opposition).

MR. W.E. SMISHEK (Regina East): – Mr. Speaker, at the outset I want to join with the Premier, the Leader of the Opposition (Mr. Lloyd) and others in expressing my deepest sympathy in the untimely passing of Mr. Cuelenaere. We shall all miss him from this Legislature, his counsel will be missed by the government. He was an able and honorable man. My deepest sympathies go to his family, relatives and friends.

Mr. Speaker, when I adjourned the debate last Friday I described in some detail the callous disregard this Government has in meeting the education needs of our children, and in developing a meaningful manpower training and upgrading program. Let me take a moment to recap the government's three year dismal education record. Upon examination we find that many of their announced programs are inflated for propaganda purposes and do not correspond with the facts.

Let us take a look at the university program. First we find that in the last two years \$7,000,000 of university construction expenditure approved by the Legislature have been cancelled or deferred on the orders of the Premier. University tuition fees have been increased by \$35 per student despite the fact that the Bladen Commission said that no increase in tuition fees should take place. The Provincial Student Aid Fund has been virtually eliminated and the Government is trying to take credit for the Federal Student Loan program. Last year \$3,000,000 of funds set aside by the CCF Government for university student education purposes was taken into provincial general revenue to cover up a deficit budget. Last year also \$3,000,000 of increased federal grants for university operating costs were used to reduce provincial financial responsibility to the university. Taking all the university students into account full-time and part-time, we find that operating grants last year were reduced from \$419 to \$386 from the previous year, a reduction of \$33 per student. The International Student Scholarship Program was eliminated.

The Minister of Education (Mr. Trapp) boasts about the increase in university student enrolment. What did he expect, Mr. Speaker, a reduction? The Bladen Commission in its report predicts a threefold increase in university enrolment within a period of 12 years. The CCF Government foresaw this higher education explosion and proceeded with the development of the Regina campus. The Premier on taking office, the Government on the other side, Mr. Speaker, deterred its progress. The Premier directed the university to spread the three-year program, resulting in controlled student enrolment, the final and devastating result being that hundreds of youngsters last year were denied an opportunity of university education.

Mr. Speaker, excluding university construction but including all other school construction, public and separate elementary and high schools, technical and composite schools, all schools, we find that in the current fiscal year less than \$4,000,000 of provincial funds will be spent on capital construction. True more money was spent in the province on school construction but it came out of federal and municipal funds. The Minister (Mr. Trapp) boastfully recited the increased in per capita student grants since 1963. Big news, Mr. Speaker, but the Minister did not bother telling people that he was comparing apples with oranges. He omitted to tell us that his figures included some federal grants. He omitted to tell us that the CCF Government at the 1964 session added the separate high school system as a

provincial responsibility, which sharply increased the costs. He omitted to tell us that in the fiscal year 1963-64 the CCF Government provided more money from provincial funds for school construction than the Liberal Government did in this current year. And he forgot to mention that since 1963 the Federal Government has made available to the province more money for education purposes.

There are other details Liberals don't talk about when they discuss education. One of these is that municipal taxes in Saskatchewan have increased by some \$18,000,000 since they took office, principally to meet rising education costs and I predict, Mr. Speaker, the municipal taxes will rise again. This Government has, and continues to shift the education cost responsibility on the property owners. I wonder, Mr. Speaker, why the Minister did not report that the so-called incentive grants are rejected by school boards and trustees as a means of financing education.

Mr. Speaker, in the past three years Members on this side of the house, organized labor, employers and other groups, seriously questioned the 1964 Liberal promise to create 80,000 new and additional jobs in the province, within a four-year period. Well, sir, we finally got our doubts confirmed last Friday. The report, prepared by Hillis and Partners entitled, "Saskatchewan Manpower-Needs and Resources" tabled last Friday is the most critical indictment ever cast on this government. It shatters completely the Liberal promise. It confirms once and for all that the Liberal 80,000 job promise was irresponsible, mischievous and greatly damaging to the people of Saskatchewan.

The report shows that the non-agricultural labor force between 1961 and 1964 grew by 25,700, an average increase of 8,500 per year. It notes that in the two years, 1964 to 1966, the growth was only 5,000 per year, 3,600 per year less than during the CCF administration. The report states that the agricultural labor force is declining at the rate of 2,500 per year. It projects that in a four-year period, 1964 to 1968, the non-agricultural labor force at best will increase by 22,800. The farm labor force on the other hand will drop by some 10,000. A net increase of perhaps 12,800; they promised 80,000 new jobs. The growth is only 16 per cent of what they promised. During the last three years of office under the CCF Government the net gain was 18,200. The report shows that it would take a Liberal Government from 1964 to 1971 to add only 18,650 jobs. It will take seven years for the Liberals to do the job that the CCF did in three years, Mr. Speaker.

SOME HON. MEMBERS: – Hear, hear!

MR. SMISHEK: – The Manpower Report confirms that Liberals do not have a farm policy to halt the exodus of farm families from the land, particularly from the smaller farm units. It confirms what I said last Friday. When Liberal spokesmen condemn and malign labor they are in fact vilifying the sons and daughters, relatives and friends, of our farm families. In the long run, Mr. Speaker, they are condemning their own children.

I ask the Government to print additional copies of this Manpower Report and give it broad circulation. I ask the press to do a more thorough analysis of this report and print a more objective story of its contents. Printing misleading headlines

is mischievous and a disservice to the people of Saskatchewan.

The report sets out three principles for Government action, none of them new, Mr. Speaker. We on this side of the House have urged action on each one of them at the previous regular sessions of this Legislature. The recommendations contained in this report were acted upon by the CCF Government when it was in office but largely ignored when the present Liberal administration took over. The recommendations are: (1) development of education facilities that better prepare people for work in the nonprofessional occupations; (2) providing information on jobs, training and individual abilities, with concentration on youth; (3) providing financial assistance for moving and training.

Let me tell you of the attitude of this Government in meeting these principles. Let me tell you about how completely they disregarded the needs in developing technical and vocational school facilities in the province, resulting in 880 persons last year being denied admission to technical schools for lack of space. Likely more will be denied the opportunity for technical education this year. On taking office in 1964 they immediately cancelled \$2,000,000 appropriated for technical school construction. Regional technical schools planned by the CCF government were abandoned by the Liberal administration. The Premier announced construction of technical and vocational schools for Lloydminster, Melfort, and Swift Current in 1965 and again in 1966. Lloydminster cost will be shared with Alberta. Construction of technical schools were also announced for Estevan and North Battleford in 1965. In the 1966 budget these were repeated and Regina and Prince Albert were added to the list. In 1967, Mr. Speaker, no progress, nothing started.

On several occasions the Government announced extension plans to the Moose Jaw and Saskatoon technical schools. To date not a single room has been added to Moose Jaw. In the 1965 budget the Premier said that \$2,500,000 to \$3,000,000 addition is planned for the Saskatoon Technical School. That year only \$75.06 was spent on capital expenditures. Last year he upped the figure to \$4,000,000. It is interesting to note that the Federal Minister of Manpower (Mr. Marchand) said that the school construction will cost only \$1,750,000 with the Federal Government putting in \$1,300,000 and the province slightly over \$400,000. Why was this Legislature given the figure of \$4,000,000? Why were we and the people of Saskatchewan misinformed? Why was the name of the Saskatoon Technical School changed? Why were we not told, Mr. Speaker, that the Saskatoon addition is really an addition for a School of Nursing? After three years of office the only addition to provincial technical school facilities is the Weyburn Vocational Centre, a renovation job of the Saskatchewan Hospital, which will accommodate approximately 200 persons. I am surprised that they didn't add to the list Saskatchewan House as a vocational school.

Mr. Speaker, I acknowledge that composite schools were built in Yorkton and one in Regina, the Miller High, but I also ask the Government to acknowledge that local school boards invested more money in these composite schools than did the Provincial Government. Large sums of money are available from the Federal Government, 75 per cent is available for vocational school construction. A vocational school is badly needed in the city of Regina. Dr. Reynolds's survey confirms the need for a technical school in Regina. The Minister of Education (Mr. Trapp)

firstly agreed but apparently someone changed his mind and he later said: "I think we must have it here by 1970." Well, Mr. Speaker, would you believe the year 2000 – if the Liberals continue in office.

Facilities are not the only problem. We need a positive upgrading program to first upgrade academically some 120,000 workers and farmers who today have grade eight or less education. We have a shortage of teachers, particularly in technologies and trades. We need an effective guidance and counselling service. We need a new apprenticeship program. I have already told you that the Apprenticeship Board did not even meet last year. Living allowances must be increased and broadened. We need education research. We need more specialized administrative staff and teaching personnel. We need to keep the skilled people we have and recruit additional personnel. I regret, Mr. Speaker, that some of our best people are leaving. Several months ago, the Deputy Minister of Education quit, the Moose Jaw Technical School principal left us, the Director of Inplant Training has also given notice, several Department of Education employees have severed or are considering severing employment; some have been persuaded to stay on for a while. These terminations are taking place because of frustration for want of adequate government support in education and some freedom of action to develop new and better programs in the field of education.

SOME HON. MEMBERS: – Hear, hear!

MR. SMISHEK: – Mr. Speaker, the Economic Council of Canada in its Second Annual Review said:

The advancement of education at all levels be given a very high place in public policy and that investment in education be accorded the highest rank in the scale of priorities.

The CCF party at its last convention adopted a new, positive and exciting education and manpower training program. We believe that equality of opportunity begins with education. Our aim must be to guarantee to every citizen the right to develop his or her capabilities to the fullest, regardless of financial circumstances or geographic location. The CCF government when re-elected will start with the elimination of student fees and eventually the provision of living allowances for all qualified students at provincial universities, technical schools and where circumstances require, high schools.

We believe that a manpower policy cannot operate effectively in a climate that denies civil rights. Legislation like Bills 2 and 79 must be repealed. As we enter upon our second 100 years of Canadian History, I can tell you, sir, and the people of Saskatchewan that the CCF party has an agenda for action. We invite the people to join us in building a better Saskatchewan and a greater Canada.

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

SOME HON. MEMBERS: – Hear, hear!

MR. J.A. PEPPER (Weyburn): – Mr. Speaker, I would like to extend my words of sympathy

and condolences to the Government and to the bereaved in the passing of the Hon. John Cuelenaere. My acquaintance with him has been but a short time. I found him to be a very highly regarded gentleman both in the session and during his daily work.

I want to take part in this debate because I feel there is so much to be desired from the Speech from the Throne and it is our duty as Members from our constituencies to express our views and to debate the issues. I would first like to congratulate the Members from Notukeu-Willowbunch (Mr. Hooker) and from Moosomin (Mr. Gardner), in the manner in which they moved and seconded the acceptance of this Speech. They did quite well with what they had to work with but certainly wandered a long way from the subject in order to try and secure material to emphasize their points.

This is the first occasion, Mr. Speaker, since the Redistribution Bill that was brought in that I have had an opportunity to comment on it. As you know a portion of Bengough and Souris-Estevan constituencies, including the prosperous town of Midale, have been added to Weyburn constituency. I welcome this area, Mr. Speaker, and can assure them that their interests will be my interests and I will endeavor to serve them to the best of my ability.

SOME HON. MEMBERS: – Hear, hear!

MR. PEPPER: – As the representative from Weyburn, I would first like to say a word about my constituency. It is situated in perhaps one of the most diversified areas of the province. Here is found some of the best agricultural land. Because of that agricultural land, agriculture is perhaps its key industry for not only the growing of grain, but also for livestock raising. Some of the best established herds of cattle, some of the largest 4H clubs are found operating within this area. And in the centre of all this is our thriving and progressive city, Weyburn. We are also fortunate to have discovered in the area some of the larger oil fields within the province dating back to 1955, when the first wells were discovered and brought into production. These two industries are perhaps the main industries contributing to our favorable conditions in the Weyburn constituency.

While we realize that these have been contributing factors to our buoyant conditions, we as all other constituencies are faced with a substantial increase in the cost of living, and feel that immediate steps have to be taken to curtail this increasing rise in costs. And I would say this is one of the first measures or issues that our government must deal with today. It is not enough to find that this is of prime concern to our people, but we must face up to the task and do something to alleviate the condition and take some drastic steps to bring things to a reasonable level.

Being a farmer I am perhaps a little prejudiced towards agriculture. I cannot find within this document or Throne Speech very little help or provisions made to encourage or induce this industry towards a brighter outlook. True enough there is the extension of the brand inspection program, and approving additional expenditures on community pastures or perhaps putting forth proposals regarding the irrigation program or the continuance of the Veterinary College at Saskatoon. This, Mr. Speaker,

is just a continuance of the agricultural program over the last few years. The farmers of Saskatchewan want and deserve much more consideration than this, and from a government that professes to be such a friend of the farmer. I would think that when it has the opportunity to prove itself it would jump at the chance.

Just about a year ago now, Mr. Speaker, there were hearings being held in various centres in the province pertaining to the surface rights of farmers under His Hon. Judge Friesen, hearings in which all parties concerned had equal opportunities to present their case. A report known as the Friesen Report then brought down its findings. Perhaps the main reason for the hearings that were held on surface rights was the need for an adjustment of some kind in the contracts and in the remuneration that the farmers were able to get because of the now higher assessed land and the much greater increased sale value of land. Experience is a very good teacher, and the farmers through this past experience in surface rights negotiations had discovered many things. Little did these farmers realize the difficulties that they would encounter or that would prevail when oil industry moved into their area. It is a new experience and it meant a little ready cash annually to them if they would sign these contracts and they, the oil companies, would then build lease roads into the well sites, set up their necessary equipment and that would be pretty well the complete issue. The farmer thought this was a fair deal. They were not informed of the vast changes that would be required when the pipelines were laid and the disturbance of their top soil on these lines, or of the many oil line breaks that would be encountered or the well-heads bursting, and from pressure, blowing oil and gas and salt water all over many acres of their land. They were not informed of the danger of contamination of their soil due to flare pits becoming too highly filled salt water and escaping into their agricultural land. They were not told of the manner in which this gas and sulphur that is polluting the area surrounding each battery and well-site would rust and pit any galvanized object or chrome fixture it might come in contact with, or that their barbed wire fencing would have to be replaced. Any houses, particularly those with aluminum siding, that are close to these flare pits are turning in color and seriously deteriorating. After a short period of time it is brought to the attention of the farmer that a water-flood method to build up pressure under the land and force the oil up would be installed. Again this meant tearing up more of this land, further disturbance of soil and when these pipe lines or water lines are installed, it leaves a very severe cave-in in many areas which the farmer has to try and move his machinery over, time and time again. The only other alternative is to notify the company and after a period of time and persistence it will be repaired. Another very disturbing factor was that these wells and batteries and satellites and plans would all require power to operate them. There is now such a network of power lines and poles on each farmer's property that it is almost impossible to operate some of the large expensive machinery that is required to farm today. Aerial spraying is completely out in some areas. Some farmers have had the misfortune of having some of their livestock poisoned by carelessness of battery operators leaving red lead around well-sites. Others have lost livestock in some of the trenches left open to lay pipeline. These are some of the educational experiences that the farmer has encountered over the past 12 years in the development of oil and its production. And due to the dollar value and the vast increase in price of machinery, increase in price of land,

and the present cost of farming operations, they are asking for a substantial increase in their present contracts and a right to negotiate contracts much more in their favor. They are asking for this so that they might share more equitably in the profits which are secured to the oil companies by and through disturbing this area known as the farmer's surface rights.

I understand, Mr. Speaker, that the Surface Rights Association was quite prepared to accept the findings of Judge Friesen and has urged the government and particularly the Minister of Mineral Resources (Mr. Cameron) to pass legislation to implement this report so as to give him, the farmer, a fairer and more equitable agreement in their surface rights contracts which they are without a doubt entitled to.

This would have been a good chance to speak for the farmer and agriculture, but I see nothing in the Throne Speech to indicate any consideration will be given to them. I wonder, Mr. Speaker, just why the Hon. Members are so silent at this time, especially those from the areas so concerned. Here is a perfect opportunity for them to act on behalf of our farmers, the pioneers of the agricultural province. I do not see any proposal to take any action to assist our farmers who are faced with the great possibilities of rail line abandonment. I know because I have been given a copy of a letter of application to the Board of Transport by the railroad company of two branch lines within my own constituency to abandon that portion of the railroad. I can assure you these farmers are very perturbed about the situation. It will mean a considerable added expense and hardship. As well, it will mean the breakdown of many communities and districts if these applications are granted.

Why are our Hon. Members opposite so silent on this subject? They didn't even think our farmers were important enough to take the time to send one Member to Ottawa and present a brief in person opposing any action to abandon these rail lines. I was very pleased to see that our Leader of the Opposition (Mr. Lloyd), took a very firm attitude and presented a brief in person on behalf of the farmers of this province, asking that no steps should be taken at least at this time in the field of rail line abandonment. I ask you, Mr. Speaker, just who is the friend of the farmer when the chips are down. This is certainly another example in the Speech from the Throne where the government failed to give consideration to our farmer and our rural people.

I notice the Speech from the Throne says nothing about highway programs or construction. I fully realize that the highway program during the past year was a large one if you look at it in dollars and cents. But when you try to see the great amount of work that this money should produce, I fail to see it. And as to which areas get the priority is also puzzling to me. During the last session I inquired of the then Minister of Highways (Mr. Grant) of the possibility of including certain highways which I am concerned with into his program. He stated that the road count didn't warrant further consideration at that time. This stretch of highway had a count of 235 vehicles per day at that time. I immediately checked on some highways which they had blacktopped in Bengough just prior to the by-election and I found that they had hard surfaced or blacktopped one with a road count or check of 127 vehicles per day. So this puzzles one to know just what is required to be eligible for consideration, particularly when the highway I have in mind from Torquay to Minton or No. 18, goes through a very important oil development area,

supposed to be some of the greatest oil well discoveries in the history of the Liberal government. Highway safety is a very important topic in this day and age, and to secure full benefit from its planning, highways such as I have just mentioned must be given greater priority.

Our Members across the floor boast how they are inducing tourist trade to come into Saskatchewan and spend many days fishing and hunting in our northern areas. Might I suggest, Mr. Speaker, that a little action on the rebuilding and oiling of such highways as No. 35 from junction 13, north to No. 1 would not only alleviate a lot of traffic on No. 39, but it would certainly add safety and convenience to those hundreds of people and tourists that use it.

Just a word on education in the Throne Speech. This field has been quite well covered by former speakers. I would like to say I appreciate Weyburn being chosen as a city in which you have started to operate a vocational school and I will do what I can to make this endeavor prove a success. Judging from the progress of these schools in other areas of the province, I hesitate to predict the possibilities of us having one in Weyburn, had our present government not evacuated the patients in such wholesale manner from the Provincial Hospital. In my judgment they had to commit themselves to utilizing this portion of the building in order to save face. And they stepped into this with very little planning, hoping it provides a satisfactory adventure. I hope it proves satisfactory too, Mr. Speaker, because we already have the promise from the Hon. Premier (Mr. Thatcher) and the Minister of Education (Mr. Trapp) that a College of Agriculture could quite easily be established there as well. But at this point, Mr. Speaker I remind myself that a politician is one who looks forward to winning the next election, a statesman is one who looks forward to the next generation. We will just wait and see what proves out.

I notice there is not any legislation in the Throne Speech pertaining to labor, and I have heard several of the Member opposite make the statement that they have done more for labor than we in CCF ever did. I most heartily agree that they have done more. They have done more towards promoting disturbances and strikes than we ever did. They have done more towards taking away the privilege of sitting down and negotiating with management in an honorable fashion which we, the CCF had made available to them. They have done more towards shackling labor and have taken away their privilege of full collective bargaining. This is my only comment, Mr. Speaker. When the time comes I know that labor will speak for itself.

I have tried to deal with different parts of the Throne Speech so as not to repeat statements made by former speakers. Three are other areas I would like to cover but my time allotted to me is now used. I have tried to be constructive in my criticisms and feel we as elected representatives have a very responsible obligation to our people to promote good legislation. I am sure, Mr. Speaker, you will have gathered by now that I am not supporting the motion, but will support the amendment.

SOME HON. MEMBERS: – Hear, hear!

MR. A.B. GUY (Athabasca): – Mr. Speaker, I must first of all add my words of regret at the passing of the Hon. John Cuelenaere. It was my privilege to act as his legislative secretary for some time and I can say only

that as a true northerner we were very proud of the way that he represented the interests of the northern part of the province. I would add my sympathy to his family on their bereavement.

I would also like to congratulate the mover and seconder of the Throne Speech for a fine job. The Speech they referred to in their address was one of the most aggressive and comprehensive this House has ever had the privilege to debate. It is true that there was no great beating of drums, no excess verbiage, no excess double-talk like we had to listen to in the speeches of the Socialists on former years. It outlines simply the policy of the government for the coming year with no apologies for the past. A policy of Liberal action for progress. It is hard to understand how speakers across the way can stand up one after the other like automatic pins in a bowling alley and claim that the Speech contained nothing. To my mind never did a Speech provide so much for so many. It provides opportunity for our youth, comfort for our aged. It provides assistance for our cultural and intellectual communities, as well as for the vocational and technically inclined; relief for those who are oppressed by taxation and aid for those not blessed with good health; programs to assist our farmers, our consumers, our workers, and our municipalities. Educational and health institutions have received prominent attention. Safeguards of individuals' rights, recognition of the rights of our minority groups and above all, justice for all, highlight the Address. No one has been forgotten by our Government in our desire that all citizens of our province receive a fair share of the benefits resulting from policies of our Liberal government over the last two and a half years.

The other highlight of last week was the contrast between the speeches of the Premier and the Leader of the Opposition (Mr. Lloyd). At no time in the past has the difference in the two philosophies our leaders espouse been more clear – the Premier in his address emphasizing our success under a private enterprise system; the Leader of the Opposition (Mr. Lloyd) apologizing for the failures of Socialism.

The Premier's speech was one of the finest given in this Legislature. Vigorous, positive and vibrant in its survey of what two and a half years of Liberal Government has done for the people of Saskatchewan, a record that the Premier and his colleagues can be proud of. The Leader of the Opposition's speech, on the other hand, was apologetic and half-hearted as if he realized nothing he could say could refute the evidence of the progress acclaimed by this government. While the Premier outlined his program for the coming year, the Leader of the Opposition quoted a little Shakespeare, quoted from an American trade magazine and finally read a chatty little letter from a Socialist friend in California. All of which, I am sure is of little interest to Saskatchewan voters as they decide who they will support in the coming election.

SOME HON. MEMBERS: – Hear, hear!

MR. GUY: – It is no wonder after the Premier's speech that the Members opposite appeared whipped, discouraged and beaten as they slumped down in their seats. Socialists have never done too well in open debate where one must stick to the truth. This dates back a number of years to the little town of Mossbank. They are much better off in some far corner of the province, in some back room where they can distort the facts to their own choosing.

Their Bible in these circumstances is not the facts printed in the Dominion Bureau of Statistics or other reliable sources, but is the Commonwealth, filled with distortion and untruths like no paper before it. This is the type of debate the socialists excel in. Members on this side had been looking forward to this session as one that would be vigorous and interesting. The socialists for months have been telling all and sundry that when the House sat they would have some comments on this, they would be constructive, they would be placing a brand new socialist program before the House. But where is it? To date this has failed to materialize and one can only surmise that the socialists have no answers, they have no program, only a few warmed-over pieces of propaganda, so dry that even their own speakers choke on them.

SOME HON. MEMBERS: – Hear, hear!

MR. GUY: – When the Leader of the Opposition (Mr. Lloyd) spoke last Monday he said he would spend a major portion of his time next day in a devastating attack on the Liberal Government's attitude to education while presenting a new socialist approach to the problem. However, Tuesday came and Tuesday almost went, before this attack appeared. Then a major portion of time proved to be nine minutes of a 95 minute address, and when did it come? When he was on the air so all the citizens of Saskatchewan could hear it? No, it came when the radio time was over. His remarks were full of errors, half-truths and distorted facts, and he had no new program, his old program was obsolete, and his government's record compare to the Liberal's was a joke, so one can only conclude that on sober reflection he knew he had nothing to say so it would be better if as few people as possible heard it.

SOME HON. MEMBERS: – Hear, hear!

MR. GUY: – In reality the bulk of his remarks related to what good things the Liberal party had accomplished. Like a broken record he kept repeating: We congratulate you for doing this, we are pleased you are doing that; but each time he said it he tacked on the worn-out phrase, "but it was our idea first." If they really believe this, that is fine because it proves once again that socialists can think, but it takes Liberals to act and that is what this province needs, Liberal action. It also proves beyond doubt that the socialists make a good opposition, but a darn poor government, and that is where they are likely to stay.

SOME HON. MEMBERS: – Hear, hear!

MR. GUY: – I was sorry to hear that the lone Conservative Member of our Legislature (Mr. Pederson) was not going to support our free enterprise Throne Speech. However, I suppose it is difficult to sit among the socialists for so long without having a little socialism rub off on him. I must say, I could hardly believe my ears when he gave is little sermon about referring to the Liberal party, NDP party and so on, when talking really about what a government does as the representatives of the people. If it had come from anyone but a Tory, I could have taken it seriously, but when I recall Alvin Hamilton and John Diefenbaker going the length and breadth of Canada not saying that the Conservative party sold our wheat and gave us payments, but taking personal

credit for these things. All we have heard from 1957 on was John did this and Alvin did that; in fact, they did so much, so well, they destroyed the Conservative government in the process. I find it hard to believe, Mr. Speaker, that the Member from Arm River (Mr. Pederson) really meant what he said. Either that, or his memory is extremely short.

The speeches from Members opposite to date have been uninspiring. One gets the feeling that disunity runs rampant among them. City Members rise and in a monotonous harangue extol the virtues of labor. Farm Members cannot hide their distaste for the wild and inflammatory remarks of their left-wing radical members who, as paid employees of the labor union, must earn their keep and who in so doing cost each farmer Member a vote with every word they speak.

SOME HON. MEMBERS: – Hear, hear!

MR. GUY: – Farm members on the other hand dare not speak out on the side of the farmers against their labor colleagues for they know they must depend on union funds for their next election campaign. So they remain mute, trying to hide their distress and hoping that there won't be an election this year and there won't be as many strikes against the farmer in the year ahead. One note of unity that has always been noticeable among the socialists has been their view of international affairs, nuclear disarmament, and Vietnam. But even this appears to have come to an end as they are now faced with deciding whether to support the Moscow or the Peking line. Some Members favor the stronger anti-Americanism of the Red Chinese, but others fear that the Muscovites will win the power struggle and then where would they be. As a result of this conflict on the other side, I thought for the first time since I entered this House we might go through this session without having to bring Vietnam into our provincial affairs. However, the Member from Saskatoon (Mr. Link) couldn't resist the temptation, and as he sat down he whispered that the people in Vietnam are unhappy and why doesn't our Provincial Government do something about it. I gather from newspaper reports that the Member from Saskatoon (Mr. Link) is also unhappy and I don't blame him. After the hard work and good service he has given the NDP organization in Saskatoon to be dropped like a hot potato and forced to contest his re-election elsewhere is a heavy cross to bear. I regret that I cannot give him much hope of success in his new constituency.

Mr. Speaker, I would like to say just a few words about the transformation that is taking place in Northern Saskatchewan. In 1964, when we took over the government, the Northern part of the province was a forgotten area. The socialists had failed completely to recognize the human and natural resources that existed there. The Liberal election program for Northern Saskatchewan was short and simple – provide the climate for free enterprise development of our natural resources, provide the necessary social services for the development of our human resources and provide equal treatment for the people of the north as compared to the people in the southern part of the province. One trip through the north today and you can see how successful we have been. After two and a half years of Liberal Government the north is a different place. There is employment for all, mining and lumbering activity is unprecedented and optimism is high. The result certainly shows our faith in Northern Saskatchewan as well warranted. Northern Saskatchewan is progressing like never

before in our history, and like our partners in the south we are looking forward to our next One Hundred Years. We do hope however, that our next one hundred years will not be broken by an unhappy depressing 20 years of socialism as it was in the first hundred.

SOME HON. MEMBERS: – Hear, hear!

MR. GUY: – I will have more to say in regard to the development of Northern Saskatchewan when I have more time in the Budget Debate. Mr. Speaker, before I take my seat, I feel that some reference must be made to the article which appeared in the Canadian last week. We are aware that figures in public life are favorite targets for writers and pressmen. We are aware also that interpretations of any one individual will vary. They may be praised by one, criticized by another and this must be accepted. All that is usually asked by public figures is that a fair and just interpretation be given. Unfortunately the article appearing in the Canadian on Saskatchewan and its Premier was neither fair nor just. I am sure that the majority of the people in Saskatchewan found the article distasteful, shocking and ridiculous. Not only was it a cheap, distorted attempt at character assassination of our Premier, but it was an attack on all the people of this province. Regardless of politics, the Premier of any province is a symbol of that province's government and as such deserves the respect due that position. When a Premier is maligned so is the province and every individual in it. For the most part, representatives of the press are members of a fair, unprejudiced and respected profession who are loyal guardians of our democratic way of life. However, as in any profession, there are a few unprincipled members who for reasons of their own flout the accepted ethics of their group. It is hard to believe that a reporter could accept the hospitality of the province, the Premier, his family, his colleagues and friends and then write the kind of biased, scurrilous garbage that he did. It is even more difficult to understand how an eastern newspaper would allow such an unprincipled and unfounded attack on a province, its Premier and its people. I hope the editor of the eastern paper realizes that he has done nothing to foster east-west unity in this our Centennial Year. For whether the people in Western Canada, and particularly Saskatchewan, agree or disagree with our Premier's policies, they do agree that he is a champion of Western rights and solidarity. This unmitigated attack on a Western province and its Premier by an eastern newspaper will not be forgiven or forgotten easily. I am sure that all our citizens resent the insinuations, innuendoes, and untruths that the article portrays. And will join together to refute this attack on the integrity of Saskatchewan people. Mr. Speaker, needless to say I will support the motion and oppose the amendment.

SOME HON. MEMBERS: – Hear, hear!

HON. D.V. HEALD (Attorney General): – Mr. Speaker, in rising to take part in this debate, my first words must be words of sympathy to the family, and members of the family of the late John Cuelenaere. I would like to associate myself with everything that has been said by all Hon. Members this afternoon in respect to John Cuelenaere and the very great contribution that he made to the public life of the province, not only in this Legislature, and not only in the counsels of the government of this province, but in the public

life of the city of Prince Albert, the public life of the University of Saskatchewan. So I with a heavy heart this afternoon, rise to my place in this Legislature to take part in the debate and acknowledge that John Cuelenaere is no longer with us.

It is a great deal of pleasure for me, Mr. Speaker, this afternoon to take part in this debate and to explain in detail the provisions of the White Paper which I tabled in the Legislature on Friday last. I would like to say that I am very proud to be a part of a government that sees fit to bring in such enlightened legislation for the protection of all our people. Before I do so, Mr. Speaker, I must with regret and resentment make reference to the venomous and scurrilous article that the Member for Athabasca (Mr. Guy) referred to which appeared in the newspaper supplement, the Canadian, February 11, last.

MR. R.A. WALKER (Hanley): – Mr. Speaker, can the Hon. Member tell us where we can get a copy of this. I haven't seen it.

MR. HEALD: – I'll get you one. In a most shameful and outrageous distortion of fact, in a carefully calculated piece of yellow journalism, the Canadian has attacked the people, the province, and the Premier of Saskatchewan in a manner unparalleled and unequalled in the entire history of Canadian politics. Now, Mr. Speaker, every one of us who has ever stood for public office has been aware of the rules of the game. We expect, we have expected a certain amount of abuse, a certain amount of indignity as the price we pay for public service. We've been prepared and we are prepared to bear it, but surely, Mr. Speaker, there are limits.

When an eastern newspaper in an obviously preplanned and premeditated operation undertakes a deliberate character assassination; when coldly calculated deceit is cunningly employed to attempt to destroy an individual because of his position and accomplishments, surely we must all rise up and protest in the strongest possible terms. This ruthless attempt to smear, to defile the Premier of this province deals a staggering blow to responsible journalism in Canada. Half truths, outright evasion of fact and insidious innuendo are piled one on top of the other with apparently only one purpose – to discredit Saskatchewan by disparaging its Premier. Those of you who read it will remember the reference –

All there is to do in Saskatchewan, these hundreds of thousands of square miles of frozen waste, is to talk about football and politics .

This is the attitude of the man who came out here to do this article. I say, Mr. Speaker, apparently for one purpose, because there can be no clear reason for this outrage. One wonders what could possibly be the hidden motives.

Now it is well known that Saskatchewan before too long will face a provincial election, so one would expect that such an article might clearly evaluate the political situation in Saskatchewan. One would think that a reporter coming from the east might discuss the Government's policies, what it has done or what it should have done and didn't do. But, sir, I remind you that there is not one word about policies or position, just vilification and abuse, that's all.

The Premier of Saskatchewan has fought and defeated all over Canada the narrow economic nationalists whose restrictive programs would have seriously damaged Western Canada. This has been resented in some quarters. Could this not be one of the hidden motives behind the article? Ross Thatcher successfully organized the Western Liberal Conference. This resulted in Western Liberals for the first time having their views known and accepted at the national level. This has been resented in some quarters and could be another of those hidden motives for this wretched attack. The Liberal Premier of this province has proven time and time again to be a courageous and persistent fighter in the battle for Saskatchewan's rights. This has been resented and might be another of the hidden reasons behind this smear. The policies and practices of the government led by our Premier have started Saskatchewan on a new road in prosperity and expansion. That this too has been resented in some quarters, hardly covers the situation. Could this be another of these yet-to-be revealed reason for this vicious attack?

Mr. Speaker, simply to say that such an article is senselessly vicious is not enough. It must be pointed out that this kind of irresponsible journalism has an effect far beyond this building or this province. And this is the sad part of it. At a time when our democratic system of government is under constant attack and we desperately need to attract bright and keen young people to public service, this malicious kind of stupidity makes it only more difficult to add lustre to public office. I have made many speeches, and I'm sure other Hon. Members of the Legislature have made speeches in this province and in other parts of Canada extolling our younger people, advising them, persuading them that one of the highest things and one of the best things that they can do is to get into public life and to offer themselves for service, the service of their fellow human beings. And this is the kind of vicious attack that someone who gets into public life subjects himself to. And so, Mr. Speaker, I say to you this: If the editors of the Canadian have any interest in true journalism, if in fact they were not motivated to some devious purpose. If in fact they have a positive interest in the good of Canada and its people, then they will retract the article and they will apologize publicly to the people of this province and to the Premier of this province.

MR. R.A. WALKER (Hanley): – You guys like to dish it out, but you don't like to take it.

MR. HEALD: – We don't need to take that.

MR. A.R. GUY (Athabasca): – Why don't you say something, Bob?

MR. HEALD: – Now, Mr. Speaker, I would like to turn to the White Paper entitled the Citizens Protection Code for the Province of Saskatchewan, and I would like to deal in some detail with the various statutes which are proposed in this White Paper.

The first Bill is entitled, "The Unconscionable Transactions Relief Act" which will be presented to the House for enactment during this session. This Bill will provide measures of relief for persons who have found it necessary to borrow money from professional money lenders or who have secured credit for the purposes of any transaction and who have secured the loan or have been granted credit subject to a high interest rate. In other

words, Mr. Speaker, this will cover all kinds of credit transactions. This will cover the case of the man who goes to the loan company and borrows \$50, or it will cover the case of the chap who goes and buys good at Eatons or Simpsons or any place else and finances them on time. This Act provides that if a court finds in any action or proceeding that the transaction is harsh or unconscionable or the interest rate is out of line and is excessive, the court has the power to reopen the transaction and take an account between the debtor and the creditor. And the court has power after this hearing to relieve the debtor from paying any sum in excess of a sum that the court determines to be fair in respect of this loan transaction.

Now let me give you an example of how I visualize this statute will work. Suppose party X received a loan from lender Y, we'll say a finance company, in the amount of \$2,000 and this loan is secured by a first mortgage on a house worth \$5,000. Now, we'll say that the lender has stipulated the rate of interest at 15 per cent, but in addition to the interest rate of 15 per cent, there has been a bonus or discount of \$500. Now many Hon. Members may say that is pretty stiff and I agree it's pretty stiff, but there are many examples in this province and elsewhere where the interest rate is that high and where there is a discount of \$500. So in my example, the man has to pay back \$2,000, but he only received \$1,500 and in addition to that he has to pay 15 per cent interest. The security is a first mortgage on the house. We will add another circumstances; say that this borrower had some government bonds and the lender said, "You put up this collateral as security of \$500 in bonds." Now at the time he enters into this transaction the borrower has a full-time job and he's a good risk at the time he enters into this transaction. However, he runs into problems, perhaps he gets sick or he is laid off from his job and he is unable to make these monthly payments. The lender comes along and say, "I'm going to forfeit that \$500 bond that you left with me and in addition to that I'm going to foreclose your mortgage." After the passing of this Act, the court will have the power to look into this entire transaction to decide whether or not it's a reasonable transaction. If the court decides that the discount was unreasonable, it can order the creditor to give back the bonds to the borrower. If it decides that the 15 per cent interest is harsh or unconscionable, it can reduce the amount of interest, so I say, Mr. Speaker, that this is an Act that has long been needed in this province and I'm surprised that my honourable friends didn't get around to enacting it sometime ago.

I know the Member for Hanley (Mr. Walker) my predecessor as Attorney General, did have an Act which they were looking at, but I think it's like purple gas. They said in the debate on purple gas that we looked at purple gas for quite awhile too. They didn't think it would work and I don't know whether The Unconscionable Transactions Act was in the same category or not, but anyway it wasn't passed by the CCF while they were in power.

You might say, "Do we need this kind of an Act?" Let me give you one or two examples of the kind of situations that have been brought to my attention by various people. Here's a case of a farmer in Saskatchewan. The contract was \$1,858. The fellow didn't read the fine print and when he ended up, he had to pay \$3,220. Pretty high interest, I'd say. Here's another example, which I think is probably one of the worst that I've ever heard of. It is a pretty pitiful letter and I think I'd like to read part of this letters. Here's a chap who got into trouble with an aluminum siding company. He said:

A salesman came to my house in February of 1964 and wanted to fix my house over. At the time I was ill, but he stayed for four hours and asked me if I wore the pants around the house, and finally persuaded me to agree to have aluminum siding placed on the house. He said the total cost would be \$4,800. At the time I was having serious heart trouble which I still have. I signed the note, which I thought was for \$4,800.

Then he goes on to say that he paid a couple hundred dollars and then he says:

Then the company sued for their money, and I did not know enough to contest the suit as I am a farmer with no business training. They obtained a judgement against me which I have been told amounts to between \$10,000 and \$11,000.

Here's an aluminum contract that started out at \$4,800 and it ended up between \$10,000 and \$11,000. He says:

Now I've been informed that the Sheriff has my land advertised for sale. I own five quarter sections of land, a total assessed value of \$2,960.

Anyway this story has a happy ending because through the efforts of officials in my department, we were able to persuade this company to take \$2,500 in full settlement of this claim. But this is the kind of thing that makes me believe and I am confident that we very much need in this province and have needed for sometime, an Act like The Unconscionable Transactions Relief Act.

Now a Bill closely associated with the Unconscionable Transactions Act will be a Bill entitled "The Cost of Credit Disclosure Act" and that title aptly describes the subject matter of this Bill. This Bill will contain provisions respecting the business of persons who sell goods or provide services for a price and advance credit to the purchaser of the goods, so it covers finance companies and it covers Simpson's, Eaton's and all these kind of people who sell goods on time. The proposed Act will require all of these lenders who extend credit to furnish to the borrower a statement that shows in respect of each transaction the amount of money in terms of dollars and cents, actually received in cash by a borrower or where the credit is extended in a transaction, the amount of the cost of the goods or services. Where the lender is a seller of goods or provider of services the statement will be required to contain a specification of the sums, if any, to be credited by the lender as a down payment. Now, the cost of borrowing must in all cases be set out as one sum in dollars and cents and it will also be shown as a percentage of the sum of money actually received so there will be full disclosure, there will be dollar disclosure and there will be percentage of interest in terms of annual interest rate. The statement is also to contain the amount, if any, included for insurance, official fees and is to set out the basis upon which additional charges are to be made in the event of a default on the part of the borrower.

It is common these days to purchase goods or secure services and pay for them on a periodic basis. I refer, of course, to buying on the instalment plan. A charge is usually made for the opportunity to buy now and pay later and this is frequently called a carrying charge. The Bill will also require that persons, selling goods and extending credit on these instalment

plans, will also have to make full disclosure, must supply the purchaser with a written statement that sets out the carrying charge in terms of an annual percentage that the purchaser pays on the unpaid balance, and it also shows the carrying charge expressed in terms of dollars and cents in the form of a schedule showing the amounts of outstanding balances and the corresponding carrying charges in respect of each. There is also a provision that the seller must supply to the borrower, at least every three months during the term of the agreement, a statement showing for the period covered by the statement the outstanding balance in the account of the purchaser at the beginning of the period, payments made on account during the period, and the date and amount of each purchase made during the period, and the carrying charges incurred during the period that are to be expressed in dollars and cents.

Now what are the teeth in this Act? Failure to comply with the Act does not render the agreement null and void, but it will place the person who extended the credit in the position where he cannot recover any more than the cash price. So we think that by making a provision that, if these people don't comply with the Act, the teeth are, they cannot get any interest or any carrying charges. We think that this will be very effective way in which we can ensure compliance with the provisions of this Interest Disclosure Act.

Now, Mr. Speaker, I would like to deal with our new plan of legal aid for indigent persons in criminal matters which will be implemented at this session of the Legislature. One of the fundamental principles of our system of justice is that all persons are entitled to equal treatment before the law. This principle includes the right of every person who is accused of a crime to be represented by competent legal counsel at his trial. It occurs, however, that persons who are in necessitous circumstances and who are charged with a criminal offence sometimes have difficulty arranging for the services of legal counsel. The accused hesitates to seek legal advice because of his inability to afford the services of a solicitor in many cases. On the other hand, members of the legal profession in the private practice of law can, because of simple economic reasons, only handle so many cases for person who can't afford to pay for the services they receive. The government feels that it is proper that a program of legal aid in criminal matters should now be established by The Law Society have taken place with officers of the law Society and the general principles of a plan of legal aid have been agreed on between the Government and the Law Society.

The plan of legal aid to be established in cooperation with the Law Society will be a plan with respect to criminal matters. The scope of the plan will be to render legal aid to indigent persons who are charged with offences under the Criminal Code of Canada or under the Narcotic Control Act. Juveniles, who are indigent and who are charged with offences under the Juvenile Delinquents Act or who are charged with any other offences under such circumstances that the presiding judge feels that the juvenile should receive legal aid, will be supplied with the services of legal counsel under the plan. Indigent person will be able to secure legal counsel under the plan in respect of matters such as applications to a superior court with respect to the granting or refusal to grant bail or the providing of legal advice where bail has been granted by a

court but cannot be obtained because of the confinement of the accused.

The right of an appeal against a conviction is a fact accounted for under the plan. Let us suppose that an indigent person charged with an offence within the scope of the plan and defended by counsel provided under the Legal Aid Plan is convicted upon his trial. Now his lawyer, who acted for him may feel that he has good grounds for an appeal to a higher court. To continue his participation in conducting the defence of the accused, by means of an appeal within the scope of the plan, counsel for the accused will be required to apply to the Needy Persons Committee of the Law Society for its approval to the intended appeal. The Needy Persons Committee will be responsible for considering the case and, if it feels the appeal has merit, it will certify in writing to defence counsel its approval in respect to the appeal. Let me say that the approval of the Needy Persons Committee is required for an appeal to fall within the workings of the legal aid plan. Now the accused doesn't lose his right of appeal if the committee does not certify its approval of an appeal to legal counsel acting on his behalf. The taking of an appeal in this situation would be a decision by the lawyer to continue on the basis of doing so outside the plan.

Legal counsel will also be available under the plan to indigent persons in respect of an appeal against conviction for an offence within the scope of the plan where a judge of the Court of Appeal requests that counsel be appointed to act on the appeal. In addition any application to a court to name an offender, who is an indigent, to be an habitual criminal or a dangerous sexual offender falls within the plan for which legal counsel will be available. Now, I have been speaking about a plan of legal aid for indigent persons. The question arises as to when is a person indigent within the meaning of the plan. Now, Mr. Speaker, the plan will contain the following criteria.

An unmarried person having a yearly earning or other means of subsistence of less than \$2,000. The amount of \$2,000 is increased to \$2,500 in the case of a married man with a dependant wife together with \$300 per year in respect of any other dependent wife and three dependent children, so that where you have a married man with a dependent wife and three dependent children, he could have an income of \$3,400 and still be eligible for assistance under the Legal Aid Plan. A married man with a wife and five children would be entitled to have an income of \$4,000 and still be eligible for inclusion in this plan. Now, there is a requirement or there will be a requirement that a public or private welfare society will certify the individual as coming within one of the monetary categories to which I have referred. Now there is a further provision for eligibility notwithstanding the fact that an individual may rise above the annual income which is being used as a criterion. If there is a person, who, in the opinion of the chairman of the local aid committees – a local aid committees being established to operate the plan on the local level – if required to pay for legal services, would have insufficient means for adequate representation, he can still be included in the scheme. So it is not intended that this be an absolute bar but that this be a guide, and where the local aid committee in a particular area feels that, notwithstanding the fact that a man perhaps earns over \$3,500 or \$4,000, it would simply not be possible for him to have funds from his own private means to

have legal counsel to defend himself, the local aid committee has the power to look into this matter and they can still certify that this is a worthy case for legal aid.

The tariff of fees according to which remuneration will be paid to lawyers rendering their services under this plan has been arrived at by negotiation with the officers of the Law Society. It naturally does not provide for full payment of legal fees to solicitors rendering aid as the Law Society and the government agree that the legal profession has a duty in this area as well as the government. Moneys for the payment of fees under the tariff will be supplied from government funds.

In this connection it will be proposed that should it be determined that an indigent person is found able to contribute some portion of the cost of his own defence, the person will be required to pay such an amount to the Provincial Treasurer. Should the status of an applicant for legal aid change, a decision will be made by the local aid committee to continue or withdraw the granting of legal aid to this person. The establishment of a plan of legal aid in criminal matters is recognized by this government as the start of a program whereby indigent persons may secure the advice of legal counsel for any legal matter in which they require such advice. The Government proposes to initiate the program this year in the area of criminal matters. Administrative problems will no doubt arise and it is felt that experience is necessary before a more embracing plan or more comprehensive plan can be provided.

Now, Mr. Speaker, in 1964 the New Zealand Government introduced what this Government feels to be a very progressive measure. The same measure is presently in operation in the United Kingdom and all indications are that this measure is being very well received by the public in both countries. I refer to the plan of both the United Kingdom and New Zealand whereby compensation is payable to innocent person who have suffered physical injuries as a result of certain criminal acts or omissions, and whereby compensation is payable to dependents of innocent person who have been killed as a result of certain criminal acts or omissions. There has been a recognition in recent years for a program of this kind because of an increase in the crimes of violence in the society in which we live. The law as it presently exists is inadequate in many cases to afford the kind of remedy that is necessary. In many cases, as well, a legal remedy is worthless because of the lack of assets of the offender, because the identity of the offender in many cases is unknown. The loss of the bread winner either permanently or temporarily is recognized to cause extreme hardship in many cases. It is primarily to remove this hardship in deserving cases that we propose at this session to introduce a Bill in this House to provide for the payment of compensation in the event of certain injuries or deaths caused by criminal acts or omissions.

The scheme of the plan will be to constitute a statutory board composed of several persons with a lawyer as chairman. The board will be given wide powers under the Act and will be similar to the powers delegated to the Statutory Tribunal in New Zealand under their Act. It will be the duty of the board to consider applications for compensation received from persons who have suffered physical injury or who are dependents of persons who have been killed as a direct result of crimes of violence.

Having stated the foregoing, perhaps you will allow me, Mr.

Speaker, to explain the circumstances under which compensation will be payable under this Bill. The Bill will contain a schedule of offences, that is a list of crimes of violence from the Criminal Code. If a person is directly injured or killed by some person or person committing acts or omissions that fall within the schedule of offences that I have referred to, compensation may be payable to the injured party or to dependents of the person killed. Injury or death resulting from criminal acts or omissions when the victim was rendering aid to the police or when the victim apprehended or attempted to apprehend an offender or suspected offender will come within the scope of the plan and compensation may be payable in respect thereof.

Now I have been saying that compensation may be payable in respect of certain criminal acts or omissions. It will not be an objective of the Act to make compensation payable in every case where an injury or death results as a result of a crime of violence. In many cases, injuries may be incurred following an incident provoked by the victim himself or herself. Injuries suffered from an assault that was instigated by the victim is an example that immediately comes to mind and is a case where compensation probably should not be paid. In other cases, members may become involved in squabbles that result in injuries. It will not be within the scope of the program that payment of compensation will be made in respect of injuries or death suffered in these circumstances.

Now what kind of compensation will be payable under the plan? Mr. Speaker, it must be appreciated that your Government does not have the experience of any similar plan to draw upon at this time. This plan will be a first for Canada and indeed for the North American continent. As a matter of fact, the United Kingdom plan in Great Britain is operating in the absence of legislation. The Compensation Board, in that case, exercises wide powers of discretion and is guided by administrative directions in many areas of its jurisdiction. The amount of compensation payable under our Act will, within guidelines set out in the Bill, be in the discretion of this Board that I referred to a few minutes ago. The Bill will prescribe minimum and maximum limits for payments that may be ordered to be paid either in the form of a lump sum or by periodic instalments. Compensation will be payable in respect of any one or more of the following matters. First of all expenses, actually and reasonably incurred as a result of the victim's injury or death. Secondly, monetary loss to the victim as a result of total or partial incapacity for work. Thirdly, monetary loss to dependents as a result of the victim's death. Fourthly, pain and suffering of the victim. Fifth, any other monetary loss resulting from the victim's injury and any expenses, that in the opinion of the Board it is reasonable to incur. I would add that these matters for which compensation may be paid are similar to those set out in the New Zealand statute in that regard. Periodic payment for monetary loss because of total or partial incapacity for work shall not continue for a period longer than three years. The same period of time will be set out as the period during which payments will be made to dependents of the person killed by an act or omission listed in the Bill. A limit will be placed on expenses that may be paid for. Other monetary limits have not, at this point, been fully determined and will not be decided until final drafting of the legislation nearing completion shortly. The right to payment of compensation under the plan will not depend on the identity of the offender being known nor will it depend on the offender being prosecuted or if prosecuted, being convicted.

It will only be necessary that the Board be shown that the act of omission that caused the injury or death falls within the specification of an act or omission to constitute one of the crimes listed in the schedule or the Bill.

Now what about the offender? The fellow kills somebody else and does all this damage. Does he become involved in any way because of payment of compensation under the Bill? The short answer is yes, he could. If the offender is known and is prosecuted and is convicted of an offence that arose out of the act or omission in respect of which compensation is paid, this Bill will empower the Board to require the offender to appear before it to show cause why the Board should not order the compensation that the Board has granted in respect of the injury or death. I would point out that a person causing injury or death by a criminal act or omission may be ordered by the Board to make contributions if the Board, considering all the circumstances of the incident, is of the opinion that this person should make a whole or partial contribution towards the compensation paid. Now, the Board, I point out, will only have the power to make such an order against the guilty party if this person has been convicted of an offence in respect to the actions that caused the injury or death.

Now, the Bill will also contain provisions that will require the Board to reduce any compensation that might be payable by any amount that is payable with respect to the injury or death under any statute. The prime examples of course are payments provided in case of injury or death as the result of the operation of another vehicle under the Automobile Accident Insurance Act. An exemption will exist with respect to superannuation statutes which have death benefits. However, the government has decided that the receipt of insurance under private insurance contracts will not be considered in determining the amounts of compensation that might be granted by the Board. By the same token, pension payments under superannuation statutes will not be taken into consideration. Compensation that might be granted by the Board will be required to be reduced where the victim or his dependents recover a similar judgement against the offender and realize upon the judgement, not just getting the judgement. I would make it most clear that the victim or his dependents will not, as a condition to the receipt of compensation, be required to pursue a civil remedy against the offender before applying for compensation.

Now, Manitoba, Mr. Speaker, is looking at legislation of this kind, and one of the conditions and I think it is too narrow a condition in their setup, requires that before anybody can apply to this Board and get any compensation they have to pursue their civil remedy, ad infinitum, up to the highest court in the land. To me, that's ridiculous; that takes the remedy away. Before they can get any compensation from this Board, they have to apply to the Supreme Courts. We, of course, are not making this kind of requirement; we are not requiring the applicant to pursue this civil remedy against the offender. Also, the victim or his dependents may be unaware of the identity of the offender who did all this damage and may not be able to afford the necessary costs to maintain an action against a person who, after all, in the final analysis, may turn out to be judgement-proof.

Now, where a victim or his dependents are granted

compensation under this plan, and have a cause of civil action against a wrongdoer, that they do not intend to pursue, the Bill will empower the Attorney General to initiate an action against the wrongdoer to recover the equivalent to the compensation paid. It is not likely, however, that compensation will be sought where a civil action would be maintainable as the amount of compensation that might be granted under the plan will, in some cases, be less than the amount recovered by civil action.

To illustrate how the plan will operate, allow me to cite an example. Consider a person who is violently assaulted while responding to the request of a police officer for assistance in making an arrest. The injuries suffered by the person prevent him from attending at his employment, we will say, for a period of two months, and necessitate his hospitalization for a period of time. Now, under this plan, the victim of the assault will be entitled to apply to the Board for the payment of compensation to defray expenses such as ambulance services and special drugs that are not provided under existing medical and hospitalization statutes. The person may also be awarded an amount to compensate him for loss of wages for the time that he is absent from his employment up to a fixed maximum per week, and also the board has power to award an amount to this person for the pain and suffering that he endured as a result of this injury. Now should the injured person in this example pursue the assailant and recover a judgement against him and then realize upon his judgment, no payment of compensation will be made under the plan if the amount that he receives from the judgement exceeds the amount that he is entitled to under the plan. In these cases the Board will decide which is the next situation. Now, in the event that the injured person did not pursue his civil action, the Attorney General will be in a position, if compensation had been paid under the plan, to institute and maintain a civil action against the wrongdoer to recover the amount of compensation paid.

Now the Government realizes, Mr. Speaker, that many unforeseen matters will have to be overcome in the actual working of this plan. The United Kingdom Plan is proceeding on this basis and we are confident that our program in this regard will relieve hardship in hundreds of cases in our province, where, before this Act, the unfortunate family of a victim himself had no means of getting any assistance. I am sure that every Hon. Member can think of cases where he has been personally aware of untold hardships resulting to the wife, the wife and family of one who has been involved in this kind of an accident through no fault of his own. Through the commission of a criminal offence by someone else, the breadwinner and the father, the head of the household has been taken away. This Act is an attempt on the part of the government to fill the gap, to provide compensation to families in these sort of circumstances, and I am confident that every Member of this House will endorse this legislation when it comes before it.

SOME HON. MEMBERS: – Hear, hear!

MR. HEALD: – Now, Mr. Speaker I would like to deal briefly with some of the other Acts that are mentioned in the White Paper. I would like to deal with the Mortgage Brokers' Act. This Bill will clothe the Superintendent of Insurance with supervisory powers in respect of persons who carry on the business of lending money on the security of land or any interest in land and carry on the business of dealing with mortgages. Why is this Act necessary,

Mr. Speaker? Well, here again, there have been some bad cases, cases of abuses and I have here an example of a company who are active in the province of Manitoba. They had a Royal Commission there a couple of years. This company started advertising in Saskatchewan a while ago, telling the people of Saskatchewan how cheap they could get mortgage money for them, announcing a new mortgage broker's service for people who want to borrow \$1,500 to \$10,000 at amazingly low-cost loans, low-cost alright, 12.634 per cent, 12.824 per cent, and a bonus of several hundred dollars.

Here is an example of a cases, a mortgage. This was in Manitoba but this is a company that thinks maybe it should come into Saskatchewan. Here was a mortgage of \$10,000 . This is what the man had to pay back. What did he receive? He received \$8,000, so he paid a bonus of \$2,000 and in addition to that he paid a fairly high interest rate of 8 per cent. So we are going to keep these high binders out of Saskatchewan. If they want to stay in these other provinces it's all right with us, but we are going to pass this Mortgage Brokers' Act to ensure that this kind of company does not come into the Province of Saskatchewan. We don't need them; we haven't got them now and we don't need them.

This will empower the Superintendent of Insurance to ride herd on these kinds of companies and to make sure that they don't come into our province. The Bill will empower the Superintendent to suspend or cancel the licence upon any ground where he is satisfied that the licensee has been guilty of fraud, misrepresentation or dishonesty or has by misrepresentation induced any person to borrow money on the security of a real estate mortgage. The Superintendent of insurance also has power to look into any complaints and if he is satisfied that this mortgage broker is not operating within the regulations in the Act, he has power to suspend and to cancel his licence. Now, Mr. Speaker, in the area of trading and securities, the government, as the White Paper forecasts, will introduce a new Securities At. The present Securities Act is now considered to be inadequate; and extensive changes, in the main adopting features of the new Ontario Act, will be proposed. Legislation dealing with securities is of a highly technical nature and for this reason I will not attempt to outline in detail the effect of the changes in this Bill, but shall speak in general terms about some of the major changes that will be proposed.

Under the present legislation, banks, trust companies and insurance companies can trade in securities without qualifying a prospectus. This will not be the case with the new legislation under which these corporations will be required to file a prospectus with the Securities Commission before selling the shares on the basis of a primary distribution. As a result, employees of these companies will be required to be registered with the Securities Commission the same as anybody else. Now, I spoke earlier about the "cooling-off" period set out, and I have spoken on other occasions – I didn't today – about the "cooling-off" period which is in the Direct Sellers At, a four-day "cooling-off" period. The acceptance by the public of the concept of a period or time for reflection following a purchase in the direct sales field has led your government to include a similar feature in the new securities legislation, in the new Securities Act, for anybody selling shares in any company for primary distribution, there will be a provision for a two-day "cooling-off" period after purchase of shares on a primary

distribution.

Why do we think this two-day "cooling-off" period is good or why do we think that a four-day "cooling-off" period is good, Mr. Speaker? I have received many, many letters in my department and my officials have received many, many letter thanking us for the Direct Sellers Act which we passed and which came into effect on the 1st day of July, 1965. Because of this At, many hundreds of our citizens have received money back which they wouldn't have received back under any other circumstances, because of the licensing and bonding of direct sellers, and because of the "cooling-off" period. Here is one:

I am writing to inform you that I received my refund of \$70 from such and such a company in Edmonton. Please accept my thanks for your trouble. It is wonderful to know you can receive help in a case such as mine. I know I have certainly received a lesson by it.

This is somebody who got oversold on a hope chest, I think, and so on all the way through, magazines, haring aides and so on, . Here is another one:

I received my cheque for the amount of \$129 which I had paid to them. I have also been notified to consider my contract cancelled. Thank you for the part that you and your department took in helping me receive the money and the notice of cancellation of the contract.

And so on, and we have many letters like this. So this is the reason, Mr. Speaker, why we are incorporating the "cooling-off" period through the provisions in the Securities Act.

The Bill will also contain provisions respecting take-over bids. The take-over bid is an offer to take a number of shareholders shares that will, together with the shares that the offeror then holds, aggregate a certain percentage or more of the shares of the company. A person making a take-over bid for shares will be required to deliver a take-over bid circular to the person where shares are being sought . The Bill will contain numerous terms and conditions with respect to take-over bids. The take-over bid will be required to be kept open for 21 days by the offeror, that is, the person making the offer. There will be a seven day period for comments by advisers and for the making of counteroffers to the shareholders whose shares are being sought. There will be a portion of the Bill which will deal with the trading in securities by persons who are directors or other officers of a corporation that is offering to trade in securities or who are persons otherwise in a position to obtain special information respecting the securities. We talk about insiders, people known as insiders. The two basic features of this portion of the Bill are that the persons defined by the Bill as insiders will be required to report any trading they do in securities and liability for improper trading by insiders will be crated so this will be a new offence. For people on the inside, there will be much stricter regulation on people known as insiders in any particular company.

Now the last feature of the amendments to the securities legislation in this province, which I will mention, concerns the provisions respecting financial disclosure by corporations trading in securities. The holder of securities and anyone who might buy the securities from him will be able to evaluate the security and know generally the condition of the corporation that issued the

security. The requirements of disclosure in this new Act go far beyond the present requirements in our legislation. Legislation providing the requirements of disclosure was discussed extensively at Federal and Provincial Conferences which I had the pleasure and opportunity to attend as a representative of the Government of Saskatchewan. I can say that the securities legislation which we are enacting here is along the lines of similar legislation that is being enacted in other provinces which will give to the investing public a far greater measure of security than they have had in the past. And it's high time, I say, that the people of this province and the people of Canada have more security in dealing with people who go out and sell shares in various companies.

Now, Mr. Speaker, I have taken quite some time to provide highlights, not details, of the various items of legislation which will be presented to the Legislature at this session. At another time I would like to perhaps give a progress report on some of the Acts which we have passed in the last two years. I mentioned the Direct Sellers Act. I mention the Garage Dealers Act which was passed last year which provides for the licensing and bonding of Garage Dealers in the Province of Saskatchewan. I am pleased to say that the amendments to the Cemeteries Act, I hope, are going to remedy some of the abuses that there have been in this field and when you take the legislation which we did pass at the 1965 session and the 1966 session of the Legislature, I think, Mr. Speaker, that you will agree and all Hon. Members will agree that this government is concerned with the rights of our citizens, with the protection of our citizens. So, Mr. Speaker, I am proud to be a Member of a government that does think about the consumer, that does think about the people of our province, and for those reasons, I am sure you will agree and will observe that I am going to vote for the motion and against the amendment.

SOME HON. MEMBERS: – Hear, hear!

MR. A.N. NICHOLSON (Saskatoon City): – Mr. Speaker the Throne Speech contained so very little that was new or exiting that it wasn't unusual that the mover and seconder should use a good deal of their time in developing the anti-labor views of the Premier of this province. When the Premier was a Socialist Member of the Canadian Parliament he took a good deal of pride in the fact that Saskatchewan had enacted the most progressive labor legislation anywhere on the continent. A contented labor force was a very important factor in making it possible for Saskatchewan to change from a depressed area to one of the have provinces in Canada. I regret very much that Bills 79 and 2 are now recognized as two of the most objectionable measures to have been passed in any of the Canadian provinces in recent years. Most of the so-called labor bosses in Saskatchewan are farm boys who found that it was impossible. . .

SOME HON. MEMBERS: – Hear, hear!

MR. NICHOLSON: – Hon. Members might laugh, but the senior Member for Moose Jaw (Mr. Davies) is an Indian Head farm boy, his parents were farm folks; the Member from Regina East who has made one of the most outstanding speeches in this debate is a farm boy who might

still be on the farm if the farm sector of our economy were able to get their fair share of the wealth. And the junior Member for Saskatoon (J.E. Brockelbank) is also a farm boy from the Kelsey constituency. The financial wizard from our constituency is also a farm boy, as is the gallant Member for Saskatoon (Mr. Link). By the way, he is one of the very few from Saskatchewan to have won a George Medal during the war. He is also one of the boys who worked at \$5 a month during the years when we had Liberal Governments in Saskatchewan and Liberal Governments in Ottawa.

The farm boys were not in the labor force very long until they realized that the industrial worker is in precisely the same position as the farmer. He's unable to secure a fair share of the wealth produced without having a more effective organization. Those in the labor force in Saskatchewan and Canada, whether they are organized or unorganized, are aware of the fact that they're living in a very affluent period of our history and they know from watching TV and reading the papers, that they are not receiving a fair share of our gross national product. I might mention that for the four years that I was Minister of Welfare, I was the responsible Minister for prisons of this province. I have also visited the federal penitentiary in Prince Albert. I wasn't able to discover a single trade unionist who was serving time in the institutions, although I can't say as much for the profession of the Attorney General (Mr. Heald) who spoke just before me. But there has been a very good record in Saskatchewan on behalf of those who have been trying to get a little larger piece of the pie for . . .

MR. STEUART: – For Jimmy Hoffa.

MR. NICHOLSON: – Well Jimmy Hoffa has been mentioned a good deal but it's surprising that the only two names that are ever mentioned are Jimmy Hoffa and the well known Liberal, Hal Banks. There are two who are very well known. You have to go to the United States to find them and then they represent a very small percentage of the total labor force. I do not think that we will have our maximum production in Saskatchewan until Bills 2 and 79 have been repealed and until Saskatchewan again passes legislation which will assure those who are members of the labor force that they will be able to have better housing than is presently available that they can look forward to providing for themselves and their families the high standard of living which our gross national product can and will provide for all.

The Premier recognized the shortcomings of the Throne Speech and made two additions in his address the other day. Everyone is delighted that the present Minister of Health (Mr. Grant) will be able to meet the electors in due course in Regina and report that the Government of which he is a Member is committed to establishing a base hospital in Regina without demanding that the Regina taxpayers should assume part of the cost. However, there are a few details in the Premier's statement that cause me some concern. He intimated that the hospital would be part of the University complex in Regina. It would appear to me that had the announcement been made as a joint statement after there had been full discussion with the Federal authorities and the University, that everybody would be much happier. If it's to be a hospital for teaching and research, is it proposed that there should be a medical college established on the Regina campus?

About four years ago the previous Government approved of major additions to the University Hospital in Saskatoon so that this province could maintain the reputation which has been established as having one of the most exciting medical centres on this continent. It was estimated that the plans which came before Cabinet, when completed, would cost in the neighborhood of \$12,000,000. The previous Government considered that such an expenditure was in the public interest and the green light was given to proceed with the plans. It was agreed that it was essential that there should be better facilities available for Geriatric Teaching, for Pediatrics, for Rehabilitation and also for Psychiatry. But as soon as the present Government took office there was a ten per cent slash across the board, and for the University Hospital this represented about \$700,000. Consequently, the plans for this essential extension apparently had been shelved indefinitely. As far as I know no new plans have been made to give the University Hospital and the medical college at Saskatoon the essential services which are a must in this decade. And so, if the Premier is proposing to spend \$16,000,000 on a hospital complex and half of it is to come from the Federal Government, I think at the earliest possible date he should give the Legislature and the people of Saskatchewan additional information as to the arrangements and what the timetable is going to be.

Another reference in the Premier's speech would indicate spending of considerable sums of money. This too, might have been held till Friday of this week for the budget Speech, but the Premier must have felt that the original Throne Speech had so little appeal that something should be added, and so there was mention of rental housing. I note it is proposed to have rental housing at a number of centres in Saskatchewan where I'm sure there is ample need. But I was disappointed that Saskatoon was not included in his list. Our city continues to be the fastest-growing centre in the province. With the potash industry encircling our city it is certain that for the foreseeable future we will require a great deal of rental housing. As the gallant Member for Saskatoon (Mr. Link) mentioned the other day, there are families who moved to Saskatoon because of their work and when they found that it was impossible to find rental housing suitable for their purse and their families they were obliged to move elsewhere in Canada. And so I hope that in the Budget Speech the Premier will have another look at the details he overlooked in both the Throne Speech and in his speech the other day.

I might say that just at the time that Saskatoon's first low-rental housing was completed the buildings at the airport had just been vacated and a valuable tract of land was available. The city of Saskatoon had been in touch with the appropriate authorities in Ottawa, as well as with the Department of Municipal Affairs and the Department of Welfare responsible for housing. At that time it appeared that this location would be a suitable site. Again the new government backed away from additional low-rental housing for this rapidly expanding city. As far as I know, no plans are under way. It usually takes about four years from the time that the federal and provincial and the local authorities make a decision that there is a need before projects are completed. I'm glad that the Minister of Municipal Affairs (Mr. McIsaac) is listening to me. I hope that he will be able to convince his colleagues that at the earliest possible moment negotiations should start again with Saskatoon with a view to having the three levels of government participating in constructing rental housing that's needed so badly.

The Minister of Public Works (Mr. Gardiner) on Friday intimated that he plans to give high priority to the problems of water and pollution. I am pleased to note that he is expecting to meet with the City Fathers in Saskatoon at an early date. I am sure it would be helpful if before he meets with the Saskatoon City Council he could convince his colleagues in the Cabinet that Saskatchewan should move in the direction of the Ontario Water Resources Commission. In a letter by D.S. Caverly, the general manager of the Ontario Water Resources Commission to Mr. W.N.L. Godsall the chief City Commissioner in Saskatoon on January 9 of this year, I find two or three interesting paragraphs. The letter reads:

In August 1965, the Prime Minister of the Province (Prime Minister Robarts of Ontario) made an announcement which expanded the authorization of this Commission for the provision of water supply and sewage treatment facilities. This new program allowed the Commission to contract certain works for municipalities or areas and these are financed by the province of Ontario. This program is related basically to water supply and sewage treatment and to clarify OWRC policy. The applicable portions of the sewage system include outdoor sewage, sewage treatment works, and the main connecting facilities to the treatment works from the municipality's collection system. In waterworks, the portions of the work to which this arrangement applies have been established as the supply and treatment works together with the main connecting need of facilities.

The associated cost of supplying these works, including amortization of capital costs, together with operating and maintenance charges, is recovered by the sale of service to the effective municipalities by rates determined on a usage basis. These facilities are wholly owned by the Province of Ontario and the arrangement for service are formalized by contracts between the Commission and the municipalities concerned. The installations are operated entirely at cost with appropriate provision for adjustment in rates. And still continuing from his letter:

It is noted that only major works are eligible for provincial ownership and consequently, if a provincial program is developed, the internal sewage collection and water distribution system must be financed either by the municipality independently or other agreements with the Commission.

As the province is deriving a great deal of revenue from the potash industry and while we take a great deal of pride in the fact that Saskatoon is now recognized as the potash capital of the world, the burden that is placed on the municipal taxpayers is a very heavy one. It appears to me that this would be an important advance if the Government of Saskatchewan came up with a program such as the one operated by the Ontario Water Resource Commission.

Hon. Members would be surprised if I did not have something to say about the controversial social aid operation which existed in Saskatoon for too long a period. I would like to, at this point, extend my congratulations to the Member for Milestone, the new Minister of Welfare (Mr. MacDonald). By training and temperament he is well qualified to assume these new duties. I believe that had he been asked to accept this assignment when the new Government was formed in 1964, that department would not have lost

so many outstanding civil servants and his work in the weeks and months ahead would be much easier.

After the Legislature concluded its business a year ago, the social aid problems in Saskatoon occupied the attention of the citizens for quite an extended period. The daily papers, radio and television stations had something to say nearly every day. The Premier was the guest speaker at a Liberal fund raising dinner in Saskatoon and he was reported in the Star Phoenix of April 20, as using a big club. The Premier is quoted as saying:

While I'm not suggesting anything I would remind you that the Government is providing \$1,600,000 for highway work in the city this year. If you beat us in the court we might have to look at that figure.

There aren't many municipalities that can run the risk of being saddled with picking up the tab for \$1,600,000 on a previously agreed formula even though they did have the best legal advice that was available, that if the social aid controversy went to court, it would have been possible for Saskatoon to have recovered quite a sizeable amount, but a good deal less than \$1,600,000. The Star Phoenix of the same date carries the story that Mayor Cole was critical of the news reports of the Premier's speech. Now, the former Mayor didn't say that these words were not used, but the press got a bit of a scolding for reporting accurately what was said. The former Mayor said Mr. Thatcher in a light mood, talked about his relationship with the Federal Government and said in a light vein that the city might receive similar treatment to that which Provincial Governments received from the Federal.

MR. R.A. WALKER (Hanley): – A progressive view.

MR. NICHOLSON: – Yes, but it was something worth thinking about, apparently. About this time, City Council unanimously passed a resolution calling for a public apology from the former Minister of Welfare (Mr. Boldt). The conduct of the previous Minister of Welfare resulted in several editorials in the Star Phoenix. One said:

In the battle between Dave Boldt, the Minister of Welfare and the city social aid office, Mr. Boldt has ignored protocol and basic ground rules in singling out one Saskatoon official for dismissal. Mr. Boldt has set down as a condition for his Government taking over the social aid, the replacing of I.R. Jones, social aid director. Mr. Boldt is out of order in his interference with civic employees; he is not their employer; he is treading on questionable ground when he urges the removal of Mr. Jones from his office.

And Alderman Quigley said:

I am shocked by the statement of Mr. Boldt. It is premature and poor taste. The city has made no decision as to whether it wants to operate its own social aid program or not.

And in concluding this chapter, the people of Saskatoon have found that they had to get a new Mayor. The Premier decided that it was in the public interest to have a new Minister of Welfare, and Mr.

Jones as a result of this decision, made by a Minister of the Crown, found himself out a job. Mr. Jones gave three of the best years of his life in the services seeking to maintain a free society so that the individual would be free to do his job from day to day as best he could and should not be dismissed without having a fair hearing, without knowing the specific charges made against him.

There's been such a keen interest in the social aid controversy in Saskatoon that city council has been anxious to find out what's been the experience of the Provincial Government in administering aid in the city. Has the work been done better? Is it costing more or less? In the Star Phoenix of the 22nd of August, I note that the city council was informed by the Provincial Welfare Department that there will be no monthly report on Saskatoon social aid statistics such as the one issued previously by the province. This is a decision that was made purely because it was known that the Government would not be able to support the claims that social aid could be administered more efficiently by the Provincial Government and that they would save money. In answer to the question I asked the other day, I was told that in the regional office in Saskatoon they are now employing 81 compared with 47 in December of last year. This is an increase of 72 per cent in personnel since the change in programs. I am aware that the region is looking after a larger area than the city of Saskatoon, but I understand that it is requiring a much larger staff to do the work which was previously done by the city welfare department. I want to serve notice that just as soon as there is a change in government, the Department of Welfare will issue monthly reports giving information similar to the information which was available at City Hall and which is available on a monthly report of the Federal National Employment Office. There is no reason why this information cannot be made available on a monthly basis. There is no reason why it must be held until the Minister is in the Legislature. Hon. Members are frequently contacted by constituents who are in receipt of public assistance. As one who has dealt with these problems now for many years, I'd like to offer a few suggestions to the Members in the hope that all might be able to be more helpful.

I have in my hand the Needs Test Decision Sheet. Now everyone who gets public assistance in Saskatchewan must supply the information that is required on these sheets. These sheets have right at the top, a municipal code, and by pressing a button a computer will tell you how many there are in Saskatoon or Regina in a particular category. It is amazing what the machines do. Every applicant must give his name, his address and his age. And then there's a section for occupation, employability, final grade in school, other trades, other allowance and over the other side of the sheet you have your net monthly income. They calculate what you should have for food, for clothing, or for personal or comfort allowance, household appliances, depending on the size and ages of your family. This return happens to be a from a blind man whose wife isn't old enough to get the old age security yet. The budget deficit for this blind man and his wife with no income but the \$75 per month, is \$85.67 per month. Now it's not an embarrassing question for you to ask the person who wishes the public assistance: Have you your Decision Sheet available?

This is a sheet which does not go into the wastepaper basket. It is a document that people study and compare it with similar

sheets their neighbors in similar circumstances have. I think the present Administration and the previous Administration have supervised the municipalities faithfully. The municipalities were using similar forms to this when they were administering social aid. I hope that the Minister of Health (Mr. MacDonald) will have support from his colleagues in denying the charges that people on public assistance, by and large, are crooks, chiselers and deadbeats. Many of these people spent their best years when conditions were very difficult. They have been unable to increase their income as the cost of living has gone up by leaps and bounds.

I'd like to make some mention to the question of employability. This is a decision that is often not easy to make. The person who approves the application form decides whether the person is employable or not. Mr. Speaker, I'm sure that the Member for Rosthern (Mr. Boldt) and the present Minister of Welfare (Mr. MacDonald) are aware of the many problems in administering public assistance. The rules that were in effect when I was Minister, have not materially changed. In spite of anything that has been said, I found excellent cooperation on the whole all over the province. An employable person is a male or female recipient between the ages of 16 and 60 years of age who is physically, mentally and socially capable of placement to the labor market whether or not employment is available. If the recipient is over 60 and considers himself employable, or has recently been employed and suitable seasonal employment is available, he should be considered employable. In family cases where the spouse is a housewife and is not unemployable for physical, mental or social reasons, and is under the age of 60, she should be considered as employable. Mr. Speaker, I presume there is now and there was, a penalty attached to the individual who was regarded as employable who was seeking public assistance. This was a device to make sure that everyone physically, mentally and socially able to work, would be in the labor force without getting public assistance if jobs were available.

Now then, as for the unemployable, again these rules were in force while I was Minister. If the individual says that he is not employable for physical reasons, there must be a certificate to show he has been examined by a doctor within the past three months. Also a certificate stating that he is unable to accept work in his principal occupation or suitable existing alternative employment. Where the recipient or spouse is suffering from a chronic disorder, a certificate or verbal verification from a doctor every six months is sufficient. If the applicant is under treatment in an institution or has an obvious permanent disability, no certificate is required. A further category requires the recipient or spouse to be examined by a doctor within the past six months and to have a certificate stating that he is unfit for work in his principal occupation or suitable existing alternative employment by reason of a mental disorder. I'm sure that Mr. Hones and the staff in the Saskatoon office observed these regulations as carefully as they could. I think it's unfortunate that the Premier, in complaining about not getting good press coverage, gets a heading over a five column story here in the Star Phoenix, April 27, "Thatcher Claims City Paying Aid to 850 Able-bodied Persons." After this charge was made, the press got in touch with the proper authorities. What about these 850 able-bodied persons? It so happened that at the time this charge was made, there weren't 850, but 257. There were 142 heads of families, 82 single men and 33 single women. The Premier was just out over 300 per cent in his reckless charges that social aid was being given out to employable

people in Saskatoon.

Mr. Speaker, as soon as there's a change of government, it will be quite an easy matter to find out each month how many employable people in the Saskatoon regional office are getting social aid. The information that is on this decision sheet and with the computer system, it would take just a matter of seconds to put together the information. In turning down the request the department said that it would take some time. If Saskatoon was given the statistics other municipalities would ask for the, and to meet their request would be time consuming. Why shouldn't we be able to get this information if we want to for Regina, Moose Jaw, Weyburn, or any place in the province? So, Mr. Speaker, I'm sure that there are a lot of people in municipal government that would be glad to know that just as soon as there is a change of government again, we'll revert to the system of making available to the public each month, information regarding the number of people seeking public assistance and information regarding the exciting developments that will take place as you develop an exciting rehabilitation program.

Mr. Speaker, another very important problem that hasn't been discussed in the budget is in the field of health, welfare, and education. It wasn't mentioned in the Throne Speech and it hasn't been mentioned by any of the Members on the government side so far. This is the question of the emotionally disturbed children. I'm indebted to the Saskatchewan Council of Women for an excellent brief presented to the government before the session started. The Star Phoenix in reporting the outcome of this visit to the government quotes the Premier as follows:

Emotionally disturbed children are not a major problem in Saskatchewan, and providing facilities for them is not a high priority item in the Government budget.

The Members of the delegation included: the President, Mrs. John Hnatyshyn of Saskatoon, Mesdames O.J. McNeil, J. Hoag, J.D. Ruddy, S.D. Clark, W.L. Countryman, and J. Richards. The brief reports that the two child psychiatrists in the province are both in Saskatoon and despite the fact that there are two in Saskatoon, there is a very long waiting list of children needing treatment. I'm told that if it's decided that children should have some treatment, there is frequently a six month waiting period before they can be seen.

In the February 1st issue of The Prairie Messenger, a full page is devoted to telling the story of Johnny, one of Saskatchewan's emotionally disturbed children, as told by his mother. Thanks to the efforts of Johnny's mother and others like her, there now exists the society for children with emotional problems, in Saskatoon, the first of its kind in Saskatchewan and one of the very few similar organizations in Canada. The article in The Prairie Messenger points out that no one has ever calculated the social cost of our present failure to rehabilitate these children. Many of them become dropouts, many end up as court cases. I suggest that the new Minister of Welfare (Mr. MacDonald) will find some interesting reading when he has time to study some of the case histories of inmates in the Provincial Correctional Institution. The public has no concept of the seriousness of this problem. As a result, very little has been done for them in an organized way. The Johnnys of this world have a long life ahead of them. Why should they be ignored or even punished by society because of their handicap, which in most cases has nothing to do with any behavior on their part?

They are victims of circumstances which they did not create and cannot control. They must be helped in any society that calls itself human.

The closing of the Embury House was one of the early mistakes made by the present government, and I am sure that the new Minister of Welfare (Mr. MacDonald) is anxious to repair the damage as quickly as possible. While Minister of Welfare I was well aware that Embury House didn't solve all our problems. Embury House was only able to cope with the most difficult emotionally disturbed children of the total number in Saskatchewan.

Now that the Government has admitted that there is a problem and has made provision for annual expenses which will approximate over a quarter of a million dollars for two organizations, Ranch Ehrlo and Brown Camps, compared with the \$100,000 per year that Embury House was costing. I hope the Government will give this group of children the priority which they deserve. Since the cost in these two different institutions exceeds \$9,000 per year per child, I suggest that the government give consideration to including care of this type under medicare, so that parents, who are unable to deal with the problems of their socially emotionally disturbed children, should not be compelled by economic factors to make the children wards of the Department of Welfare or bankrupt themselves by incurring these costs which sometimes extend for two or three years. In answer to a question that was brought down the other day, I note that the cost of Ranch Ehrlo is to run at \$25 a day and that at present there are 20 there. Twenty-five dollars a day – this is \$9,125 a year. At Brown Camps, where the charge is \$26.30 per day, it would cost \$9,599.50 a year to maintain a child. Now that the Government is committed to using public funds to make these disbursements they must recognize that there are other children in addition to the wards of the Department of Welfare who need this type of treatment. I suggest you need a very large income to be able to pay the \$9,599.50 at Brown Camps or the smaller amount of \$9,125 per year at Ranch Ehrlo.

I would like to urge the Minister of Welfare (Mr. MacDonald) to recommend to his colleagues that at the earliest possible time the responsibility for caring for this group of Saskatchewan children be returned to the proper sector, the public sector. Ranch Ehrlo has been in the news quite frequently since the Legislature met a year ago. Although negotiations for this undertaking apparently were underway while the Legislature was in session, I think it is unfortunate that the previous Minister did not take the Members into his confidence and tell what his plans were in case they might have had some suggestions. In the Leader Post, May 26, it is reported that a 29 acre site was purchased at an undisclosed price. The story suggests that at the rate of \$25 a day, with 12 to 15 boys, the agency would be out of debt in 12 months time.

I note that Ranch Ehrlo was incorporated under the provisions of the Societies Act on the 21st of April 1966. I note that the directors are Lorne Mitchell, Murray Sawa, Otto B. Driedger, Joan Monette, and Kathryn D. Wellman. I must say I was surprised to find that one of the directors is also the director of child welfare, the man who is directly responsible to the Minister for the care of more than 3,000 children. It does not appear to me to be in keeping with the best traditions of parliamentary government for more than a quarter of a million dollars of the taxpayer's money to be turned over to private agencies, no matter how good they are, without the appropriate Minister being able

to answer questions during estimates regarding every detail that Members might wish to ask regarding the qualifications of those employed, the salaries which are paid to social workers working in the private sector compared with what they were paid working in the public service. I note in the press that there are quite a number of well-known citizens who are directors of Ranch Ehrlo. I am confident that they have become involved with a view to making the best contribution they can towards a very important Canadian and Saskatchewan problem. But I do ask the Minister to discuss with his colleagues whether they consider it appropriate that the Director of Child Welfare should wear one hat in looking after the 3,200 children who are wards of the -mi and then another hat as a director of Camp Ehrlo and be responsible for the operations of this type of organization. And so, Mr. Speaker, I hope that this group of children in Saskatchewan are going to receive the sort of treatment that they should have and that we can look forward to the public sector just as has been demonstrated in the field of education, in the field of health, having a chance to develop programs that will bring to Saskatchewan those who are well qualified and so that when achievements are made, the Minister can stand up and take full credit for what has been done.

Mr. Speaker, Hon. Members will have concluded from my remarks that I will be voting for the amendment and against the main motion.

SOME HON. MEMBERS: – Hear, hear!

MR. F. LAROCHELLE (Shaunavon): – Mr. Speaker, it is again an honor and a privilege to address this House as representative of the Shaunavon constituency. I would like this afternoon to join the other speakers who have previously spoken in extending my most sincere sympathies to the family of John Cuelenaere. I've known John only since he was a Member of this House and through the only two years that I have been here, I've learned to respect John because I always thought he was always very tolerant and very kind in his address to the Members of this House.

I would like to congratulate the mover of the Throne Speech, Mr. Hooker, the Member for Notukeu-Willowbunch, my seat mate, and the seconder, Mr. Gardner, the Member for Moosomin. I think they did a lovely job in the Address to the Throne Speech.

I would also like to congratulate the Members for Milestone, Mr. C.P. MacDonald, on his appointment to the Cabinet as Minister of Social Welfare, and I am sure that Mr. MacDonald will do a good job in that position.

The constituency of Shaunavon is one of the largest in the province. It comprises 6,500 square miles. On the west side of the constituency we have a large cattle industry and also, we have in that part of the country, the oil fields. On the west part of the constituency it is largely devoted to wheat and cattle. Shaunavon has also some large deposits of lignite coal and also a very large deposit of white mud which is exported to the province of Alberta at Medicine Hat which they use for ceramics in that part of the country. This year, we have been blessed with one of the largest crops in our history. Our cattle industry is still one of the finest and the market prices on the average have been good. So, therefore the economy in that part

of the country. I would say, Mr. Speaker is good. The oil fields of the southwest are mostly all in the Shaunavon constituency. And there again, we can see the constant expansion and development of the oil industry in our province.

Mr. Speaker, I have sat here and listened to some of the speeches of the Opposition trying to paint a picture of gloom to the people of this province, that the Liberal government is going to ruin this province. Sir, I cannot help but think that the Opposition would like the people of this province to think of the past. During their term of office, they were always referring to the dark years of the 1930s. Sir, these Socialists have had this province live in the past for the last 20 years, while our sister provinces were forgetting the past and were planning for the future and going ahead. This living in the past is one of the reasons why our economy was lagging behind, and we were one of the have not provinces. Today, with a Liberal Government in office for less than three years, we have seen this province move ahead with industries, with the development of our mineral and natural resources, which has brought us to a near full employment. Today anybody willing to work can find a job. This type of leadership by the Premier and his Liberal Government has brought the economy of this province to a point where we are now the envy of our sister provinces and we are now one of the have provinces of this Dominion of Canada. And this Liberal Government intends to keep these developments moving ahead so as to make this province a still better place for its people to live in.

SOME HON. MEMBERS: – Hear, hear!

MR. LAROCHELLE: – Mr. Speaker, I am amused by some of the statements from the Opposition that we are not spending enough money on education and other departments. From the figures I have, in the field of education in the last fiscal year this Liberal government spent \$22,000,000 more than the socialists spent in their last year of office, which was their highest budget for education in their 20 years in office. In public health we spent \$16,500,000 more; on highways, \$23,500,000 more; on agriculture, \$4,000,000 more. So, Mr. Speaker, just how much is enough?

Mr. Speaker, I think we have reached a saturation point as to the taxes that the people of Saskatchewan can pay. I think that this Government should hold the line and not dig into the pockets of our citizens for more money. We must be realistic. Outside of the revenue of mineral resources and natural resources, the only place a government can get money for these programs is from the pocket of the people of this province through taxation.

SOME HON. MEMBERS: – Hear, hear!

MR. LAROCHELLE: – Mr. Speaker, I can assure you that as industries develop and the revenue from our mineral and natural resources develop, this Liberal Government will expand its program for the people of this province. I think this Government has done many things to help alleviate the tax burden of the people. One of these, the homeowner grants, has given this year alone, \$8,000,000 to the people of Saskatchewan to help them with their tax payment and I was happy to hear the Premier say the other day that he intends to expand in this field. Another one was the increased municipal grants for equalization, grid maintenance, and snow

removal. In my constituency, these grants in 1966 amounted to \$68,425. I am sure the people of my constituency appreciate these grants, especially at a time when they are reluctant to increase the revenue of the municipality with increased taxes. I sincerely hope that these grants can be increased for the coming year.

Mr. Speaker, this afternoon I want to say a few words about roads. I think it is well known that I am a transport operator and as such hold the view that roads, good roads, are a very, very important part of our provincial progress and development. Some of you may recall that I pointed out a year ago that as opposed to the view that a country can't expect good roads until after it is rich enough to afford them, I contend that a country doesn't really become well-off until after it gets good roads. Before narrowing things down to the points I want to make this afternoon, let's take a moment or two to reflect on just how much we as a people depend on roads. We'd be completely immobilized without roads. No means to market our production, be it wheat or cattle. No means to restock with the necessities of life, from buns to combines. We take these things for granted, of course. Well, Mr. Speaker, I don't think we should. Nor should we overlook or fail to appreciate the very mobile means of transport we have in this province which delivers the items we need to our door every day, every week, every month throughout the year. I am talking about our trucks now and those hard-working chaps who operate them. I'm proud to be numbered among them. Mr. Speaker, good roads are synonymous with good highway transport and taken together, they spell good living. We have only to remember how our highway haulers stepped into the breach last September when we had a rail strike to realize how essential it is that we do everything we can to sustain a healthy trucking industry. We can't afford to do otherwise.

Now, I'm not going to talk about our fine provincial highway system. I'll leave that to those best equipped to deal with that subject. I wish to speak about grid roads, but not about the extensive network of these that is being created throughout the province. I'm not too sure of the total mileage now involved in that grid road system. I think it's somewhere around 16,000 miles, I believe, the last reference I heard. So, Mr. Speaker, I'll leave discussion about those grid roads to better hands also.

Fact is, I want to draw the attention of the House today to the mileage within the grid system which has been taken over by the Department of Highways and incorporated into the provincial highway system.

Since our Government was elected to power, over 400 miles have thus been taken over by the Department. That isn't a big figure when compared with the total grid road mileage. But when those first few miles were re-designated and re-assigned to the 300 Series Highway category in April, 1965, it marked the start of a pattern which I, for one, hope will continue to be followed for some time. For it was tangible evidence that we as a Government were aware of the problems our municipal fathers are facing.

We know of those problems: an already overburdened tax base, steadily rising costs in administration of the municipal tasks and there are many. It was a real dilemma. They had two alternatives, either find new revenues or reduce their costs. And this is where the decision to start a gradual takeover of some of the grid road mileage, to re-allot it to the provincial

highway mileage meant so much to those hard-pressed municipalities. And it illustrates the philosophy of those on this side of the House; and that is, that taxes are already too high for many of our people and that we should step in and help by reducing costs, especially where there has been a demonstrated genuine effort to keep those costs within reason.

Mr. Speaker, this program has only been in effect for some 20 odd months. But already the results have been worthwhile. During the fiscal period ending March 31, 1966, about a year ago, over \$100,000 has been spent by the Department of Highways on what I call major improvements in these formerly grid road system miles.

During the current year – and this surely illustrates the intention to continue and accelerate the program – over \$280,000 has been either spent or committed for this purpose.

Nearly \$400,000, Mr. Speaker, in less than two years. I suggest, Sir, that for the areas affected by these take-overs there is genuine appreciation of the desire of this Government to ease the tax burden of our people. And as I've stated, those areas will increase in numbers as the months go by.

Those major improvements are what are generally called structural improvements, including gravel, clay capping where essential – we all know that clay capping is an expensive operation much more than gravelling – and other standards of routine improvement, carried out and taken in stride by the department, but a very large undertaking by a local government group, hard-pressed for funds.

To be an asset to a community, roads must be available for use the year round. Long gone is the old concept of isolation for two or three months every winter because roads were snow clogged.

And these 300 Series highways, now within the provincial system, are receiving the attention they deserve during winter as well. For the last fiscal year, ended last march, some \$90,000 was expended by the Highway department on regular and winter maintenance.

This year, to date, an equal sum of \$88,000 has been spent. Once again, I draw attention, Mr. Speaker, to the fact that what the Department of Highways can and does do as a normal routine highway task can be anything else but that, when it has to be carried out by a municipality pressed for funds and with limited facilities and equipment to do it.

Mr. Speaker, all this has meant that the standard of maintenance on those 400 miles has been greatly improved to yield driving conditions similar to those on all provincial highways. Those 400 miles are now available to traffic the year round and that means that the quality of service and usefulness which roads are designed for in the first place has been enhanced. Surely this is the way it should be. Surely we should continually be on the search for ways to improve the lot of the small urban and rural dweller. Our modern way of life, our modern methods of distribution must rely on adequate roads, available to traffic and commerce throughout the year. This, then, is one of the objectives which the take-over plan envisaged when announced some two years ago. When you combine this with the

genuine savings in road upkeep costs which accrue to the municipalities, it is no wonder, in my view, that the program is being accepted as the forward-looking legislation it is.

And, Mr. Speaker, the program carries with it some worthwhile fringe benefits. For as the municipalities are relieved of the responsibility for building and maintaining these key roads, they will be able to turn attention to other and maybe lesser roads which lie within the municipal system and which could stand some upgrading as regards to service.

Mr. Speaker, as stated earlier, I for one trust that we will find it possible to sustain this program of aid to the smaller governing bodies of this province. Good progress is being made, as my remarks this afternoon have intended to convey. There is still substantial mileage than can usefully be taken from the grid system and included into the provincial highway system.

Conditions vary, of course, and it's important that we have some type of yardstick to determine what roads should be included. Some roads still within the grid system are important connectors and it is well, I think that we keep this in mind when selecting mileage for take-over. Traffic counts are also important and must be part of the overall consideration.

Equally important, Mr. Speaker, in the determination of what miles of grid road will or will not be gathered into the large system is the ability of the municipality concerned to carry on in the face of rising costs. Surely this must be a factor. Flexibility and good commonsense in the use of that admittedly important yardstick are obviously desirable.

Mr. Speaker, I should like to extend through you my thanks to the Members of this House for their forbearance this afternoon in allowing me these few minutes to say what I have on this important matter.

Mr. Speaker, as you can see, I will support the motion, but not the amendment.

SOME HON. MEMBERS: – Hear, hear!

MR. WHELAN: – Mr. Speaker, I wonder if we might call it 5:30.

HON. J.W. GARDINER (Minister of Public Works): – Before you leave the chair, I wonder if I could make on very brief announcement. Unfortunately, I just learned a while ago that Members of the Legislature, through some oversight by the Centennial Corporation, had not received invitations to the Centennial Dinner to be held Saturday night. I know there's about a half dozen who did because they are either chairman of Centennial committees or they are on the committee itself. But through some error the matter of the invitations did not go out to all MLAs. They will be receiving those invitations sometime this evening from the office. They are getting them ready at the present moment. I want to apologize for the delay in having these forwarded. The chairmen of all Centennial committees in the province have been invited to this dinner, plus MLAs, MPs and so on, and I hope that many of the Members of the Legislature in spite of the lateness of the invitations will find it possible to attend Saturday, with their wives, when John Fisher, the

Centennial Commissioner for Canada will be our guest.

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

MR. E. WHELAN (Regina North): — Mr. Speaker, I would like to join all other Members in expressing my sympathy to the relatives of the late Minister of Natural Resources, John Cuelenaere. I knew him when he was the Mayor of Prince Albert and always found him cooperative and dedicated. Saskatchewan has lost a good citizen.

Mr. Speaker, I should also like to associate myself with the other Members of the House in congratulating the mover and seconder of the Speech from the Throne. This traditional introduction of the policies of the Government was only handled by the two Hon. Members. I should also like to congratulate the Hon. Member for Milestone (Mr. MacDonald) on his elevation to the Cabinet. Government changes which have taken place may have been necessary in some departments. I am looking forward to some improvements in some area. I say with sincerity and I say with conviction that the only cure that you can depend on and the only cure that is available and the one we will be working on as the Opposition, is the ultimate and complete removal of the government from Treasury benches

SOME HON. MEMBERS: — Hear, hear!

MR. WHELAN: — . . . because of the philosophy Government Members hold and the manner in which it has been applied in the administration of the affairs of the Province of Saskatchewan. Application of this philosophy by the new Minister and the Hon. Ministers in the senior Departments and in junior Departments, whether they come from Prince Albert or whether they come from Milestone, makes very little difference. It adds up to a concentrated effort on the part of the Government to turn back the clock of progress. Take away the propaganda mill that the government Members have, which is second to none in Canada, a propaganda mill that leaves out figures and tells only half the story and lets the people find out from experience, and you discover that this Government is probably the worst government that Saskatchewan has had in more than 20 years.

In provincial elections and federal elections and in provincial by-elections, there's been no endorsement of their anti-labor, anti-democratic, pro-Goldwater policies, and without endorsement they plunge recklessly on, destroying programs that have been painstakingly and democratically developed over decades. There is only one way to put a stop to this and the sooner the better, and that is by calling a provincial general election.

SOME HON. MEMBERS: — Hear, hear!

MR. WHELAN: — The other day in this House, in bitter fashion, the Hon. Minister of Education (Mr. Trapp) tore into the most popular mayor the city of Moose Jaw has ever had. He didn't have much reason to do this based on the evidence he presented except that the Minister of Education belongs to that large group of Liberals who have convinced themselves and most of the people in Moose Jaw that the Mayor of Moose Jaw is going to win that riding in the next provincial election.

SOME HON. MEMBERS: – Hear, hear!

MR. WHELAN: – The Minister spoke about a civil servant, a civil servant who has served Saskatchewan well. In one statement attributed to him in the Moose Jaw Herald the civil servant said he was disappointed. Well, the facts are these: (1) He was highly respected as a civil servant in his capacity at the Moose Jaw Technical Institute. (2) He wrote a report on the Technical Institute Program and its needs in the future. He wrote it for the Government opposite. (3) The Report was handed to the Government but was never made public.

Maybe the civil servant claimed that the Technical Institute Program was a good one. The Report would shed some light on the difference of opinion that exists. Instead of using wild adjectives, instead of getting all steamed up, instead of growling and snarling in his seat just behind the Premier, I would suggest in order to clear up the mystery, that the Minister (Mr. Trapp) enlighten the whole Province of Saskatchewan and let us know what this able civil servant thought of the Technical Institute Program of Saskatchewan. And how do I suggest that he do that? I suggest, Mr. Speaker, that he table the Report. I suggest that if he has a good Technical Institute Program that he hesitate no longer; that he put the Report on the table, and I will repeat the Mayor of Moose Jaw's challenge. I challenge the Minister to table the Report and the House will be able to judge how the civil servant felt when he left the province. As a matter of fact, it seems to me that it is unethical and unfair to withhold this Report, in view of the controversy the Hon. Minister has introduced into this House.

The Premier, in his Speech from the Throne, talked about housing, and judging from the enthusiasm, wild noise, the waving of arms and deep voice, you would have thought that he had the answer to the housing problems. As a matter of fact, Mr. Speaker, the total number of houses he mentioned, the total number of units that he would build would not even meet the housing needs of Regina city. They do not offset the number of houses that were not built and are still needed from last year's construction season.

Mr. Speaker, the present housing program of the Liberal government, federally and provincially: (1) will not provide housing for rural areas at a reasonable price; (2) will not in any way bring stability to the construction industry, and (3) places the price of a home beyond the reach of those who are in desperate need.

Why do I say this? Why do I make these charges? In a period of 10 months during the year 1966, interest rates on new NHA loans rose from 6 3/4 per cent to 7 1/4 per cent. What would this mean if you had a 30-year mortgage? It means precisely this: I am holding in my hand, an interest rate book. Anyone can obtain one of these books, and turn to the page where it says 7 1/4 per cent interest and look up \$15,000 for a 30-year period. On a 30-year mortgage you pay \$101.24 per month. Taxes in Regina city for this type of home, I would say, average \$33 or \$34 per month, so you would have to pay a total of \$135 per month on this type of home. Since the purchase of housing is supposed to be no more than 2 per cent of your income, the person who is buying this home must make close to \$600 a month in order to purchase it. Then there are the deductions that have to come off his salary. You've got to deduct from his salary income tax, pension, union

dues and so forth.

And let's look at this increase from another point of view. Members opposite talk glibly and at length about the homeowner grants and while they're talking about the homeowner grants, quiet as mice, without a sound of protest its Federal Liberal Government at Ottawa increased the rate of interest on NHA mortgages one whole percentage point during a period of 10 months, the same year that the homeowner grants came down, increasing the payment on a \$15,000, 30-year mortgage from \$19.38 per month by approximately \$10 per month. In other words, in order to safeguard the interests of big business in Canada, the people who finance their party and the federal Liberals, raised the cost of living to anyone purchasing a new home in this country to the tune of \$120 a year. But let's look at the overall picture. They have increased the price of that mortgage to the average homeowner during its life time, during its 30-year period by \$3,400. If you borrow \$15,000 at 6 1/4 per cent over a 30-year period you pay back \$32,940 but at the 7 1/4 per cent interest rate, and that's the present rate, the buyer will pay back \$36,300. He will pay back \$21,300 in interest.

But these fellows gave us the homeowner grants and aren't they nice? The homeowner grant, if you got it, at \$50 a year for 30 years would be \$1,599, but in the same period they increased the cost of a home by raising the interest rate \$3,400. By one fell swoop, the Federal Liberals and the Provincial Liberals working nicely together have stuck the future homeowners of the country to the tune of \$3,400 because of this increased interest rate. The net result: no homes are being built, no homes are being bought. No one can purchase them. Who is going to pay \$21,500 in interest? These are NHA loans; I remind the House these are NHA loans. I'm not talking about the people who have to go on the open market, the people who because they are in the lower income bracket cannot qualify for an NHA loan. They don't pay 7 1/4 per cent interest, they pay 8 1/4 and 8 1/2 per cent interest rate right now. What is the net result? The net result is that the housing construction industry as we know it in Saskatchewan is in a shamble; good tradesmen have done, they have taken jobs that are more secure. The winter-works program of \$500 bonus has been withdrawn.

The evidence is readily available as to what is happening in the housing industry in the city of Regina. The number of housing starts on new homes has dropped and I quote a recent copy of the Leader Post, February 6:

In Regina, the number of dwellings started, completed and under construction in 1966 was 977. In 1965, the number was 1,686, a 42 per cent decline in housing construction.

But the final blow comes from the Provincial Government. They are the most helpful people. If you read the headlines, as the Hon. Member from Moosomin (Mr. Gardiner) suggests, regardless of what he has to say, when you're building a home, you must install electricity and gas in the city on the low-priced lots. The homeowner who wants to save money tries to buy one of these lots. He'd like to buy a low-cost lot. He finds that in the city of Regina, sewer and water have been installed, streets have been laid out, but at the instigation of the present Minister in charge of the Saskatchewan Power Corporation (Mr. Steuart) there is no natural gas and there is no electricity available. They're certainly doing a great job helping the housing industry.

And providing homes in the city of Regina. Hundreds of city lots surveyed with sewer and water but said lots sit idle with a huge investment by the city while the Premier makes speeches about what he is doing for housing. The facts are that, combined with the Federal Government, the Premier and his Government have brought housing construction in the city of Regina almost to a standstill.

The Premier is going to build rental units. If they are going to be like the present units, all I can say is that he should examine the situation carefully. All he has to do is call on the directors, starting with the vice-president of the Regina housing Authority who is a supporter of his party, and on the executive of the party, and she will tell them, as she has told the housing meeting recently in the city of Regina, that rents at Regent Court, rents at Greet Court are beyond the means of the low-income people. Low income people cannot pay these rents. I can show him instances where people are paying \$109 per month and their take-home pay is \$350 per month, or where they are paying \$100 per month and their take-home pay is, after all deductions, \$326 per month. If you want these figures, I am sure that you can get them from the Regina housing Authority.

We have two subsidized housing projects in the city, and I know from personal experience for one of these projects is in Regina North, that no sooner are the people in the projects, no sooner are they in there then they are looking for other accommodation. If this is what the Premier means by low-rental housing, if he means this type of housing and 7 ½ per cent interest rates and no lots to build on, then the Federal and Provincial Liberal policy on housing is bankrupt, and the housing industry and those seeking homes are in for a bad time.

At the recent housing meeting in Regina when the Hon. Mr. Nicholson was present, the Minister of Welfare (Mr. MacDonald) said that, if we don't get the interest rate down for building, we can't continue to charge economic rents for senior citizens and that type of housing project; and he's right. I agree with him. Senior citizens are saying this. I've heard this many times. I congratulate him for speaking out but there is the overall picture, the overall policy of the party of the government opposite.

Does it consider the senior citizens? Does it provide proper housing at an economic rent? I suggest that it doesn't at 7 ½ per cent interest; it doesn't consider the low income people for housing; it doesn't provide a policy for our rural people who need housing. I would suggest that an interest rate, a reasonable interest rate of four per cent, might provide housing for these people. No, that isn't what you do if you're a Federal or Provincial Liberal. You defend the loaning interests, the banking interests, the loan companies; and housing for the old people and housing for the young people and for the rural people at an economic figure just isn't there. It hasn't been a part of the platform of the Liberal party at any time.

I was invited to attend a housing meeting in Regina under the auspices of the Minister, Mr. Nicholson is a very nice person. I asked him how he expected the construction industry to operate when they turn the money off and on as they do. He gave me the same kind of answer that I have given this House. He outlined the kind of policy I have given the House, and then he said, "If you have any suggestions or any answers to this problem, give them to me." It was Mr. Nicholson's meeting and I was an

invited guest and I didn't tell him what the construction people who were sitting in the meeting were thinking or mumbling under their breath. I didn't tell him what the people in Regent Court or Greet Court are saying, but I am going to tell this House.

What do I think the answer is? If we want a housing policy for Canada let's look at the picture. Here was a Minister (Mr. Nicholson) in charge of housing for all of Canada, the most affluent country in the world, the richest country in the world; here is a country that can supply all the component part for a good house from our natural resources: lumber, clay for bricks, steel, cement, tradesmen anxious to work. Here is a Minister with the entire resources of Canada at his disposal; here is a Minister whose government could lend money at a low rate of interest. Here is a country that could find money in a time of war in great quantities. Here is a country that says it has declared war on poverty but the Minister can only apologize to the people who own this country, the people who live in it and charge them 7 ½ per cent interest for housing. The Minister with this background and with these facts which he must know, said to me, "If you have any answers or if you have any suggestions, give them to me." Well I have the answer and a copy of this speech will go to him, and my answer is this: get a new Minister for Housing in the Dominion of Canada. Get a new Minister for Housing for this country and if he doesn't change the federal policy and there isn't a housing program that will meet the needs of Canada very soon, the rest of the answer is to elect a government that will provide the answer. Elect the New Democrats.

SOME HON. MEMBERS: – Hear, hear!

MR. WHELAN: – There is nothing I the performance of the Provincial Minister in charge of housing to suggest to me that he has been aggressive enough on behalf of the low-income groups, on behalf of the construction industry, on behalf of those who are paying high interest rates. Either he doesn't know or he doesn't care. My constituents will know where I stand and what I think of the present housing problem. I think the Minister's representation on behalf of the people as far as housing is concerned has been ineffective. True, the Federal Government has the finances; true they can set the policy, but I would expect the Provincial Minister to take a strong stand. Let him speak up in the strongest terms; let the housing needs of Saskatchewan's rural people and low-income people and senior citizens and future homeowners be known right across this country.

Mr. Speaker, I would like to turn for a moment to the cooperative movement. I can recall very vividly sitting in this House when the Hon. Minister for Gravelbourg (Mr. Coderre) discovered the credit union movement. And then he spoke on the Throne Speech last week and I felt that eh had just discovered the cooperative movement. A few years ago I recall when we challenged the Member for Gravelbourg, the Minister for Cooperation, to let us know whether he was for or against the requested taxation of cooperatives by cooperatives opponents, and the then Minister of Agriculture, now Senator McDonald, said, "We are against it." The Member for Gravelbourg said, "Yes, me too." Well The Cooperative Consumer carried a letter in the last issue, January 24th. After reading the news, and without seeing the actual minutes of the Senate-Commons Committee on price increases, this letter gives the impression that I got when we were blessed recently with the brilliance of the Senator from

Saskatchewan when he spoke at Ottawa. This is what the man in the letter says and I quote, regarding the comments of the recently named Senator at Ottawa, Senator McDonald, and this is what he says:

Testifying before the Parliamentary Committee investigating prices, Senator Hammy McDonald, who at one time was a big shot in the Liberal party and for a period was Leader in Saskatchewan, made a statement on the bulk cooperatives that he saw no difference between the Loblaws and the cooperatives except that the cooperatives are bigger and paid no taxes.

That's what happens when they get into the Senate. Senator McDonald doesn't think cooperatives pay taxes. The Hon. Member for Gravelbourg (Mr. Coderre), who is the Minister of Cooperatives, tells the people at coop meetings that he is in favor of coops. I wonder how the Member for Gravelbourg would feel if he were a Senator. I just wonder what he would say if he were within the protection of the Senate walls. Would he change his position as did Senator McDonald?

The Senator has a counterpart who sits in the House of Commons and who makes some very interesting statements. In the House on February 6, 1967, James A. Byrne, Parliamentary Secretary to the Minister of Transport, a big wheel in the Liberal Party, representing one of the Kootenay ridings in British Columbia, spoke on behalf of that little industry, COMINCO, that little wing of the largest corporation in the world, and he made the most outrageous attack on the cooperative movement that has appeared in print in the last 20 years.

In page after page of savagely slanted mistruths, Mr. Byrne acting as the mouthpiece of a company situated in his riding tore the cooperative movement to shreds. He sits as a key Member of the Liberal Party. I refer the Member for Gravelbourg, the Minister of Cooperation, to Hansard, page 12705 to 12711 February 6, 1967:

If time would allow, I would quote the speech, but I ask the Hon. Minister to read Hansard. Let me give you a little sample. Mr. Byrne is talking about Federated Cooperatives Annual Report on page 12707, and I quote him:

We find net sales of \$110,988,000 and other income of \$182,000 for a total of \$111,000,000 odd, expenditures are \$92,000,000, estimated income tax \$207,000 for a net saving available for distribution to members of \$5,065,000.

Here is the paragraph that I'm sure Mr. Byrne was aiming at the people of Western Canada:

I wonder whether anyone can find anywhere in this statement anything that faintly resembles a disbursement to a charitable institution unless of course 50 per cent of the western farmers on the western prairies are in need of welfare. Incidentally none of these dividends have apparently been distributed to the western prairie farmers and others. You will note, Mr. Speaker, that in any portion of the operation in which a deficit has incurred, the shortfall is described in such bourgeois terms as a loss.

This is a key Member of the Liberal party speaking. He has

no knowledge of the manner in which Federated Cooperatives operates, no knowledge of how funds are allocated to members. Acting as a spokesman and in all probability he has the full sanction of the Cabinet and leaders of the Liberal party, Mr. Byrne has not been refuted by the Hon. Member for Gravelbourg, the Minister of Cooperation for Saskatchewan.

SOME HON. MEMBERS: – Hear, hear!

MR. WHELAN: – If he was speaking for cooperatives he would speak up against this man. He would let us know where he stands.

Mr. Byrne goes on, and I quote:

A confirmed anti-Socialist, I personally believe such a development could be even more insidious than state ownership and control of our means of production and distribution.

I recall how the Hon. Member for Gravelbourg (Mr. Coderre) talked in glowing terms about the coops and cooperation. Let him read Mr. Byrne's complete speech and I want him to refute this economic illiterate who has maligned cooperative leaders in Canada in page after page of Hansard, maligned the leaders of Federated Cooperatives, Interprovincial Cooperatives, and the Cooperative Fertilizer Company. While he criticizes the Fertilizer Plant he failed to explain who COMINCO is, which he defends with such vigor. COMINCO is part, as I have said, of the largest corporation in the world.

If the Hon. Member for Gravelbourg would like to retrieve himself, I have a project for him and one which the people of Canada have sought for many years. Let us go away back to the year 1907. Many of those who have appeared before the Senate-Commons Committee on the cost of living have recommended that cooperatives could contribute to the solution of consumer's problems. There is a need for a Federal Cooperative Act in Canada. The request for such an Act goes back to that year. In that year a Federal Cooperative Bill was passed with one dissenting vote in the House of Commons. But in the following year it was defeated by a majority of one vote in the Senate. Later a bill for Cooperative Machinery was defeated in 1910. Cooperatives have sought this Act for almost 60 years but it has not yet passed Parliament at Ottawa. The only legislation which cooperatives use and under which they can incorporate is found in provincial statutes and individual private bills introduced in the House of Commons. Denial of a Federal Cooperative Act is grossly unfair to them for the following reasons: (1) Other forms of business enjoy the privilege and convenience of incorporating under federal legislation; (2) Cooperatives at the present time have to incorporate under legislation not basically designed for cooperatives; (3) Cooperative legislation was sought and defeated during the days of Sir Wilfred Laurier. This federal legislation is needed now more than ever before.

When we learn that one man has control of 30 per cent and possibly more of the food business in Canada; when we learn the extent to which control of Canadian industry is in the hands of people who do not live in Canada; and when each day we learn that Canada's economy is dominated by giant national and international concerns in which Canadians themselves have little influence; and when we learn and hear from one of the giant

food chains that there is more profit in processing and packaging foods than in merchandising and retailing, then I say that there is a need for this legislation.

Producers do not get enough for their goods, and consumers are finding prices much too high.

In 1959, the report on Food Price Spreads in Canada suggested that the cooperatives might offer a solution. That Royal Commission also recommended a federal statute providing for incorporation of cooperatives at the federal level. Cooperatives must be large and must cross provincial borders if they are going to challenge foreign ownership, if they're going to process and package food stuffs. It is impossible to perform the cooperative role of balancing and regulating other forms of business as small cooperatives, while the giants with whom the cooperative must compete are both national and international in scope. Opponents of cooperatives are able to incorporate both federally and provincially, as they desire, but cooperatives which pay both federal and provincial taxes and other taxes, can boast of no further legislation designed for their particular needs.

I would just like to quote the statement made at the annual meeting of Federated Cooperatives a few days ago. In their annual report, they say:

If it is true that cooperatives of today must compete with giant enterprise, if it is true that cooperatives can help overcome problems of the consumer and those of the producers, if it is true that cooperatives are one answer to the foreign domination and control of Canada, if it's true that there are areas of activities in which cooperatives are needed but cannot hope to succeed on a limited scale, then it is true that we should in every possible way make known to Ottawa our demand for a Federal Cooperative Act.

These things are true, and if the Hon. Minister believes in cooperatives he will put forward a resolution asking for a Federal Cooperative Act immediately, if he wants to prove the sincerity of his enthusiasm for the cooperative movement. Until he does so, then I presume that Mr. Byrne and Senator Hammy McDonald speak with more force and influence in the Liberal party than does the Minister.

It would be impossible for me to relate, and time will not permit me to tell this House how often I've been challenged and approached as a Member of the Legislature, because overtime pay was not mailed, because a mistake was made in a cheque, because of the fact that construction had been completed for months but the payment for this work had not been received. One gets the impression from being in a Regina constituency, close to the hub of government, that the Cabinet Ministers keep fouling up the civil servants, that the administrative procedures have bogged down, that there seems to be a one-man show preventing decisions from being made on time.

Much has been said about helping the Indian and Métis people. I'll leave this one example with you. I received a telephone call on Saturday last from someone who was boarding young people who are receiving additional schooling in Regina. These young Métis people have been boarding with this lady since January 23, 1967. She felt that the pay should come from the Federal Department of Indian Affairs and took the matter up with the local MP. She

was advised that the payment was in the hands of the Treasury Department in the Province of Saskatchewan. She has been unable to obtain payment from them to date. I remind Members that this woman has to buy groceries and food for these young people. It is an embarrassment for the young natives who are strangers in the big city. It is a further embarrassment when they have to borrow money because the allowance which was supposed to be paid as well as their board, as not arrived. So, in addition to being without the board money she has given the young people an advance and she can't afford this. She is not that well-to-do. An advance of \$10.00, so they could go to a show, buy a chocolate bar, or a package of cigarettes, and in effect, live like normal people.

The Hon. Member for Moose Jaw (Mr. Snyder) raised the matter of overtime payment, payments for overtime that were in arrears. I think the government should pay its obligations on time, particularly board and allowance for the native people, above any other payments. These young people without funds suffer the embarrassment of an inefficient administration as well as the shock of being in strange surroundings.

It was with some interest and also with some amusement that I listened to the Hon. Member from Moosomin (Mr. Gardner) talking about Miller High School, the new high school in Regina at the corner of College and Winnipeg. One would almost think that the province built it and yet its contribution was to pay the regular grant, a fraction of the total cost. Full credit for the development of the school goes to the Board of Education for the Separate High Schools, particularly to the Superintendent. But to hear the Hon. Member for Moosomin (Mr. Gardner) rise in his place, I'm sure the people of Regina will laugh up their sleeve. They know that the Ford Foundation paid for trips for the school board all over the North American continent, and that two people from the Department of Education accompanied them and also a person from the Board of Education, Regina. But it was the imaginative genius, the progressive thinking, the research and the leadership of the architect, the Separate School Board, and the education authorities, who working together, produced Miller High. The Hon. Member (Mr. Gardner) had the article in the Globe and Mail. Why didn't he quote all of it instead of quoting just part of it? Let me quote the first two paragraphs:

Regina's Miller Composite High School is a little like the Saskatchewan Roughriders, you don't expect such a city slicker operation so deep in the west. At least not unless you know Lew Riederer, director of education for the Regina Separate School Board and mastermind behind Miller, Canada's most up-to-date school.

Over and over again the article quotes Riederer's leadership and his ability.

Miller is intended to synthesize the best ideas from the most advanced high schools on the continent. The Nova School near Fort Lauderdale, Florida, had the greatest impact on the trustees. Riederer took groups there twice. Unlike Miller the Nova School, an academic marvel with an individual curriculum for nearly every student has not technical, vocational branch.

Riederer's synthesis is so attractive that he was one of the few Canadian education officials from outside Ontario

invited to appear before the province's Hall Committee on the Aims and Objectives of Education.

They would climb on the bandwagon. No one who knows the qualifications of Lew Riederer, one of the ablest educationalists in Western Canada, can doubt for one moment that his tremendous leadership was ably demonstrated in the construction of Miller High.

Credit goes to all these other people. The Provincial Government has no right to take the credit away from them. But this, sir, is a good lesson, I hope, to every person that has anything to do with the Separate School Board. I hope they have a good look at the comments that were made by the Hon. Member for Moosomin (Mr. Gardner).

It indicates clearly that the Member from Moosomin would try to take credit for the ability, the imagination, and accomplishments and ultimate results of a dedicated education group headed by an able superintendent.

Students in Saskatchewan's secondary schools are talking about the need for counselling, indicating clearly that there's a shortage of counselling to meet the challenge of the computer world, the world of cybernation. We must have counsellors not just two or three of them travelling to the borders of the province to try and prevent the young people fleeing in droves from an unimaginative Liberal government, but counselling services that will train hundreds of teachers to counsel for the present needs. The Counselling Caravan will be like the headline in the news story the Member from Moosomin talks about. We will need more than the Caravan. We will need hundreds of counsellors and we should begin immediately to introduce a course to train them. To talk about a handful moving from one area to another in a truck or a Caravan, or whatever it may be, is inadequate to meet the need. I suggest that if the government is serious about counselling, it begin immediately training the best teachers for counselling students, students who must meet the challenge of cybernation.

Mr. Speaker, the Speech from the Throne should have contained: (1) Housing programs, that will meet the needs of senior citizens of low-income groups whereby housing can be obtained at a reasonable rate on a rental or purchase basis; (2) It should have more adequate provisions for the development of a university course to provide student counsellors; (3) it should have urged immediate Federal legislation to provide a Federal Cooperative Act; (4) It should contain a guarantee that the administration of our provincial affairs would be improved.

Mr. Speaker, because of these omissions, I will not support the motion. I will support the amendment.

SOME HON. MEMBERS: – Hear, hear!

MR. H.A. BROTEN (Watrous): – Mr. Speaker, I'd like to associate myself with the fine things that's been said about John Cuelenaere, Hon. Member for Shellbrook. He was one of the first Ministers that I contacted after the government formed office in 1964, and it was indeed a fine relationship that we had at that time. Saskatchewan is indeed poorer for losing him at this early date.

I would like to congratulate the mover and seconder for

being chosen to move the motion for the Speech in Reply.

The Member from Notukeu-Willowbunch (Mr. Hooker) tried to put a wedge between the farmer and labor. May I say that in the last few months there have been such obvious attempts to do this that the people of Saskatchewan are getting fed up. Almost every farmer has a sister or brother or a son or a daughter in the labor force. And they can see there is a deliberate attempt to split farmer and laborer, and they resent this.

People know that the areas of mutual interest can be found and are found. But the Liberal party knows that if a climate of reasonableness and good judgment exist, they are not going to receive the political nod. And this they dread.

The Liberal type of politics flourishes in discontent, disparaging remarks to drive in wedges. Wide-open patronage in every area of government decision is the order of the day, such as government employment, land allocation and land sale.

Now, Mr. Speaker, I represent the agricultural constituency of Watrous. May I say how I appreciate their confidence in me over the past seven years.

Our highways were oiled and paved except for six miles before the Liberals came to power. And I hope the Government is giving honest consideration to those six miles in the Prudhomme area and on into Saskatoon from there.

A seal coat was applied on No. 2 Highway from the junction of No. 5 to the junction of 14 some six years ago. This seal coat was applied to a very expensive bed of gravel. This section should receive a closer scrutiny in order that the bed isn't allowed to deteriorate before a proper paving job is applied.

Another section of former highway that needs attention is the old No. 5 that runs into Bruno from the present No. 5. There are four miles there that has the high count of 390 cars per day, which is more than many highways and therefore could be taken over by the Highway Department. The municipality of Bayne is having a hard time supplying proper maintenance and care for this section.

Another part of my constituency that needs consideration is a proper highway link between Watrous and No. 14 to the potash area there. This is clearer now than in former year's because of the potash development at Lanigan and expanded activity at the Watrous resort. Many people would like to commute to the potash mine and live in Watrous or Manitou Beach.

This type of development should have an early priority so that communities have an even chance of growth and people have a free choice of communities in which to live.

There is a lot of loose talk by Government Members of Saskatchewan prosperity, especially amongst the farmers. One must not forget that this farm prosperity is in the communities which have larger than average crop, like we've had this year. You give farmers that are trying to pay for farms and educate children an average crop and they are completely up against it.

In my home community in a radius of 20 miles I know of only one young farmer that has started on his farmstead and built from there. Young farmers have quit 15 years ago trying to

start and build or take over other farmsteads. This poor economic condition of the farmers does not seem to be recognized by the Government either in Saskatchewan or Ottawa. There seems to be a misguided idea that some of the farmer's income has to wait until he sells his land, and that his present income be deferred until sale of farm or some other pie-in-the-sky time. Does industry wait for returns on invested capital? Does General Motors wait until some other time to get profits? Does Canada Packers wait until some other time to get 11.6 per cent return on investment like it received last year? The February 4th Financial Post declares that Canada Packers received 11.6 on invested capital last year and for a period of five years has averaged 6.9 per cent on the invested capital.

On the other hand, if the farmer mentioned above is to receive 10 per cent on invested capital like Canada Packers, he would have to get \$1.76 a bushel to cover investment and wage. All of his cash expenses are above that for seed, fertilizer, fuel, depreciation, repair, spray, hardware, etc., which could amount to well over \$1 a bushel. And hence, he would have to get at least \$2.76 a bushel if he is to get equal treatment with that of Canada Packers.

Mr. Speaker, I have distributed a separate sheet to all Members to show that in order for farmers to get 10 per cent on invested capital like Canada Packers and a \$6,000 wage, he would have to receive \$1.76 a bushel, just for wage and 10 per cent on invested capital. Now I deliberately picked out a two-section farm because many people say that the larger farms, the two-section farm, is considered large enough to be of the paying type. I make this comparison as a sort of shock treatment to show where the farmers stand compared with industry.

We hear so much from the Liberals that farmers never had it so good. Well, let me say, Mr. Speaker, that \$1 a bushel more is what it takes to get somewhere near the same economic treatment as Canada Packers.

It is high time the Liberal Governments in Ottawa and Saskatchewan recognize the farmers must get a just and equal return and thereby their fair share of the national income.

Mr. Speaker, the constituency of Watrous is one of the areas that are receiving benefit from the Saskatchewan Water Development Commission and I want to thank the government for this. Water is an invaluable asset and a real necessity in this modern age.

I must say here that the main surveys that were made to get water to the Black Strap and beyond were made as long ago as 1948. And a precedent in supplying water to larger town in Saskatchewan was made in 1973 by our CCF government of that day; water was brought to Kindersley and Eston in the season of 1963. The CCF set up the Water Commission in the winter of 1964 as we know it now.

There are many aspects of the Commission's working which are very irritating to the farmers whose land is needed either for canals or reservoirs. The irritant that perhaps is more felt than all the others is that of agreeing on the price for the land. The setting up of the land price seems to be from an old formula which is out of date in this era of higher land prices. There is much concern of the farmer selling land on forced sale for less than he can buy other land. This harassment takes place in the whole transaction by the simple method of delay. Then

the farmer is told to sign or land will be expropriated anyway, and in most cases the farmer is not aware of his rights, costs or procedures. I know of farmers who sold land for \$80 an acres who will have to pay well over a \$100 to replace an acre of land and perhaps drive many miles to farm it.

There is also much concern because of water canals which cross the whole constituency of Watrous. Now we know we cannot have water without ditches and canals. But we also know that better machinery should be set up to deal with the whole problem of expropriation.

The former CCF Government because it knew that there would be more expropriation of land, as the completion date of the Saskatchewan Dam drew nigh, did appoint a special Committee of the Legislature to recommend ways and means of solving problems relating to land expropriation. This Committee did meet with a good staff and sufficient means to do the necessary work. The committee's report was tabled in the winter session of 1964. And the present government has not acted on the unanimous recommendations of that committee. Mr. Speaker, I think this is typically Liberal in character. Ram your way through is the order of the day.

The committee did recommend certain ways of determining compensation and recommended the necessary bodies to set up to carry out this important work. In Section 6 of the drawn-up Bill it mentioned the Public and Private Rights Board whose power it would be to report disputes to the Legislature. Thus there would be someone from farmers to do to with their problems who would not be part and parcel of the specific dispute itself.

I think it is high time something is done by the government in cleaning up this whole mess. I would like to hear the explanation of the Minister of Public Works or Agriculture why there wasn't something done about ways and means of proper settling of compensation. One of the things that I see that is necessary is a new look on return for land that is taken in the canal. There is hardly any consideration for the loss of income in perpetuity on land so taken.

Most people agree that the farmer will do as much work on a quarter of land from which a canal is taken or perhaps more than if a quarter was left intact. Well the expense of farming the acreage is real but not a cent of income is in return for the expropriated land. The man would have to receive sufficient price for the land so he could capitalize his income at six per cent in order to look after average income of the land acreage.

In order to do this, the price of land would have to be well over \$330 an acre for fair agricultural land so that the interest would compensate for loss of crop income. Remember, sir, that the extra work is already done on a quarter because of extra turning and inconvenience.

And there is much discontent regarding this. And I think the government should be scored for not implementing the Expropriation Committee's recommendations.

Mr. Speaker, there could be much said of the government sending out cheques in large numbers to people and not having enough money for new hospitals and technical schools.

Mr. Speaker, what of higher taxes? We heard much of this

before the last election, that is, lower municipal and school taxes. On my own farm, Mr. Speaker, taxes have gone up eight mills in two years or \$24 a quarter section. School and municipal taxes went up \$63 in the 20 years that the CCF were in power from 1944 to 1964, or \$3 a year when the CCF were in power. In the last two years school and municipal taxes have gone up \$24 or \$12 a year or at a rate four times faster than when the CCF formed the government.

Mr. Speaker when we get tax increases four times the former rate, sir, is there any wonder that many in our area wonder if they will ever support the Liberal party again, especially after solemn promises of ways and means for tax reduction?

Mr. Speaker, there are two other areas in which the Leader of the Opposition, the Member for Biggar (Mr. Lloyd), did a terrific service in this province in the last few months. First I would like to say how fortunate we are in having the Member for Biggar take such a keen interest in transportation problems not only in Saskatchewan but in all of Canada. One may say the Leader of the Opposition (Mr. Lloyd) does have a fund of knowledge and keen interest in this problem and ably displayed it when he presented a brief to the Standing Committee on Transportation and Communications. We have taken a firm stand regarding the Crow's Nest rates, and the vital importance that transportation does play in the development of Canada as a whole and Saskatchewan in particular.

Our Party and Leader have played a very able and leading role in opposition to the wholesale rail line abandonment. At the moment, I would say without fear of documented objection that the present government fails to lead in this area which is so vital to Saskatchewan.

Mr. Speaker, the other area of fine representation was made by the Member for Biggar and the Member for Regina West (Mr. Blakeney), to the prairie Provinces' Cost of Living Commission on behalf of consumers of Saskatchewan. We are becoming known as the consumer farmer party. We are saying, Mr. Speaker that the CCF has as its Centennial project the defeat of the Liberal party. A worthy cause I would say, Mr. Speaker.

Because of the many failures and of the many shortcomings of the present government, Mr. Speaker, I support the amendment but do not support the motion.

SOME HON. MEMBERS: —

HON. D. BOLDT (Minister of Highways and Transportation): — Mr. Speaker, first of all I want to thank the mover and the seconder for the good addresses that they gave here about a week ago. They certainly represented the thinking of the Liberal party. They presented the case well. In the last ten days that I have been in the House and out in the country, I have found that the majority of the people felt that this was one of the best lead-off debates that they had heard for some time. I also want to thank the Premier for his speech here a few days ago. It was one of the finest speeches that I think that I have heard the Premier give in this House. It was well accepted in the country and I'm sure that the Opposition have found very little to needle him or the government about. As a matter of fact, Mr. Speaker, I have found it very difficult to take down notes from the Opposition in which I could really get into an argument with

them, to stir up quite a bit of argument in the House. I hope that I can raise a few questions here today, but it has been rather difficult to find any good argument coming from that side of the House. The new Minister of Welfare (Mr. McDonald) had a few bouquets sent to him and at the same time, I didn't receive any.

SOME HON. MEMBERS: – Hear, hear!

MR. BOLDT: – I have not been offended, I can tell you this, and I am not sorry either that I have been moved over to the Highway Department. I gather from the faces on the other side that they are real glad. As Minister of Welfare, I think I only made three enemies. One party I would say who didn't agree with the way welfare was administered was the CCF MLAs, the NDP or the Socialists as they are called. The other party that I think didn't always agree with me was the Saskatoon Star Phoenix, which is supposed to be a good Liberal paper, but somehow they didn't always agree with what I said, and the other party that I don't think was too friendly to me was the news editor of CFQC, who had some bad things to say about me at times, but they have been forgiven.

SOME HON. MEMBERS: – Hear, hear!

MR. BOLDT: – This afternoon, the senior Member from Saskatoon (Mr. Nicholson) tried awfully hard to bring back the Saskatoon hassle but he sure made a weak attempt and I couldn't even get stirred up.

SOME HON. MEMBERS: – Hear, hear!

MR. BOLDT: – The Saskatoon affair has been settled. Everybody seems to be happy except the senior Member from Saskatoon. Alderman after alderman has told me since we took over the administration of welfare in Saskatoon how pleased they were. Everything is operating fine, since the Commissioner of Saskatoon resigned and a few changes were made in the Welfare Department. The government has taken over, everything has operated very successfully. I can assure you that the new Cabinet Minister for Welfare will have easy sailing in Saskatoon. There will be cooperation and furthermore I'm quite sure that the Minister of Welfare is very able and capable of running this department in a very fair and just manner, similar to the way I operated it.

SOME HON. MEMBERS: – Hear, hear!

MR. BOLDT: – Not so long ago I watched a television newscast and I saw the Member from Regina North (Mr. Whelan) who just sat down a few minutes ago. He said that this session they were going to hit up the government for automobile insurance, the accident rates, the number of deaths on the highways and oh, you name it, and I didn't hear them even mention it because we have announced that we are going to bring in a Driver Training Program, which will be the first on the North American continent, maybe the first in the world, and apparently the Members from Regina North agrees.

MR. WHELAN: – Wait until we see your figures.

MR. BOLDT: – You know I was very interested in the Leader of the Opposition (Mr. Lloyd) when he spoke in the Throne Speech Debate. He expressed some concern which amazed me. He expressed some concern about the savings that some people in Canada lost through some corporation or insurance company. Well I want to assure the consumer-farmer party I believe it was called, I don't know what they are called, the CCF, the NDP, the consumer-farmer party. I don't know what's going to be next. You had better get your name straightened out because you might be identified on the ballot pretty soon. While the Liberal Government of Saskatchewan shows some concern, I would say more concern than the Socialists in bringing in legislation that will safeguard public interest, why is the Opposition so concerned at this present time? When they were the Government, every shyster on the continent was permitted to run at large. Shares and stocks were sold in wholesale lots to the public without being carefully screened by the Government and the public lost millions in unsafe investments. In the Socialists' days, investments were only good for a decided few. Fines and Company were the few who hit it rich and are now living in foreign lands off the sweat and toil of the Saskatchewan people.

SOME HON. MEMBERS: – Hear, hear!

MR. NOLLET: – On a point of privilege the Hon. Member has certainly levelled a charge. What facts has he got to back that statement? Withdraw that statement.

MR. BOLDT: – The fact that I have is the fact that it hurts.

MR. NOLLET: – If you can't prove it, withdraw.

SOME HON. MEMBERS: – Hear, hear!

MR. BOLDT: – Not only were the Socialists delinquent in safeguarding public investments, they robbed the taxpayers through high premiums in insurance rates, to the tune of over \$3,600,000 to save the face of a socialist Crown corporation, the Saskatchewan Guarantee and Fidelity Company that had gone broke . . .

SOME HON. MEMBERS: – Hear, hear!

MR. BOLDT: – . . . Before it got off the ground. This happened while the Gold Dust Twins in the Opposition, sometimes referred to as the intellectuals, were in charge of Saskatchewan Government Insurance Office.

SOME HON. MEMBERS: – Hear, hear!

MR. BOLDT: – No, really, Mr. Speaker, the Socialists are not interested in safeguarding public interest and public investments. They will not rest until capitalism is eradicated from the face of the earth. They don't care about the rich; they don't care about those who can afford to invest, even though it may be big or small. They want the public to be poor, so that we can exercise complete control . . .

SOME HON. MEMBERS: – Hear, hear!

MR. BOLDT: – . . . They want the public to be poor so they can exercise complete control, through their own manipulated welfare programs. In plain talk, they want to make beggars out of every citizen in the province.

The Leader of the Opposition (Mr. Lloyd) also criticized the closing of Embury House, substituted for free enterprise services. I am sure my colleague will have something to say about that. All I want to say at this time is I am very proud of the welfare services made available to Saskatchewan under the Liberal Government. It is not only said by us. It is said by the officials in the department and by people across the nation, that we did more in the field of welfare in two and one-half years than the socialists did in 20 years. Why, they talk about the emotionally disturbed children. When we took over Embury House, they looked after six to eight boys and the Saskatchewan Boys' School had less than 20 guests. Today, the Boys' School look after twice that many children. Ranch Ehrlo looks after 20 boys; the Lutheran Victoria House looks after a good number of girls; the Mennonite Central Committee looks after some boys in Saskatoon and Brown Camps in Moose Jaw is capable of looking after 15 children, plus the two institutions of Dales House in Regina and Kilburn Hall in Saskatoon. Yes, Mr. Speaker, the member for Hanley (Mr. Walker), and I'm sorry that he is not in his seat, but if there should be an election campaign going on, he'd tell the people of Saskatchewan the Liberals threw the children out into the streets. We have more children in care today, I would say two to three times as many emotionally disturbed children in our care today as when we took office.

SOME HON. MEMBERS: – Hear, hear!

MR. BOLDT: – Mr. Speaker, we even made - and this is what hurts the Socialists more – we even made some people work whom the Socialists had raised on welfare for 20 years, and I am proud of it, and so are some of those who have learned to work. Yes, the welfare program in this province is moving ahead at a pace of never before, yet the socialists find this very hard to believe.

SOME HON. MEMBERS: – Hear, hear!

MR. BOLDT: – What about education? This is the only platform that the socialists have. But I want to say a few words about education, and I want to make it plain that these are my personal opinions, and not necessarily the Government's. We give a good deal of priority to education, and to a degree, I agree that this should be. I feel that the time has come when we must re-examine priorities. The Socialists talk about free tuition, they talk about everything free – this is a great investment.

The Premier expressed some concern the other day about farm help. Now, what is the basic reason for not being able to hire farm help? Why are our farms becoming larger and larger? It has been mentioned in this debate that the Provincial Government is paying 83 per cent of the cost of educating a university student. Now, isn't this the best investment that any young person can look at financially, to say nothing of obtaining the benefits of higher education. My argument today is that we need your farmers just as badly in this country as we need engineers, doctors,

dentists, teachers, or what have you. If I suggest to this House that we set up our young farmers on an 83 to 17 per cent basis, as we do those who attend the university, you might think that I was away out in left field. But this is exactly what we are doing for those who choose to go beyond high school. As long as we keep on doing this, we will continue to have a shortage of farm help and our farms will become larger and larger, and I would just guess that within 20 years from now or maybe even sooner there'll be only half the farmers remaining on the farm today. Land values and machinery prices are just away beyond the ability of any young individual to afford. So, under present policies, there's no hope for the young man who would like to farm, to obtain one or remain on one. So, Mr. Speaker, our university students are getting a tremendous bargain when one compares their cost to the cost of establishing a young man on a farm, or likewise for the person who wants to go into private business. Education is a priority, but there are other priorities that we will have to face up to, and one is to assist the young man who wants to farm. I personally have no sympathy for free tuition for the university student. There is money available for him through interest-free loans or he or she has five months available to work at jobs available to them through summer employment made available by this Government at very good salaries. All they have to do is ask for it and they'll get it.

SOME HON. MEMBERS: – Hear, hear!

MR. BOLDT: – Now, Mr. Speaker, a few of the Members opposite have made some remarks about our transportation policy, that we are anaemic. Well, you know the Socialists would like us to go, the moment the CN or the CP talk about railway abandonment, they want us to go up to a certain area and stir up the people, get them to spend a lot of money, go on marches. Well this is not the way the Provincial Government of today operates. The present Government of Saskatchewan in its deliberations with other provinces, provincial organizations and federal authorities on the question of all this important and massive new transportation legislation believed that the best results could be obtained by working with the groups rather than by taking the narrower, emotional approach which past experience has proven to be less effective. We believe that the application of persuasion gets better results than does compulsion. The results are self-evident in the passing of Bill C-231 which certainly everyone will agree is a vast improvement over the original Bill C-120. Saskatchewan did not get everything it wanted out of the Bill – nor did anyone else. This is understandable in view of the national scope of the legislation. Before we went and prepared the submission on November 1, the Government of Saskatchewan met and consulted with the major Saskatchewan organizations: the Saskatchewan Urban Municipalities Association; the Saskatchewan Association of Rural Municipalities and the Saskatchewan Federation of Agriculture. It is conceivable that our good neighbors opposite might think that anything this government would do might lack color or drive, in this instance called “anaemic.” It is inconceivable, however, that this stigma would also be placed on the good judgment of the three above mentioned major Saskatchewan organizations. The presentation of the Saskatchewan submission was made by the Saskatchewan Government Counsel in Ottawa, referred to as the Ottawa lawyer. This lawyer which ably represents Saskatchewan's interests in Ottawa and who is a product of Saskatchewan, is as well informed as the best on the question of the transportation legislation. We are happy to know that our friends opposite recognized these good

qualities in initially acquiring his services which we subsequently retained.

Much has been said and heard about rail abandonment, particularly in the prairie areas. This is a natural reaction simply because it is in the prairie provinces where much initial ill-planning by the railways occurred. The Royal Commission in their report of 1961-62 pointed out that some of these lines are uneconomic. The railways have been blamed for a loss of traffic on many of their lines. It is also true that people have deserted the railways in favor mainly of road transport. The questions are: are the railways going to be forced to operate uneconomic rail services which ultimately are a cost on the people of Canada or are the railways going to be allowed to dispense with certain of their uneconomic operations which ultimately will benefit the people of Canada – the latter of course guided by strict rules and regulations? The position of Saskatchewan on this matter is well documented in the two submissions to the federal authorities previously mentioned. The Government of Saskatchewan believes the people in the prairies have a good piece of legislation with which to resolve a very acute and real problem. Within the framework of the legislation remain many procedural and administrative problems. For instance, personnel must be selected, procedures established for costing, and others, all of which are subject to pressure of time. Because of time requirements, I have not attempted to cover all aspects of the new transportation legislation. I would like to summarize briefly Saskatchewan's feelings towards this broad legislation. It can be appropriately stated that the new legislation will give to the Canadian people a better integrated transportation network (this includes all media). A major step in the right direction is an appreciation of the necessity to bring all inter-provincial transportation media under one controlling agency. This emphasizes the forward-looking approach taken by those who drafted this momentous piece of legislation under which Canada is bound to benefit for many years to come.

Mr. Speaker, as responsible Minister of the Saskatchewan Government Insurance Office, I would like to say a few words about this corporation. As you know, the Saskatchewan Government Insurance Office serves two main functions. It administers the Automobile Accident Insurance Act and operates on a competitive basis in the general insurance filed in the province. I will deal with each function separately, dealing first with the Automobile Accident Insurance Act.

There is a great deal of interest in Canada, and indeed on the North American continent, concerning the Automobile Accident Insurance Act. As a matter of fact, the entire problem of automobile insurance is the subject of the Royal Commission Legislative Committee and other studies by Provincial Governments in this country. As responsible Minister, I have followed these investigations with more than passing interest, and particularly any reference to the Saskatchewan plan. I believe there is a lack of understanding by many people elsewhere about the Automobile Accident Insurance Act; however, I am sure that this is not the case in Saskatchewan. The Automobile Accident Insurance Act fund continues to operate without any subsidy or grant or payment whatsoever from the Provincial Treasury, or does the Treasury receive any surplus that the Act has built up. We can say without fear of contradiction that rates, increases or otherwise, are a direct result of the driving pattern of Saskatchewan motorists and not at the whim or control of politicians. The only area that the Government has concerned itself

with is the administrative costs, and to this extent, I am pleased to report, Mr. Speaker, that the administration costs have been continually dropping. When the Socialists were operating this plan, from 1962 to 1963, the administrative costs stood at 20 per cent and 20 cents out of every \$1 went to the Socialists' administration. In 1963-64 it improved a little, but by 1966-67, we were down to 12 per cent. This means that the cost of administration, adjusting and litigation is 12 cent on every \$1 of premiums paid by Saskatchewan motorists.

SOME HON. MEMBERS: – Hear, hear!

MR. BOLDT: – A further advantage to the driving public is the fact that interest earned on the premiums collected is plowed back into the fund. This amount is sizeable and was almost \$400,000 or four per cent of premiums written in 1962-63. Today it has reached an all-time high; in 1966, the interest accumulated was almost \$700,000 or at an interest rate of five per cent, the end result being that administrative cost is decreasing percentage-wise and the investment interest to the Act Fund has increased percentage-wise. This means the motoring public is getting a better insurance bargain than ever before. The accumulative surplus in the fund is now approximately \$1,000,000 which is short of the minimum level of \$2,000,000 set some years ago. We are also confident, however that the Saskatchewan Government Insurance Office's recommendations will keep this fund at a safe level in the coming year, despite the fact that over the last two years the motoring public received the greatest return for their dollar. In the licence year ending April 30, 1965, 91 cents out of every dollar was returned in claims. In the licence year ending April 30, 1966, 96 cents out of every dollar as returned in claims. This licence year, while it still has three months to run, will show a proportionately high return to the motorist. This compares to the 20-year average of 85 cents on the dollar return to the motorist.

Now I'd like to deal with the general business. I think sufficient time has now elapsed to give an intelligent analysis of the effects of removing the compulsory controls of schools, hospitals, Crown corporations and government business. I'm sorry that the Member from Hanley (Mr. Walker) isn't here because I'm sure he could learn from this. We all know that schools, hospitals, Crown corporations and departments of government were paying too much for their insurance prior to the opening of this type of business to competition. There are many examples of this, and in case my friends opposite want them I'll read some out to them.

Saskatchewan Government Telephones as an example. The Saskatchewan Government Insurance Office bid a premium of \$229,000. They were high by \$172,000, the successful bid being \$56,000. In this insurance alone there was a saving of \$172,000. This premium we didn't get, but it certainly was a saving to Saskatchewan Government Telephones.

Let's take a look at another example. This one caused quite an uproar in Saskatoon. I'll just read from the Saskatoon Star Phoenix of October 19, 1965. The headline reads:

Collegiate Board Wants to Know Why SGIO Reduced New Premium.

The story reads:

Saskatoon Collegiate Board is to ask the SGIO why a new premium for city collegiate schools is almost half the cost of the previous one. The Board considered seven tenders on Monday, received as a result of the Provincial Government's decision to put school insurance coverage out to open competition. It accepted a low tender of \$18,000 from the SGIO for eight schools over a 39-month period. Previously the Board had paid \$37,000 to cover seven collegiates for 36 months. All seven bids were substantially lower than the premium previously paid by the Board. The high bid of \$23,000 was \$14,000 less than that previously paid to SGIO.

I could go on to read further. One of the trustees said that the Board was obviously overcharged in past years.

Board members agreed with his suggestion that SGIO be asked for an explanation of the reduction, and whether a rebate on premiums previously paid could be forthcoming. The business assistant to the Collegiate Board said that the new SGIO tender would insure the Board for a total of \$10,000,000 in fire insurance compared to \$8,000,000 under the old contract.

Ross Finder, Board chairman, said he wonder how SGIO could submit a tender that was half the cost for the previous coverage for one additional school over a longer period.

Trustee Austin Forsythe said it was amazing to note what throwing the field open to competition could do. Trustees said they might have been overcharged \$6,000 a year for the past 20 years for insurance coverage.

This is what the Socialists do to the educational field, overcharging premiums and you have to add that to the cost. I think it would suffice to say, however, that hundreds of thousands of dollars in premiums have been saved by the boards of hospitals, schools, etc., since section 15 was removed by the present Liberal Government.

SOME HON. MEMBERS: – Hear, hear!

MR. BOLDT: – How has SGIO fared with this rates? The Saskatchewan Government Insurance Office I'm pleased to report has been able to adapt itself to Liberal policy operating on a competitive basis with no help.

SOME HON. MEMBERS: – Hear, hear!

MR. BOLDT: – We have every confidence that the management, staff, and agents of this corporation could compete without legislation forcing business into their hands.

MR. M.P. PEDERSON (Arm River): – Mr. Speaker, may I . . . I wonder if the Minister would permit a question at this point. You mention the competitive position and I'm wondering if you're referring to the type of advertisement that appeared in the February 10th issue of the Carillon, the university students' paper here in Regina. It's very short. I'll read it.

The Pill may be sufficient for some but Government Insurance gives you a lot of protection too. See your Government Insurance Agent Like Now.

It is reported as got out by the Government Insurance. Is this the type of competitive position that you're talking about?

MR. BOLDT: – I'm informed that the editor of the Carillon is nothing but a Socialist so I wouldn't even want to comment.

SOME HON. MEMBERS: – Hear, hear!

MR. BOLDT: – Why don't you ask them? We haven't paid for that advertisement I'm sure.

MR. BLAKENEY: – We hate the Socialists.

MR. BOLDT: – Of course, if you want . . .

MR. PEDERSON: – Paid by . . .

MR. BOLDT: – I don't think so.

MR. PEDERSON: – Do you use it?

MR. BOLDT: – You are permitted to use the pill.

SOME HON. MEMBERS: – Hear, hear!

MR. BOLDT: – We have every confidence that management, staff, and agents of this corporation could compete without legislation forcing business into their hands. They are now receiving a larger portion of the Saskatchewan premium income than ever before and the Socialists were selling it down the river. As a matter of fact, this might be of interest to them. The SGIO portion of total business written in the province is increasing. In 1964, this was the peak Socialist year. Prior to the removal of Section 15 when they had all the schools and all the hospitals and all the Crown corporation buildings under the Saskatchewan Government Insurance Act, they wrote 31 per cent of the net premium income in Saskatchewan. In 1965, since we removed this compulsion and we are not competing, we wrote 40 per cent which is an increase despite the fact that they now compete and despite the fact that competition meant a substantial reduction in premiums. Not only were they getting a larger portion of the premiums in this province but as matter of record they made during that year the greatest profit in history. Their success continues. When the results are tabled for 1966 you will find that they have more policy holders than ever before, have written more premiums than ever before, and have the largest profits ever returned to the Provincial Treasury.

SOME HON. MEMBERS: – Hear, hear!

MR. BOLDT: – I know my friends opposite thought that the removal of restricting legislation pertaining to insurance purchases for schools and hospitals would adversely affect the Saskatchewan Government Insurance Office. I submit, Mr. Speaker this difference of opinion is one of political philosophy, and the

results leave no doubt as to who is right. Mr. Speaker, there will be amendments to the Auto Accident Insurance Act brought in at this session of which I will speak further. These amendments will make it possible to surcharge the accident-prone. I am sure this policy has the approval of the public at large. Mr. Speaker, you will no doubt be aware that I shall not support the amendment but shall support the motion.

SOME HON. MEMBERS: – Hear, hear!

MR. G.T. SYNDER (Moose Jaw City): – Mr. Speaker, before he takes his seat, in view of the fact that SGIO has just enjoyed the best year in its history, I wonder if the Minister could tell us why when I paid my premium in October of this year, the premium rates in the city of Moose Jaw have been increased by some 40 per cent.

MR. BOLDT: – The only answer I can give him is that he's a very poor risk.

SOME HON. MEMBERS: – Hear, hear!

MR. J.R. BROCKELBANK (Kelsey): – Could I ask another question. Are we to take it that this statement of the Minister applies to all those in Saskatchewan who had their policies, their premium increased that they are all poor risks you mean?

MR. BOLDT: – Did he have a question, Mr. Speaker?

SOME HON. MEMBERS: – Hear, hear!

MR. BROCKELBANK: – I'm sorry the Minister can't understand.

MR. W.J. BEREZOWSKY (Cumberland): – Mr. Speaker, I'm sure that I won't be able to entertain the House as we've been entertained in the last half hour by the Minister of Highways (Mr. Boldt). I promised myself this being Centennial Year, that I should be very kind to the Members on the Government side today. But if it so happens that there may be something that appears to be harsh, it will be accepted as such.

Now, Mr. Speaker, I have to speak off the cuff today. I like other prepared my speech but it so happens that my notes are still on this tape, but I'll do the best I can this evening. And so my first words are congratulations to the over and seconder of the Throne Speech. I think that I can honestly say that the presentation was excellent and well done. They were good speeches but as far as the arguments presented to this House, that of course is a different matter and I would not be true to myself if I said these were good. If anything, the arguments presented by both the over and seconder were biased, narrow and I think in poor taste. And this of course is exactly in line with the arguments we have heard from Hon. Members on the Government side in this debate. Let me illustrate. I have never in my life heard a more vicious attack by a laboring man (and farmers are laboring men) against another laboring man. I think that the two speeches which opened this debate were worse in that respect than any capitalist could have invented against his slave. And from time to time we've heard charges against Her Majesty's Loyal Opposition which belong pretty well in the same

category. Otherwise the speakers were good.

SOME HON. MEMBERS: – Hear, hear!

MR. BEREZOWSKY: – Now I want to say a few things about the Premier of our province. When I came to this Legislature, I heard Government Members of this House rationalizing and making excuses for our Premier concerning an article in the Canadian. I happened to get a copy and as I read it over, I was both ashamed and amused. On the other hand, Mr. Speaker, this is only a profile and the Premier or no one else should be surprised if a reporter or a stranger comes into our province and gets a mental impression of individuals with whom he comes in contact. The Premier had got exactly what he deserved, Mr. Speaker.

MR. HEALD: – Agree with the article?

MR. BEREZOWSKY: – And no amount of rationalization by the Attorney General (Mr. Heald) or by the Member for Athabasca (Mr. Guy) will make any difference. After all I don't blame them for trying to smooth things out on the radio so the people of Saskatchewan should hear that the Premier isn't such a person as has been depicted because every mother must praise her child no matter what a monster it may be. I have some opinions of the Premier too and I'm going to express them today in this House and I'm going to be as truthful as I honestly can be. My opinion may not be amusing. I'm not accusing the Premier of anything nor am I saying that I don't like him because we clash at times. I think the Premier is an actor. For instance when the Premier goes down to Washington he is a good American. When he goes down to Toronto to meet with his friends from Bay Street and from St. James Street, oh, then he's a great Canadian. He is not a very good friend of the Indians for he belittles our Indians and says how few of them keep their jobs and how they breed like rabbits. He's a good actor and when he speaks in this House, off radio, he jumps up and down. He shouts and he accuses us, calls us names, but when, oh when, he is on the radio he becomes a statesman, and purrs like a kitten. That is my impression of the Premier. I think he is a first class actor and I think he missed his calling, Mr. Speaker. He should have gone to Hollywood.

All through this session, Mr. Speaker, and through the last two or three sessions we've heard charges against Hon. Members on this side, who are part of this Legislature as being such terrible socialists. Yet these actors on the government side of the House have retained legislation which we socialists brought into effect and there's very little of it that they have changed. When talking and boasting about Liberal progress, they say that this is their legislation. That of course is not true. It doesn't matter whether they talk about industrial development or the progress with Indians, the story is the same. Programs that the CCF started they today call their own. They can't come up with anything better, Mr. Speaker, than to copy and adopt what the socialists have brought into effect and that's fine with us as I think our programs and policies were good. But I think that the government should be trying to find ways and means to improve on these socialists programs and policies and try to make this a better province, and so maybe I should discuss socialism and what it means to me, Mr. Speaker.

The group on this side of the House, represent modern

thinking in line with world trends which is a transition toward a better life for mankind and a freer life, so I'm proud to be called a Socialist. When Hon. Members on the Government side slur and call me Socialist, then I'm proud that I am working, Mr. Speaker, for society, for the good of other people, be they teachers or farmers or businessmen and others. I'm proud to be a Socialist and I'm proud to build a good society. And surely as society becomes more complex and its problems more diversified and difficult, we in the Legislature must modify our thinking and bring in whatever legislation is necessary to lead out people forward to such a better life that I have in mind. In other words we must do the right things right and we must do them at the right time, otherwise, Mr. Speaker, I am sure that this system which the Hon. Members opposite praise as being free enterprise would crash into a chasm and would never appear again.

Instead we would have war and misery and depression. Those of us who are old enough have lived through all that and it is only because we do not want to repeat that kind of thing in the next century that we work toward social democracy or Socialism as you call it. And I say that humanity must go forward so that we have greater happiness and security. Surely then, Mr. Speaker, we can and must produce more schools where schools are necessary. We must produce more opportunities for education where it is necessary to have more education and surely it's a black mark on our society when this Government which has been in existence for three years denied 800 students the right to an education. These young people will never regain what they have lost, Mr. Speaker. Surely it is the responsibility of the Government to bring in Socialistic legislation, if you call it, which provides security for the aged and for the helpless. And surely we must have recreational centres for young people so that they can grow up healthy both in mind and in body and we must have libraries for their edification. And why? Because, Mr. Speaker, we are human beings, we are not animals. We have a destiny in the future and it is thus the responsibility of governments to see that humanity goes forward to that destiny and a future. I think, Mr. Speaker, it is true to say that this kind of philosophy I believe in, and my honorable friends call Socialism, is the proper name. Through Socialism we are going to get to those goals of human destiny in the fastest possible time. We can't say behind other countries, when other countries are going forward. Are we Canadian in this day and age going to stay behind or shall we work together with the rest of the world towards progress?

Now, Mr. Speaker, this is Centennial Year and as I said a while ago, I may not have another opportunity to speak a hundred years hence, I'm sure I won't. So I cannot help but speak of the pioneers that came to this country many years ago from the country of my fathers and the country of your fathers. I can see in my mind's eye the early immigrants from the Ukraine, from Poland, from Czechoslovakia, from Ireland, wherever it may be particularly from the central European countries, coming to this land, not able to speak the English language, and not knowing what to do with themselves and yet hoping that they would find something that they never had in the old country. And I think that it is proper for us in this year to remember them in this House. We must remember when they came to this country that they did not leave their beloved land that they were born in because it was not a beautiful land or because the songs and the stories and the people back home were not wonderful. They came for some other reason and I think, Mr. Speaker, that it would be proper to

mention two main reasons why many of these people came to this country. They came to this country for two reasons. One was to find freedom.

MR. CODERRE: – They found socialism.

MR. BEREZOWSKY: – Nonsense! My people were socialists when they came to this country. They fled from capitalism, Mr. Speaker. You can't tell me. I know. You should have lived there then and you would have known better than to talk such nonsense at this time.

But I do not intend to talk about my personal relatives. Mr. Speaker, I'm talking about many people who came to this country and I know many of them, many of them who could speak four and five languages . . .

AN HON. MEMBER: – All at once?

MR. BEREZOWSKY: – . . . but who couldn't speak English. They filed on a quarter section of land where there was no home, where there was nothing, but wilderness, but they were fortunate! They met people speaking a foreign language kind enough to give them domicile in a granary. Many of these immigrants walked straight. Yes, they may have had big walrus moustaches but they were able to walk straight because they had served either in the Czar's Imperial Army or in the Austrian Imperial Army or some other Imperial army. They were trained men, disciplined men. They were good settlers for this country though they were looked upon as men in sheepskin coats and as something that was inferior. It took many years for that opinion to change, Mr. Speaker. Yes, they were called bohunks, they were called foreigners, they were called Galicians, they were called anything and everything. Today you find these same people integrated into our society in Canada. I happened to be one of them in this Legislature and so I am very proud today in the commemorating of this birthday and in giving tribute to all of these pioneer people.

I said that there were two reasons why they came in Canada. Many of these people in Europe, Mr. Speaker, down deep in their hearts understood what freedom was because once they had been free men until the Junkers, or Polish Pans or the robber barons dispossessed people off their land, enslaving them into serfs. They suffered for centuries of time until completely dispossessed of their land, many of the people came to Canada. True, many of them were illiterates. So they came to Canada to find freedom.

The other reason why they came was to find some economic security. I'm very proud today to say that in spite of our differences of political ideologies, to some extent at least we have found these two great freedoms here in Canada. Not entirely in one case, pretty well in the other. We have the freedom to stand up and to speak our minds and stand up as free men anywhere in Canada. But economically we are still controlled by barons and establishments that are here too.

Now, Mr. Speaker, I would like to get at the Throne Speech for a few minutes. I'll have more to say at another time. One of the things mentioned in the Throne Speech is of course, the homeowner grants. Once again I must say in this House that if we are to have a good name across the country we must be honest

and truthful. If there's any suspicion at all, we will of course get one kind or another of punishment. Nearly everybody in Saskatchewan who owns land and a home, gets a homeowner grant, but not everybody, sir. There are all kinds of little kinks and some of them I have discussed with the Minister of Municipal Affairs (Mr. McIsaac). He tells me that some of these are going to be corrected and I think him for that information but I'm particularly opposed to the kind of propaganda that the Liberal Government sends out to the homeowners of this province who get the grant. They get a letter like this, sir, from the office of the Provincial Treasurer. In one corner you have a picture of a pulp mill, in the other corner you have a base metal mine; in the third corner is shown a potash mine and then there is an oil well in the last corner. I'm not going to read the whole letter, Mr. Speaker.

SOME HON. MEMBERS: – Hear, hear!

MR. BEREZOWSKY: – I will read the last paragraph and I will let this House judge whether the Premier has been honest with the people of Saskatchewan. He says, "The enclosed grant is your dividend from this industrial development and it is not subject to income tax."

SOME HON. MEMBERS: – Hear, hear!

MR. BEREZOWSKY: – Well now, that's nice. Now, Mr. Speaker, I would like to ask a question of the Ministers responsible or the Member for West Prince Albert (Mr. Steuart), (I happen to be the Member from East Prince Albert, so I hope the Member doesn't forget when he says he's the Member for Prince Albert that the pulp mill is in my constituency). I'd like to ask him and any Minister in this House and the Premier just what dividends has this Government obtained from the pulp mill. All that you've done so far is invest \$25,000,000 or \$30,000,000 and will eventually invest \$50,000,000 of tax money that belongs to the people of Saskatchewan. You are paying interest on that money and will continue for a long time. We are glad to have a mill – don't get me wrong and don't misrepresent my words – but the statement in this letter is not true, Mr. Speaker. This pulp mill has not earned one cent of dividend for the Province of Saskatchewan and the Premier of this Government has no right to give our people this kind of misinformation. It's propaganda plain and simple, Liberal political propaganda, and I challenge anyone in the House to prove differently. Now let's take a look at the base metal mines.

HON. D.G. STEUART (Minister of Natural Resources): – Peanut mine.

MR. BEREZOWSKY: – Yes, a peanut mine. In three years all it has made, Mr. Speaker, is some \$100,000 or \$200,000 profit. That's all they have been able to come up with and they haven't paid royalties yet. This mine hasn't paid this Government one cent of royalty; as a matter of fact we spent millions of dollars on roads for the company. We built a special road so they can take their ore down to Flin Flon, and that's good. We'll use it too for moose hunting as well.

SOME HON. MEMBERS: – Hear, hear!

MR. BEREZOWSKY: – But this mine, Mr. Speaker, and this is the point I'm trying to get across, has not produced for the Government of Saskatchewan any dividends as yet, but the Premier signs his name to the document saying, "The enclosed grant is your dividend."

MR. CODERRE: – . . . jobs . . .

MR. BEREZOWSKY: – You don't have to tell me about jobs. I know that all that's on your brain is jobs! jobs! carry water! split wood! and be satisfied. No dividends for the people of Saskatchewan. The resources are there but somebody else should benefit from the royalties that belong to us under this Government.

AN HON. MEMBER: – Tell the truth!

MR. BEREZOWSKY: – That should shut you up, Mr. Minister. That's your opinion of what the rights of labor are, jobs and nothing else.

Now take potash. It's not so long ago that the Premier was running round Canada and running to Ottawa to the Prime Minister of Canada telling him that he must relieve the company down here at Belle Plains from paying royalties and taxes. He said they should have the same kind of tax-free period as the hard rock mines had. I talked to people who worked at Kalium, persons in a responsible position who say the mine is doing very well, Mr. Speaker. No doubt they should be paying some taxes to Canada and to the Province of Saskatchewan! The Premier recently announced that he is going to levy a tax on these potash mines but so far you have not been collecting any taxes to speak of from these mines and you can't produce the evidence that you have as your letter says, "These are dividends for the people of Saskatchewan from the resources developed under the Liberals." I say, Mr. Speaker, that the Government that stoops to such low propaganda should be thoroughly ashamed of itself and certainly should be punished. It isn't going to get it any votes in the next election and a number of them are going to be told just that. I am going to take this letter around and show it to every voter in my constituency and in the constituency of the Hon. Member for West Prince Albert (Mr. Steuart). You won't be here, sir, after the next election and I'm quite serious.

MR. STEUART: – If you don't like the homeowner grants, if I were you I'd send back my cheque.

MR. BEREZOWSKY: – I did send my cheque back to the CCF fund. I gave it to a political party that is beneficial for the people of Saskatchewan.

SOME HON. MEMBERS: – Hear, hear!

MR. BEREZOWSKY: – And now, Mr. Speaker, let's get into the Throne Speech again, agricultural income is mentioned, the biggest ever. Of course, I am a farmer and have some experience in farming. I also prepare income tax returns for some of the peanut farmers over there like myself. Some who operate three quarter sections and quarter sections and I can tell you this, sir, that I still have to come up with a balance sheet of say such sized farmers,

of ordinary farmers producing cattle and grain and so forth that can show a taxable income. I did one just the other day for a half-section farmer. He sold cattle, he sold hogs, and other farm produce, sir, and his total income after depreciation was about some \$350. Yet, this Government will come out in the Throne Speech and tell the people of Saskatchewan and the people of Canada that Saskatchewan's crop was the best on record and our farmers are realizing the highest returns ever. Nonsense, after the last war the farmers had much better net income than they have right now. This is true and every farmer knows it. The Throne statement is a lot of hogwash. Get out and do some farming yourself. Ask the Minister of Agriculture (Mr. McFarlane) who farms, how much money he made farming. Let him get up and tell me that he made a profit.

MR. STEUART: – He's wealthy rich!

MR. BEREZOWSKY: – Unless he has another job, and he has another job. Now, look at him turning red in the face. He knows I'm telling the truth!

SOME HON. MEMBERS: – Hear, hear!

MR. BEREZOWSKY: – Now, Mr. Speaker, as I say I'm not trying to offend anybody in this Legislature, but I'm standing here as the Member of my constituency and I want this Government to tell the world the truth about the farm situation. Otherwise, we as farmers can't put up the proper kind of fight for our rights. Our farm unions can't fight alone. Our pools and our cooperatives can't fight alone. We must have the assistance of the Government to fight and it's about time that in this Centennial Year at least that we smartened up.

SOME HON. MEMBERS: – Hear, hear!

MR. BEREZOWSKY: – I remember something that happened years ago and I'll mention it again. I got up in this House, I think it was in 1952 or 1953, Mr. Speaker, and I mentioned that the farmers were squeezed. I think I mentioned that half the farmers had left their land. I knew I was telling the truth and I remember the Hon. Member for Cannington (Mr. McCarthy), and he is a very fine gentleman, sir, but he got up in the House and said that the Member for Cumberland didn't know what he was talking about. "Why," he said, "the farmers have never had it so good in the history of Canada." We hear the same thing now. God help the farmers if that's the best that the farmers ever had or what they have now. I say I think we have a responsibility to this largest of industries in Saskatchewan to tell Canada and Canadians the truth and not try to divide labor against the farmers and farmers against labor or leave the impression that farmers are making a lot of money, which is not true. I want the press to print this truth. If they don't believe me let them go out to the people on farms that know these facts even better than I do and so get the truth across to the people of our province and of our country. And let's fight elections on philosophy, on principles, and not on false promises and propaganda.

If you are free enterprisers and win your elections as free enterprisers, we'll win ours as Socialists. I am not worried about myself and I'm not as ambitious as is the Member for West

Prince Albert (Mr. Steuart). My only ambition is to serve my people well and that's good enough for me.

Mr. Speaker, nothing has been mentioned here about what the Government will do to help the farmers with their marketing problems. Just recently my son who has a store has been trading groceries for eggs at 35 cents a dozen. He sent in a few cases of these eggs to Prince Albert to the grading station there and do you know what he got a dozen, sir, for fresh A and B eggs? They were graded as mostly C, averaging 13 cents a dozen. Last year he shipped out 300 dozen of such ungraded eggs which cost 30 cents to 35 cents a dozen, according to the University of Saskatchewan, to produce a dozen eggs. This is a private enterprise in flower and here is a Government sitting back with nothing in the Throne Speech to show what it will do to help the farmers either to organize marketing agencies or do something else about it. The Socialists did something about it in some of the areas of production. We guaranteed fishermen in the North – the Hon. Member for Athabasca (Mr. Guy) should know that – a minimum a pound for every pound of fish that is produced on the northern lakes.

MR. STEUART: – Who said?

MR. BEREZOWSKY: – Even this two cents is better than what you have done. It never was two cents. Mr. Speaker, the Hon. Member always likes to minimize or exaggerate. I know that it may have been so with jackfish or mullets, but for white fish up as far as Reindeer Lake where the transportation was quite costly, I am sure it was at least six cents but if I'm wrong it won't be much off. In other places we guaranteed eight cents and 10 cents depending on the type of fish. We did give guarantees but mostly we didn't have to use those guarantees because we found good markets for the product and as a result the fishermen were happy with prices obtained.

And this Government could do the same for egg producers. You could do the same for hog producers, helping them to organize marketing boards for orderly marketing. But when the farmers sometimes do want marketing boards, what do you do? You use your means of publicity and everything to try and destroy the chance of even establishing marketing boards.

And what has this Government done about farm machinery? Do you realize, Mr. Speaker, that a few years ago a combine, a good combine, a large combine, could be bought for \$3,000 to \$5,000. Do you realize that for some of the biggest combines this year, you have to pay as high as \$14,000 to \$15,000? And do you realize that it takes a lifetime of work to buy one single combine and that every one of us knows that none of these combines are worth that kind of money. I know, and you know, that these combines aren't worth that. They're worth probably half that price and no more. When you look at the financial statements of machine companies you find that instead of making a \$1,000,000 or \$2,000,000 a year for the shareholders as was the case a few years ago, they now make \$30,000,000 and \$40,000,000 and at that they are not satisfied. They still threaten to raise prices.

MR. I.C. NOLLET (Cutknife): – Of course, it's labor's fault.

MR. BEREZOWSKY: – And my goodness, Mr. Speaker, where is the farmer going to

get more money? I'm an average farmer and I had difficulty in getting enough expense money this fall before the payments came in. Banks put a squeeze on us farmers, so where do you get the money to buy all this expensive machinery? And what is this Government doing about the whole situation?

MR. G.T. SYNDER (Moose Jaw City): – Social aid.

MR. BEREZOWSKY: – Social aid is right. And then if you want social aid, of course, it's been discussed, you know what happens so I don't need to discuss it now.

Now take the business of land allocation. I know the Minister (Mr. McFarlane) is a honest man and maybe he doesn't know about this, well I'm telling him right now. I was in his office the first of the session a year ago. I mean in his deputy's office. I had a case which is well known to this House about two returned men that were living on this land. I went to his office and I was assured at the time that these men could buy the land. Mr. Speaker, by the time I prepared an application to purchase for these people to sign and by the time they could sign the letter, the Minister's department disposed of this land to a third party and the Kennedy family had to leave. These were veterans, returned men who spent five years of their lives in Germany during the last war. Maybe they were not good farmers, Mr. Minister, and I told you that, but this was their home. This is the home of their parents. This is where they lived and they paid their taxes. I ask, why was I assured that they could buy the land and then two weeks later they were dispossessed. I don't know. There are some unpleasant things I know about other land. Last year I mentioned in this House about certain land allocation. The Minister at that time said something like this, "Your son has some land." Well my son never got any land. I did apply for some lease land which was adjacent to me because I wanted to make a farm unit for my son who quit the Department of Natural Resources, but what happened? I applied, other people applied but a farmer by the name of Bodnarchuk got the land. Mr. Bodnarchuk never supported the Socialists. I can assure of that. But he got the land. The Allocation Board gave this man the land because he needed it the most and because he needed it more than I did. So I did not appeal and three or four of the other farmers who are decent farmers in the district did not appeal, but some did. One of them came to me and angrily said, "How is it that a CCFer can get land now under the Liberals?" These local Liberals then used every effort to dispossess Bodnarchuk of this land. After the appeal one of their men got it. He had formerly held a quarter from the local Improvement District 959 a few years ago. He didn't pay his taxes and these arrears are still unpaid. He couldn't use the land for any purpose at all and now he gets this half section away from a man who needs it. I suppose the only reason is that one is presumed to be other than a Liberal, while the successful applicant is definitely a Liberal because he's in the Liberal organization there.

We have another situation which the Minister should know and look into if you're going to have honest government and that's what I'm talking about.

The local President of the Liberals in the poll in that community, where I have a farm, has considerable land. He didn't need any more but there was a lease coming up a year ago, and a

number of people from Weirdale wanted this lease and I'm sure the Minister knows about the land. These needy people from Weirdale didn't get it. The Liberal got it and how did he get it? He applied for the land and his son signed the application. He got another man who has no cattle, but sheep, to apply for the land, and they got a fourth fellow that works out in British Columbia as a laborer but has a farm up here, to sign for the land. These four, I understand, got the lease. Liberals, four Liberal, and then the Hon. Members opposite dare get up on their feet and state that their program is better than ours. I am not pointing a finger at the Allocation Board, but somewhere by the time it leaves the Allocation Board and gets to the Liberal party, something happens to a lot of these allocations and a number of these people to whom the land is granted are dispossessed. All I'm saying, Mr. Minister . . .

MR. MCFARLANE: – Where's the Allocation Board.

MR. BEREZOWSKY: – You can find it out if you inquire. I'll give you the land description. It is in Township 53, range 23, somewhere around section 31.

Now, Mr. Speaker, I see I still have time. I am enjoying myself as I don't often get an opportunity like this, sir. This is very much like a political meeting. Another thing I'd like to point out, and I pointed this out repeatedly, Mr. Speaker, concerns the housing problem in the farm communities such as mine. There are farms around Regina, Rosetown, Kamsack and other places where we have well-to-do farmers who got established early in the century and who are able to carry on fairly well. Those aren't the ones that are really suffering today, but those who have their farms out in the southwest where the mover of the motion (Mr. Hooker) lives and he should know about it. And then farmers along the northeast and northwest right through along the fringe of the settlement, who live, as the Member from West Prince Albert (Mr. Steuart) knows, on small parcels of land, do have problems. I have during my campaigning seen many places in northern Saskatchewan, and I can only say, Mr. Speaker, that it breaks your heart to see some of the disgraceful conditions under which many people live, not native Indians but people of European origin, English, Irish, Scotch, Ukrainian, German, or whatever else they may be, living in hovels that are a disgrace to this country. Let us in this century make a resolution. Let's do something about it. I've asked for this in previous years. I pointed out that there has been a study by ARDA made in the Torch River municipality. I have pointed out that 60 or 80 per cent of the houses there were not fit for human habitation. Isn't it time that the Government smartened up and got together, got their heads together with the federal authorities so that Central Housing and Mortgage can make money available so these people could construct decent houses.

MR. GUY (Athabasca): – Speak to them.

MR. BEREZOWSKY: – Yes, we spoke to them and we eventually got a program for the Indian Métis for which this Government is trying to take credit today. If we had not had that program you'd be talking for the next three years, but we did the negotiating. The Hon. Member from Athabasca (Mr. Guy) shouldn't open his big mouth so often and then he wouldn't get into trouble every time he does so. But I'm suggesting to the Government this is something

Mr. Speaker, that we as good Canadians can do. Let's build a foundation for these smaller farms. After all you don't have to have 10,000 acres or 1,000 acres to be a successful farmer. One can make a success on a quarter section of land or even less in specialization. Yes, to specialize in growing seed, or maybe in raising fruit trees, or something like that and it can be done. It can be done with cattle, and with sheep, that is if you have other land for forage. It can be done, and we should try to do something about it, first of all to see that these people keep their roots on the small farms. I hope that this Government will take a good look at the situation and if it can use our ADA program which was brought in by the former Minister for the people in Cumberland House to establish two or three of them with cattle, then surely ADA can be used for the rest of the people of Saskatchewan who live in similar circumstances. And surely you should be able to arrive at some kind of arrangement with Ottawa to bring in a good housing program and then use the ADA legislation which the CCF passed in 1964 as well as to provide water and sewage for these homes. But you can't do it if you expect these farmers to raise money when there is no money to raise, the money's not there. I ask, will the people have to live in poverty on social assistance or else will you do something about it as a Government?

Only one or two more items do I wish to mention because I want to leave most of my remarks for the next debate. And this has to do with hospitals. I think, Mr. Speaker, that first of all I am very happy to have heard the Premier announce, after he presented us with the Throne Speech, of the plan for the Regina Base Hospital. I don't know what converted him to the decision of building a base hospital in Regina, but whatever did it. I'm glad he is converted.

MR. NOLLET: – I think it was the Minister of Highways (Mr. Boldt) and the Minister of Health (Mr. Grant).

MR. BEREZOWSKY: – I'm glad that this hospital is going to be paid for by all the people of Saskatchewan. I'm glad that we're paying for a base hospital as we did for the university Hospital at Saskatoon, but not happy that in Prince Albert where we have a hospital under construction for not only the people of that Union Hospital district but for all the people of the North, that local people are to be taxed for the structure. People ask me the question that is going to be asked quite often, "Why is it that we have to pay the tax when everybody else from far away is going to use this hospital?" and I think that this is a moot point. I think the time has come for it to be under universal hospitalization, which is here to stay and because we have medical care insurance. We're going to have other programs according to the Liberals themselves, such as free drugs when these programs should be paid from general funds. We are going to get these things eventually anyway. Why not look into the future and say to ourselves that any major hospital that we build, we build at the cost of the public of Saskatchewan with the help of the people of Canada.

The reason that I'm saying this is not only because everybody uses these hospitals, but also because there is unnecessary waste. I happen to be on a hospital board in Prince Albert, and I do know that there is some waste that could be avoided if the Government were more closely involved. For example, we are building a complex in Prince Albert. We are building two wings.

So what happens? The contractor has to set up temporary furnaces to heat these parts that are being built. This costs the contractor a lot of money. I asked the contractor about it and he said that it cost him an extra \$100 a month which he didn't anticipate when he made his bid; it's all very expensive. Why put in a permanent heating unit right from the start, instead of putting in a temporary one, then having to remove it and setting up the permanent one later. These are the kind of things that happen. For example, I had another experience and the Minister from West Prince Albert (Mr. Steuart) has heard about it and it is true. I asked the question at one of the board meetings about certain land that was acquired from, I think a Mrs. Scobey. I asked: what did we pay for this land? The administrator said \$9,000. I should have shut up then but I didn't and I said, "Well how much did Mrs. Scobey get?" And he said \$3,400. And I exclaimed, "Who got the difference? \$5,600 lost in the transaction." Well, because the Board is set up the way it is, somebody in the real estate business smelled a chance to make himself a handsome profit. By the time our agents got around to writing up the deal the price was \$9,000 demanded by a third party. Yet we could have got it for \$3,400. These are the kind of things that are happening all the time, Mr. Speaker, and I think that if the government became more involved, and more responsible for the construction of these hospitals that much public money could be saved.

I also think that hospital boards should be elected instead of appointed as they are now and I would like to see the Government bring in legislation to that effect. I'm not going to discuss the merits of it at this time but I think there is a lot of merit to my suggestion.

Another place where the Government is wasteful and nothing has been mentioned in the Throne Speech about this one. I refer to training camps that are being established. I think the motivation is good. I think it's a good thing that the Government or the Forest Products Branch of the Timber Board decided to put up training camps such as the one at Squaw Rapids. However, when you are dealing with people who are coming out or the first time from trapping and northern areas into what are more modern communities, they find themselves lost in our complex communities and they must be handled very, very carefully. And whatever you do it must be of such a nature that it will appeal to these people. Now what happened in Squaw Rapids? They have excellent camps there and I never argued with that. Mr. Minister, as a matter of fact I heard that the Premier – and he could tell me different – when he was down in Calgary attending a big dinner with some of his business friends, had to show his appreciation to his hosts and so he ordered these five or six trailers at about \$10,000 each. If I am wrong I would . . .

MR. STEUART: – Mr. Speaker, on a point of privilege, that's not right.

MR. BEREZOWSKY: – Maybe the Minister would tell me whether they were tendered for?

MR. STEUART: – They were bought by the Timber Board and they were tendered for, and they were bought by the Timber Board.

MR. BEREZOWSKY: – I accept that then, but I

didn't hear the story that way. Now I'll ask a question in the House in due course so to prove that that is so. I accept that. The fact is that they are good camps, they cost \$10,000 a piece and there are five of them there, costing \$50,000. There is good food there, the training period was good too. They received \$35 a week for being trained how to use a saw to cut pulp wood with. But what was wrong? I have it here, the return to the question; the amount that was paid to these men after they started actual work. Now the Timber Board or the Forest Products Branch bought some equipment, and the Minister can tell us now if he likes, what it cost. I think about \$140,000. These machines bulldozed trees, (because it's got to be a clear cutting operation.) These men were expected to go and pull these tress out, trim the branches and to pile them into cordwood piles and they were paid a total, (what is it, \$4.50 a cord?) People who know what it costs, what they can earn in a day just don't accept that kind of pay and so everyone quit. One of the public relations men from the Forest Products Branch went down to Candle Lake and offered a similar opportunity of making a fortune to a couple of men there and when he quoted the price they just walked away. Now you are going to have problems and I sympathize with you and your problems, but you can't resolve those problems this way. You must give these men something, some kind of a security. You can't expect men to work for two and one-half months, experienced men in the bush, to work for only \$35 a week and maybe another 20 per cent hold back. Such earnings do not sustain a family. One can't pay his rent. You've got to pay decent wages and if you can't pay a decent wage at least give them a minimum wage, but you don't even do that in your corporation. What is compatible? What kind of minimum do you give these men – \$35 a week and 20 per cent, another \$7 – and expect a man to keep his family and work in the bush the year around at those rates. Well any program that you bring in for the Métis people or for the farmers in that area or for the bushmen, if it isn't better than this, just won't work. If that is the best that this Government can offer through its Crown corporation, then the pulp mill will stand empty for a long time if you don't do something better than that.

Now, Mr. Speaker, I think that I have indicated my displeasure with some of the things that the Government has not done that I think it should have done. I could discuss for hours this vacant space in the Throne Speech. Tough there are some good things there which any government would have done yet the more important things are missing. So you can see quite well that I have no option but to vote against the motion and support the amendment.

SOME HON. MEMBERS: – Hear, hear!

HON. G.B. GRANT (Minister of Health): – Mr. Speaker, the late John Cuelenaere was my desk mate in this House for the first year I was a Member and I found him to be a most sincere and conscientious Member and very helpful during that period. I will, like the rest of the Members in this House sorrowfully miss him and regret him passing.

This is the first opportunity I have had to convey my good wishes to the new Cabinet Member, the Hon. Cy MacDonald. As indicated by other Members, Mr. MacDonald brings to the Cabinet and this government not only youth and vigor but sound judgment as well. During his short term of office as Minister of Industry

Commerce, he certainly aptly demonstrated his ability not only to meet people well but to deal with difficult problems, and I wish him every success in his new portfolio.

SOME HON. MEMBERS: – Hear, hear!

MR. GRANT: – The Opposition, through the Hon. Leader (Mr. Lloyd) and the Hon. Member from Weyburn (Mr. Pepper) have been clamoring noisily that the Government thinks so little of the farmers and rail line abandonment that may take place that we didn't send anyone to Ottawa to make our feelings known. Mr. Speaker, let me inform this House that the present Government is every bit as alert as the previous Government on the ramifications of the new Transportation Bill. Since early 1964 a Cabinet committee has been involved in all discussions involving Saskatchewan and this Bill and its predecessor and that is a continuing committee. As chairman of this committee until last fall, I made representation to various committees at Ottawa, the Minister of the department, departmental personnel on more than one occasion. I'll admit that on one occasion when I was not there, the CCF, Saskatchewan section, sent a spokesman.

Now we are accused of deserting our prairie friends, of ignoring an important hearing and several other things. Now what are the facts? First, the Hon. Minister of Highways (Mr. Boldt) mentioned the solicitor that we used in Ottawa. This solicitor represented us because of the highly technical nature of the hearing. Our solicitor is recognized as a Canadian authority on transportation and on this Bill; secondly, who represented Alberta? Their solicitor. Who represented British Columbia? Their solicitor. Who represented the Maritime provinces? Their solicitor. These provinces, like ourselves, recognized that since the railways had not supplied cost data they could not usefully comment on the maximum rate formula. Mr. Speaker, I can tell this House that it was largely through the leadership of this province during the past three years that collaboration between the provinces has continued, otherwise I fear it would have collapsed.

SOME HON. MEMBERS: – Hear, hear!

MR. GRANT: – I can assure this House that we did not and will not desert our prairie friends. We will continue our active participation in transportation problems particularly as they affect branch lines.

The Hon. Member from Arm River (Mr. Pederson) – and I am glad to see he is with us this evening. I thought I had lost him – commented on the Premier's travels outside Saskatchewan and inquired just what has Saskatchewan done to attract industry to Saskatchewan. Just what has the Government done to attract the major implement manufacturer. Why do we not set up, I believe, opportunities? It is a real pleasure, Mr. Speaker, to answer these questions. First, the people of Saskatchewan elected a Liberal Government which immediately changed the business atmosphere from the former Socialist atmosphere. Our first duty was to let business and industry know that they were now welcome in Saskatchewan, the new Liberal Government would welcome them and help them in every way to establish in this province. The Premier was and is the logical one to do this and I think he has done it well.

SOME HON. MEMBERS: – Hear, hear!

MR. GRANT: – The Department of Industry and Commerce is geared to back up the Government with helpful data and service and to act as a one-stop centre for business inquiries.

With respect to a major implement manufacturer, our Government has energetically and thoroughly canvassed all the major farm implement companies to locate in Saskatchewan. I have personally seen and spoken to each one of the. In their opinion they feel that they do not want to fragment their operations by establishing a manufacturing plant on the prairies. While I can disagree with them nevertheless it is their decision. This is why, Mr. Speaker, I was pleased to announce in the House last week that local companies have combined with an Alberta company to establish in the former General Motors building what we believe will develop into a worthwhile farm machinery manufacturing and assembly plant.

Finally, the Department of Industry and Commerce has a young dynamic deputy, a real salesman for Saskatchewan. He is backed up by staff who are skilled in selling Saskatchewan, and I am sure can accomplish more than a resource committee could. I am sorry the Member from Regina East (Mr. Baker) His Worship the Mayor, is not with us this evening. I suppose that's one of the hazards of his dual-purpose type, as described by the Hon. Member from Arm River (Mr. Pederson). He is out on the banquet circuit, no doubt. A YMCA stint would be more helpful to him and I'm a little concerned as he doesn't look too good these days.

Once again, Mayor Baker has now disappointed us. He came forth once again with his blue-plate special by way of what he called a seven-point program. I don't know of anyone in public life who is better at coming up with these high sounding programs involving huge expenditures by senior levels of government than Mayor Baker. I have long since lost track of the dollars involved in his annual programs. But in his recitation last week I can see some \$15,000,000 or \$20,000,000 being involved. He blithely suggests a two-price system for wheat. Now this is one area I'm not going to get into and I'm not going to get into many other ones. But it doesn't seem too difficult to figure that at \$2.75 for the first 2,000 bushels and \$2 for the balance, that it appears that this could be another federal handout of something in excess of \$10,000,000. Next, he suggests unconditional municipal grants of \$5 per capita, another \$5,000,000. I would suggest that His Worship take a different approach next year and bring in a seven-point program of how senior governments and possibly the city of Regina should be raising money rather than spending it. I am sure that the citizens of Regina would find it very, very refreshing. It would certainly be a change for His Worship.

Mr. Speaker due to the lateness of the house I will now ask leave to adjourn debate.

Debate adjourned.

The Assembly adjourned at 9:55 o'clock p.m.